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**FOREWORD**

The Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture (SASLC) is a collaborative project that aims to produce a reference work summarising current scholarship concerning the knowledge and use of literary sources in Anglo-Saxon England. Departing from J.C.L. Coxe's *Ecgbert's Book* *Name in the English, 940-990*, and incorporating more recent scholarship, the SASLC volume will include contributions from specialists in the various sub-fields of Old English studies. The book is intended to complement other research tools that are either compiled or in progress, viz. the *Dictionary of Old English*, the *Greenfield-Blondheim Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to 1979*, and the *Prose Anglo-Saxon*. When completed, the work of SASLC will exist in multiple forms: codex book, diskette, and loose-leaf binder. The rationale for these different forms is to encourage a continuing process of revision and correction.

This volume is a *Trial Hymn* of the final work. Since the usefulness of a "partial" reference tool could be questioned, it might be appropriate to stress the several purposes here intended. As a preliminary publication in anticipation of the complete volume, this version seeks to serve these several purposes: 1) a test-run for editorial procedures, including input, layout and design; 2) a public document released to solicit even wider field criticism than the project committee has already sought; 3) an efficient sample of the project that will stimulate wider participation from scholars working in Anglo-Saxon studies and related fields; 4) a partial record of work done in the first two years of the project; 5) a publication for many who have successfully participated in the project thus far. There is a sixth and more general aim, which will naturally be more fully realized by the complete volume: to stimulate source work in the field by calling attention to what has been accomplished thus far and to the vast amount of work still remaining to be done. Furthermore, in reviewing the various entries submitted to SASLC so far, the members of the Advisory Committee and the editors of this volume have had privileged access to several up-to-date scholarly summaries of what is known about books and authors known to the English. It seems...
to be in the best tradition of scholarship to share this work at the earliest opportunity within the practical limits imposed by funding constraints. The entries here published for Apocrypha and Hellenistic Latin...are clear and evid- ence examples of such work, which supersede any earlier attempts to col- lect and present similar information regarding the works or authors concerned. The emphasis in this First Version is, therefore, on process, i.e., the notion that publication of source work is never definitive and final, but rather a continuing process, requiring not rigid dogmatism but rather an openness to new possibilities. The word processor is accordingly both a practical aid supporting this research tool and a metaphor signaling that the next revision is at hand. The committee is aware that this volume is incomplete and that readers will find this First Version inconvenient in several regards; readers should rest assured, however, that the system of cross- referencing will be expanded in the final, complete volume and that the final volume will include extensive indices. In the Introduction immediately following this Foreword, Thomas D. Hill presents the intellectual rationale and methodology behind the project. Here I seek only to sketch the administrative history to date and projected future plans.

History of the Project

SASEC is a direct outcome of the 1983 Symposium on the Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, held at the Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University, which was co-sponsored by the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies (CEMERS), State University of New York at Bing- hamton, and granted major funding by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research Programs. The proceedings of this first Symposium appear as Sources of Anglo-Saxon Culture, Studies in Medieval Culture 20 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1986). The Symposium, now continuing into its eighth year (1990), sought at its inaugural meeting to focus on three sub- fields in Anglo-Saxon Studies, namely literary culture, iconography, and archaeology, and to consider new directions. Discussions in literary culture, which is by far the dominant area of interest in North America, focussed on questions of methodology, the usefulness and availability of research tools, and advances in manuscript studies. While a transcript of the open discussion and a record of many informal meetings would reveal specific points of interchange and several new ideas, a strong consensus developed that under the right conditions the development of a successor volume to Ogilvy's Beowulf Known would meet the apparent greatest need.

This first Symposium stimulated activity in Great Britain, serving as the forerunner for a Conference at Leeds University in March, 1984 or- ganized by Joyce Hill and J.E. Cross. Before long the British initiative took a different direction, viz., towards a very large scale, multi-volume project encompassing all vernacular and Latin works, organized on a different prin- ciple, i.e., that of identifying, listing, and excerpting for a database all the sources used in the creation of works produced in Anglo-Saxon England. Thus, in contrast to SASEC, which works forward from classical, patriotic, and medieval sources seeking to summarize the most convincing evidence for their being known or used in Anglo-Saxon England, the British-based Beowulf Anglo-Saxon/Potomac Anglo-Saxon will work backwards from each Anglo-Saxon text, es- tablishing wherever possible the immediate source of each passage. SASEC and Beowulf are thus in inverse relation. Unlike SASEC, Beowulf aims to estab- lish new source relationships. The scale envisioned by the Beowulf initiative will require two or three decades of work and many scholars committed to specific volumes. At this writing, Beowulf is well under way with an in- cipient data base at Manchester University. In organisational parallel with SASEC, the Beowulf group meets annually in March at a rotating site for a public meeting and conference to discuss the progress of the project. There are annual fall meetings for the Beowulf Executive Committee, in which SASEC Administrative Committee members have actively participated. One hap- py and tangible piece of evidence for the spirit of cooperation is the joint sponsorship of the publication of Michael Lapidge’s Abbreviations for Sæter and Specification of Standard Editions for Sæter (1988), which has served as a working document assisting both projects. The Lapidge list has served as the basis for this volume’s Bibliography Part I.

To support the first two years of SASEC (1987-89), the National Endow- ment for the Humanities, Division of Research, awarded a major grant. As the project committee began to work out the practicalities of the project and to refine specifics of its original plan, issuing invitations to participate to a broad base of scholars and soliciting criticism of various ideas, it also saw how SASEC could evolve into a considerably more useful tool than had originally been proposed. The project committee instituted several major design changes; the most thoroughgoing change was the addition of a head- note for each entry, consisting of five distinct categories of basic informa- tion about a work’s currency among the Anglo-Saxons, i.e., manuscripts, Anglo-Saxon booklets, Anglo-Saxon versions, quotations/citations/echoes, and references. The gathering and weighting of information to be provided under these headings have naturally complicated the work of the contrib- utors and extended the life of the project. The grand strategy for the SASEC volume has concomitantly changed. In almost all cases SASEC entries have become new creations rather than mere corrections of Ogilvy’s Beowulf Known.
All these changes were welcomed by the full Advisory Committee at successive meetings, and likewise endorsed by colleagues in the *Rituem Angli-Saxonum*. The committee hopes that the revised format will elicit a similar positive reaction from students, scholars in general, and Anglo-Saxonists who will use this *Triad House* and the ultimate volume. As indicated above, a major purpose of this *Triad House* is to solicit the reactions of reader-users to the usefulness of the entries, as now designed.

**Present and Future Plans**

The current academic year (1989-90) is the third year of the project. Operating under a no-cost extension of the original NEH grant and receiving further incidental support from the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies at SUNY-Binghamton, S4SLC should come by year’s end to the completion of all major entries and to almost all minor entries. For the completion of the core of the project, S4SLC will rely heavily on committees of research supervised by Thomas D. Hill (Cornell) and Charles Wright (Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), whose home departments will offer support. The current revised plan calls for a fourth and fifth year of the project to present a reasonably comprehensive treatment of saints’ lives and liturgy, two special areas in the study of Anglo-Saxon literary culture that offer daunting complexities. Particularly problematic for Anglo-Saxonists is the reality that most reference works in the field of hagiography, including the Bollandists’ guides to hagiographical texts and manuscripts, are keyed to continental sources and collections. One result of this situation is that Anglo-Saxonists have been forced to rely, for Latin sources of Old English texts, on mislabeled editions based on non-Insular manuscripts. S4SLC’s *Ada Sancta* will constitute the first effort to produce a comprehensive survey of the versions and manuscripts the Anglo-Saxons possessed and used in their study and composition of hagiographical texts. Already the *Ada Sancta* database set up by Gordon Whitley contains provisions for 330 entries on the basis of a preliminary survey of the most accessible large-scale sources of evidence. It is expected that the S4SLC format, by virtue of its rigor, its general design, and the information it provides can inspire and facilitate a new understanding of early medieval hagiography from the Anglo-Saxon perspective. *This Triad House* offers thirteen sample entries treating saints’ lives.

The Liturgy in the Anglo-Saxon period offers its own complexities. In this area of study S4SLC cannot simply rely on what has survived, but rather it will have to concoct an informed imagination controlled by such facts as can be established in order to present in full dimension the variety of matters gathered under the heading “Liturgy.” For Richard Pfeil and the research team he will assemble for this last major task for S4SLC, the challenge will be to establish an adequate framework for understanding the dimensions of possible liturgical influence during the whole of the period.

**An Invitation**

At this time more than 60 scholars from the international community have contributed or promised to contribute entries for S4SLC. While a large collaborative project poses many practical problems of administration and coordination, such a design nevertheless has the great advantage of employing specialist contributors for individual authors, works, or genres. The end result for the volume should be the best work by the best qualified scholars. Even with the many willing hands now working for S4SLC out of a common, sustained, and shared purpose, the project can still benefit from more scholars interested in sources. Thus, the committee invites those interested to write for further information. There are still minor entries awaiting their writers. Clearly, the project needs contributors to its major sections on Saints’ Lives and Liturgy. Appendices B and C, which give a List of Entries and a List of Saints respectively, suggest the scope of work. Now, as always, the project can use expert criticism and reading of entries that are in hand.

For further information on S4SLC write to:

Prof. Paul E. Searsbach
Project Director, S4SLC
CIMESRS, SUNY-Binghamton
P.O. Box 6000
Binghamton, NY 13902-6000
PHONE: 607-777-2730
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Introduction

The predecessor and inspiration for our present volume is J.D.A. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English, 597-1066*, whose title neatly synopsized the aims of his collection. Our title is vaguer and more amorphous—in part because it was composed by a committee and in part because our goals are less easily defined. Ogilvy was concerned simply with "books"—with Latin texts transcribed and transmitted in the Anglo-Saxon period—whereas we are interested more broadly in "sources," including oral traditional literature as well as written texts, and in written texts such as charters, medical recipes, and charms which can only be loosely described as books. These concerns necessitated a new, somewhat more inclusive title, and it was necessary to distinguish our project from his in any case, but we have lost something in the change. Since our title no longer speaks for itself with the brisk assurance of Ogilvy's, and since the user of the Guide needs some general orientation in any case, this essay is intended to serve as an introduction to the entries gathered here. The present reference volume is a collaborative endeavor; it consists of a collection of single entries by numerous scholars and obviously reflects diverse scholarly opinions. This introduction, in contrast, is written by one individual, and it should be emphasized that the views expressed in the introduction—to the degree that they are not merely platitudes—are those of a single individual, who has, however, received enough commentary and criticism over a period of time that he feels it is appropriate to use the editorial first person plural. What we hope to accomplish in this introduction is a definition of certain key terms, a guide and warning to users, and a prospectus concerning the objectives of this particular kind of scholarly inquiry—to put it simply, why we think source scholarship is valid and worth consolidating in a reference work of this kind.
Methodology

Since the terms "source" and "influence" are used with a good deal of freedom in literary scholarship, let us begin by defining a literary source and its derivative as a particular mode of textual relationship. The first step in establishing such a relationship is to demonstrate parallels between two texts which are so striking that to assume they were fortuitous would "outrage probability," to use R.L. Rask's phrase. Once such parallels have been established, the next step is to evaluate the historical relationship of the two texts and to determine the kind and direction of influence that these parallels imply. In principle, at least, it might be possible to distinguish between a source and a text derived from it on the basis of careful analysis of the idiom, style, and structure of the two texts. But in practice scholars rely on such analyses only when external historical evidence is not available. And our assumptions about the larger historical context in which a given text was composed can affect our interpretation of apparently straightforward evidence. Thus, given textual parallels between some of the homilies of Augustine's *Breviarium sanctae ecclesiae* and certain of *Ælfric's* homilies, the conclusion that Augustine is the source and *Ælfric* derivative is determined not by analysis of the texts themselves, but by our knowledge of the historical relationship of the two texts. This example is obviously a very simple one. No one has yet proposed that *Ælfric* influenced Augustine. But it is important to emphasize at the outset that defining source relationships is not as simple as it might seem, one must always consider questions of historical and literary context. To take a supposititious example, parallels of exactly the same sort as those between Augustine and *Ælfric* which involved an Anglo-Saxon and a Greek text would not necessarily be accepted as proof that the latter was the source of the former. The probability of some Latin intermediary would seem a more plausible way of accounting for the parallels than the assumption that an Anglo-Saxon author knew Greek. But at the same time the assumption that the Anglo-Saxons were Greekless can become a self-fulfilling prophecy if all parallels between Anglo-Saxon and Greek texts are explained away by hypothesising lost Latin intermediaries. For a variety of reasons, the current working assumption of most Anglo-Saxonists that the Anglo-Saxons were generally ignorant of Greek seems to us plausible, but source-scholars must be sensitive to the fact that this is an assumption, and an assumption that shapes the way they understand the "raw" data of textual relationships.

We have referred to "striking textual parallels," but must concede that defining such parallels is a matter of intuitive judgment and that the range of potential ambiguity and subjectivity is wide. The fact remains, however, that many thousands of such textual relationships have been adduced in the fields of Old and Middle English scholarship alone, and have never seriously been questioned. The appeal to the consensus omnium may not be an elegant or sophisticated mode of scholarly argument, but it has its force. If we were asked to define our working methodology, we would respond that source scholarship involves a kind of dialectical process in which individual scholars propose source relationships on the basis of intuitive judgment, and these judgments are then either confirmed or denied by the consensus of scholars who take the trouble to evaluate the argument and the supporting evidence. Such a consensus may not be reached quickly if the source relationship is difficult for one reason or another, or if the test involved is obscure. But in principle, once a number of scholars who have no immediate reason to be prejudiced have examined the evidence, a consensus, or at the least an agenda for further research, can be reached.

Implicit in this methodology is the assumption that a "true" definition of a given source relationship is both desirable and in principle attainable, but it must also be clearly acknowledged, that given the limitations of documentation during this period, even the best-established and most secure examples of source-relationships are provisional and open to correction and modification. If *Ælfric* drew on Augustine's *Breviarium sanctae ecclesiae* there remains the question of what version of the text of those homilies was accessible to him, or whether *Ælfric*'s choice of available synonyms in translation was influenced by a previous tradition of glossing; and this list of hypothetical discoveries, which might complicate the apparently simple literary-historical fact that *Ælfric* used Augustine on John, could be extended almost indefinitely. Scholars may believe that in certain areas of Anglo-Saxon literary source scholarship the work has been pretty thorough-ly done, but there is always the possibility of surprising new finds.

Terminology

Apart from the provisional character of source scholarship in the field of Old English and Anglo-Latin literature, another immediate problem that must concern us is that there is no established terminology to distin-
guish among the many possible modes of relationship between two or more texts which may obtain in any given case. For practical purposes we pre-
pose to stipulate some working definitions. In literary-historical discourse a source can consist of as little as one word or as much as thousands of lines of text. Indeed, many Anglo-Saxon texts are wholly dependent on one specific source and are conventionally defined as translations or ver-
sions of an original. But in ordinary usage the term "source" generally refers
to a text that provides the antecedent for some significant portion of a derivative text, while the terms "citation," "quotation," "allusion," or "echo" refer to smaller and more limited instances of similar textual relationships. These less-extensive verbal parallels are sometimes indicated in some explicit fashion comparable to the modern device of using quotation marks. But in both vernacular and Christian-Latin literary tradition the concept of authorial proprietorship was less clearly defined than it is in the modern English literary tradition, and authors would often draw passages from antecedent texts without such acknowledgment. For present purposes a "citation" is defined as a passage which is prefaced or concluded by a reference to the author or text from which the quotation is drawn. A "quotation" by contrast need not include such a reference. Even briefer instances of parallel textual relationships are "allusions" or "echoes," the former consisting of words, phrases, or larger units of discourse that purposefully recall some particular antecedent text, and the latter consisting of such parallels that occur simply because one author is so thoroughly familiar with some antecedent text that he echoes it unconsciously and inadvertently. In principle it might be possible to distinguish clearly between these various modes of textual relationship, but in practice it can be very difficult to distinguish between a deliberate allusion, intended to call to mind some particular antecedent text, and an echo. For the immediate purposes of this study and in the context of literary-historical discourse, the distinction is not as important as it might seem, since either allusions or echoes reflect the fact that a given author was familiar with a specific source, but readers who consult the various editions and literary handbooks must be aware that there is a good deal of editorial judgment involved in such discriminations.

Problems of Textual Identity

A further problem involving definition concerns the question of the definition of the text itself, or textual identity. In the modern world the question is a comparatively simple one. An individual author writes a specific text and ultimately "authorizes" its publication in a particular form. The specific form of the text presumably reflects the author's intention—a useful if much debated term—and this particular form of the text is reproduced mechanically and disseminated as widely as the economics of publication permit. Anglo-Saxon literary culture reflects the influence of two original—quite discrete literary traditions—Germanic and Christian-Latin—and the concept of textual identity was rather different from the modern one in both traditions. Germanic literary tradition was in large part an oral one, and without prejudicing the much-discussed question of the character and nature of this tradition, it is clear that a "text" that exists in oral tradition exists in a radically different context than in contemporary "literary" tradition.

As far as the Christian-Latin tradition is concerned, the tradition with which we are for the most part concerned in this study, the issue of textual identity is more immediately appreciable but still raises problems. The Anglo-Saxons knew and understood the concept of textual identity as we understand it—the concept of a text fixed and determined by the intention of an individual author—but the vagaries of early medieval book production, along with scribal practice and the particular circumstances of both vernacular and Anglo-Latin literary culture, frequently complicated the issue of textual identity enormously. A conscientious scholar such as Bede was aware of the problem of textual variation and corruption, and such scholars attempted to correct and correctly identify the texts with which they were dealing. But lesser scholars were less conscientious, and in any case it was necessary to have both good texts and good judgment to correct the faults of one's exemplar. "Textual corruption was as a result endemic, and confusion about attribution and canonicity was simply part of the intellectual culture of the period. It could indeed be argued that modern scholarship is still affected by errors deriving from this period. Migne's Patrologia Latina is in large part a reprint of sixteenth and seventeenth century editions of Christian-Latin authors, and these editions in turn were often simply based on "old," i.e., early medieval manuscripts. The misattributions and textual confusions that have plagued scholars attempting to work with that monumental collection are in part a direct heritage of the scholarship of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Thus when one is faced with an apparently simple problem of source-ships—whether a given Anglo-Saxon author knew a particular classical or patristic text—the first question which must be raised is in what form the text in question might have been circulated. To take a specific example that illustrates something of the complexity of these issues, the Bible was, as it still is, a central text in Catholic Christian culture. Biblical influence is pervasive in the Christian literature of this period. But as one also might expect in a manuscript culture in which every text had to be copied out by hand, there are relatively few manuscripts of the Bible as we would define it—the full text of the Old and New Testaments from beginning to end. Psalters and Gospels, however—texts that could be used in the liturgy—are relatively abundant, and there is a good deal of evidence that Anglo-Saxons would have been especially familiar with the Bible in the form in which it was read in the services. There is also some evidence of the study of specific biblical texts both in Latin and in the ver-
Limitations of Evidence

A question that must be faced is how the readers of this volume may make use of the evidence that the authors of the various entries have gathered together. The answer is a simple one: with great caution. This caution must extend both to the evidence itself and to what significance to attach to it. As editors and authors, we have made every effort to be accurate, but errors are inevitable in these entries—particularly errors of omission. Ideally the author of any given entry should review the corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin literature in order to verify that the list of references provided in the entry is as inclusive as possible. In practice we have not been able to accomplish any such effort at verification, and indeed the editorial decision not to include newly discovered source findings has meant that even if a contributor were able to add to our current knowledge of source relationships, he or she could not ordinarily do so in the entry prepared for this volume. Thus errors of omission are inevitable and inevitably common in these entries; in fact one of the goals of this project is to indicate where the lacunae are by presenting the available evidence in summary form. To take a specific example, there is evidence for the availability of the political and sapiental text, De duodecim abutuis sancti, before the Viking invasions because Alcuin quoted from it, and evidence that it was known in the later period because Ælfric quoted from it and either Ælfric or someone in Ælfric’s circle translated an abbreviated version of this treatise. But one naturally wonders whether the text was known in the intervening years—whether the Anglo-Saxons were reading it in the generations between Alcuin and Ælfric. At present we have no clearcut evidence of the currency of this treatise during this period, and this lacuna is evident in the presentation of our evidence. But the text in question was a popular one, and we expect that further evidence of its use will turn up, and that whoever discovers this evidence will be alerted to its significance by the lacuna in our entry.

“New” Source Scholarship

A related issue that requires some discussion is the editorial decision not to include unpublished source discoveries in our entries. In part this decision is motivated by the editorial concern that if we accept and implicitly sanction original source scholarship by our authors, the project may be extended indefinitely. For better or worse all of the entries completed so far have suggested significant new lines of research to their authors and
Paleography

Another problem which the users of this volume must consider is that while the format of the entries we have chosen gives a certain prominence to the manuscript evidence, a very important kind of evidence, to be sure there are certain immediate problems with the witness of the manuscripts themselves. The first is that interpreting it depends upon the judgment of paleographers, a judgment which is ultimately as subjective and fallible as that of scholars in any other discipline. In the present volume we have simply accepted the dating and and locations suggested by the paleographers and catalogers of the major collections. It is important to bear in mind that while we have reproduced this information and have in some instances based our discussions upon it, we have not ordinarily independently verified it. Although all of the members of the editorial board have at least some experience of working with manuscripts, no member is a paleographer in terms of scholarly specialization. Here as elsewhere we have been concerned not with attempting to provide new information for the present volume, but rather with codifying and gathering received scholarly opinion as of the time of publication. What this means in practical terms is that when users of this volume notice that the evidence for the currency of a certain work is dependent on limited or ambiguous paleographical evidence, then it is important that they examine the evidence and the argumentation for themselves. Error or unwarranted dogmatism on the part of the paleographers we have quoted are, of course, obvious problems, but a more subtle source of confusion is that scholarly qualifications and hesitations tend to be suppressed in transition from one scholarly work to another. If a paleographer discusses a problem of dating at some length and in the end with some reluctance opts for a particular date, the hesitations and in particular the degree of hesitation he or she may have about assigning a particular date are not adequately expressed in the conventional notation we have accepted from our predecessors. Thus a notation like "cf Worceceter"? can mean anything from "this is the paleographer's opinion but he is not absolutely certain" to "if forced to hazard an opinion, the paleographer would desperately offer the above-mentioned." As in other areas of scholarship, part of the object of the present volume is to focus attention on possible areas of fruitful scholarly investigation, and the numerous occassions of citation and the question-marks that adorn our entries can at least illustrate the limitations of our knowledge with graphic clarity.

Literary History

Even when the paleographers agree about the place and the date—or, as more often happens, about a range of possible places and dates which would accord with the evidence of a manuscript—it is still necessary to interpret the evidence of the manuscript in specifically literary terms. If we have, for example, a manuscript of Vergil's Aeneid which appears to have been copied by an Anglo-Saxon scribe, does the format and the presentation of the text suggest that the scribe understood what he was copying? Is there evidence that the text was read? And if so, by whom? Such issues might seem narrowly codicological, but as soon as one raises the question of who ordered a manuscript to be written, for whom, and for what purpose, one is dealing with issues that pertain to literary and intellectual history. And once a scholar is dealing with these issues, he or she is very quickly involved with issues of literary criticism as well. For example, if the patuaive Vergil manuscript was glossed by an Anglo-Saxon scribe, these glosses would provide evidence that some Anglo-Saxon was concerned enough to attempt to read and gloss Vergil's poetry. This inference, however, would depend upon the assumption that these glosses were in fact available in Anglo-Saxon England or at least were an intelligent copy of some continental or Irish precursor. To say the least, those are not simple and straightforward questions, and the answer one arrives at would depend upon one's own interpretation of Vergil's poetry and one's knowledge and understanding of the tradition of commentary on the Aeneid. Even if the glosses in question were clearly wrong and inappropriate, the kind of error they reflected might tell us something about the study of classical texts during this period and the level of education of the scribe or scholar who was responsible...
for them. The point is that there is no escaping the necessity of literary and historical judgment.

One final warning for the user of this volume concerns the complexity of the issues related to source relationships. When one considers the relationship of a given Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Latin text to its sources, the more closely one examines the relevant texts, the more problems of detail emerge. Even if certain broad patterns can be discerned and clarified, there remain anomalies of detail, problems concerning word-choice, omissions, relevant aspects of textual criticism, and so on. One of the ongoing problems in this field is that scholarly attention has focused on certain texts almost to the exclusion of others. And those texts which have been studied in detail are the monuments of the native Germanic literary tradition whose sources must be reconstructed. Detailed source study of those texts which actually draw on known Christian-Latin literary sources is very much an ongoing project in modern Anglo-Saxon scholarship. As a result there are relatively few texts from this period which have been studied in detail in terms of their sources, and none that might not be profitably studied further. As this mode of study proceeds, it opens up new questions even as it resolves outstanding ones.

The Scope of the Entries

Given these various warnings and qualifications, it might seem that we have qualified our project out of existence; some positive statement of our goals may therefore be appropriate. The first point to emphasize is that each entry is the work of an individual scholar who is ultimately responsible for its content, and that therefore each entry is to a significant degree an individual statement. But while we emphasize the individual responsibility of our contributors and have allowed them to shape their entries in many ways, the definition of our common purpose is that each entry is intended to provide a succinct and authoritative summary of what evidence exists for the currency of a given text in Anglo-Saxon literary culture as a whole. Each contributor has had to balance the demand for a comprehensive and judicious presentation of the evidence on the one hand and the necessity for succinctness and clarity on the other. In the present volume our aim has been to be relatively brief. Our model has been Ogilvy's volume of approximately 300 pages, and we are very much aware of the larger project based in England, the Anglo-Saxon, a project that will not merely summarize the evidence as ours does, but will present the evidence itself in some detail. The existence of this project has freed us from the responsibility of presenting evidence or from reviewing in any detail argumentation concerning the currency and use of a given source. We do hope, however, that the bibliographical information we have gathered will permit the users to review the argumentation and available evidence for themselves relatively quickly.

We have construed "literary culture" broadly to include legal, historical, and religious literature as well as the imaginative literature with which literary scholars are conventionally concerned. In this field such a broad definition of literature is a necessary response to the fact that the literary culture of the Anglo-Saxons is fragmentarily preserved; and in any case the distinction between "imaginative" literature and other modes of literature is one which is very much a product of modern literary fashion. Even in the context of contemporary literary culture, the distinction is hard to draw, and in the literature of the Anglo-Saxon period, the distinction between literary and extra-literary genres and works would be both pointless and destructive. This is not to say that esthetic and literary discriminations cannot and should not be made, but simply that for the literary historian or the historian concerned with intellectual or religious culture, all of the available evidence is precious.

In the present volume the range of our concerns is quite wide. We are potentially concerned with the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Latin written literature and with oral literature and oral genres as well. Our treatment of some of the larger topics is very succinct indeed, and one problem which does not admit of any easy solution is that it is much easier to present the evidence for the knowledge of an obscure or little-known work than for a much-used text. Here again, the authors of individual entries have exercised their best judgment and have indicated the scope of their discussion in their articles.

Apologia

In the final portion of this essay we would like to offer a prospectus concerning this kind of research and to try to make explicit the rationale for source-work in the field of Anglo-Saxon literary culture. The first point to emphasize is that Old English is a deciphered language. The ability to read Old English accurately was lost for a long time, and the ability to read it with philological accuracy was not fully recovered until the nineteenth century. The process of recovery took place over a period of centuries and was immensely facilitated by the fact that a significant portion of the corpus of Old English literature is based upon readily accessible Latin sources.
INTRODUCTION

These texts remain the most important source of information about what Old English words mean and about what given syntactical devices imply; and the task of Anglo-Saxon lexicography was begun by Anglo-Saxon scribes who glossed difficult Latin words with vernacular equivalents. Any extended study of Old English language or literature which does not consider the problem of sources is in a sense rootless, since our knowledge of the language is so heavily dependent on the cultural intertwining of Latin and Anglo-Saxon in this period. From the perspective of the literary critic and the literary historian, those texts that are most heavily dependent on Latin sources are usually of least intellectual and esthetic merit; but from that of the linguist or the Anglo-Saxonist of any scholarly persuasion who is attempting to explain a difficult word or locution, those Anglo-Saxon texts that have a known Latin source are a crucial linguistic resource without which our knowledge of the language would be much less assured than it is. And obviously the linguist or historian who cites the Latin heritage of a given Old English text is using either the source scholarship of some predecessor, or offering his or her own. If the most immediate value of source scholarship is to enable us to understand Old English as a language, the further value of such scholarship for the intellectual and literary historian is no less fundamental. The immediate questions of literary and intellectual history—what the Anglo-Saxons knew and believed about themselves and their world—can best be addressed by detailed study of those texts which the Anglo-Saxons composed or compiled or copied. And in studying such texts it is impossible to proceed very far without facing issues of source scholarship. Tracing the filiations of one text with another is often laborious, but it can be very enlightening. Even the disjunctions, the gaps where one might expect a relation, can be suggestive, and the larger patterns that emerge when one traces the relationship of one text with its sources can be strikingly revealing. J.E. Cron has spoken of "spying close" to one's text, and there are moments in source study when one has the eerie sense of almost eavesdropping on the thoughts and hesitations of an author who may be nameless and has been dead for more than a thousand years, but whose characteristic voice and intellectual preferences are gradually becoming clear.

In considering scholarly and critical discourse about Anglo-Saxon literary culture in relationship to its sources, it is possible to discern two positions which, with some polemical exaggeration, we will call "maximalist" and "minimalist." The maximalists tend to accentuate the depth and the breadth of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, to take for granted a relatively wide degree of literary Christian-Latin culture and acquaintance with Classical culture. For better or worse, Ogilvy with his concern for libraries and Latin manuscripts was a maximalist, and many of the great Anglo-Saxonists of the first generations of Old English literary scholarship tended toward this position. One thinks of A.S. Cook or Fr. Klaeber, who never hesitated in their belief that the Anglo-Saxons were a deeply literate and literary people. By contrast (and in part in reaction to such assumptions) other scholars have emphasized the enormous obstacles which the Anglo-Saxons faced in attempting to perpetuate a literary culture and have focused on the very substantial evidence that exists to show the sharp limitations on Anglo-Saxon learning. One eminent and authoritative contemporary Anglo-Saxonist has recently argued, for example, that we must take Alfred quite literally when he says that there were no literate persons, lay or clerical, in large portions of Anglo-Saxon England in his youth. This "minimalism" is, for the literary scholar at least, a less congenial view of the literary culture of the period, but precisely because it is less congenial its implications must be faced directly.

The debate between these two perspectives is an ongoing one, and there is no reason to believe it will be concluded any time in the immediate future. At the risk of seeming to lack zeal for controversy, we would like to suggest a more subtle that grants a certain cogency to both perspectives, and that we would call "particularism." We would begin by granting the enormous problems which the Anglo-Saxons faced in acquiring, disseminating, and transmitting literary culture whether in Latin or the vernacular. The Anglo-Saxons were presumably generally illiterate before they were converted to Christianity; there is some truth in the old and nationalistic saying that the Irish taught the English to write. After the conversion, the Anglo-Saxons could acquire literary skills and literary culture, but it is difficult to know how many of them chose to do so. The literacy rate in Anglo-Saxon England is unknown and unknowable; but lay literacy is often associated with mercantile culture, and the urban population of Anglo-Saxon England was relatively small. The presumption must be that only a minority of Anglo-Saxons were ever literate even in their own language. And if Latin was a learned language everywhere in Europe, Anglo-Saxons were handicapped in comparison with the speakers of the various romance vernaculars in that their mother tongue was quite different from Latin. In addition to the immediate practical difficulties of learning Latin and copying and disseminating Latin manuscripts in the Anglo-Saxon speaking world, Anglo-Saxons concerned with literary culture faced an even larger problem in that learning was threatened by constant internal warfare and after 793 by the threat of pagan Viking raiders, who had no scruples about destroying churches and monasteries.

The list of potential threats to Anglo-Saxon literary culture could be prolonged, and it is certainly easy to find evidence for ignorance and barbarism in the written records of the Anglo-Saxons. There is, however, one
Immediate counter-argument so salient that it is sometimes overlooked. Christianity is far better or worse a religion of the book. Without a certain degree of literary culture, Christianity, at least Latin Catholic Christianity, could not continue to exist. It is possible to imagine an illiterate or semi-literate priest who fulfilled the functions expected of him by memorizing the Latin words of the canon of the mass and the other most important liturgical texts by rote with only a minimal understanding of what he was saying. But it is very difficult to imagine how such a priest could train a successor. It would therefore follow that an aspirant to the clergy would have good reason to seek out a more learned cleric for his education. It is of course true that a priest or monk need not be an intellectual or a particularly learned man in order to fulfill his office. But Christian education and the continual necessity of training younger generations of clergy demanded a certain degree of Latin and vernacular literary culture. Christianity did not take root everywhere in the early Middle Ages; there were numerous missions which failed, and it is perfectly imaginable that the pagan Anglo-Saxons newly converted to Christianity might have relapsed into the non-literate pagan Germanic culture which they traditionally had practiced. But for the most part they did not. Anglo-Saxon England converted to Christianity and remained Christian, and the consequence was that there existed a milieu, clerical for the most part but to some degree lay, in which literary culture could exist and in which, at the least, there was a tradition of respect for learning and an interest in the transmission of texts. In considering barbarian Anglo-Saxon England from such a perspective, the continued existence of any native literary culture at all in Latin or Old English represents a substantial achievement, and instances of error and native ignorance are much more understandable. The Anglo-Saxons, however, did not simply acquire sufficient literacy for a native Christian tradition to exist and perpetuate itself. Within three generations of the conversion there were Anglo-Saxon Christians whose learning and knowledge of Latin were comparable to those of any scholar in Europe. The achievement of Bede would be remarkable in any age, but when one remembers that his grandparents were probably born before the coming of Christianity to Northumbria, it brings his achievement into sharper focus. It is thus a matter of historical fact that some Anglo-Saxons attained a very high level of Latin literary culture in places and times in which one might not have expected it. It is also of course true that the Anglo-Saxons faced formidable problems in acquiring and transmitting literary culture; and we, as partisans, would argue that every Anglo-Saxon text be approached individually and as far as possible without preconceptions either maximalist or minimalist. As a practical matter, Anglo-Saxonists will have to be practicing maximalists when they first approach an Anglo-Saxon liter-
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abbreviation is from the system devised for the Toronto Dictionary of Old English as listed in the Merovingian Concordance to Old English (MODO), a refinement of the system designed by Anglus Canescens [AC]; see, however, Appendix A for the Old English MEROPE. Similarly references to standard research tools, such as the Quia Sinarum Latinarum (QLP), are sometimes unnecessary to provide much information about the source itself. Moreover, it is usual to present in a headline five kinds of information that indicate that a work was available in Anglo-Saxon England:

**MSS Manuscripts.** The inclusion of a work in a relevant manuscript provides firm physical evidence for its presence in Anglo-Saxon England. Helmut Geness' Preliminary List of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1000 [HG] provides the basis for this source of information: all contributors have been asked to use it fully, and to query Professor Geness when they notice potential discrepancies. We are grateful to Professor Geness for allowing us to use his work and for bearing with our questions. In two areas, however, his concerns do not exactly match our needs. First, the list does not yet fully identify the contents of each manuscript, and so writers have sometimes gone back to the catalogs—and occasionally to microfilms or to the manuscripts themselves—in order to develop this evidence. Second, there are some continental manuscripts that either by their script or by some other feature show that a work may have been known in Anglo-Saxon circles.

**Latina Beside.** Although less informative than a surviving manuscript, the mention of a work in wills, lists of donations, or inventories of libraries from our period provides a good indication that it was known. In "Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England" [ML] Michael Lapidge edits the remaining catalog of manuscripts from our period, and identifies, whenever possible, the work in question. The following shortened titles are used to refer to these lists: 1. Alcuin; 2. King Athelstan; 3. Athelstan (grammarian); 4. Athelstane; 5. Eilfric; 6. Sherburne-in-Elmet; 7. Busy St. Edmunds I; 8. Seaford; 9. Worcester I; 10. Leofric; 11. Worcester II; 12. Busy St. Edmunds II; and 13. Peterborough. For a discussion of these lists—and specifically of difficulties of localizing the second list associated with Worcester and the Peterborough list—see ML.

**A-S Vers Anglo-Saxon Rhetica.** Like the manuscript evidence, an Anglo-Saxon version, either in Old English or in Latin, indicates that the source was known to the English at this time. The MODO provides the basis for identifying the Old English texts. Anglo-Latin texts are identified by the abbreviations in Part I of the Bibliography. Writers of individual entries have, of course, exercised judgment in how to represent the information when a translation or adaptation is quite loose, or when the use of a source is so limited that it is better considered a quotation.

**QuotClits Quotations or Citations.** The source notes of modern critical editions can make it clear that Anglo-Saxon writers knew a work in full or in some shortened form. A citation, including both the name and the words of an author, is sometimes significant since it shows the knowledge of the origin of an idea or phrase. Writers of entries have used their judgment in determining which quotations and citations significantly further the evidence for the knowledge of a work during our period. For example, listing each use by Bede of Augustine's De genesi ad litteram may well be less significant for our purposes than indicating a single, anonymous use of a more obscure work. If the quotation or citation is noted in the edition specified in Part I of the Bibliography, or in the MODO, only the primary references—using the system for citing texts described later under Standard Editions—to the Anglo-Saxon writer and to the source are provided. If the quotation or citation is not noted in the specified edition, the primary references are noted in the same way in the headnote, and the secondary source will be mentioned in the narrative body of the entry. In order not to overlap with the developing database of the Poiana Anglo-Saxonii, this volume will not ordinarily include source identifications published after 1987.

**RefS References.** Although always open to interpretation, a specific reference by an Anglo-Saxon writer to the author or work may indicate its presence in England during our period. The letters of Boniface and his circle provide good examples of this kind of evidence. Editions are referred to in the same way as quotclits.

Although schematic, the information in the headnote summarizes much of the strongest evidence for the knowledge of a specific author or work in Anglo-Saxon England.

The body of the entry discusses any information in the headnote that requires clarification or amplification, and then introduces other kinds of evidence for the knowledge of a work in Anglo-Saxon England, such as allusions in literary texts or distinctive iconographic motifs from the visual arts. One kind of evidence that may be considered in this section—and that requires some specific comment here—is the presence of echoes in hexametrical poetry. Within this poetic tradition, the terms "quotations" and "citation" are restricted either to entire lines taken from a previous work, or to situations in which the Anglo-Saxon author calls attention to the source.
with a phrase such as "as the poet says"; these quotations and citations are included in the headnote. In contrast, an "echo" in hexametrical poetry consists of at least two words occurring in the same metrical foot (but not necessarily in the same grammatical form) in both the source and the Anglo-Saxon text; these are discussed in the body. A similar distinction between "quotations and citations" and "echoes" may be preserved in the case of some prose writers. Finally, the body of an entry may consider other questions, such as the temporal and geographical extent of the use of a work. Readers are directed to other entries in the volume—and through these entries to information about the standard edition in Part I of the Bibliography—by names in small capitals.

Entries may conclude with a discussion of bibliography, which attempts to be complete through 1987 but which may include later works other than those whose authors are modern. If for some reason the edition of the work in question cannot be located in Part I of the Bibliography, or if other editions need to be considered, notes by editor and date are recorded here, and can be expanded by turning to Part II of the Bibliography. Part II of the Bibliography also includes relevant secondary material mentioned in the entries by author and date. GR numbers may be expanded by consulting Stanley B. Greenfield and Fred C. Robinson, A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to the end of 1972 (Toronto 1980). The bibliography may conclude with any relevant comments and suggestions about work in progress or desiderata.

Thus, most entries use the following format:

**AUTHOR** and/or **TITLE** ([abbreviation]: references to research tools; cross references to other entries)

(introductory remarks)

**TITLE** of individual work ([abbreviation]: references to research tools; cross references to other entries)

**MS** Manuscript by city, library and MS number, but keyed to a secondary source, usually HG.

**LIT** Booklist: by the name or place associated with the list, with reference to the list and item numbers in ML.

**AS** Neo Anglo-Saxon Version: Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography.

---
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**Quarterly Significant Quotations or Citations** Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography. The source follows the reference to the Anglo-Saxon writer, and the system for citing texts is described below under **Standard Edition**.

**Bibliography**

Significant References: Old English by the abbreviation in the MCOE, with the full AC number; Anglo-Latin by the abbreviation in Part I of the Bibliography.

Body

**Bibliographical discussion**

The system of cross-referencing by using small capitals is complicated enough to require some comment here. In the case of a work by a known author, this system should provide little difficulty: both the name of the author and the title of the work (possibly in a shortened form) will be in small capitals the first time that they appear in an entry (including entries under either a major author or a generic gathering). References to anonymous works gathered into generic entries present greater problems. In these situations, the title of the work will appear in small capitals, and a reference to the name of the generic gathering will accompany the first mention of the work in each entry (but set merely by individual entries under either a major author or a generic gathering). Thus the first time one encounters a reference in the "Acta Sanctorum" to the "Cotton-Corpus Legendarum," COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY will be in small capitals, and will be followed with the direction to "see LEGENDARIA" where in the final volume there will be an entry on this collection; in subsequent entries in the "Acta Sanctorum," COTTON-CORPUS LEGENDARY will be in small capitals the first time it appears, but there may be no further direction to "see LEGENDARIA." If the title of a work provides little information about the generic entry under which it can be found, the reference to the gathering may always be kept. The most difficult problem in cross-referencing that has arisen in this trial volume, however, is presented by the evidence from the VERCELLI and STICHLING collections of anonymous homilies. Donald Scragg discusses both in his entry on "Anonymous Old English Homilies" [see HOMILIAE], and goes into some detail about a number of items from each, and so the reader should be directed to this information; however, in many entries references to items in either collection are limited to abbreviations from the MCOE, and in these cases it seems unnecessarily cumbersome to follow each with "seeAnonymous Old English Homilies under HOMILIAE."
Therefore the reader should remember that an abbreviation such as Hom 3 4 (Win Hom 9) can be pursued further in the volume by turning to Scruggs' work.

**Standard Research Tools**

The following abbreviations are used throughout the volume. When items are individually numbered in these works, references are to items (or to volume and item; e.g. CLA 2.139); otherwise, references are to pages (or to volume and page; e.g. OTP 2.244–95).


BHf = Autarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae François Halkin (Brussels, 1959; Subsidia hagiographica 37).

BHf = Novum Autarium Bibliothecae Hagiographicae Graecae François Halkin (Brussels, 1984; Subsidia hagiographica 65).

BHL = Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina 2 vols. (Brussels 1898–1901; Subsidia hagiographica 6); with supplements in 1911 (Subsidia hagiographica 12) and 1986 (Subsidia hagiographica 70).


Standard Editions

Unless otherwise noted, the following system for citing texts is used:

1. Old English poetic texts are referred to by the abbreviation in the MCSE and AC with line numbers from the ASPR.

2. References to Old English prose texts are to the edition specified in the MCSE for a text which is line numbered as a unit in the edition cited, only line numbers follow the abbreviation. For a text in which sections (e.g. books or chapters) are line numbered separately, sectional divisions are in roman (upper case for larger divisions, e.g. books, lower case for smaller ones, e.g. chapters) followed by line numbers (e.g. II.x.3–4). For a test line numbered by page (or column) or not provided with line numbers in the edition cited, page (or column) and line numbers are used (e.g. 26.1–15 or 37.6–42.4).

3. The headnote refers to Latin editions by the abbreviations expanded in Part I of the Bibliography. The system for citing sections, pages, and lines is the same as used for Old English prose texts (above).


The following abbreviations for standard series are also used; these abbreviations may be followed by volume and page (or column) numbers (e.g. PL 33.45).

ACTA SANCTORUM

Hagiography was clearly an important genre in Anglo-Saxon England. In the early period BEDE, ALDWELM, and ALCORN, and later ELFHRIC, devoted much of their energy and output to one or another form of hagiographical writing or study. A substantial part of the surviving corpus of Old English narrative poetry (including three of the poems of "Cynfell"") is likewise hagiographical, as is much of the anonymous Old English prose. Yet most of the scholarly analysis of the hagiographical compositions of Anglo-Saxon England has been produced in a kind of vacuum, without a thorough knowledge of the Latin hagiographical texts and contexts that Anglo-Saxons knew and by which they might be influenced. Although much valuable work has been done on individual works and authors, there is as yet no thorough treatment of Anglo-Saxon hagiographical compendia, vernacular or Latin, or of the Anglo-Saxons' neglect of the hagiographical texts produced on the Continent. The materials for such studies have not been readily available. It is only in recent years, for example, that the Latin manuscript legendaries of Anglo-Saxon provenance have begun to be studied with the attention they deserve. The Source of Anglo-Saxon Library Culture hopes to facilitate the more sophisticated study of hagiography in Anglo-Saxon England by presenting all the currently available information about the hagiographical texts—saint, passion, miracles—known to the Anglo-Saxons. We have not, however, attempted to incorporate most of the evidence as to cult, such as is to be gleaned from calendars, litanies, etc.

The entries below (one by Frederick M. Biggs, five by Hugh Magennis, and the rest by E. Gordon Whatley) are a representative sample of the 330 or so entries that will comprise the hagiography section of the final volume in which all the works of Latin hagiography known to the English up to 1000, listed alphabetically by saint, are to be treated. For the most part, these entries will deal with anonymous texts concerning both native English and foreign saints, the latter far outnumbering the former. In most cases also, the texts to be dealt with are those that were considered by the scribes as distinct works, as opposed to the lives, deaths, and miracles of
those saints who were known mainly through their inclusion in "collective biographies" such as Gregory the Great's Dialogues or the Historia Monasterii of Sigeus, which will be treated elsewhere in the final volume.

Works of hagiography by a known author will be listed under the saint's name here, but the proper entry for each work will appear as part of the main entry for the author. Occasionally, however, the author of a given hagiographical text may be known only by that one work; in such cases the proper entry for the work will appear here in this section, not as an author entry. For example, Felix of Crowland, the eighth-century author of the Vita S. Guthlac, will be listed in the alphabetical author sequence of the volume, but the reader will be referred to this section, under Guthlac, for the full entry (see below).

Specific hagiographical texts are identified not only by the saint's name and the genre of the work, but also, where possible, by the Balesander's classification number, as listed in their standard reference guide to Latin hagiographical texts, the BHL (Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina 2 vols [Brussels 1890-1901] with supplements in 1911 and 1965). The section also follows the conventions in the BHL for ordering works such as the "Seven Sleepers" (under "U" for documenta) and the inventae sanctorum (included under the general heading "Jesus Christus").

The sources of information from which the entries are being compiled are many and varied, but the chief are as follows: BEDE'S MARTYROLOGY; ALFRED'S prose and verse de virginitate; the Old English Martyrology [Marc. BII], especially in the light of source studies by J.R. Catesby, ALFRED'S CATHOLIC HOMILETS [ALSHE], and lives of saints [ALS], the anonymous OLD ENGLISH LIVES OF SAINTS [LS], and several manuscripts containing Latin hagiographical texts, including most notably, the surviving eleventh-century copies of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary (see LEGENDÆRIS). London, BL Cotton Nero E.I and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9, and the closely related MSS, Salisbury, Cathedral Library 221 and 222 (Oxford, Bodleian Library Fedi 4 and 3). Patrick Zetti's unpublished Oxford thesis (1979) has been a valuable guide to these MSS. In his opinion they represent a legendary of late-ninth-century continental origin that was in widespread use in later Anglo-Saxon England, where it was introduced most likely at some point during the tenth century.

E. Gordon Whalley

Dormientes (Septem) passio [ANON.Pol.Dorm.sept.] BHL 2316. See also GREGORY OF TOURS, PASSIO SEPTIMI DORMIENTUM (BHL 2313) and his LIBER IN GLORIA MARTYSM (BHL 2314).
Corpus legendarily, but various discrepancies suggest that his source was not identical with Cotton-Corpus, and further that he also drew on the passio written by Gregory of Tours, BHL 2311, which is not otherwise known to have been read in Anglo-Saxon England; see Magennis (forthcoming).

Ælfric also briefly mentions the Seven Sleepers, as an exemplum of the resurrection of the body, in a passage he added toÆlfric, 16 in the period 1002-05, but which is not printed by Thorpe; the passage would occur on p 236 between lines 22 and 23. It appears in six of the eleven extant MSS of the homily (see Gatch 1977 pp 86-87, and Magennis, forthcoming). Here, as inÆlfric II, 32, Ælfric says the length of the sleep is 372 years, which suggests his dependence on a text of BHL 2316 different from that in the Cotton-Corpus legendarily.

The Vitæ Aureomî nihi (BHL 2421), attributed by Barlow to Guoelin of Canterbury, contains Edward the Confessor's vision of the Seven Sleepers turning over onto their left sides (Barlow 1962 pp 66-71). The authoritative MS (HG 420), however, is deficient at this point and the vision has to be supplied from later revised versions. Barlow (1962 pp xxxii-xxiii) is suspicious of the episode, but concludes that in its truncated form it may well have been in the original version of the life, composed, as many believe, as early as 1067. The details of the legend as presented in the Vitæ Aureomî are not specific enough to indicate any particular source. Barlow (1962 p 68) sees the figure of 372 years as a harmonization of more than one tradition.

Hugh Magennis

Eulalia Barcinoensis passio [ANON Pass.Eul.Bar.]: BHL 2696; CPL 2069b; DIDGE 15.1380-84. See also EULALIA EMERITAE.

MSS
- Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1086: HG 890.
- None.
- Quaest.Chr. Beda Mart. 221,1-5: see below.
- None.

Eulalia of Barcelona (fourth year Feb. 12), purportedly martyred as a young girl under the prefect Dacian during the Diocletian persecution, is regarded by many (IBL 4.530) as a doublet of EULALIA EMERITAE (least year Dec. 10). But the question is by no means settled, especially in Spain where Fábrega Grau argues that Eulalia of Barcelona's passio (BHL 2695) is a mid-seventh-century composition by Bishop Quixent of Barcelona, based on oral tradition surrounding the saint's authentic local cult, and that it is entirely independent of the cult of Eulalia of Merida (see his summary

date

of his position, DIDGE 15.1380-84). The Ballandiste de Gaflier (1959), along with other scholars outside Spain, does not accept Fábrega Grau's arguments. A more recent Spanish assessment by García Rodríguez (1966 pp 289-90) is unfavorable.

The earliest version known to the English, BHL 2696, used by Bede in his Martyrology (see Quixen 1908 p 71), and represented in the Paris MS, relates the passion of Eulalia of Barcelona, but associates her with Dec. 30. According to Fábrega Grau, this version was composed in the early eighth century, outside Spain. The anonymous passio (BHL 2696) also lies behind the entry in the Old English Martyrology (Cros 190la), ALDRICH's brief effusion in his poem its versamentum 300:10-12, indicates only his awareness that she was a virgin martyr, but his source is undefined, although a possibility is PERSPECTHANUS III, which he uses elsewhere.

E. Gordon Whately

Eulalia Emeritana passio [ANON Pass.Eul.Em.:] BHL 2700; CPL 2069b; DIDGE 15.1384-85. See also PRUDENTIUS, PERSPECTHANUS.

MSS
- Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9: HG 16.
- None.

The cult of Eulalia, virgin, martyred at Merida, Spain, for her defiant Christianity under Maximian in the early fourth century, is attested in the early fifth century by the poet PRUDENTIUS in PERSPECTHANUS III (his hymn on her shrine and martyrium). BHL 2700, according to Fábrega Grau (DIDGE 15.1384), was composed in the late seventh century, drawing not only on Prudentius but also on a lost "texte primitif" which was itself Prudentius's source. This argument is not completely convincing, since there is no tangible evidence for the existence of the lost "acta." The passio's non-Prudentian features need not necessarily derive from a pre-Prudentian source. Fábrega Grau admits in the end (1583) that all we know for sure about Eulalia is that she is in Prudentius.

Eulalia of Merida may have been known to ALDRICH (and possibly more), who echoes Prudentius' Perspecthane III. The passio that most clearly squares with Prudentius's treatment of Eulalia, BHL 2700, was adopted by the later Anglo-Saxons in the eleventh-century cotton-corpus legenda and its later affiliates, including the twelfth-century MSS Hereford, Cathedral Library P.7.v, and Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354.

For further information on Eulalia, see Roger Collins (1980 pp 189-219) and García Rodríguez (1966 pp 284-85).

E. Gordon Whately
Euphroynos vita [ANON, Vit. Euphr.]: BHL 2723.

**MSS** - Lists none.
A-S Hess LS 7 (83.3.7).
Quote/Cite - Ref. none.

Evidence so far adduced for Anglo-Saxon knowledge of this vita (translated into Latin in the eighth century; see Siegmund 1949 p. 235) is confined to the existence of the Old English translation, LS 7, which occurs in London, BL Cotton Julius Evi, and in fragmentary form in BL Cotton Otho R.ii. The source of LS 7 was identified first by Loomis (GR 3538, pp 5–6); see also Magennis (1985 p. 299). Loomis had assumed that the Old English text was Ælfric’s work. Although this is not the case (Magennis 1986 pp. 94–95), the similarity of approach to the Latin source supports the generally accepted view that LS 7 is contemporary with Ælfric. Venisch (1979 pp 57 and 291) finds in its vocabulary occasional traces of Anglo-Saxon influence.

Further work remains to be done on the Latin vita, of which Rosweyde’s edition is reprinted in PL 73.643–52, in addition to the A-S (cited in the Bibliography Part I). The A-S edition is based on several MSS and collated with Rosweyde’s. Neither is satisfactory as a guide to the early medieval state of the text.

Hugh Magennis

---

Eustachius passio [ANON, Pas. Eust.]: BHL 2760.

**MSS** - Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9: HG 16.
Lists none.
A-S Hess LS 8 (83.3.8).
Quote/Cite - Ref. none.

The first mention of Eustachius in the West is considered to be that of John of Damascus, *De Encyclia* (PG 94.1382), a work translated into Latin immediately after its composition in 726 (Hefferman 1973 p. 65). A considerable number of Latin versions of the legend of Eustachius were produced from the ninth century, of which at least two were known in Anglo-Saxon England, one prose (BHL 2760), the other verse (BHL 2767; see next entry). BHL 2760 is a reworking of an older text, BHL 2761, believed by Siegmund (1849 p. 236) to have been translated from the Greek of BGH 641, possibly in connection with the introduction of the cult of Eustachius into Rome under Pope Gregory II (715–33).

The date of the composition of BHL 2760 is unknown, but the earliest extant MSS are from the tenth century (Monteverdi 1908–11 p. 397), and the original may have been composed slightly earlier. It was incorporated into the Cotton-Corpus Legenda and survives in the Corpus MS of the mid-eleventh century; another copy is in the twelfth-century MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 354 (Zettel 1979 p. 29).

As first pointed out by Loomis (GR 3538, pp 6–5), BHL 2760 is the source of the Old English prose translation, LS 8, surviving in London, BL Cotton Julius Evi, and, in fragments, in Cotton Vitellius D.iv. Magennis (1985) shows that the Cotton-Corpus texts of BHL 2760 represent the Old English writer’s source more closely than the printed editions used by Loomis. Although the Old English version is not Ælfric’s work (Magennis 1986 pp. 356–42), as Loomis assumed, it is reasonable to date it in Ælfric’s time. Examination of the vocabulary has led Venisch (1979 pp 57, 258, 291, and passim) to suggest Anglo-Saxon influence on its composition.

In addition to the edition in Mombrius (Bibliography Part I), the text also appears in the A-S (Sept. 6.127–37).

Hugh Magennis

---

Eustachius passio metrica [ANON, Pas. Eust. metr.]: BHL 2767; ICL 1937; RCVL 5670.

**MSS** none.
2. Peterborough: ML 15.60.

The “Passio Eustachii Placidii urseiform,” mentioned in a booklist thought to come from Peterborough around 1000 (ML 13.60), and probably identical to the “Vita Eustachii” donated to Peterborough by Bishop Rehbould (ML 4.9), must be, according to Lapidge, the metrical poem, BHL 2767. See also Monteverdi (1908–11 p. 407). According to Lapidge, “on the evidence of the Archbishops donation, the poem must have been in existence by the late tenth century, and its style marks it as a Carolingian product.”

Hugh Magennis

---

Felix II passio [ANON, Pas. Felix II]: BHL 2857.

Felix Nolanus presbyter. See Beox and Paulinus of Nola.

The prose and verse lives of Felix of Nola are treated under Beox and Paulinus of Nola, but his confusing relationship with another Felix (of Rome) requires some comment here.

The earliest literary records concerning this saint of Campania are several poems (BHL 2876) by Paulinus of Nola, who adopted Felix as his patron on retiring from public life to Nola in 394 (P. Brown 1981 pp 53-60). Among the score of Felix's in the Roman calendar, two share the feast day Jan. 14: Felix "priest of Nola," and Felix "priest of Rome" ("in Pincio"), martyr (BHL 2885). It is generally accepted that Felix of Nola is the authentic original of the two Jan. 14 saints, and that the church "in Pincio" was originally a locus of Roman devotion to the Campanian saint (for the later, spurious Felix of Rome, see below).

Paulinus' poems on Felix of Nola were well known in early Anglo-Saxon England, and are quoted and echoed many times by Bede, Bede, and Alcuin. In addition, Bede wrote a prose epitome (BHL 2875) of the poems, which he knew to be Paulinus' work (see Paulinus of Nola). But Paulinus' patron was gradually forgotten by later Anglo-Saxons. According to Cross (1985a p 114 note 75), the ninth-century Old English martyrologist, in his entry for Felix, drew on both Bede's MARVORELOGO and life of Felix, but the vernacular writer already shows the influence of the confusing development of Felix's cult in Rome, since he identifies Felix as "priest of Rome, in the place called Piacenza," bypassing Bede's "in Campania." This suggests that the Old English Martyrology entry may depend on a calendar or liturgical work, as well as on Bede.

In the later Anglo-Saxon period, the Paulinus-Bede traditions concerning Felix are displaced by the Roman tradition represented in BHL 2885.

E. Gordon Whately
Guthlacus vita [FELIX. VIT. GUTH]: BHL 3723; CPL 2150; INGSE 22.1214-18.


Although his death seems to have occurred in 714 (least day April 11), Guthlac, the hermit of the Pen, is not mentioned by name, and the Latin life by the monk Felix is dated by Colgrave to 730-49, that in the completion of Bede's ecclesiastical history. Felix's life of Guthlac, while written in the original Insular style, is heavily indebted for its content and structure to Bede's prose vita Cuthberti and to the early classics of monastic hagiography such as EUGENII vita ANTONII et WULFSES vita MARTINI; see KRUPE (GR 5884) and Colgrave (1938).

Guthlac was widely venerated in Anglo-Saxon England and his popularity is reflected in the number of extant pre-Conquest copies of the life, and related versified texts. A late-eighth- or early-ninth-century fragment of Felix's life survives as the fly leaves of a tenth-century MS Royal 4.A.iv, and the complete copy in the Corpus MS 507, of unknown provenance, is dated to the ninth century. The other Latin MSS listed above are of the tenth and eleventh centuries; for descriptions of these and other MSS and for their affiliation, see Colgrave (1936 pp 26-31). Lapidge identifies the item in the Sæwold list (ML 8.19) as Arvaz, Bibliothèque Municipale 1029 (HG 781), and he suggests that the item in the Peterborough list (ML 13.16) may be London, BL Harley 3597.

Guthlac's continuing importance in the period is reflected in versacular versions in both prose and verse. According to KRUPE (1938 pp 2 p 301), the entry on Guthlac in the ninth-century Old English Martyrology appears to draw mainly on Felix's life (the short account of Guthlac's sister, Pegga, in M Froth 510a draws on Felix's chapter 53), although J. Roberts (GR 3811, pp 203-04) thinks it more likely that the martyrology's immediate source for these entries was liturgical. The anonymous homiletic version, LS 20, a versacular prose translation of Felix's life in a late West Saxon MS (London, BL Cotton Vespasian D.xxxi, formerly part of Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 509; NRK 344), was probably composed in the ninth or early tenth century in Mercia (J. Roberts 1965). A portion of the translation (corresponding to Felix's chapters 28-32, concerning Guthlac and the demons), but independent of the Vespasian text or its immediate exemplar, appears in the VERCELLI BOOK (Homily 23; see ANONYMOUS OLD ENGLISH HOMILIES under HOMILIAE). Bolton (GR 644a) points to Corpus 2689 or Cotton Nero E.1 (or a similar text of Colgrave's group IV type) as the Latin source text of LS 10. The Old English glosses in these MSS, however, are apparently not related to the Old English prose translation.
Inventio sanctae crucis [ANON, Inventor.]: BTH 4169.

5. T Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 22053.
8. T St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 225: CLA 7.928.

List none.

ASS Rev. 1. E (A.2.6).
2. LS 6 (B3.3.6).

Quota/Cita Mart (B19.ck): see below.

Refl none.

The Inventio, which recounts the discovery of the cross by Helena, is neither a vita nor a panegyric, which may account for its preservation in MSS that are not primarily hagiographic. Cox's Catalogue (1854–85, fasc. 2, col 129) describes Laud Misc. 129 as "ix, literis Anglo-Saxonics exaratus." Lowe states that BTH lat. 2769 "by the 8th century . . . may have migrated . . . to a center under Anglo-Saxon influence." Citing Loewi (952A), who discusses the general indebtedness of Continental libraries to the Anglo-Saxon, but who does not mention specific manuscripts, Graeken (GR 5635) comments that the St Gall MS "could have derived from an English original" (p. 19 note 3). Lowe notes insular abbreviations for "sax" and "er" in this MS. The Munich MS may have been copied from an Anglo-Saxon original, especially in light of the use of runic symbols for "ps" and "cmi", see Waldman (1975 pp 1–2). Avril (1917 p II) notes that BTH lat. 5574 was in England at the beginning of the tenth century.

The Old English Elene and the anonymous bonny LS 6 both use this text, and the details in the Old English Mandegyld (B19.ck) could also have been drawn from it. The Inventio is also cited as a possible source for two passages in the Dream of the Rood (Dream, A2.5): the vision of the cross in the sky (4–7), and the discovery of the cross (76–78). On the first passage, see in particular Patch (GR 3500), who points out that the wording is somewhat closer to the Latin than to the Old English version in Elene, but who also concludes in part, "the episode in the Dream may possibly be based on one having nothing to do with the story of the Inventio" (p 237).

The liturgical celebration of the Invention of the Cross on May 3—the day to which BTH 469 is firmly tied in the text—was originally Roman (established by the sixth century), and was introduced into Gaul in the eighth century (see Clavius 1908 pp 330–37). Willibrord's calendar (edited by Wilson 1918) assigns the feast to May 7, suggesting that the new date had not reached Gaul in his time, and does not mention the feast, implying that it reached England after the mid-eighth century. The Paedia
cal of Egbert (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10575; edited by Greenwell 1826) contains a benediction for the Inventio on May 3, but Grosec (1905 p 132) notes that "the attribution to Egbert is unfounded." Thus Elene and the Dream may represent some of the earliest evidence for the legend in England.

For bibliography on Elene, see GR 3558–3600; on LS 6, see Bodden (1987), and on the Dream, see GR 3482–3600. For a general discussion of cross lore in Anglo-Saxon England, see Stevens (GR 621) and for more information on the Irish material, see McNamara (1975 pp 78–79).

Frederick M. Biggs

Juliana passio [ANON, Pas.Julianae]: BTH 4522/4523; CPL 2201.

The earliest Latin account (BHL, 4522–3) of the virgin martyr Julianus of Nicomedia is believed to be the original form of the legend, despite the saint's purported Eastern origin (see Siegmund 1949 p 197; and Geith 1965 p 27) and was probably composed in Italy before the putting of the saint's relics from Pozzuoli to Corone in the mid-sixth century (see Woolf, GR 3880, p 11). The latest opinion of the Bollandists, on the evidence of the early martyrologies, is that Julianus was originally a local Cunean martyr whose cult became general in the Naples area before spreading elsewhere, and whose martyrdom at Nicomedia is (along with the whole legend) a fabrication (see AS Nov. vol 2 part 2 pp 301–2).

Geith (1965) regards England in the late-sevenths- to the early-eighth-century as an early locus of devotion to Julianus. As evidence he points to the use of the paschal in his martyrology, the eighth-century English recension of the Hieronymian martyrology (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10857 – the Epitresch MS), and Neapolitan influence through Abbé Hadrian of Canterbury. He also argues that two of the three main families of MSS of the pascha originated in England (note that Geith's classification of MSS does not retain the Bollandists' distinctions between BHL, 4522 and 4523).

Four MSS now known to be of English provenance contain copies of the pascha. BN 10861 is almost certainly written at Christ Church, Canterbury, in the early ninth century (M. Brown 198?), and belongs to Geith's Würzburg family of MSS, which links with the Anglo-Saxon mission to Germany: Harley 3020, however, is a member of Geith's Corbie family, most of the members of which he associates with Anglo-Saxon influence on the monastery at Corbie founded by the princess Bethild. Geith was unaware that the Paris and Harley MSS are actually of English provenance, as pointed out by Price (1986) in her recent study of the Middle English Efphe. None of these scholars, however, seems to have been aware of the copies in the mid-eleventh-century Worcester legendary, Cotton Nero E.I, and the somewhat later Salisbury legendary, Salisbury 221, which have not been classified (Zettel 1979 p 18, simply lists them as examples of BHL, 4522; both MSS represent the Cotton-Corpus legendary). April (1887 p 11) notes that BN lat. 5574 was in England at the beginning of the tenth century.

The lack of an entry for Julianus in the Old English Martyrology (ninth century) is doubtless due to the loss of most of the February saints.


This text, which was translated from the Greek by Paulus Diaconus "Neapolitanus" in the ninth century (Siegmund 1949 p 269; Kunze 1969 pp 26–28), was known in England in the late Anglo-Saxon period, although it is uncertain when it was first introduced. Of the MSS listed above, Cotton Claudius A.I has been dated mid-tenth century, but was written on the Continent. The other two MSS (from Worcester and Salisbury) are copies of the Cotton-Corpus legendary, which was known in England by the late tenth century, if not earlier.

The Old English homiletic version, LS 23, is a fairly literal translation of BHL, 5415. Comparative study of the Old English and Latin versions reveals that the translator must have worked from a text very like that in the Cotton-Corpus group, which is also close to Cotton Claudius A.I. LS 23 shares with these Latin MSS many features that contrast with what we find in the printed editions; see Magennis (1985 pp 294–97). Chase (1986)
ADO OF VIENNE

De sex actatibus mundi [ADOVIENN.Sex.act.mundi].

MSS
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 290: HG 84.

Aðo of Vienne used the earlier history of Rome as one of his sources, but his own reciprocal influence on Anglo-Saxon writers appears to have been modest. Both MSS owned in England date from no earlier than the mid eleventh century. The Cambridge text is “in all respects” like the London, including a faulty title: “incipit annus Oxonii abbatis.”

Daniel Noden

ADELFRI OF EYNSHAM (c. 950–1010)

Alfric’s numerous writings, in English and in Latin, were extensively copied and circulated in his own time and throughout the next two centuries. His immediate impact is evident from the prefaces and rubrics to individual works. His first major work, the CATHOLIC HOMILIES, was addressed to Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury, and apparently encouraged by him. Other works were commissioned by Wulfstan, Bishop of Sherborne; Baldredman Æðelhelm and his son Æðelric; Wulftæn, Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester; and Æthelweald II, Bishop of Winchester. Others are addressed to Cenwulf, Bishop of Winchester; to several individual laymen, Sigerfryth, Signeward, and Wulfstan; and to the monks of Alfric’s own abbey, Eynsham. His writings were used as sources by his contemporaries Wulstan of York, and Bythsfith of Ramsey, and by a host of anonymous writers; in particular, his homiletic works were plundered for telling passages and phrases by subsequent writers of vernacular sermons. Yet the only external references to him as a writer are a colophon in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 (written in the first quarter of the eleventh century, and at Worcester later in the century) explaining that the homilies in that MS have been taken from the books which “Æðelricus abbatus” translated (NRK 62), and a rubric in Oxford, St John’s College, 154 (written at the beginning of the eleventh century, and at Durham in the thirteenth century) by Aðelricus data assigning the collocypte which follows to “Æðelricus abb-axis who was my teacher” (NRK 456).

For the canon and chronology of Alfric’s works, see Clements (GR, 5397, pp 136–50). Recent surveys of his work include Hunt (GR 5215), and Greenfield and Calder (1986 pp 60–88). A study of his influence on Anglo-Saxon writers is by Godden (1978 pp 99–117). [For this trial issue, only the homilies are included.]

Catholic Homilies (æÆðelHom I and II; B.I.1–41, and B.II.1–50).

MSS see below.

Add. see below.

See ÆðelHom see below.

Quot/Col — Ref. none.

There is one surviving MS of the whole collection, Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28, dating from Alfric’s lifetime and possibly produced in his own scriptorium. London, British Library Royal 7.C.xii (a facsimile is by Elsas and Clements, GR 553) contains the First Series only, with annotations in Alfric’s own hand, and there are two other copies of the First Series from the early eleventh century (London, British Library Cotton Vitellius C.v, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 180). Some 30 other MSS containing selections or fragments, ranging in date from the end of the tenth century to the early thirteenth century, are listed in NRK pp 511–15, apart from one edited by Fausbøll (1986). Álfric composed the two series of Catholic Homilies at Ælfric’s Abba, but sent copies immediately to Archbishop Sigfric at Canterbury, and it was probably from there that they were mainly disseminated. Chirch Church Canterbury, Rochester, the New Minster at
The Old English translation is preserved in London, BL, Cotton Julius Evi (NRK 162) a MS containing Ælfric’s Lives of Saints, and there are also fragments in two other MSS of the first half of the eleventh century (NRK 177a and 177). Although not written by Ælfric himself (see Magenais 1986 pp 332-56), LS 23 has generally been regarded as coming from the same period. Elements of its vocabulary, however, have been seen as suggesting an Anglian origin (Wenich 1979 pp 56, 257-58, 261, and passim).

Hugh Magenais

ADO OF VIENNE: LFR 1.150-51; AOE 133-134.

De sextaeatibus mundi (ADOVIENN.Sex.gest.mundi).

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 290: HG 84.

Lim—Ref none.

This ninth-century Archbishop of Vienne used the earlier history of Rome as one of his sources, but his own reciprocal influence on Anglo-Saxon writers appears to have been modest. Both MSS owned in England date from no earlier than the mid eleventh century. The Cambridge text is “in all respects” like the London, including a faulty title: “Incipit annus Odonis abbatis.”

Daniel Nokes

ÆLFRIC OF EYNSHAM (c. 900-1007).

Ælfric’s numerous writings, in English and in Latin, were extensively copied and circulated in his own time and throughout the next two centuries. His immediate impact is evident from the prefaces and rubrics to individual works. His first major work, the CATHOLIC HOMILIES, was addressed to Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury, and apparently encouraged by him.

Other works were commissioned by Wulfstan, Bishop of Sherborne; Baldred of Ælhelmewold and his son Æthelhorm; Wulfstan, Archbishop of York and Bishop of Worcester; and Æthelweald II, Bishop of Winchester. Others are addressed to Cenwulf, Bishop of Winchester; to several individual laymen, Sigefrith, Sigewaedd, and Wulfgeat; and to the monks of Ælfric’s own abbey, Eynsham. His writings were used as sources by his contemporaries Wulfstan of York, and Byrhtferth of Ramsey, and by a host of anonymous writers; in particular, his homiletic works were plundered for telling passages and phrases by subsequent writers of vernacular sermons. Yet the only external references to him as a writer are a colophon in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 (written in the first quarter of the eleventh century, and at Worcester later in the century) explaining that the homilies in that MS have been taken from the book which “Ælfricus abbas” translated (NRK 62), and a rubric in Oxford, St John’s College, 154 (written at the beginning of the eleventh century, and at Durham in the thirteenth century) by Ælfricus datus assigning the collogry which follows to “Ælfricus abbas who was my teacher” (NRK 456).

For the canon and chronology of Ælfric’s works, see Clements (GR 5397, pp 136-50). Recent surveys of his work include Hunt (GR 5215), and Greenfield and Calder (1986 pp 66-88). A study of his influence on Anglo-Saxon writers is by Goddess (1978 pp 99-117).

[For this TriAL issue, only the homilies are included.]

Catholic Homilies (ÆELFHM I and II, BL.I.1-41, and BL.2.1-50).

MSS see below.

Lim none.

A-S Hex see below.

Quote/Ref—Ref none.

There is one surviving MS of the whole collection, Cambridge University Library Gg.3.28, dating from Ælfric’s lifetime and possibly produced in his own scriptorium. London, BL Royal 7.C.xii (a facsimile is by Eilson and Clements, GR 553) contains the First Series only, with annotations in Ælfric’s own hand, and there are two other copies of the First Series from the early eleventh century (London, BL Cotton Vitellius C.v, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 180). Some 30 other MSS containing selections or fragments, ranging in date from the end of the tenth century to the early thirteenth century, are listed in NRK pp 511-15, apart from one edited by Fausboll (1886). Ælfric composed the two Series of Catholic Homilies at Cerne Abbas, but sent copies immediately to Archbishop Sigeric at Canterbury, and it was probably from there that they were mainly disseminated. Christ Church Canterbury, Rochester, the New Minster at
Lives of Saints (ÆLS, B1.3.1-35).

MSS see below.

List: Peterborough: ML 15.54.

AS His none.

Qua: see below.

Ref: none.

The only exact copy of the whole collection is London, BL Cotton Julius E.xvi (from the beginning of the eleventh century, later at Bury St Edmunds). Selectors appear in 17 other MSS (indexed by NRK, pp. 190-35). The Peterborough booklist includes a collection of saints' lives in English, which may be this work.

In his preface, Ælfric says that the Lives were written at the request of Ealdorman Æthelheard and his son Æthelwine. Excerpts from items in the Lives collection appear in three anonymous composite homilies: HandJ 26 (B3.4.26; see Jos, GR 6582b; a text printed in Morris (GR 6314, pp. 296-394; not in AC), drawing on Sleat items 13 and 16; and an item in London, Lambeth Palace 489 (NRK 283, article 6; AC under B3.2.49 and B3.4.23).
Liber de virtutibus et vitii [ALCVIN: Virt.uit.]

MSS
1. Avranche, Bibliothèque Municipale 81: HG 783.

Lists none.

2. Ak: 14 (Förs, B9.7).
3. Ak: 16 (Förs, B9.7).
4. HesS 36 (Varia 20, B3.2.28).

Quot/Cita 1. HesS 11.2 (Varia 3, B3.2.11): see below.
2. HesS 36 (Ass 12, B3.2.16) 99-103: ALCVIN Virt.uit. 629.30-34.
5. HesS 41 (B3.2.41) 6-12: ALCVIN Virt.uit. 621.23-29.
6. Lambida (B4.54): see below.

Ref. none.

The Liber de virtutibus et vitii is a book of biblical and patristic common-places meant to help the addressess, Count Wido, attain eternal salvation. Written at Duisa after 799 and in Alcuin’s (d. 804) last years, the work enjoyed wide popularity in the early Middle Ages (and later), being pilaged and adapted in whole or in part in the Latin tradition. Because of its commonplace nature and the rhetorical tradition of adapting contentions, some of the current attributions to the Liber, which are commonly accepted, may not on further analysis prove acceptable. Thus, the theme “the three kinds of alms,” present in chapter 17, is not in itself evidence of the Liber because the theme enjoyed a wide currency. On the treatise generally see Wallich (1959 pp 231-34) and Szarmach (1981 especially pp 133-34).

The Avranche MS, lacking a list of chapters and the preface, offers different titles for chapters and otherwise contains different readings from BL or Pembroke. The BL MS contains some 30 Old English interlinear glosses for a Latin text that diverges greatly from the mainline tradition. The Pembroke MS contains a redaction of the work in three homilies (articles 93-95; see the homiliary of St Fêre de Chartres under homiliaries), thus showing transmission through intermediary forms. Cross (1987a pp 52-54) summarizes the use of the treatise elsewhere in Pembroke (also articles 20, 23, 25, 46, and 91); see also his analysis of sources (pp 17-43).

HesS 36 (included in AC under B9.7), commonly known as Verselli 20 (see anonymous Old English homilies under homiliaries), relies on an earlier version of the Pembroke MS (see Cross 1987a). The other versions are incomplete translations or single chapters. Thus Ak (Worm 35) gives the first sixteen chapters (Cambridge, University Library II.13, not listed in MOCB, but included in AC B9.7, offers a variant through thirteen chapters); Ak 14 (Förs) translates chapter 14; and Ak 26 (Förs) chapter 26. The relationships of these texts to each other and to the Latin tradition needs further work. Lindström (1988) examines a number of passages for their problematic and defective features, and see also Szarmach (forthcoming, 1989/1990).

The quotations in the Old English texts are noted by the following scholars: for HesS II.2 (commonly Verselli 3), Förster (GR 6200, pp 71-72), listing thirteen parallels; for HesS 16, Jost (GR 6592, pp 307-12); HesS 41, Bance and Cross (SRK p 90), and with caution, Less (1865 pp 177-78); for Lambida, Torkar (1981, 248-55), printing the Latin of chapter 20 opposite the equivalent Old English. For the issues involved in source analysis with particular problematic examples in Alcuin and Wolfrun see the overview in Torkar (1981, pp 22-33), the discussion focussing on Alcuin’s works in Pope (GR 5297, pp 284-85), and Less (1858b pp 170-85). Förster (GR 248, and 6200) is incorrect in questioning the authenticity of the Liber. Rochas (1951 p 79) has no evidence for his suggestion of the separate existence of chapters 27-34 as a treatise, though clearly these chapters were detached, as in Vatican, Var. lat. 650. Ogilvie (BKE p 56) is right in questioning the provenance of BL Add. 10336 and in questioning the eleventh-century BL, Harley 3070. The CGSE project an edition of the Liber in the mid-1990s (to be edited by Szarmach).
Alcuin’s life of Martin is a reduction of three works by Sulpicius Severus on the Saint, his vita, dialogorum libri iii, and epistulae. The Cambridge MS suggests that the work may have first circulated in England in the monasticism of St Pere de Châlons, and was added later to the Cotton-corpus legendarum (see legendarium) represented by the Salisbury MS. Zetter (1979 pp 99-110) first noted Alcuin’s use of this work in his first life of St Martin, identifying the four major passages previously thought to have come from Sulpicius’s Dialog as deriving more directly from Alcuin’s reduction. He discusses as well some other correspondences.

For a discussion of Alcuin’s sources, see I Desp-Su (1983 pp 167-72); and for an analysis of Alcuin’s change in attitude to this source, see Biggs (forthcoming).

Frederick M. Biggs

APOCYRHPHA

The term “Apocrypha” is used here instead of “Pseudepigrapha” because the perspective of this volume is not exactly the same as that of modern scholars who distinguish among three kinds of biblical material: books accepted as canonical by Catholics and Protestants (from the Hebrew canon), additional books accepted by Catholics but not by Protestants (from the Septuagint canon), and books excluded by both groups. For Anglo-Saxon England, where the Bible was essentially the Vulgate (see Vulg), it is more appropriate to distinguish between the Bible as the canon and the Apocrypha as the non-canonical books, a distinction suggested by the contemporary writings Alcuin’s (the prose de virginisacta 313.11-14), Bede (extracted in actus apostolorum 1.13.56), and prisciano (proloqui-um vita vulgare 110b-4); for patristic uses, see NBD 1.25-26. The use of the term, however, is not meant to imply that the advances in modern scholarship in dating, placing, and characterizing these texts will be ignored.

Unfortunately, deciding which term to use is less difficult than defining what it means. While useful, the definitions of modern scholars—in particular Charlesworth (OTP 1.xiv) and Hennenck (NBD 1.50-28)—are perhaps too strict for our purposes because they exclude works that would have appeared to be “Apocrypha” to the Anglo-Saxons. For example, the revelatin of Ps. Methodius, now dated to the mid-seventh century and so too late for Charlesworth’s criteria, is in some ways similar to Daniel. Thus for practical purposes, this section adopts the inclusive list of

Frederick M. Biggs

I. OLD TESTAMENT APOCYRHPHA

Life of Adam and Eve [ANON.Vit.Adam]: RBMA 74; OTP 2.249-93. MSS—R65 none.

Surviving in distinct Greek (sometimes called the Apocalypse of Moses) and Latin recensions, the Life of Adam and Eve was composed—probably in Hebrew—late in the first century AD, and translated probably before the beginning of the fifth century (OTP 2.252). The Latin version relates events in the life of Adam and Eve from the expulsion to their deaths.
Alcuin's life of Martin is a redaction of three works by Sulpicius Severus. The Cambridge MS suggests that the work may have first circulated in England in the monasticism of St Beor de Chartres, and was added later to the Cotton-Codex-Legendary (see Legendaria) represented by the Salisbury MS. Zettel (1979 pp 99-100) first noted Alcuin's use of this work in his first life of St Martin, identifying the four major passages previously thought to have come from Sulpicius' Dialogue as deriving more directly from Alcuin's redaction. He discusses as well some other correspondences.

For a discussion of Alcuin's sources, see I Deide-Su (1985) pp 167-72; and for an analysis of Alcuin's change in attitude to this source, see Biggs (forthcoming).

Frederick M. Biggs

APOCRYPHNA

The term "Apocrypha" is used here instead of "Pseudepigrapha" because the perspective of this volume is not exactly the same as that of modern scholars who distinguish among three kinds of biblical material: books accepted as canonical by Catholics and Protestants (from the Hebrew canon), additional books accepted by Catholics but not by Protestants (from the Septuagint canon), and books excluded by both groups. For Anglo-Saxon England, where the Bible was essentially the Vulgate (see text), it is more appropriate to distinguish between the Bible as the canon and the Apocrypha as the non-canonical books, a distinction suggested by the contemporary writings Alumnus (the prose de virgo virginatate 313.11-14), Rede (retroactive in actus apostolorum 1.13.56), and Wifredom (revel Ecclesiasticum Vitae Wifredi 1120-II); for patristic uses, see NTA 1.25-20. The use of the term, however, is not meant to imply that the advances in modern scholarship in dating, placing, and characterizing these texts will be ignored.

Unfortunately, deciding which term to use is less difficult than defining what it means. While useful, the definitions of modern scholars—in particular Charlesworth (OTP 1.xxv) and Hennings (NTA 1.26-28)—are perhaps too strict for our purposes because they exclude works that would have appeared to be "Apocrypha" to the Anglo-Saxons. For example, the Revelations of Ps Venus, now dated to the mid seventh century and too late for Charlesworth's criteria, is in some ways similar to Daniel. Thus for practical purposes, this section adopts the inclusive list of Apocrypha in volume 1—and expanded in volume 8—of the Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi [RBMA]. This list also provides a convenient system of dividing the works into Old Testament Apocrypha, Apocryphal Gospels, Apocryphal Acts, and Apocryphal Apocalypse; the Apocryphal Gospels and the Apocryphal Acts have their own introductory remarks. The section includes a few texts not listed in the RBMA but which are often considered with the Apocrypha. An example is the biblical antitologies of Ps Hrnel, which, following the OTP, has been included with the Old Testament Apocrypha even though the RBMA treats the work as a biblical commentary. A concluding Miscellaneous section, which has been omitted from this "Trial Version," will include several texts that do not fit neatly into the scheme but that are discussed by Anglo-Saxonists as Apocrypha.

There is considerable overlapping within apocryphal books, which of course increases the difficulty of distinguishing which were known in Anglo-Saxon England. For example, as Cross (1979b p 17) notes, the Ps Hrnel collection of Apocryphal Acts, which has been cited as a source for works such as the Old English Marriage (Mey, B19), draws on earlier lives, and so is often indistinguishable from them. Moreover recent studies of Hiberno-Latin biblical materials (see Hiberno-Latin biblical commentaries: Bischoff 1976; McNamara 1975; Cross 1986a; and C. Wright 1987a) indicate that many apocryphal motifs circulated in these works, and so an individual motif may not necessarily reflect a direct knowledge of the entire book in question.

Contributors to the Apocrypha have signed their individual entries, but all have read the entire section, and have been generous in offering advice and criticism. The unsigned entries are my own. For further scholarship on the texts themselves, see Charlesworth's bibliographies for works related to the Old Testament (1983) and to the New Testament (1987).

Frederick M. Biggs

I. OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHNA

Life of Adam and Eve [ANON.Vit.Adar]: RBMA 74; OTP 2.249-95.

MS — Ref. none.

Surviving in distinct Greek (sometimes called the Apocalypse of Moses) and Latin recensions, the Life of Adam and Eve was composed—probably in Hebrew—late in the first century AD, and translated probably before the beginning of the fifth century (OTP 2.252). The Latin version relates events in the life of Adam and Eve from the expulsion to their deaths.
Adam Ocyipartic and Adam's Name [ANON.Adam.comp.]: RBM4 75,22.

MS* 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326: HG 93.
List none.
A-S Rev Sl I (85.1).
Quote/Cite—Ref. none.

The motif that describes Adam's creation from eight substances may seem ultimately on II Enoch 30.8J (OTP 1.150). It is widespread in Insular circles, appearing in the eighth-century Liber de Numeris (in Hibero-Latin biblical commentaries, number 59, see also the Questions of Bar-tholomew) and later texts. The Durham Ritual (p. 192, see Limited) has an Old English gloss (Prosthetic, C15.1). This motif occurs in questions 8 and 9 of the prose Solomon and Saturn (Sl III; see Cross and Hill (1982, 26-48), and their discussion of sources and analogs (pp. 68-70).

Along with the description of Adam's material creation in the Cambridge MS is another motif also perhaps derived from II Enoch 50.13-14 (OTP 1.152, also mentioned in the Assyriological Sumerlian bilinguals S.24-26; OTP 1.362), the derivation of Adam's name from four stars. This motif underlies questions 6 and 7 of the prose Solomon and Saturn (see Cross and Hill 1982 pp. 66-67), but does not occur in the Durham Ritual. A version of the motif, which links the names to the four corners of the world but does not mention stars, occurs in the pseudo- COMMENTARIES IN GENESE (1.729-35). Bede apparently follows Augustin (Breviarium XCV.15.6-12) or Augustine (Practicae IX.14.9-14 and XIII.2.2-4). DAVENPORT (1976 p. 169) notes a trace of this motif in one of the illuminations in Bythrift's Manual (Byed 1, Crawford, BYO.30.1), printed as the frontispiece in EETS OS 177: the cardinal points are also given the names that spell out Adam, and reinforced with separate capitals.
This composite work, attributed to Enoch (Gen 5:24) but composed in Hebrew or Aramaic between 200 BC and 100 AD, presents eschatological themes, discussion of the fallen angels, and astronomical lore. The only known Latin fragment is a shortened version of chapter 106 (considered in the OTP to be an appendix from an independent work), which describes Moses' miraculous form at birth, and foretells the Flood. Mühl (1976 pp 78-85), who argues that "there is no irrefutable evidence for the existence of a Latin version of the Enochic writings," proposes that the fragment and its surrounding passages are "probably some extracts from a chronicle or from a collection of Exempla or of Testimonia." Dampp (1975) identifies the manuscript as Brera from the ninth century, but states that it was in England (perhaps Worcester) during the next century" (p 331).

According to Kaske (GR 2343), Bede's discussion in his Commentarius in EPISTOLAS I Enoch is clearly based on a similar discussion by Augustine in De Civitate Dei" (XV.25.104-24), but "it does at least raise the question of whether Bede may not have known of the Book of Enoch directly" (p 422). The passage Kaske cites as suggesting independent knowledge by Bede is referred to in Enoch 9-7 in the Cassel edition of Bede's commentary, although Augustine may be Bede's only source.

As evidence for the circulation of I Enoch, James (1909-10) has identified a number of early Insular works that include the motif of the seven archangels: Corkhill's coffin; the Dubhnam Ritual (pp 145, 146, and 196; see Liturgy); The Book of Cerne (pp 153; see Liturgy); The Antiphonary of Bangor (p 85; see Liturgy); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 (p 536; HC 59); and the St John's Prayer (EESF 7 fol 126v); as well as several other Irish and Continental examples. Hill (1974) adds that some of the names from the list occur in the Peter Norton Dialogue (Sol II, 353; 169.3 and 9) and that Boniface condemns a prayer containing the names of eight angels (AGH KS 1.127). Cross (1986a) discusses the possibility of Irish biblical commentaries as intermediaries for such material (see McNulty 1959 p 28 for a further Irish example).

Menner (GR 4337) cites I Enoch three times for parallels to the poetic Solomon and Saturn (AGH KS 1.247-48; 555b, and 256-64). The possibility that I Enoch may underlie the depiction of Grendel and Grendel's mother in Beowulf (Beo. A.1) has long intrigued critics, with three details commanding the most attention: the monsters' cannibalism, their home in the wasteland, and the "et" ending of Grendel's name; see in particular Rout-terweck (GR 7313, p 490), Emerson (GR 623, p 878 note 1); Kaske (GR 2343); Pelchta (GR 2353); Mellinkoff (1979 and 1981); and Gros (1986a pp 82-83).

Two of the illuminations of Enoch, one in the Old English Hexateuch (BL, Cotton Claudius B.v); JASD 191.23) and another in the Junius MS (Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 11; JASD 163.35); illustrate Gen 5:24, the translation of Enoch, and show no apparent influence of the apocryphal tradition. A second illustration in the Junius MS, however, is less straightforward, showing "Enoch, nimbed and holding an open book, trampling a dragon, while an angel addresses him" (JASD 163.34). Neither the Vulgate, nor Genesis A (Gedd, A.1.1; 1951-2127a) accounts for this depiction; Gell- lancez (GR 196, p 815) suggests it may represent Enoch as the inventor of writing (Eucharis 4.18) or as the author of an apocalyptic book (see I Enoch 13.6, 14.7, etc.). Similarly, Gellancez suggests that the sign above the family inhabiting the first city earlier in the Hexateuch (JASD 191.22) is the sign of Aries, and can be explained by assuming a confusion of Cain's son Enoch (Gen 4:17) and Jared's son Enocli (Gen 5:19); the latter, according to Pudens 4.17 composed an astronomical text. According to Mühl (1976 p 11) this passage from Jubilees refers to I Enoch 72-82.

A translation of the entire work, based on the Ethiopic but including references to the Greek and Latin fragments, appears in OTP 1.15-89. The Greek fragments are edited by Black (1970 pp 19-44). In addition to editing the Latin fragment, James (Bibliography Part I, pp 146-50) discusses the work.

Oratio Mosis: (RBMA 89.7); see PS PHIL, BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES.

Jannes and Mambres [ANON;Jannes]: RBMA 89.13; OTP 2.427-42.

MS London, BL, Cotton Tiberius B.v; HC 373.

List none.

A-S Ver Memb | Bbl.5.7. | Quote/Gi | Ref. none.

Legends about Jannes and Mambres (Greek: Jannes and Jambres), at some point identified as the two Egyptian magicians who compete against Moses and Aaron in Ex 8, are pre-Christian since they are extant in the Dossarwan Document, a text dated around 100 BC (OTP 2.427). The OTP notes that "most early development of the Jannes and Jambres tale took place in a Greek (and Latin) Christian milieu," with early references to the two including II Tim 3.8. By the third century, origin refers to an apocryphon devoted to their exploits (Commentary on Mt 27.3, PG 15.1769), and a Latin version is condensed in the Gelasian Decree (303-04).
The Latin excerpt and Old English translation from the British Library MS were printed by Cockayne (GR. 295) and James (GR. 5734), and then more carefully edited and discussed by Förster (GR. 5735). The Old English translation, amounting to some 15 lines and accompanied by a full-page illustration, is the only vernacular version that has yet come to light. In it, Mambres raises the spirit of his dead brother James from hell with the aid of ocromancing spells in James's magical books. The shade of James appears and warns Mambres of hell's tortures, adjuring him to lead a better life. Comparison with the reconstructed Greek fragments shows this episode to come near the end of the apocryphon (OTP 2.440–41). The excerpt has apparently been added to the manuscript of the text.

Three other passages in Old English mention the magicians by name but are not manifestly dependent upon the apocryphon. One of the Old English additions to Osiris (B.9.2, 26.19–22) tells that by means of sorcery, "James and Mambres" persuaded the Egyptians to follow the Israelites through the Red Sea. Nothing in the extant Greek fragments agrees with this assertion; see however Lindsay's etymologies (VII.4.44–45) which connects the names with the sea, and may thus have given rise to the addition. Alciati makes a similar comment in his piece on auguries (AES, Auguries, B.3.18–14) where he states that James and Mambres made many pronouncements through the devils' craft, deceiving Pharaoh with their cunning tricks so that he drowned in the deep sea. Finally, the anonymous Life of St Margaret (LS 14; MargaretAnn 15), B.2.14–258 records that when God cast Satan out of paradise, he gave him two lands (presumably to rule), one named James and the other Mambres. This detail accords with none of the extant Latin lives of St Margaret (BRF. 5205), which do mention James and Mambres, but only in a speech in which a demon proclaims, "Satan is our king, who was expelled from paradise. In the books of James and Mambres you will find our lineage [recalled]" (Monbritius 1930 vol 2 p 194). The precise relationship of these three Old English passages to the apocryphon, or related legends, has yet to be determined.

Janes and Mambres also have been identified in three illuminations. The illustrated Old English Historia (BL Cotton Claudius B. iv; IAM 191) depicts the miracle of the roes (Ex 7:12) with two figures between Moses and Aaron and Pharaoh, although the text does not identify them, Chilgren's (IAM 191.237) suggestion that they are James and Mambres seems likely. Two similar figures appear in the depiction of the plague of lice (Ex 8:18), and again Chilgren (191.238) identifies them as James and Mambres. BL Cotton Tiberius Bv (see above) depicts the scene described in the fragment (IAM 192.67).

For an English translation of the extant fragments in Greek, Latin, and Old English, see OTP 2.437–42; on the texts themselves, see the introduction to the translation, with further bibliography in Charleworth (1981 pp 133–34). The Toronto Dictionary of Old English is using Förster's edition (GR. 5735). Further discussion of the Old English appears in James (1920 pp 31–38).

Thomas N. Hall

Threnis Scellae Tephthed in Monte Stelacum: RBMA 89.16. See ps philo, biblical antiquities.

Visio Zeno: RBMA 91.4. See ps philo, biblical antiquities.


MSS—Ref. none.

Composed in the late first century AD, with four chapters added in the third century, 4 Ezra contains seven visions concerning primarily the end of the world. The work circulated in some Latin Bibles (for a list of early manuscripts, see Gray 1930 vol 1 pp xiii–xiv), and was certainly known in Irish circles (see McNamara 1975 p 27). Ogilvy concludes too readily from a passage quoted in James's introduction to Bede's (855) edition that "the French family of MSS are thought to rest on an English archetype" (BKE p 69). According to Biscoff (1968 p 24), the manuscript in question (now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1504 and 1505) is from St Germain in Paris, although the illuminated initials may show the influence of Insular practice. McNamara (1975) indicates that one of the Irish texts dependent on 4 Ezra belongs to the French family.

A number of motifs perhaps derived ultimately from 4 Ezra have been noted in Old English texts, particularly Gnomic (AS.1; see GR 626, 2945, HII 1865, Biggs 1846, and Biggs 1898; see also heremino-latin commentaries, number 1).

For an English translation, see OTP 1.525–59. In addition to the text in Bede and James (1895), the introduction includes a list of parietic and medieval citations of the work. See also Gray's (1938) study and edition, which contains French translations of the Syriac and Ethiopic, and a Latin text with many variants. On the relationship of 4 Ezra to other Ezra material, see Stone (1982).

Revelatio Endrae [ANON. Rev. End.]: RBAJ 99


List—none.
A-S Vers
1. Prg 3.9 (Féret; B25.3.3.9).
2. Prg 5.1 (Warner; B25.3.5.1).
3. Prg 6.4 (Cookney; B25.3.6.4).

Note

The Revelatio Estrate, which predicts the weather for the coming year on the basis of the weekday on which the new year falls, is closer in genre to the Prognostica than to the Apocrypha; it is, however, associated with Ezra in the seventh-century Chronicon of John of Nikiem, and in Latin MSS such as Vatican, Pal. lat. 1449 (Mercati, Bibliography Part 1). The two eleventh-century MSS in the BL (printed in Birch 1892 pp 257–58; and Fürsten, GR. 6152, pp 296–97) do not associate the work with Ezra. The work also occurs in Vatican, Pal. lat. 235, but beyond the portion of this manuscript accepted in HG 910.

In addition to the glossed Latin text, Cotton Tiberius A iii also includes a version only in Old English (Prg 3.9). The other two Old English versions are from the twelfth century. Prg 6.4, unlike the other versions known in Anglo-Saxon English, associates the predictions with Christmas rather than with the new year; this tradition is also found in London, BL Sloane 475, a MS not included in HG, but dated by Matter (1982 p 369) to the eleventh century.

Matter (1982) pays special attention to the English transmission of the work, and also provides a translation of the Latin. In addition to the Latin texts printed by Mercati (Bibliography Part 1), a version appears in PL 90.951 among the dual-worship of Bede.

Psalm 151 [ANON. Pr.151]: RBMA 105.2; GTP 2.610–12.

MSS
1. Florence, Biblioteca Medica Laurenziana I (Ambrosianus); HG 825.
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 272: HG 77.
3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 296: HG 104.

Note

Composed originally in Hebrew, and translated in the Septuagint, Psalm 151 draws much of its content from I Sam, purporting to be spoken by David after his flight with Goliath. In the Codex Amiatinus it is introduced as "psalmus david proprium extra aumenum." The psalm is also included in the Psalmorum Romanum (see Liturgy)—brought to Canterbury by St Augustine (Weber 1953 p iv), but the psalm does not occur in several English MSS of this psalter, including Pierpoint Morgan 776 (HG 862), Cambridge University Library Fi.123 (HG 4), and East Berlin Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Hamilton 533 (HG 790). It does occur in the Additional MS (the Bosworth Psalter), but without an Old English gloss (Morrell 1965 p 125).

The Vespasian Psalter, in its original plan, deliberately omitted this psalm, but it was added by the 4th hand on an inserted leaf (EEEMP 14:46), and has been glossed. NRK (203) suggests that the Latin text is "probably by the same hand" as the Old English glosses, which date to the mid ninth century. Morrell (1965 pp 104, 111, 114, 118) records the presence of Psalm 151 in some Gallican Psalters (see liturgy) with Old English glosses (above, nos 6, 9, 11, and 12), although in these cases the psalm is apparently not glossed. Mears (1914 pp 94–95) notes simply that this psalm "is in many of the earlier Psalters," and in addition to those already noted, he includes references to two more Gallican Psalters listed in HG (above, nos 7, and 10). James' catalog (1911–12 vol 2) notes the psalm in the three Corpus MSS (the beginning is imperfect in 272); Schenkl (1960, V. Salisbury p 44) in the second Salisbury MS (above 15); and Wilamowitz' catalog (1937–45 vol 1) in the Vatican MS.

Citharismus Regis David contra Daemonium Saulis: RBMA 105. See in philo, biblical antiquities.

Interdictio Solomonis [ANON. Inter.Sal.]: RBMA 108.13.

MSS

Ref: none.

The Gelasian Decree (332) mentions as apocryphal an "Interdictio Salomonis" also called in some manuscripts the "Contradictio Salomonis." Because this work has not yet been identified, its relationship to other Solomon literature, particularly the Testament of Solomon—in which the Old Testament ruler interrogates various demons (RBMA 108.3, and GTP 1.935–47)—remains uncertain. The work has often been mentioned in connection with poetic Solomon and Serafini (MSdA, A.13); for example, James (1920 p 92) states the Interdictio was the source for the Old English. Menner (GR 4337), following Vincze (GR 4345), notes that "this sixth-century Contradictio could hardly . . . be the immediate and sole source of a poem which contrasted Germanic and Christian wisdom," but he concludes that...
it is at least welcome testimony from an obscure period to the continued popularity of the apocryphal literature concerning Solomon, and if really a debate, might well be the ancestor of the medieval dialogues" (p. 24).

_Sibylline Oracles_ [ANON.Sibyl]: _RBMA_ 122; _OTP_ 1.317-472; _NTI_ 2703-45.

_ASS-4-S Rev_ none.

_Quot/Cit_ ALDH.Metz. 79.24, 93.21, and 93.33: see below.

_Reb_ _ALL_ 4 (Bl.3.4) 132-25: see below.

Surviving primarily in Greek, the Sibylline Oracles span the pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions, being written between the second century BC and the seventh century AD. According to Collins (OTP 1.318), "the most characteristic feature of these works is the prediction of woes and disasters to come upon mankind." The Latin tradition, as Bischoff (1966 pp 150-71) has shown, is dominated by the discussions of Lactantius and particularly Augustine, who in his _De Civitate Dei_ XVIII.23 includes a Latin translation of a Greek acrostic poem that begins ἩΒΙΩΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ἩΣΟΥ ὈΥΣΙΩΝ, and a collection of oracles drawn from Lactantius. However, Bischoff (1966 pp 164-66) has also edited a Latin text (_RBMA_ 124.2.2), identified in one MS as the "prophesia Sibilaris magna," that he has discovered in three MSS, two of which date to the ninth century. Another Latin text (_RBMA_ 124) is printed among the "dubia" of Verhelst (PL 90.1081-86); Bischoff (1966 p 151) dates this work to the eleventh century. Aldhelm quotes three lines from a Latin translation of the Greek acrostic poem mentioned above, identifying in each case the "Sibyllinus versus" as his source. His citations, however, do not correspond with Augustine's translation. Butal (1938) suggests that Aldhelm may have been the translator of this version; Lapidge (In Lapidge andRosier 1985 p 265 note 9) considers this unlikely due to Aldhelm's limited knowledge of Greek, but indicates that the translation may have been produced in the school of text producers and madrinas (p 19).

In his discussion of the Old Testament canon, Alford identifies the Sibyls as ten virgins who prophesied Christ to the heathens; he apparently follows traditions about the Sibyls represented in Timotheus's _Symphoria VIII.B_. Gras (GR 656, pp 51 and 67) cites Augustine's translation of the acrostic poem, and a passage in the Greek text as possible sources for ChristC (AS.1; 964-70a and 1995); neither however is conclusive (see Biggs 1988 pp 13 and 24).

The Greek text is edited by Geiffken (Bibliography Part I). Translations appear in the _OTP_ 1.335-472; and the _NTI_ 2.709-45 (on pp 741-45 in a translation of Bischoff's "prophesia Sibilaris magna"). For further bibliography, see Charlesworth (1988 pp 184-88).

_Ps Methodius, Revelation_ [ANON.Rev/PS.METH.]: _CPC_ 1830; _RBMA_ 124.4-8.

2. ? London, BL Royal S.Favilii.
3. ? Oxford, St John's College 128.

_Lat-AS Rev_ none.

_Quot/Cit_ see below.

_Reb_ see below.

The original version of the Revelation was a Syriac apocalypse with historical and prophetic sections. It recounts the Creation, Fall, and Flood followed by the succession of empires, the Arab invasions, the eventual triumph of the Last Roman Emperor, the coming of the Antichrist, and the end of the world. It was composed between 546-678, then translated into Greek in the seventh century, and into Latin in the eighth century (and thence into various vernaculars), directly influencing _adom's Targum_ (Verhelst 1973 pp 94-97), the _Visio de Davide_, the medieval Alexander legend (Alexander 1885 p 14 etc., p 18 etc.), and the Liber Actuum delicii ex cornographia (ATS p 576).

Although the Revelation is attested in 22 pre-twelfth-century Latin MSS and in four Latin recensions (Laureys and Verhelst 1888; Prinz 1985 pp 4-5), only Salisbury 165 (not listed in Laureys and Verhelst) is accepted as originating from England before 1000. The three other MSS are quereled above because some uncertainty remains about their date and provenance. Royal S.Favilii is considered a Salisbury MS of the eleventh or twelfth century (Wittem 1987 pp 60-61) or a Continental MS of the second half of the eleventh century (Prinz 1985 p 4 note 16). Bodley 165 is a composite MS, and the folios including the Revelations are not listed in HG 555. Both parts of the MS are considered from the first quarter of the twelfth century by Maudan (Maudan, Craeser, and Hunt 1893-1953 vol 2.1 p 164); Ker (1964 p 151) lists the MS as eleventh century without distinguishing the parts. D'Orey's (1910) text is from St John's College (she selects variants from Bodley 165), which has been dated either to the beginning of the eleventh century (Coxe 1852 vol 2 pp 38-39) or to the second half of the eleventh century (Prinz 1985 p 4 note 17).

BL Cotton Claudius B.iv (Hesychastus) contains Latin and late Old English notes to Genesis (Bl.1.4.7) which cite "Methodius." NRK (142) dates the Old English notes to the mid-twelfth century. Crawford (GR 5236, pp
II. APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

The general term "Infancy Gospels" is used by modern scholars (e.g. Cullmann, in NTS 1.563-69) to refer to a number of overlapping texts that describe events in the life of Jesus. Because the manuscript evidence is often incomplete, the relationships among these works remains at points unclear, but it seems preferable on the whole to consider them as discrete works, as follows: the Protoevangelium of James, the De Mortuus Mariæ, and the Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus.

The Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus, as it is known, is a collection of stories that relate events in the life of Jesus. It is believed to have been written in Greek, although the exact date and location of its composition are unknown. The Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus is considered to be an apocryphal text, meaning it was not included in the New Testament. It is a part of the Christian tradition, but it is not included in the canon of the Bible.

Questions of Bartholomew

Bartholomew's name appears in the New Testament as the author of the Gospel of Bartholomew, which is considered a part of the apocryphal literature. This gospel was not included in the canon of the New Testament and is not considered to be a part of the official Christian scriptures. However, it is considered to be an important text in the history of Christian thought and has been the subject of much study and discussion.
of the complete Latin text published by Moricca. James (1924 pp 166–81) and the NTX include eclectic English translations of the Questions of Bartholomew, conflating the various versions; for criticism see Kaestli (1988 pp 18–21).

Two MSS preserve Latin translations of the Questions of Bartholomew: Vatican, Reg. lat. 1050 (L), which contains three fragments of the text, edited by Wilmart and Timmerant (Bibliography Part I), and Rome, Biblioteca Casanatense 1880 (C), the only complete version, edited by Moricca (Bibliography Part I). Kaestli’s reference to a gospel written by Bartholomew (CSSL 120.19) depends on Jerome.

Gellner (GR 156, p civ) suggests that the devil’s reference to a “son” of Satan in Christ and Satan (Sat, A1.4) may depend on the Questions of Bartholomew, in which Satan has a son named Salasar. However, other more plausible explanations have been offered for the allusion (see Cubb), GR 3344, pp 62–63; Hilt 1977c pp 933–35; and Finnegans 1977 p 27.

Grant (1982 pp 43 and 46) cites the "Gospel of Bartholomew" among other apocryphal texts for the archangel Michael’s participation in creation and struggle with Satan in L2 24 (Michaelstext, 3.9.3.54).

Henderson (1986 p 81, note 33) refers to the "Gospel of Bartholomew" (i.e. the Questions of Bartholomew, translated by James 1924 pp 174–75) as a possible source for Bartholomew’s power over the devils in Gudke A (Gudke, A3.2); but see Hill (1977 p 885, note 1) for another possible source in SS Innoc, de Genet et Genit Patrum (the section on Bartholomew is dependent on SS Innoc according to Dumville 1975 p 314).

C. Wright (1987a pp 145–45) cites a passage from the Questions of Bartholomew (from Moricca’s edition, p 512) as a possible source for a description of the creation of Adam (De platumata Adam, CPL 1155 viii; edited in PL 4.937–41, and C. Wright 1967a pp 140–41; see also ADAM OCCUPYING in the apocryphal text) found in four early manuscripts, including an Anglo-Saxon manuscript known as the Rockholt Sven Gall (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 9/3, second half of the eighth century, “by a scribe trained in the Anglo-Saxon tradition,” CLA 7.926; edited by Barroche 1933). C. Wright (1987a pp 143–45) draws attention to a similar description of the creation of Adam in the probably Irish Fragmentum Pragense (CPL 2255; KJS An creit, edited in PL 21.1494–85), where it is accompanied by allusions to the creation of the angels from fire and water and to the prior creation of Saturnalia, both motifs also found in the Questions of Bartholomew.

Charles D. Wright

Protevangelium of James [ANON, Protevangelium Jacobi: RBMA 141; BHRG 1046; NTX 1370–88].

MSS Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 121.

List: Quaestor none.

Right 1 for Allīric, see under Gospel of St Matthew.

This Greek apocryphon, compiled around 150–200 AD, contains the earliest written account of the Nativity and dedication of Mary, providing the names for her parents. It also recounts the miracles attending the births of John the Baptist and Christ, the flight of John and Elizabeth from Herod, and the murder of Zacharias. Extant Greek manuscripts number over 130, and translations exist in at least eight other Eastern languages. It has been translated into Latin by the early sixth century when it was condemned in the Council of Earth (251). The first eight chapters of a Latin version, as noted by Clayton (1986a p 289) and Cross (1987a p 57 item 51), were known in England from their inclusion in a sermon on the Nativity of Mary in Pembroke 25 (see homilies of St Peter de Chantris under HOMILIAE).

Ties with Old English literature are not well established. Hill (GR 348) proposed the Protevangelium as the source for a passage in the Decretals of Hadrian (AD 166, A3.26; 99–100) on the status of the Jordan River, but see Hall (forthcoming in Idée) for an alternative view. Randly (1974) advanced the apocryphon as the source for a passage in Hare 4.5 (Harean 10, B3.2.40–6) which contains an obscure allusion to Solomon by “sanctus Iacobus.” Her thesis—that the passage confirms a statement in the canonical Iac—has been rejected in the Protesvangelium or another “Inferno Gospel” and was also suggested for the Joseph-Matthew dialogue by (lyric 7) in Quoted (A3.1.1). Cook (GR 3206) thus refers to supposed parallels from the Protevangelium, the Gospel of St Matthew, de Nativitate Mariae, and the History of Joseph the Carpenter (RBMA 146; at present there is no evidence of this work in Anglo-Saxon England) in the notes to his edition; for further bibliography, see Reinhart (1879 p 124). Any direct debt, however, has since been discounted (see Burlin, GR 3329; and Hill 1977b for a more likely source).

A new edition of the Greek text by A. Frey is forthcoming in the CSSl. At the moment, the best edition of the Greek is by de Strzycker (1961), other editions include Tischendorf (1876 pp 1–50), Arama (Bibliography Part I), and de Santis Orosio (1963 pp 136–76), which includes a Spanish translation, notes on the text, and a bibliography. An English translation appears in NT1 1.374–88, prefaced by a brief textual history pp 570–71. On
surviving early Latin versions, see Canal-Sánchez (1968) and Vattoni (1977). The Latin Nativity sermon in Pembroke 25 is unedited, but a variant is edited by Vattoni (1977) from a thirteenth-century MS. Other evidence for early circulation of a Latin version in the British Isles is offered by McNamara (1975), who draws attention to several distinctively insular features of the Protevangelium in Montpellier, École de Médecine 55 (eighth or ninth century), concluding that Ireland in particular was connected with the transmission, if not even the formation of this Latin rendering of the Protevangelium (p. 39; see also pp. 42-47 and 49).

Thomas N. Hall

Letters of Abgar and Jesus [ANON.Epist.]. RBMA 147; NZE 1.437-44; DACL 1.87-97.


List none.

A.S. Ver. ALS (Abdon & Senanu, BL 3.24) 81-188.

Quote/Cite Ref: none.

Eusebius Ecclesiastical History I.3—known through survives' translation—is the first witness to this apocryphal correspondence between Abgar, ruler of Edessa, and Christ. Other Church Fathers noted that Christ left behind no collection of writings (e.g. Augustine, de controversiis II.6-18), which may have led to the letters being condemned in the Gelasian Decree (538-9).

The Royal MS, which contains only Christ's letter but with additions not found in the Ecclesiastical History, is closely related to Irish prayer books; see SEPH 576. Loomis (GR 5358) notes that Alpers's source is Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History.

The Royal MS has been printed in the appendix to Krupers (1902 pp. 203-6). An English translation of the relevant part of Eusebius' work is in the NZE 1.441-44.


MSS—List none.

A.S. Ver. 1. HomU 35.1 (Nap 43, B3.4.35.1).
2. HomU 35.2 (Nap 44, B3.4.35.2).
3. HomU 36 (Nap 65, B3.4.35).
4. HomU 46 (Nap 57, B3.4.46).
5. HomU 53 (NapSunEpis, B3.4.53).

6. HomU 54 (Priebach, B3.4.54).
7. HomU 6 (KerKthN 10, B3.5.6).

Quote/Cite Ref: BONIF.Epist. 39, 115.13-28; see below. Refs ECCRED.Epist. 21-22.

The Sunday Letter (also known as the "Heavenly Letter" and the Carta Dominica), apparently composed in Greek in the sixth century (RBMA 140), became widely disseminated in the West; see Delahaye (1899). The letter purports to be from Christ, and to be written variously in his own blood, with a golden rod, or dictated to an angel, and to have fallen on one of the principal altars of Christendom—often Rome, Jerusalem, or Bethlehem. The work survives in a number of Latin MSS (that have been only generally divided into recensions), but has yet to be identified in MSS known in England during the Anglo-Saxon period.

The Old English versions, however, can be divided into three groups that are related to different recensions of the known Latin tradition. HomU 36 and HomU 54 are generally agreed to represent the first Latin recension, which survives in Venice, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek lat. 1555 (edited by Priebach, Bibliography Part I), and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 12270 (edited by Delahaye, Bibliography Part I); see Priebach (Bibliography Part I), Whitelock (1982 p. 54) and Lees (1985a p. 133). The Paris MS is recognized as particularly close to HomU 36; see Priebach (1936 p. 19), Whitelock (1982 p. 62 note 95), and Lees (1985a pp. 133-34). Apparently HomU 6, destroyed in the 1731 fire, belonged to this group; see White- lock (1982 p. 54 note 51). The second group includes HomU 46 and HomU 53; Whitelock (1982 p. 55) states that these are "independent translations of a text with similarities with [Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek] Clm 9550," (edited by Delahaye, Bibliography Part I). The third group includes HomU 35.1 and 35.2. Whitelock (1982 p. 51) has discussed these homilies in detail, arguing that they "are variant versions of a lost homily," that in turn was based on "Pehreth's book" mentioned in Ecgred's letter to Wulf- tilge (see Ref above). This letter makes it clear that the book contained a version of the Sunday Letter. Whitelock (1982 pp. 52-58) also compares these two Old English homilies with the Irish Cim Domasg (in the Irish tradition, see McNamara 1975 pp. 60-63), and both the Old English and Old Irish texts with Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 9550 (pp. 58-59).

Priebach (1936 pp. 4-5) notes that boniface quotes from the beginning of a version of the Letter similar to that printed from the transcription of a now lost MS in the Cathedral Library of Saragossa by Petrus de Marco, archbishop of Paris (d. 1654); the transcription is edited by Priebach (Bibliography Part I).
De Nativitate Mariae, a revision of the gospel of St Matthew, dates from the Carolingian period or, more probably, later. It has frequently been attributed to Paschasius Radbertus, but Bever (1980), the most recent editor, has shown that this attribution is improbable. The first proof of the existence of the apocryphon is in a sermon by Fulbert of Chartres (sermo de nativitate 6–29). In private communication, J.R. Cross has noted the presence of this work in the Worcester MS, which, although not listed in HG, is a companion to Winchester E 27 (HG 769) and F 22 (HG 767).

De Nativitate Mariae was clearly known in Winchester in the eleventh century. The Durham manuscript, a version of the homily of Paul the Deacon, has Winchester connections, as it contains texts for the feasts of St Swithin and for the feasts of St Birinus and St Ethelwold. The author of the benediction for the feast of the Conception of the Virgin in the Canterbury Benedictinal (London, BL, Harley 2392: HG 429) seems to have known the text also. The benediction (Woodley 1917 pp. 118–19) refers to the angel’s announcement of Mary’s name before her birth, a detail that seems to depend on the De Nativitate Mariae, the only apocryphon to include it. Prescott (1907) argues that the Canterbury benedictional was probably composed in Winchester.

Amann (Bibliography Part 1) has been superseded by the superior but less accessible Bever (1980), which includes as well a discussion of the history of the text. An earlier edition is by Tischendorf (1876 pp. 113–21). For further discussion, see Clayton (forthcoming).

Mary Clayton

De Transitu Mariae [ANON:Trans.Mariae:]: RBMA 164.

RBMA Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 131.

List: none.

AS Rev 1, 20 (Assumpt.Mor., B3.3.20), see below.

2. LS 21 (Assumpt.Trier, B3.3.21).


2. ? AUCH 1, 30 (B1L,32) 436–62: see below.


Apocryphal texts discussing the death and assumption of the Virgin appear, at the latest, by the fifth century. Because of complex textual histories in several different languages, the versions have yet to be fully sorted out into separate traditions, but the Latin versions relevant to Anglo-Saxonists (Transitus B2 [RBMA 164,5,1] and Transitus C [RBMA 164,6,1])

Clare A. Lees

Historia de ligno crucis: RBMA 151.

[Thomas N. Hall]
apparently both descend from a lost Greek version of the fifth century via a Latin text of the fifth to seventh century (see Clayton 1986b pp 25-26). Transitus B2, which purports to be the work of Melito (thus the attribution to St. Melito), dates to the fifth century according to Häbi-Bach-Reinisch (Bibliography Part I) and is older than the version (B1) published by Tischendorf (1866 pp 124-36). Transitus C, composed according to Wengler (1955 p 66) in the seventh or eighth century, has been edited by Wilmart (Bibliography Part I), but Pembroke 25 (see the homiliary of St. Wælde de Cherwernes) was not collated for this edition. The work is condemned in the Gelasian Decree (296).

L520 (AssumpTrim) combines Transitus C (pp 137-55.19) and Transitus B2 (pp 155.20-57.55); see Willsard (GR 684 and 685) and Clayton (1986b). The homilist, however, apparently used an abridged version of Transitus C, from which references to the corporal assumption of the Virgin had been eliminated (Clayton 1986b). The version of C in Pembroke 25 is closest to the Old English than is the one in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 732 (Wilmart’s Q), although even this MS does not correspond to the Old English in all respects.) The homilist then draws on B2 for a detailed account of the assumption. The two accounts may of course have been compiled in a source not yet discovered. L521 (AssumpTrim), also from B2 (see Clayton 1989), is a more faithful and competent translation of this version than is L520.

B2 was known to Bede, who quotes directly from it and objects to its chronology in his Excerpta (the CCSL provides references to PC 5.1233 and 1234, and to Tischendorf 1866 pp 1258). Halbach-Reinisch suggests that B2 was disseminated in southern Germany by Anglo-Saxon missionaries. This version is probably the basis for the account of the Virgin’s assumption given by the Anglo-Saxon nun Huneberc (Vita Willehad, MGH Scriptores 15, part 1, 93.16), who wrote in Heidenheim Germany around 780, although it contains details which do not agree with any published apocryphon; her account may be based on hearsay.

In his Assumption homilies in both Catholic Homilies I and II, alvric objects to the circulation of unauthorized apocryphal accounts: he was presumably referring to B2 or to C, or to both.

The influence of the Transitus texts can also be discerned in Anglo-Saxon art. A carved stone slab in Wirksworth, Derbyshire (published J. Campbell 1807 Illustration 136), which Cramp (1977) dates to the first half of the ninth century, includes a representation of the dead Mary on a bier carried by two apostles (Peter and Paul, according to the apocryphal tradition), preceded by another figure carrying a palm (John). Attached to his hands to the bier is the Jew who wished to burn Mary’s body and in a circle or cloud above are six heads, presumably angels. The Benedictional of St. Etheldreda (London, BL Add. 49398, fol 102v; JASSM III.25), a Winchester manuscript of 971-84, includes a miniature of the feast of Mary’s Assumption which depicts nine apostles, above whom Mary lies on a bed, attended by three women, and the hand of God, flanked by four angels, crowns a lower. The scene clearly illustrates the death of Mary as recounted in the apocryphal narratives. Denham (1970 pp 86-87) and Thorpe (1984 pp 53-54) argue that the artist was illustrating a scene found only in Transitus A (Wengler 1955 pp 245-56), but there is no evidence that this particular apocryphon was known outside of Reichenau; moreover, the scene can be paralleled in Transitus C (see Clayton, forthcoming). A simplified version of this miniature is found in the Benedictional of Robert of Jumièges (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale 369, fol 54v; HG 925).

L521 has been edited more recently by Grant (1982). For the knowledge of the Transitus Mariae in Ireland, see McNamara (1975 pp 122-23), and Willsard (1987 pp 94-96). For further discussion of Transitus C, see Willsard 1959.

Mary Clayton


A-S vers. L533 (B5.3.18).
Q-Vers Clm I. HomL.10 (VindHun 6, B5.3.140): see below.
Ref. 1. ? ANON.EMlat (NRS pp): see below.
Ref. 2. ? L533H (8 Ass 3, B5.8.7): see below.

The Gospel of Ps Matthew is a composite Latin apocryphon whose date is difficult to determine; NTV 1.406 advises "probably about the eighth or ninth century." Scholars once speculated that THEODORUS BARDULUS compiled the tract in the first half of the ninth century (see Galán-Sánchez 1966 p 473; accepted by RBMA vol 8), but the most recent assessment has pushed the date back to 10th-700, rendering the text once more anonymous (Oijel 1981 p 12). J.E. Cross in correspondence notes that chapters 1-6 "with slight variations and omissions" occur in the British Library MS Cotton Nero E.i. Pt. II, fols 116v-18. He continues "thus a section of Ps Matthew is used as an item called 'acres' in a legendary"; see further the cotton-corpus legendary (see LEGENDARIA), and Cross 1985b pp 125-26 who shows that this tract also appears in ninth-century Continental MSS. It
Clayton (forthcoming) discusses the two illustrations of Ps Matthew in Cotton Colligia Axiv, the earliest surviving in a Western MS (see ISIM 202.7 and 8).


For early Irish knowledge of this work see McNamara (1975 p 48); note too that the Gospel of Thomas circulated in Ireland. For further discussion of the Old English evidence, see Healey (1985 pp 102–03).

Thomas N. Hall

Gospel of Thomas: RB 175: see the gospel of Ps Matthew.

Gospel of Nicodemus [ANON, Euchar Nic:]: RBMA 179,4–27; NLT 1.444–54; DR 5.543–47


List Exeter: ML 10.14

A S Hen 1. Nic (BB.5.2.1).

2. NicD (BB.5.2.2).

3. NicC (BB.3.3.1).

Quest/Quaer — Ref. none.

The title Gospel of Nicodemus, used in the later Middle Ages (e.g. Vincent of Beauvais, Speculum historiale Book 7, chapters 40, 41, 48, 50, etc.), has been variously applied to the four recensions of the work distinguished in the scholarship. Since translations of Greek recension A exist in several oriental languages, scholars generally agree that it is the original version, but disagree on when it was composed; the prologue dates the work to 425 and extraneous refers to what might have been something like it in the late fourth century (NLT 1.1447). This version, known as the "Commentaries" of Nicodemus (a supposed disciple mentioned in Is 3:1-40, 7:50, and 19:39), retells the trial, passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ. The later recensions, one in Greek and two in Latin, add to the narrative the "Descensus Christi ad Inferior" (the Harrowing of Hell), the ostensible account by Kartius and Leucius, two "eyewitnesses" who rose at the Crucifixion (Nm 27:32–33). Of main interest to Anglo-Saxonists is Latin recension A, which contains material from both the "Commentaries" and the "Descensus" and appends a letter from Pilate to the emperor Claudius. An early witness of Latin recension A, which contains only the "Comment-
taries," is a sixteenth-century MS (GLA.10.1485), O'Ceallaigh's (1963) error in dating this MS to the sixteenth century (see Philpott 1970 p 396) under-
mines many of his dates. A later MS of Latin recension A, which contains all three parts, is Einstein Stiftbildarchiv, MS 536 (RBNV 179.27, edit-
ed by Kim, Bibliography Part 1); this recension apparently underlies the Old English versions.

Editors refer to the "Commentaries" as part 1 (prologues and chapters 1-8) and to the "Decretum" as part 2 (chapters 17-27 and the latter). The titles Acta Pilati and Gestis Pilati are sometimes applied to part 1 and sometimes to the whole work. The decretals theme dates to the early patriarchic period, and part 2 may be earlier than part 1 (cf. Titz 1449), but O'Cec-
allaigh (1963 p 25) believes that the Gospel of Nicodemus decretal narrative was originally a Latin production (see also Collett 1981 p 30).

The Royal MS (RBNV 179.12), "written in several hands of continental type, but with corrections in an English hand of the tenth century" (Wam-
ner and Ginzel 1921 vol 1 p 116), belongs to Latin recension A. It omits the prologue and the MS ends as a preliminary shortly before the end of chapter 27. Ker (1964 p 209) lists it as a Worcester manuscript. J.J. Camp-
bell (1962 p 112 note 5) doubts it was the source of the Old English trans-
lations.

Each of the three Old English versions "seems to descend independently from the translator's autograph" (J.J. Campbell 1962 p 114), though the possibilities of intermedial versions and of subsequent collations with the Latin complicate matters. NicA (Cambridge, Univ. Lib. I.2.11), in which the Gospel of Nicodemus appears after the four Gospels, is the earliest manuscript. It represents a literal translation except where it omits and "splices" sections together (Allen 1968 p 11). Allen identifies two major omissions from part 1: chapters 5-11 (debate of the Jewish leaders with Nicodemus, scourging, and crucifixion), and chapters 16-17 (reports of Christ's post-resurrection activities). Part 2 omits chapters 27-29 (dialogue between Pilate and Ananias and Caiphas). NicB (London, BL Cotton Vitellius A.15) lacks at the beginning approximately two printed pages of NicA. Although NicB contains some details from the Latin not found in NicA (and so NicA cannot be its sole direct source), it omits the three major sections omitted by NicA, and is otherwise so closely verbal to NicA that Hulme (GR 5741, p 363) and Förster (GR 5740, p 318) suggest a common original. Allen (1968 p 53) postulates the existence of a version based on NicA that NicB used while consulting the Latin. NicC (London, BL Cotton Vespan-
ian D.xiv) "extends the splicing and abridging technique" (Allen 1968 p 49) of NicA and B in homilistic form. Again, minor additions lead Allen to postu-
late collation with the Latin, though he admits that it is not "an absolute necessity" (p 53).

In addition to the direct use of Latin recension A, scholars have often cited the Gospel of Nicodemus when discussing examples of the Harrow-
ing; see GR 3344 p 98, GR 3479 pp 349-352; and Allen and Gatherer (1976 pp. 175-176). The motif is popular in Old English poetry and prose from at least as early as the time of Bede (see, for example, his in ASCENSIONE DOMINI). The issue, however, is complicated both by the evolution of or-
thodox Church doctrine and by popular developments of the theme. In-
dependent of the Gospel of Nicodemus proper, but of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists, is the Pseudo-Augustine, homily no 16 (FL 59.2059-61) on the Harrowing proposed by Förster (GR 3353) as a source for Hms 26 (RBNV 7, B3.2.20). Building on this argument, Danesby (1972 p 375) postulates a lost Latin homily that drew on homily 160 as a source for the discussion of the Harrowing in the ninth-century section of the book of Chris-
mer (see literary). Hms 26 (RBNV 7). This tradition may also un-
derlie the entry on the Harrowing in the Old English Menologia for March 26 (B298), and it may also be related to an anonymous homily in Ox-
ford, Bodleian Library Junius 121 (Hms 28, B3.2.28; printed by Loizelli Facida 1972); but J.J. Campbell thinks not (1962 p 140). Similarly, the Har-
rowing composes the first part of an anonymous homily for Easter preserved in two Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MSS, 41 and 303 (NcD and E (B3.5.3; a better title would be Hms 29 B3.2.29.1 and 2). The im-
mediate source has not yet been found, although the phrase "an psatem bokum" implies that the homilist worked from written sources, and the connection of 41 to the Leofric donation (NRK 32) may indicate some link to NicA (ML 10.41). Moreover, a discussion of the Harrowing appears in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162 (Hms 27, B3.2.27; see Lesz 1986). Descert loic in Old English poetry include the Dusant into Holo (Hms, A5.25); Christ, B and C (A3.13); Christ and Sater (Sb, A1.4), and GainB (A3.2).

J.J. Campbell's study (1982) is the most comprehensive for the Old Eng-
ish material although his thesis—that little convincing evidence has been advanced for the knowledge of the Gospel before the translations (NicA, B, and C)—as a negative one leaves the question open. Healey (1985) is more willing to see the direct influence of the Gospel in a variety of texts; see also the bibliographical entry by Pelteret in Woods and Pelteret (1985 pp 164-165). Hulme (GR 5736) prints NicA and NicB. Allen 1968 prints NicA and variants from NicB and C, as well as a Latin text based on Tischendorf (1876). NicA also appears in Crawford (GR 5737) and NicC in Warner (GR 5929). In addition to the text edited by Kim (Bibliography Part 1), see Tischendorf (1876) and more recently Collett (1981), who edits an exam-
ple of recension A in Oxford, Bodleian Library Fairfax 17 (twelfth centu-
ry) and of recension B in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 280 (thirteenth
III. APOCRYPHAL ACTS

From the New Testament, the Anglo-Saxons would have known of the Apostles as the twelve disciples chosen by Christ to spread his message (Mt 10:1–42; Mk 3:13–19; Lk 6:12–16; and Acts 1:13–26; for a discussion of the term "apocryph" prior to the writing of the Gospels, see NTA 2:25–31; and for remarks on discrepancies in the canonical lists, see the NCE under "apocryphale". In addition to the canonical traditions, apocryphal material also circulated in the early Church, with five early Acts (John, Peter, Paul, Andrew, and Thomas) competing with the canonical Acts of the Apostles. According to Schneemelcher and de Santis (NTA 2:571), the "literary type" of the apocryphal Actsingered on and proved effective beyond the third century and then gradually merged with that of sacred legend (see ACTA SANCTORUM). The Anglo-Saxons would have derived much of their knowledge of the apocryphal traditions from these later texts, referred to as "Passionaries," which are dated generally between the third and sixth centuries. BEUKERT (in ACTA APOCRYPHAE I) refers to "historia" containing "passiones apostolorum," which he asserts are held by most to be apocryphal. The detail he cites is referred to in the CCE to Ps Abdis, APOCRYPHAL HISTORIAE, but Bede need not be referring specifically to this work. Similarly the mention of "passiones apostolorum" in the Esseur List (ML 10:42) could refer to the Ps Abdias collection, to the anonymous BREVIARIUM APOTOLORUM, or to collections such as Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M p.h.f.78 (CLA 9:1425; Anglo-Saxon majuscule and minuscule, written according to Lowe, "in an Anglo-Saxon center on the Continent, perhaps in the Würzburg region") and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale II 1069 (CLA 10:153; also "written in an Anglo-Saxon center on the Continent"). Apocryphal traditions about the Apostles circulated as well in other works; see in particular the two collections called SCAH ET SHRPH PATRUM, by SIRINUS and PS SIRINUS.

Following the RBMA, this section begins with works that include most of the apostles, and then considers works dealing with one, or sometimes two, apostles, arranged by apostle in alphabetical order. As in the RBMA, PS CLEMENS and the apocryphal BSTYLE OF PAUL TO THE LAODICEANS are included in this section. For an overview of research on the Apocryphal Acts, see Rovers and van Estebroeck (1981), MacDonald (1986), and the AS under "apocrypha."

Breviarium apostolorum [ANON.Breu.apos.]: RBMA 191:1; BHL 652.

MSS

List? see APOCRYPHAL ACTS above.

A S [Ref.]: none.

The Breviarium lists thirteen apostles (including both Paul and Matthias, but excluding Judas Iscariot) and provides in most cases an etymology for the name, a brief biography, and the feast day of each. The first manuscript witness of the work is in the two supplementary quires of the Gelasian Sacramentary (Vatican, Reg. lat. 316) preserved in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 7195; see Lowe 1925–26 pp 357–73), a MS that dates to the eighth century. As noted by de Guiffier (1963), the work also appears in Vatican, Pal. lat. 235, but beyond the folios accepted by HG 910.

The possibility that the Breviarium is a source for Cynonis’s Festum de Apostulis (Fate, A2.2) has been discussed since Sarrasin (GR 3653; see also 3656, 3446, 1419, 6357A, and 1430), but the problem has remained unresolved because there is much overlap among the possible sources, and no single source has been identified for the entire poem; see, in particular, Cross (1979a passim). Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier (1985 p 62) asserts that section 4 of ALDRESE’s GARMINA INCERATISSA ("On the Allure of the Twelve Apostles") belongs to a tradition that includes this work.

In addition to Möhler (Bibliographie Part I), the work is printed in Schermann (507 pp 207–41), who notes readings from six MSS. It is translated in Allen and Alder (1971 pp 37–39).

Notitia de locis Apostolorum [ANON.Notiz.Apost.]: BHL 648, not in RBMA.

MSS [Ref.]: none.

Printed in the introductory material to the MARTYRLOGIUM HIERONYMITANUM (see MARTYRLOGIAE), the Notitia lists the feasts of twelve apostles, in most cases a place with which they are associated, and in some cases, additional biographical details. Broocks (GR 1430, p xxv) comments that the order of Apostles in the Fate (A2.2) is closest to that found in this work; see also Cross (1979a).

In addition to the edition in Schermann (Bibliography Part I), the text
Andrew in the *Ritus* (A2.2; 16-22), but none of these details are restricted to this source. See also *Acta Andreae et Matthiae*.

Bartholomew: see *Passio Bartolomezi et questions de Bartholomew*.

James the Great: Herzipeld (GR 6364 p xii) cites this account in relation to the Old English *Martynge* entry (B19.e), but Cross (1979b pp 32-34; following Coadyke, GR 296) notes that the Bible is the primary source. Cross (1979a p 172) mentions this work as a possible source for details about James in Cynewulf's *Rites of the Apostles* (Ritus, A2.2; 335-357), but here, too, most are biblical. See also the *Passio Jacobi Maioris*.

James the Less (BHL 4310): Cross (1979b pp 29-31) notes that this account relies on *Theobaldus-Hieronimus Historia Eucharistica*, and so is a possible source for the Old English *Martynge* entry (B19.d), similarly Cross (1979a p 174) considers this account a possible source for material on James in Cynewulf's *Ritus* (A2.2; 70-74). See also the *Passio Jacobi Maioris*.

John (BHL 4310): item 20 of Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 25 (see the homilyary of St Peter de Chartres, and Cross 1987a p 22) is largely drawn from the account of John's death in the *Historiae* (BHL 3-391). Herzfeld (GR 6364 p xcviii) cites this work as the source for the entry in the Old English *Martynge* (B19.e), but Cross (1979b pp 34-37) qualifies this suggestion. See also *Ps Selenus, Passio Johannis*.

Matthew: see the *Passio Matthiae*.

Paul: see the *Passio Pauli*.

Peter: see the *Passio Petri*.

Philip: see the *Passio Philippi*.

Simon and Jude: see the *Passio Simonis et Judeae*.

Thomas (BHL 8410): apparently not used in Anglo-Saxon England, but see the *Passio Thomae*.

According to Kaestli (1981 p 52), Fabricius (Bibliography Part I) reprints the edition of Lattius (1531); however, the edition of Nazo (1531) is closer to the manuscripts.

Ogilvy (RCG p.68) incorrectly states that Förster (GR 675, pp 202-6) identified this work as the source of Blickling 19 (LS 1.1). Förster in fact showed that Acta Andreae by Matthiae is the source of this homily. The case of Worcester Cathedral Library E30 is less easily resolved: Flierer (1906 p 46), the catalog from which Ogilvy apparently worked, comments on this MS: "Bound up at the end of the volume are three folios of a treatise (Acta of St. Andrew?) eleven centuries, or earlier." This MS is in HG 762.


MSS - Lists none.

A-S 10 1. And. (A2.1).
2. LS 1.1 (Andrew-Bright, B3.3.1.1).
3. LS 1.2 (Andrew-Mor, B3.3.1.2).

Quote/Ref - None.

This originally Greek legend (written according to the RBMA in Egypt around the turn of the fifth century, but dated perhaps to the sixth century in the NJK) relates the adventures of the two apostles among a race of cannibals. On the relationship of this work to the Acts Andrew (with implications for dating), see Flamion (591) and the recent exchange between MacDonald (1986) and Prior (1986).

In a study of the sources of the Old English Andrea, Schaar (GR 3494) distinguishes two main traditions of the legend, the "detailed and fantastic" and the "shorter and less miraculous" (p 15). He includes the Greek versions, the Latin prose version in the Casanatense Library, and the Old English Andrea (And) in the former group, and the Latin poetic version and the Old English prose versions (LS 1.1 and 1.2) in the latter. He also notes that the Greek versions sometimes contain details relevant to Andrea not found in the Latin versions (p 23). Brookes (GR 4825) asserts that the Latin poetic version "is in fact so free a rendering that it cannot be considered the source of any of the existing Old English versions" (p 87), although he acknowledges that in using the proper names Achaisa, Mirmidonia, and Plato it contains details not found in either the Greek versions or in the Casanatense. Baumler (1985) adds further general similarities between the Latin poetic version and Andrea.

The introduction in Bright Old English Grammar and Reader (GR 314) to the Old English prose version found in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 (LS 1.1) notes that this version is "a very lightly abridged form of the text" in the Blickling collection (LS 1.2), but it "cannot be derived directly from the earlier manuscript (p 205). The editors also assert that the "Bonnet Fragment" is closer to their text than is the Latin version in the Casanatense, and they print this version, with one omission, in the apparatus of the text. Baulander (1985 p 71) suggests that there may have been "more than one model" for the Cambridge and Blickling versions.

The surviving Greek versions have been edited by Tischendorf (183) pp 152-56) and by Bonnet (1809). Tischendorf's text has been translated by Walker (1875). Blatt has edited two Latin versions: one in prose is found in the twelfth-century MS, Rome, Biblioteca Casanatene 104 [Bibliography Part I, translated by Allen and Calder (1976 pp 15-34)]; and the other in verse is found in the eighteenth-century MS, Vatican, Vat. lat. 1724. The "Bonnet Fragment" (Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Plut. I, tom. iii), an eleventh-century palimpsest, is also in prose; Blatt prints it opposite the Casanatense text (pp 15-35). A shorter Latin prose account occurs in the University of Bologna MS 1756; it has been edited by Blatt (1805 pp 90-122), who dates the MS to the eleventh century. Finally, much-condensed Latin versions occur in the pseUDARIA (Fabricius 1119 vol 2 pp 457-59) and in Gregory of Tours' Liber de miraculis sancti Andreae Apostoli (MS MARSB 1827-28). For further discussions of Andrea's relationship to its sources, see Hill (GR 1466); Stiriya (1973); M.M. Walsh (1977 and 1980); Earl (1980); and Bigge (1988).

Passio Andreae [ANON, Pass. Andr.]: RBMA 199.6; BHL 428.

MSS - Lists none.

A-S 10 1. ActHun 1, 38 (B1.40) Thorspe 586.29-588.32.

Quote/Ref - None.

The Passio recounts the conflict between Andrew and Aegias, the ruler in Achaia who attempts to force the Christians to worship idols; Andrew is eventually put to death on a cross. Zettel (1979 p 32) lists the Passio as item 139 in his reconstructed corpus corpus legendarium. Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus manuscript, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 324 (twelfth century), and in the tabule of Salisbury Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell 1; HG 623). Förster (GR 5300, pp 21-22) notes that ellenric uses it in his homily for the Nativity of Andrew (A2Hun 1.38), and Zettel (1979 pp 166-71, and 244-46). Cross (1979b pp 27-28) cites it as a source for details about Andrew in the Old English Metaphor (B1908) not found in pseUDARIA. Cross (1979a pp 170-71) also identifies it as a possible source for Cynwulf's commenars about Andrew in Ratu (A2 1.16-22). Item 66 from the book of CRONE (616.4-15; see LITURGY) is taken with minor changes from the Passio (24.8-24.1); see Kuppers (1902 p 235).
In addition to the text printed in Bonnet (Bibliography Part I), see also Fährenga Grau (1955 vol 2 pp 59-64).

Passio Bartholomaei [ANON. Pas. Bart.]; RBMA 207,1; BHL 1002; NTG 2.577.

MSS

Edit. none.

A.S Hen AEChom I, 31 (BL 1.133).
Quot/Orig — Ref: none.

The Passio tells how, by overthrowing idols in India, Bartholomew is able to convert one king, Polymius, before his brother, Astigos, has the apostle martyred. Zedel (1979 p 24) identified this work as item 89 in his reconstructed Cotton-corpus logarithm: it occurs in both the London and Salisbury MSS. Forster (GR 5900, p 23) notes Alfric's use of this work for the first part of his homily on Bartholomew (AEChom I, 31) and Zedel (1979 pp 181-82) indicates several passages where readings from the Cotton MS are closer to Alf're's version than the text in Mombrivius. Herzel (GR 6576, p xii) points out that the entry on Bartholomew in the Old English Metamorphosis (B19,gh) draws on this account; see also Gross (1979b pp 19-20). Cross (1979a pp 172-74) considers this work as a possible source for details concerning Bartholomew in Cynewulf's Reat (A2.2; 42-49).

In addition to the text in Bonnet (Bibliography Part I), see also Mombrivius (1910 vol 1 pp 165-44), and Ps AEneas (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 669-87).

Ps Clemens, Recognitions [ANON. Recog./PS CLEMENS]; RBMA 208,3; BHL 6644-45; CPG 1015.5; ODCC 304; NTG 2.532-70.

MSS
2. Salisbury, Carch Lib E: HG 701.

Edit.—6.0 Mm. none.

Quot/Orig — Ref: 1. ALDH. Proc. 257,1; ANON. Recog. 6.2-3.
3. BELA. Rectract. V. xxxiv:37-40; ANON. Recog. 45.1-3.
5. BELA. Temp. iat. V.61-69; ANON. Recog. 99.4-11.


2. ALDH. Epist. 482.29.

The Anglo-Saxons would have known the Recognitions through a vernacular translation of a lost Greek text dated to the third century (ODCC 304). The work relates the story of Clement, who is separated from his family early in life; who travels to meet Peter, becoming his disciple and witnessing his encounter with Simon Magnus; and who finally is reunited with his family. But as Irmischer comments, the story is secondary to the didactic aim of the work, which attempts "to communicate the Christian doctrine or certain outward forms of it apologetically and systematically" (NTG 2.532). The narrative is adapted by various heretical groups (the Recognitions is quoted to be a reaction to heretical expansions of the earlier Herulan [CPG 1015.4]), and although Radical's translation omit unorthodox passages, a version is still condemned by the Omissions Decrees (205-64).

The Oxford, New College MS is listed in HG as a fragment; and the Salisbury MS is considered by Rehm (1605 p 68vii) to be twelfth century. Ker (1976 p 25) includes it among group 6 of his breakdown of the MSS from Salisbury Cathedral, which he suggests are later than the first 5 groups. Rehm lists both the Oxford, Trinity College MS and the Royal MS as thirteenth century, but neither appears in HG. Ogilvy (BKE p 117) notes one other MS, BL Add. 18400, but it is included by Rehm among the German MSS (1605 p xii), and is not in HG.

Ogilvy (BKE p 146; corrected in 1984 p 296) states that the "Clemens" mentioned by Alcuin in his Versus de partibus, RODUS ET SACERDotes, etc. (RODUS 552) is the author of this work; Lapidge (ML 1.12) identifies the reference as to Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, and the context of the name among Christian Latin poets supports his assertion; see also Godman (1982 p 125) who translates "Prudentius."

In both his commentary and retraction on the Acts of the Apostles, Bede cites "Clemens" as his source for information. In addition to the two other usages listed above, Bede may draw on the Recognitions elsewhere in his didactic works; see the OCS 123.734. See also Ps Clemens, Epistle ad Jacobum.

In addition to Rehm (Bibliography Part I), the work also appears in AG 1.1207-1454.

Ps Clemens, Epistle ad Jacobum [ANON. Epist. Inc./PS CLEMENS]; RBMA 208,1; BHL 6647; CPG 1015.5; ODCC 304; NTG 2.532-70.

Ogilvy suggests that this work "may have been used by Bede" (BKE p 116) in explaining the succession of Laurence to Augustine as archbishop of Canterbury by recalling Peter's designation of Clement as his successor in Rome (ecclesiastical history II 14, 144-162). Ogilvy notes, however,
that Plummer (1896 vol 2 p 87) adduces other sources including Rufinus' preface to the Ps CLEMENS BREVITATIS (4.29-3.30), and the Liber pontificalis (123.3-8), both works that Bede is known to have used elsewhere.

On the role of the Epistle in shaping this tradition, see Ullmann (1960), who mentions Bede's remarks and adds that Augustinus also identifies Clement as the first pope in his prose de virginitate (257.3-5).

Passio Jacobi Maioris [ANON.Pas.Inc.Mai.]: RBMA 213.11; BHL 4057.

MSS
Lits none.
A S. See ACHOM II, 31-32 (Bl.2.34).
Quote/Cite: Ref. none.

In this Passio, James the Great preaching in Judæa overcomes a magician named Hermogenes, but essentially is decapitated by king Herod. Zettel (1979 p 23) identifies it as item 74 in his reconstructed cotton-corp[us] legendæ; it occurs in the London and Salisbury MSS. Förster (GR 5300, p 23) notes that it is Augustin's source for his homily on James (ACHOM II, 31-32).

In addition to the edition in Fabrega Grau (Bibliography Part I), the work also appears in Memoriales (296 vol 2 pp 37-40); and in MS Arabaas (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 516-31).

Passio Jacobi Minoris [ANON.Pas.Inc.Min.]: RBMA 4093; not in RBMA.
See also MS Arabaas, Cod. Vercelli-historia, historia roediliaatica.

MSS
Lits Ref: none.

James the Less' martyrdom, as this brief Passio relates, is brought about by the Pharisees who want the apostle to speak out against Christ. James uses the occasion to preach the Gospel. Zettel (1979 p 19) lists it as item 45 of his reconstructed cotton-corp[us] legendæ; it occurs in the London and Salisbury MSS. Cross (1979b pp 29-31) cites it, among others, for details in the Old English homily on James (1819-20).

In addition to the text in Fabrega Grau (Bibliography Part I), see also de Smedt, de Backer, van Ortyo, and van den Gheyn (1889 pp 156-37).

Ps Mellitus, Passio Johannis [ANON.Pas.Inh./PS.MEL.]: RBMA 221; BHL 4520; see also NYA 2.204-06.

MSS
Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 131.
Lits none.
A S. See ACHOM I, 4 (BIL.15).
Quote/Cite: Ref. none.

Item 9 of the Pembroke MS (see the homiliary of st. pierre de chartres; and Cross 1967a p 22) includes, in a slightly shortened form with a homiletic introduction and conclusion, the opening miracles from this work (1241.18-1245.22). The following homily, on John's assumption, is drawn largely from the account in ps arabæ, and opens with a passage that overlaps with the Passio (1249.28-39).

Zettel (1979 p 33) lists this work as item 150 in his reconstructed cotton-corp[us] legendæ; it occurs only in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century). Förster (GR 5300, pp 17-18) notes Augusti's use of it in his homily on John's assumption (ACHOM I, 4); see also Zettel (1979 pp 160-62, 264-66, and 238-241) for further correspondences between Alfric's homily and this version.

In the prose de virginitate, Alfric lists the incidents of John restoring shattered gowns (254.15-17), resurrecting a woman (254.17-255.3), and drinking poison (255.3-8), all recounted in the Passio (1242.20-1245.15, 1241.33-37, and 1248.5-25). Cross (1979b p 105) asserts that these "had available, and disliked, the pseudo-Melitus account of John the Evangelist," but the exact comments in his refractorius (1.48-53 and VIII.13-14) appear to be too general to support this claim.

In addition to the edition in the PG (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in Fabricius (1719 vol 3 pp 606-23), and in Fabrega Grau (1955 vol 2 pp 192-30).

Passio Marci [ANON.Pas.Marci]: RBMA 224.2; BHL 5276.

MSS
Lits none.
A S. See ALO (Mark, Bl.3.15).
Quote/Cite: Ref. none.

This Passio describes how Mark establishes the faith in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria, before he is martyred by being dragged through the
stresses of the city. Zettel (1979 p. 19) identifies this work as item 43 of his reconstructed cotton-corporus legendary: it occurs in the London and Salisbury MSS. Ort (GR 355), pp 40-41) recognizes it as the source for Alfret's account of Mark's death (ALR2 Mark); see also Zettel (1979 pp. 224-26). Quarini (1908 pp. 63-66) shows the passion to be the source for anna's entry on Mark in his Martyrology.

In addition to Membritius (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in the AS (April, vol 3 pp. 350-51).

Passio Matthaei [ANON.Psa.Matthei]: RBMA 225:17; BHL 5690.

MSS

List — Ref: none.

After converting Ethiopia by driving out dragons and rescuing the king's son, Matthew is eventually martyred at the altar when he attempts to prevent a succeeding king's marriage. Zettel (1979 p. 26) identifies this work as item 104 of his reconstructed cotton-corporus legendary: it appears in the London and Salisbury MSS. Foster (GR 5300, p 24) notes that it is the source for Alfret's discussion of Matthew's passion (AECham II, 37). Hereford (GR 6364, p 41) cites it in discussing the entry on Matthew in the Old English Martyrology (BtH.nv); see also Cross (1979 pp. 23-25).

Cross (1979 p. 169) identifies this passion as a source for details about Matthew in Cynwulf's Nativ (AS.2.2, 63-69).

In addition to Talamo Acornoll's work (Bibliography Part I), a version of the work appears in the MS Aria (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp. 636-66).

Ps. Linus, Passio Pauli [ANON.Psa.Pauli/Ps LINUS]: RBMA 250:4; BHL 6570.

MSS

List — Ref: none.

Zettel (1979 p. 22) lists a "Passio S. Pauli apostoli" as item 68 in his reconstructed cotton-corporus legendary, and he identifies this text as similar to BHL 6570 and 6574, the version that occurs in MS Aria (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp. 441-56).

The editors of BGEN'S DR ORTHOGRAPHIA (600) refer to chapter 8, line 14 (31.157) of this work, but the correspondence appears to be a single word.

Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans [ANON.Epist.Laud.]: RBMA 233; NIB 2.128-32.

MSS

List — Ref: none.

Ref: AECham I (Sigewod, R.28.v) 94.

This short apocryphal letter is largely a timed missive from the other Pauline epistles. In his catalog, James (1900-04 vol 1 p 186) asserts that the MS B.5.2 "must have contained the Epistle to the Laodiceans," apparently basing his judgment on the explicit following the Epistle to the Hebrews at the end of the MS: "epistle Pauli numero xxxviii explb."

In his letter to Sigewod concerning the Old and New Testament, Alfret attributes fifteen epistles to Paul, listing this work.

Lightfoot (1879 pp. 282-84) provides a list of MS including this epistle. It was known in Ireland, appearing in the Book of Armagh, see McNamara (1975 pp. 103-04).


MSS — List: none.

AS#1 1. LS 32 (Peter & Paul, B.3.3.32).
2. AECham I, 26 (B.11.26), Thorpe 374.12-304.19.

Ref: none.

In this account, Peter and Paul oppose Simon Magus before Nero, and after a number of other exchanges, end his magic flight through their prayers; the two are then martyred — Peter hanged head down on a cross, and Paul beheaded. Förster (GR 873, pp 110-11) notes that Sæckerling homini- cyr 15 (LS 30) is a translation of this work. Förster (GR 5300, pp 18-20) also points out that Alfret uses this work in the second half of his homily on the passion of Peter and Paul (AECham I, 26). Cross (GR 691, pp 90-92 and 97-100) shows that Alfret used this work to structure his homily for Reformation Monday (AECham II, 21, B.2.24). Cross (1979 p. 170) notes that the pairing of the two in Cynewulf's Nativus (AS.2.2; 11b-11) may "hint" at the use of this account.

Item 62 in the book of CHERNE (158.10-15; see LITERATU) corresponds to a passage from this text (179.3-6); see Kypern (1902 p. 231).

In addition to Lipius (Bibliography Part I), the work is also printed in
Ps Marcellius, Epistolae I et II ad Fratres Nerei et Achillen [ANON.Epist.Ner.Achil.]: BHL 6060; not in RBMA.

Actus Petri cum Simone [ANON.Acta.Pet.]: RBMA 235,1; BHL 6656; NTV 2.259–322.

This work, which is preserved in its complete form in a Latin MS, Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CLVIII (sixth-seventh century), was composed in Greek at the end of the second century; see NTV 2.275. Schnelder (NTV 2.262) considers the Acts of Peter to be a more appropriate title, and he discusses its relationship to other early acts, including the Ps Carminorum reguncorum. The Latin text focuses primarily on Peter's confrontation with Simon Magus (chapters 2–29) and his martyrdom (chapters 30–39); the second part circulated also independently (RBMA 245,1). Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1983 p 239 note 42) suggests that Alberich may have drawn the details from this work in the section on Peter in the Carmina ecclesiastica.

Passio Petri [ANON.Pas.Petri]: BHL 6664.

The text is preserved in a Latin MS, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

Zettel (1979 p 23) lists a "Passio S. Petri apostoli" as item 67 in his reconstructed Cotton-Corporal legendary, and he identifies this text as similar to BHL 6664. Flescher (GR 5304, pp 18–21) links Alberich's Latin interjections opposing other traditions concerning Paul's and Peter's passion to this text and to the Passio Pauli. See also Zettel (1979 pp 177–78).

In addition to Monnertius (Bibliography Part I), a version of the work appears in ps Apostas (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 390–92 and 462–45).

Passio Philippu [ANON.Pas.Phil.] RBMA 254; BHL 6814.


This brief passio, Philip converts the people of Scythia by driving out a dragon and resurrecting the people it has killed, and then travels to Asia where he is martyred. Zettel (1979 p 19) identifies the work as item 46 in his reconstructed Cotton-Corporal legendary, which appears in the London and Salisbury MSS. Flescher (GR 5300, p 22) notes that the material on Philip in Alberich's homily on Philip and James (AECHM II, 18) is from this account; see also Zettel (1979 pp 186–87).

Hereford (GR 6264, p 226) discusses this source as the account for Philip in the Old English Martyrology (BISch); see also Cross (1979b pp 28–29). Cross (1979b pp 166–67) cites this work as a source for the Rule (A2.2; 376–41), and mentions one detail — that Philip was crucified — which occurs in Membrinius (Bibliography Part I, 585.41–42), but not in ps Apostas (Fabricius vol 2 1719 pp 738–42). Lapidge (in Lapidge and Rosier 1983 p 241 note 64) notes that in the section on Philip in his Carmina ecclesiastica, Alberich departs from his main source (Hisorhi de ortu) in claiming that Philip preaches in Scythia; Lapidge identifies ps Apostas as a possible source.

Passio Simonis et Iudas [ANON.Pas.Sim.Jud.]: BHL 7749–50; see RBMA 255,14.

This text is preserved in a Latin MS, BL Cotton Nero E.i: HG 344.

Simon and Jude convert Persia by overcoming two magicians, and performing other miracles; they are eventually martyred when they travel to the provinces to continue their missionary work. Zettel (1979 p 25) includes the Passio as item 121 in his reconstructed Cotton-Corporal legendary.
Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus MSS, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century), and in the table of Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Fell i: HG 625). Forster (GR 5300, pp 24-25) notes that it is Aphra’s source for his homily on Simon and Jude (Aphra.iiii, 30). See also Zettel (1979 pp 105-98). Herford (GR 6364, p xi) identifies it as relevant to the entry in the Old English Martyrology (B19.ii), see also Cross (1979b pp 25-27). Cross (1979a pp 169-70) considers it a source for Cynovale’s Asse (A2.5, 72-84).

In addition to Monastirios (Bibliography Part 1), a version of this work appears in PB ABDAS (Fabricius 1719 vol 2 pp 608-86).

**Acta Thomaie: RBMA 259; see Panno Thomae.**

**Panno Thomae** [ANON.Pan.Thom.; RBMA 259.8; BHL 8136; see NTA 2 425-42.

MS—List none. A.S AELS (Thomas, B1.3.34; 13-424).

Quot/Cite none.


The original Acta Thomae, composed in Syrian and surviving also in Greek, are closely linked to Gnostic sects (see NTA 2 429-41). Two Latin adaptations, the Panno and the De minuculis sancti Thome apostoli (also printed in Zettel 1977, but previously known from PB ABDAS vol 2 pp 687-733), have been largely stripped of their overt gnostic content (Zettel 1977 pp xi-xii). Zettel dates the two to the fourth century (p xxv).

Zettel (1979 p 33) lists this work as item 146 in his reconstructed Cotton-corpus legendary. Although it does not occur in either the Cotton or the Corpus manuscript, it is included in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 354 (twelfth century), Herford, Cathedral Library P 7 vi (twelfth century; see Bannister 1927 p 172) and in the table of Salisbury, Cathedral Library 222 (olim Oxford, Bodleian Library Fell i: HG 625).

As Loemius (GR 3558, p 7) notes, Allfrie adapts this work in his Livs of Saints (AEL.3 Thomas), shortening and omitting some sections. Allfrie’s possible reference to this work in his “Apology” in his Cатrophic homilies is “the Passion of Thomas we leave unwritten because it was long ago translated from Latin into English, in verse”—is further linked to this text by the reference to an exchange between the saint and a cupbearer, an account that Augustine condemns. Allfrie again mentions this incident at the beginning of the version in the Lives of Saints. See also Zettel (1979 pp 259-62).
by various early Latin authors (see De Gehhardt and Harnack, Bibliography Part I pp 60-67; DSB 7.392-35; Courcelle 1969 pp. 41, 94-95, and 228). not always favorably, although a favorable judgment by church was repeated by Kieler Klostert (see De Gehhardt and Harnack pp 84-85, note 4). Dronke (1981 pp. 37-38) argues that St Patrick knew the work.

Two Latin versions have survived: the Vulgata (V or L, dating from the second century, surviving in several manuscripts and fragments) and the Palatina (P or L, dating from the fourth or fifth century, surviving in two fifteenth-century MSS in the Düsseldorf fragment). The Vulgata includes the end of the book, lacking in the Greek manuscripts. On the relationship between the Latin and Greek versions see Curci (1983). On the Latin versions see Mazzini and Lorenzo (1980); on the Palatine version see also Mazzini (1980). For lists of the Latin manuscripts see GCS De Gehhardt and Harnack (Bibliography Part I, pp. 44 ff.). On the Düsseldorf MS see CLA 8.1187 and Coors (1956 pp. 90-91), who identifies the fragment (apparently in the 2 leaves in C 1108) as a Mandate in the Palatina version. I have not been able to confirm Ogilvy's statement (RBA 1957) that St Gild, Stiftsbibliothek 151, pp. 5 'may go back to an English exemplar.'

The brief extract (Mand. IV.1) in the Cambridge MS apparently corresponds to the Collectio canonum Hiberniensis 96.15 (see Baehrens 1890 pp. 720); the Hibernicus also has other extracts from Hermes; this particular extract occurs in related canonical collections, including Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale 221 (193) and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 3182. Another extract (Sim. II?) occurs in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 763 (see Omode 1996 pp. 255-57).

Notes commenting on the reference to guardian angels in Acts 12.15, states "quod unus usque nostrorum habet angelos et in libro Patris et in multis sanctae scripturae locis inmemoriae" (CSSL 12.5). The reference is probably to Mandate 6, as Lassner indicates in the apparatus of his edition (Bibliography Part I), rather than to Vision 5, as Lassner (1983 pp. 81) had earlier suggested. Lassner (1983 pp. 85) states that "it was undoubtedly the [Vulgata version] to which Bede had access," but the Düsseldorf MS suggests that if Bede did know the work at first hand, it might well have been in the Palatina version. According to Jenkins (1996 p. 182), however, "we may doubt if he knew the book except at second hand," since he does not refer to it on the significance of the stones of the Temple in de templo. Ogilvy (RBA 1957) thinks it "likely" that Bede knew the work first hand, in view of the Düsseldorf fragments, which Lowe considers to have been written probably in the north of England. But the passage to which Bede refers on the guardian angels was cited or paraphrased in several patristic works, including Origene, de principiis III.11.4 (in republica translation, PG 11.509 and GCS 22.235) with attribution to "Pastorius liber" (cf. Daniellou 1976 pp. 80-81), and Cassian, Conclusiones VII.8.3 (CSEL 13.235) with attribution to "liber Pastoris" and in reference to Acts 12.15 (see Courcelle 1969 p. 228). De Gehhardt and Harnack (Bibliography Part I p. LXVII and note 4) already suggested that Bede's reference, as well as one in the Vita Nisii, was taken over from Cassian. The passage also appears as a separate extract (but attributed to Jerome) in London, BL Cotton Nero A.11 folio 35 (CLA 21.86; beyond the part listed in HG; see BRM vol 4A, p. 21 which does not identify the source of the excerpt).

The same passage on the guardian angels has been cited by Menner (GR 4337, p. 14) as an early example of the conception of the good and bad angels appearing in the poetic Solmen et Satur (MSd, A35) with reference to similar descriptions in Horeb 9 (Herrenm 4, B3.4.5) and Godet (A3.2). For the Greek text, in addition to Whitaker (Bibliography Part I), see the edition by K. July (1958), which replaces the traditional divisions with consecutively numbered chapters. For English translations see Crombie (1955) and Snyder (1958).

Charles D. Wright

Apocalypse of the Virgin [ANON Apoc. Mariæ]; RBMA 275.

MS—A S '64. none.

Quo vítes see below.

Ref. none.

The Apocalypse of the Virgin, probably composed in Greek in the second half of the fourth century (W. Wright 1865 p. 7) exists in numerous Eastern languages. Although RBMA does not include any Latin version, a short Latin recension has been edited by Wenger (Bibliography Part I).

One detail—Mary's role in aiding condemned souls—in two Old English translations—Horne 6 (Herrenm 15, B3.4.6) and Nós and Nós (B8.3.3.2 and 80.5.5.5.3—but see corpus of ecclesiastical texts) may go back to this work. In the Apocalypse, Mary is taken to bell with the apostles after her death so that they can view its terrors; they plead with Christ, and He eventually grants a remission for the suffering souls. In the Anglo-Saxon texts, Mary, Michael, and Peter plead for the damned after the Judgment, and each is granted a third of the condemned souls. For further details, see Clayton (1986c).

Roman was presumably familiar with this vernacular version, and objected that neither Mary nor any other saint could save those condemned by Christ (AChen II, 44, B1.2.48; 104-95).
For the knowledge of this text in Ireland, see Docahur (1942 p. 9).

Mary Clayton


A.S lies Hom 1 (B 3.5.1).

Quot/On none.

Rph 1. ALDH Pass. orig. 256.7-14; see below.
2. Archim H 72 (B 1.2.26) 14-16; see below.

Although the NTIA calls this work the "Apocalypse of Paul" to emphasize its close filiations with other apocalypses such as the Apocalypse of Peter, the title Visio Sancti Pauli, here accepted, is more common among Anglo-Saxon texts. The Latin tradition, which contains long versions and eleven redactions, has been largely established by Silverstein (1939, 1959, and 1976), see also the NTIA 2.755-59. The Vatican MS, in an Anglo-Saxon hand of the ninth century, has recently been published by Dwyer (1988 pp 121-30), who identifies it as redaction XI. According to Silverstein (1959 p 212) redaction IV has "has special currency in England (perhaps even its origin there)", the known MSS of this redaction, however, are later than our period (see Silverstein 1955 pp 220-21 for a list of MSS).

The Visio, translated into Old English somewhere between the fourth and sixth centuries, was popular in Anglo-Saxon England as an accessible and instructive guide to the fate of the soul at the moment of death. One clear indication of its popularity is the vigor with which it was condemned by two of the most articulate voices of the period: Alcuin, writing around the turn of the eighth century, spurns the work by categorizing it with "other absurdities of the apocalypses"; and Alfric, writing three centuries later, repudiates it as "a false composition."

Only the first part of the Visio was actually translated into Old English, existing in a unique copy, Hom 1. Luluielli Padda (1974) has concluded that the translation follows a Long Latin Version, and Healey (1978) has argued that none of the extant Long Latin Versions is its source. Muster found in the Old English, but lacking in the Long Latin and yet confirmed as original by the Russian and Syriac versions establishes in a positive way the existence of another Latin recension, the source of the Old English.

A number of Old English texts are indebted to the Visio Sancti Pauli for significant motifs as well as several minor themes. The incident of the going-out-of souls can be found in Bede (B 9.6.7-9; pp 436-42), Guthfr (A 3.2), 1-29, Hom 5 (B 3.5.5), Hom 5 (B 3.2.5), and Hom 3 (B 3.2.31); most recently Acker (1980) has analyzed this motif in Hom 1 (B 8.1, 3.2.14).

The address of the soul to the body can be found in Hom 6 (B 3.5.8), Hom 6 (B 3.5.14.1), Hom 5 (B 3.5.14.2), Hom 6 (A 14, B 3.2.6), Hom 9 (Hezayn 4, B 3.4.9), Hom 26 (Nap 29, B 3.4.26), Hom 55 (B 3.4.53), and Saul 3 and 4 (A 2.3 and 3.19). The reptire of the damned, which is the climax of Paul's journey to hell in the Visio, appears domesticated in Guthfr (A 3.2, 203-34), Hom 6, Hom 16, Hom 35 (Nap 63, B 3.4.5), Hom 35 (Nap 4, B 3.4.5), Hom 55, and Saul 3 and 4. The correspondence of punishment to sin, which conveys a straightforward justice in the Visio Sancti Pauli, is appropriated by Old English writers in Hom 6, Hom 4 (B 3.2.42), Hom 37 (Nap 46, B 3.4.37), Let 1 (B 6.1), and LS 25 (Michael-Mor, B 3.3.25). Moreover, minor influences of the Visio may be seen in the detail of men with tongues of iron in Hom 4 (Hezayn 9, B 3.2.4), Hom 35 (B 3.4.5), and Hom 12 (Willard, B 3.4.12.2). And, as Hill (GR 3778) has suggested, the Visio is a possible source for the northwest direction of hell in GenB (A1.1, 779). Despite its censure by Alcuin and Alfric, Anglo-Saxon homilists and poets drew upon the Visio Sancti Pauli to articulate the direct relationship between human deeds and the fate of the soul.

Finally, the vexed question of the relationship of the hell scene in the Visio with the hell scene in the Blickling Homily on the dedication of St Michael's church (LS 25) and with the description of Grendel's mere in Beowulf (Bea; A 4.1; 1367-75) has been opened once again by R.L. Collins (1994) who observes that the vocabulary of the Blickling homily here is closer to the Visio than to Beowulf. He cautiously concludes that if there is any influence, it may be from the homily to Beowulf, the reverse of what has usually been thought.

For bibliography on the Old English Visio Sancti Pauli, see GR 4365, 4363, 6239, 6239, 6240; and Healey (1978 pp 96-98). The most complete Long Latin Version is published by James from Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale nouv. acq. lat. 1651 (Bibliography Part I). Silverstein (Bibliography Part I) publishes a second fragment of this version from St Gall, Staatsbibliothek 317; and a related fragment from Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 362. The Latin redactions have been discussed and published by Silverstein (1953, 1959, 1682, and 1976), see also his review (1980) of Healey (1978). As noted above, redaction eleven is published by Dwyer from the Vatican MS (Bibliography Part I). The work was also known to the Irish; see McNamara (1975 pp 108-09). A new edition of the Armenian version is G25 1.

A. di Paolo Healey
Apocalypse of Thomas [ANON.Apod.Thom.]: RBMA 280; CPL 796a;
NTD 2.798-803. See also col1lectanea hdbn.

MSS: Vatican, Pal. Lat. 220.
List: none.
A-S: Het. 1, Homs 12 (B3.4.12),
2. Homs 6 (Wochtum 22, B3.4.6).
3. Homs 26 (Wilken 7, B3.2.26).
4. Homs 44 (B3.2.44).
5. Homs 33 (B3.2.33).

Quote/Ref: none.

This Apocalypse, which purports to be a revelation to the apostle concerning the end of the world, survives in two recensions. The longer recension alludes to fifth-century events as contemporary, and the earliest witness of the shorter recension is in a MS also dated to this century (Vatican, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Lat. 16; CLA 3.396). The Vatican MS, in a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon hand (McNally 1979 pp 121–27), represents the longer version. The work is condemned in the Gelasian Decrees (293).

Fürer (GR 6224) reached several conclusions about the relationship of the Old English translations of the Apocalypse to the two main Latin recensions: 1) the five homilies represent four independent versions (Fürer considers Homs 33 and 44 as one version); 2) 1, 2, and 5 follow the longer Latin recension closely enough to be called translations; 3) 1 and 2 incorporate almost the entire apocalypse whereas 3, 4, and 5 use only the signs of Doomsday; 4) 4 and 5 show no trace of the interpolated Latin recension.

Probably related to the Apocalypse is the tradition of the Fifteen Signs before Judgment (Neto 21, B24.22). Although the Apocalypse lists signs for only seven days before Judgment, the use of a numbered sequence and the similarity in many of the signs suggest that the Fifteen Signs developed from this work. Heist (1992) specifically argues that the early Middle Irish poem Salair na Fuss provides the transition; however, the question remains open to new evidence such as the discovery of manuscripts of the Collectanea hdbn in which a Latin version of the work appears (PL 94.555).

Evidence for an earlier knowledge of these works is difficult to establish. Christi (A.3.1), often ascribed to the ninth century, does not list signs for the days preceding Judgment, but it contains in its description of the destruction of the world details found in these traditions. The difficulty in identifying exclusive echoes of either Apocalypse or the Fifteen Signs in poetic texts arises because the signs often have some basis in biblical passages such as Mt 24.30. See, however, the suggestion by Cross (1982 p 105 note 19) that the Apocalypse may be the ultimate source for the phrase "mare siccabitur" in St Augustine Nomiv 29.

Fürer (GR 2224, p 16) states that the Latin MSS in Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Lat. 16 (fragment) and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4563 (both in Bibliography Part I) represent the uninterpolated tradition; and that Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare 1 (fragment), and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 4585 (both in Bibliography Part I) represent the interpolated tradition. James (1953 pp 556–62) translates these versions. For other MSS, see Fürer (GR 2224, pp 9–10). For bibliography on the Old English versions of the Apocalypse, see GR 245, 923, 3543, 5300, and 6295; and on the Old English version of the Fifteen Signs, see GR 626. For further information on the Irish evidence, see McNamara (1975 pp 119–21).

Apocalypse Priscillianistica [ANON.Apod.Prisc.]: RBMA 280; CPL 795a; ECLL 120b; KVS AN Brayne.

Quote/Ref: Homs 44 (B3.2.44, ed. Bazine and Cross 1982) 51.91–96: see below.
Ref: none.

The Apocalypse Priscillianistica consist of six texts published by De Brayne (1997) from Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. CCLIV (CLA 8.1009), the first six items in a larger compilation headed in the manuscript "incipit colletario de diversis sententia." The Royal MS includes the beginning of De Brayne's item 5 (Libri "sumo in orboris" Hieronymi praehist., CPL 795; see also BREM 403 and Birchoff 1976 p 159 note 126) in an expanded version, before breaking off; see Warner and Gilson (1921 vol 1 p 185). The Salisbury MS includes item 4 (Adomus de die iudicii, CPL 793); see Schoene (1989 V. Salisbury, p 5).

De Brayne's theory of Priscillianist origins for these pieces has since been abandoned (see Vollmann 1965 p 48), but M.R. James (1918–19 p 16) remarked that they "appear to be from a Celtic workshop," an opinion supported by many other scholars; for details, see G. Wright (1987a pp 155–56), and Frede (KVS 1981 p 78). C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) outlines the parallels with Irish traditions, including the seven heavens apocryphon, extracts from Hiberno-Latin commentaries (first remarked by Dunville 1973 p 327), and other themes and enumerations paralleled in Hiberno-Latin compilations, including the Liber de numeris,
the FLORILGIOI PREMENISI, the CATACHORIS CRYPTOICA, and the homilies IN NOMINE DEI SUMMIO.}

Item 2 is an epitome of the so-called Seven Heavens apocryphon, which describes (in broken and confused fashion) the journey and purification of the soul through a series of seven heavens, assigning names to each heaven as well as to the doors of each (for other lists of the seven heavens in Hiberno-Latin texts, see (1986) pp 78-79 and 90-98). The apocryphon survives in variant forms in three Irish texts (Vision of Adamnan, Evernew Tongue, and an excerpt in the Liber Florus Fergusionis, ed. Mac Nissaili 1996) and in Old English in Homilies 12.2 (Willard, B.4.4.12.2; this homily also contains an Old English version of the APOCRYPHA OF THOMAS). The relationship between the Irish texts and the Latin fragment has been studied by James (1918, with suggested emendations for the Latin fragment), Seymour (1923), with a translation of the Latin, pp 22-23; see also Seymour 1927 and 1930 pp 112-30, Dauis (1972), Durst (1977-78) and Stevenson (1982). Willard (GR. 6235, pp 1-30) provides a detailed examination of the relationship between these versions and Homilies 12.2, in addition to a passage in Homilies 5 (B.3.2.5) on the descent of the soul through 12 dragons and 12 circles of hell (see pp 24-28).

C. Wright (forthcoming in *Neuhistorische Mitteilungen*) shows that a Judgment theme in item 4—in which Christ demands a pledge for each man's thoughts, words, and deeds; and each responds that he has nothing to pledge but his soul—is the ultimate source for a closely similar passage in Homilies 44 (B.3.2.44, ed. Bazire and Cross 1983; 51.91-96), where the Old English term used corresponds to the Latin am(s) (and aves). A similar idea occurs in several other Old English homilies. Luielli Fadda (1977 p 103) printed part of the theme from item 4 opposite a passage from Homilies 12 (B.3.2.32), but here there are no close verbal parallels with the Latin, and only one other homily, Homilies 25 (B.3.2.25, ed. Evans 1980; 142.351-55) uses the distinctive terms and C. Wright points out, however, that Cyanwulf's Exem (E.12.6; 1281b-86a) echoes the theme with the phrase use English and the "thought, word, deed" triad.

J.R. Cross, who noted item 4 in the Salisbury MS, has also noted its occurrence in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 19410. C. Wright (1980b pp 228-29) points out that substantial portions of the Apocrypha Priscillianistica (including part of item 4, but not the Judgment passage) also occur in Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek 199 (ClG 7.675). Item 5 includes parallels with the APOCRYPHA OF THOMAS (see under Apocrypha). The Karlsluhe MS also contains a text of THE THREE UTERARUMS APOCRYPHON (see under Miscellanies).

Charles D. Wright

AUGUSTINE

*Confessiones* (AVG:Confess.) C. 25.1.

7. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 118: HG 723.

Lit. — A-S: none.

*Quote/Clc* 1. BEAD.Orthogs.746: AVG:Confess. I.ix.15.
5. BEAD.Natt.Gen.: see below.

Bibl. ANCN.Lib precum.Cernea: see below.

This is clearly Augustine's most popular and widely read work, although its popularity stems largely from the Renaissance after Petrarch took it along on his famous climb of Mount Ventoux. Moderns prize the work for its ruthless psychological investigation of a sinners redeemed and for its abundant spirituality; scholars use it for its valuable biographical data. This fascination with the work is, however, rather late.

Augustine wrote the *Confessiones* between 397 and 400. Books 1-9 contain his spiritual autobiography; book 10 describes his moral and spiritual state at the time he wrote the book; and books 11-13 contain a meditation on time and eternity and the relation of God to the created world. It is a testimony to how the book was regarded that its most extensive use by *Bec* in his *Commentary on Genesis* (see (88) 15A, p 194 for a list of eight quotations) and all of his citations are from Books 12-13. Indeed, only the references in *Bede's DE ORTHOGRAPHIA* are from Books 1-9. The reference in the work of *Cernea* (see *Liturgy*) appears on p 122 therein.

Joseph F. Kelly
BEDE

Bede, Anglo-Saxon England's foremost Anglo-Latin author, "father of English scholarship," "father of English history," "teacher of the whole Middle Ages," produced works in every discipline of the monastic school system. His educational treatises—basic schoolbooks and reference works—gave the Anglo-Saxons access to classical authorities and provided early medieval supplements to late antique manuals. His scientific writings on computus and chronology established a new norm. His commentaries on the Bible offered Anglo-Saxon readers a carefully edited and annotated synthesis of patristic sources, particularly the four Fathers of the Western Church. His historical writings formed a model for later historiographers and are still the principal sources, along with the ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE, for information on England before the Conquest. By including a fairly complete bibliography of his works at the end of the HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA (V.385), Bede furnished a list to his readers of writings available for use.

Teacher, exegete, historian, and scribe himself, Bede was cited as "magister," "mater catholicae terrae," "se morea larum," "flos flosc," "se trahit," "se balga Beda," both in England and on the Continent he was ranked on a footing with the Fathers of the Church; see bonifici (EHD 180), CUTHBERT (EHD 185), LEO (EHD 188), ALEXANDER (MGR ECA 357.3, 360.16–20, 445.B), and ALFRED (in the Preface to the FIRST SERIES OF CATHOLIC MONASTERS), and in his letters to Wulfstig [ALC 5, Bl.8.1; 15] and to Sigefirty [ALC 5, Bl.8.3; 209]. Wherever Bede's name was associated with a work, scribes gave the work special attention; see CCM 123A.1v and 185, and CCM 123B.4v. Continental MSS of Bede's works are numerous, but, despite his primary importance for Anglo-Saxon culture, his undoubted influence on writers such as Alfred and Ælfric, and the honor they paid him, insular MSS of his works (except for the HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA and the Vita CUTHBERTI) are relatively few. Bede's work suffered the same fate as many other pre-1000 insular MSS. The Viking invasions and cultural decay brought about general destruction; in addition, his school texts were particularly vulnerable to abuse, hard wear, and eventual discard. Manuscript evidence suggests that most of Bede's works were re-imported into England after the Conquest.

Bede's influence generally permeates the writings of the educated class in Anglo-Saxon England, but it is difficult to establish always when authors are borrowing from him, since sometimes Bede is the intermediary source for a late antique or patristic idea or quotation which they may have gotten directly or from another intermediary, and sometimes authors incorporate material from him in a reworked fashion that conceals the full extent of indebtedness to him. As a rule, if an Anglo-Saxon author undertakes a topic Bede has written on, Bede is a likely source for at least some of it; it is fruitless to seek Bede in treatises of non-canonical and pseudepigraphical topics.

For a detailed treatment of Bede's life, see G. Brown (1987).

[For this Thal. Moses, only the headline for one of Bede's didactic works has been included.]

De orthographia [BEDA.Ortho]: CPH. 1566.

MSS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 221: HG 69.
List none.

Quo/Intent 1. ALC VIN.Ortho.: see below.
2. f. BONIF.Gramm.: see below.

Reffes none.

George H. Brown

OLD ENGLISH BEDE (Bek, 89.6)

MSS 1. Cambridge, University Library Kk.3:18: HG 22.
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: HG 39.
List—A-S Ver. none.

2. ACHEM II 9 (BL.21.10) 77–78. Bede 96.31–32.
Reffes ACHEM II 5 (BL.21.10) 7–8.

The Old English Bede is a shortened versewarce version of saec's HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA: the translator edits Bede's work, consistently omitting most epitaphs, poems, letters, and other documents, many geographical details, and much historical information about the Church which does not directly affect England; see Whitemore [G 357, pp 61–62]. Excerpts were copied into MS Cotton Domitian ix, fol 21 around 900 (NKR 155). The Tanner MS is from the first quarter of the tenth century (NKR 351). Cott-
BEDE

Bede, Anglo-Saxon England’s foremost Anglo-Latin author, “father of English scholarship,” “father of English history,” “teacher of the whole Middle Ages,” produced works in every discipline of the monastic school system. His educational treatises—basic schoolbooks and reference works—gave the Anglo-Saxons access to classical authorities and provided early medieval supplements to late antique manuals. His scientific writings on computus and chronology established a new norm. His commentaries on the Bible offered Anglo-Saxon readers a carefully edited and annotated synthesis of patristic sources, particularly the four Fathers of the Western Church. His historical writings formed a model for later historiographers and are still the principal sources, along with the ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE, for information on England before the Conquest. By including a fairly complete bibliography of his works at the end of the HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA (XXIV), Bede furnished a list of his readers of writings available for use. Teacher, exegete, historian, and lively monk, Bede was cited as “magister;” “moutre cathedrata terrem;” “se matura lateres;” brevia boreas;” “se trahenon;” “se haliga Bede;” both in England and on the Continent he was ranked on a footing with the Fathers of the Church; see also NONAGE (EJHD 180), OUTHERN (EJHD 183), ALCUVIN (MGH VICA 557.5, 559.16–20, 453.8) and ALFREDO (in the Preface to the FIRST SERIES OF CATHEDRAL NOMINUM, and in his letters to Wulfstan [Addit. 1, B.6.1; 16] and to Sigefryth [Addit. 5, B.8.5; 299]). Wherever Bede’s name was associated with a work, scribes gave the work special attention; see also CSUL 12A.2v and 185, and CSUL 12B.242.

Contemporary MSS of Bede’s works is numerous, but, despite his primary importance for Anglo-Saxon culture, his undoubted influence on writers such as Alfred and Ælfric, and the honor they paid him, insular MSS of his works (except for the HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA and the VITA OUTHERNI) are relatively few. Bede’s work suffered the same fate as many other pre-1000 insular MSS. The Viking invasions and cultural decay brought about general destruction, in addition, his school texts were particularly vulnerable to abuse, hard wear, and eventual discard. Manuscript evidence suggests that most of Bede’s works were re-imported into England after the Conquest. Bede’s influence generally permeates the writings of the educated class in Anglo-Saxon England, but it is difficult to establish when personal contacts were borrowing from him, since sometimes Bede is the intermediary source for a late antique or patristic idea or quotation which they may have gotten directly or from another intermediary, and sometimes authors incorporate material from him in a reworked fashion that conceals the full extent of indebtedness to him. As a rule, if an Anglo-Saxon author undertakes

a topic Bede has written on, Bede is a likely source for at least some of it; it is fruitless to seek Bede in treatments of non-canonical and pre-digraphical topics.

For a detailed treatment of Bede’s life, see G. Brown (1897).

[For this Thal Hebra, only the note for one of Bede’s didactic works has been included.]

De orthographia [REDA:Oroepy]: CPV. 1556.

MISS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 221: HG 69.


Lists none.

A-S Het none.

Quot/Cit 1. ALCUVIN:Oroepy: see below.

2. ? BONIEFGRAMM: see below.

Rfs none.

George H. Brown

OLD ENGLISH BEDE (Bede, 98.9)

MISS 1. Cambridge, University Library Kk.3.18: HG 22.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: HG 39.


Lists none.

Quot/Cit 1. ACHIIN II.9 (B.1.210) 57–58. Bede 96.10–11.

2. ACHIIN II.9 (B.1.210) 77–78. Bede 96.31–32.

Rfs none.

The Old English Bede is a shortened vernacular version of Bede’s HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA; the translator edits Bede’s work, consistently omitting most epitaphs, poems, letters, and other documents, many geographical details, and much historical information about the Church which does not directly affect England; see Whitelock (OR 555), pp 61–62. Extracts were copied into MS Cotton Domitian i, fol H.around 900 (NRK 151). The Tanner MS is from the first quarter of the tenth century (NRK 351). Cot-
ten Otho B.5), which was later badly burned in the fire of 1731, dates from the mid tenth century (NRK 180); in 1562, Laurence Nowell made a transcription (BL Additional 43705) of the MS. The three other MSS date from the eleventh century. See Whitelock (GR 5587, pp 60-81) for a survey which implies at least three lost MSS.

Whitelock (GR 5587, p 70 note 10) notes the specific quotations of the Old English translation by Alfric in his homily on Gregory, and he provides a number of other verbal parallels as well. She asserts that in other places where Alfric uses Bede's Historia the verbal parallels are not convincing enough to claim that he follows the Old English rather than the Latin (p 80 note 10).

At the start of this same homily, Alfric claims King Alfred translated Bede into the vernacular: "and eac historia anglicum de Alfred cyning of leden on englic wende" (see Refs above). Although the dates of the surviving MSS do not contradict this theory, Miller's (GR 5549 p xxxii) assertions about the Mercian dialect—and hence origin—of the work complicate matters considerably. After reassessing the evidence, Whitelock (GR 5587, p 77) concludes that, while there is "no evidence that Alfred took part in the actual translation of Bede," it "remains a probability" that "the work was undertaken at Alfred's instigation." In contrast, Kuhn (GR 5591, pp 172-80) has again argued that Alfred translated the work using "an older Mercian interlinear gloss" late in his career "when renewed invasions of England and the task of carrying out his ambitious domestic programs left the king little leisure for polishing his work" (pp 179-80). The problem of the dialect is apparently again discussed in Waite (1965), a work not yet seen.

Emily Cooney

BOETHIUS

Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (c. 480-524), member of the Italian senatorial class and, after his father's death, protégé of Quintus Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, rose to the rank of consul (501) and reached the peak of his public career in 522 when his two sons were named consuls and he himself became "Master of the Offices." While in this latter post, he became somewhat entangled in the political feuding between Theoderic and Justinian, emperor in the East (Boethius gives his own account of this in the first Book of the consolationis); in late 523 or early 524 he was ac-
cused of treason by Theoderic, imprisoned at Pavia, and subsequently executed (524/525).

His class and the interests of his patron Symmachus provided him with a milieu suited to his scholarly interests. Aculei at Greek, and thoroughly conversant with the then prestigious Neoplatonic schools of Alexandria and Athens, he had absorbed and understood their teaching and educational programs; through an industrious career as translator, commentator and adapter, he preserved for the Latin West much of the Greek culture and learning of his age, producing works on mathematics, logic and theology and his masterpiece, the Consolationis philosophiae. Introductions to his life and works, along with bibliography, can be found in Chadwick (1981) and Gibson (1981).

As is typical in the case of secular texts, evidence that Boethius' works circulated widely begins to appear only in the Carolingian Renaissance. The entire range of Boethius' output had at least some circulation in Anglo-Saxon England; knowledge of the individual works is discussed under four headings: Mathematical, Logical, and Theological Works, and the Consolation of Philosophy. (Only a selection has been included in this Thal Hesid.)

Mathematical Works

De institutione arithmetica [BOETHIUS:Arith.]: CPL 879.

List—Ref none.

De institutione arithmetica, an expanding translation of the Greek work by Nichomachus, became a standard text from the time of Alcuin and was studied by scholars connected with the Carolingian court especially in northern France but also in Germany, France in general, and the Low countries; see White 1981 pp 194-68; Marx's (1983 pp 50-63) very provisional survey of MSS lists 38 copies dating from the ninth through the tenth centuries. The Irish, however, knew the work and quoted it in their computational texts from the seventh century; see Joes (1939 p 49), and Walsh and Ó Críostín (1989 p 123). The oldest St Gall catalog (941-72) lists, among some 30 "libri scoticus scripti," an "Arithmetica Boethii, volumen I" (Lehmann 1918 p 71); this copy, which does not survive, is likely to have been an early one, belonging to the pre-Benedictine cell, that is pre-170 (Clark 1935 p 25).

The knowledge of this work among the Irish, the apparently early copy at St Gall, and the fact that St Gall was a foundation with close ties to
the Columbian communities and on the route between Bangor and Bob- 
binus, all make it especially interesting that the earliest fragment of De in- 
stitutio arithmetica known (Turin Bibl. Naz. F.IV, an Italian incunabul MS 
from the turn of the seventh century, CLA 4.450) was at Bobbinus. It is thus 
possible that the interest of the Irish in computational questions, sparked 
by the Paschal controversies, was instrumental in bringing this work to light 
and that it circulated among the routes of the Irish missionaries of the seventh 

But there is no direct evidence for Anglo-Saxon knowledge of De institu- 

tio arithmetica until the two MSS copies listed above (both from the tenth 

century). Despite the fact that Bede used Irish sources as a basis for his 
on own computational works, he does not use Boethian material: Jones states 
categorically that he "definitely did not use Boethius' mathematical works" 
(1939 p 49). The Corpus MS suggests that both Celtic and Continental 
influences were active when this copy was made and that the work was then 
studied seriously. Bishop (1967 pp 254-62) has argued that the Corpus MS 
was copied in the mid tenth century, probably at St Augustine's Canter- 
bury, from a Celtic, perhaps a Welsh, exemplar. He argues that the MS was laid out for 
glosses, some of which were copied from the exemplar, some of which were 
added by various later hands, and its text was collated with at least one 
and probably several Continental MSS. The Paris MS (from the end of the 
tenth century) is a more ornamental book and contains also consola- 
tio philosophiae and Illustrations but few glosses; it was at St Benoît- 
sur-Loire (Fleury) and was perhaps written there by an English scribe 

De institutione musica [BOETH.Mus.]: CPL 380.

MSS 1. Arvenschar, Bibliothèque Municipale 236 (49): HG 784
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 269: HG 72
Lat.-Ref none.

Like the arithmetica, De institutione musica became a standard text be- 

ginning with the Carolingian revival and was first studied in the same 
millieu northern France, then France generally, Germany and the Low 

Bower's (1988) survey of the extant MSS shows it very well represented 
in England in the twelfth century (nine MSS, five before around 1100), 
but extant in only two copies before 1000. The Arvenschar MS (from the end 
of the tenth century) was perhaps written by an insular scribe working at 
Mont Saint Michel; it also contains excerpts from motus on computus (Bower 
1988 p 211). The Cambridge MS (tenth century, Christ Church Canter- 
bury) contains excerpts only of the Musica (fol. 1v-2v, 17-19) along with the
The Consolatio, written c. 524, first appears in extant MSS of the ninth century, the earliest copy dating from the first quarter of this century (Orléans Bibliothèque Municipale 270, Fleury). Thereafter it was widely copied and circulated, but although it was obviously known in Anglo-Saxon England by Alfred’s time, his prose translation (Be) is the earliest certain evidence for knowledge of the work there. Although known and quoted from it (Wallach 1599 pp 64, and 66; and Coudert 1967 esp. pp 39-46), but only in works written after he had left England for the Continent, his version de sanctis eoroscehensi scolakar do not quote from or allude to it, and the books written by Boethius mentioned there (line 1348) probably do not include the Consolatio (Godman 1982 p 124; ML 1.8). As Lapidge says, “it has yet to be demonstrated that the De consolatione Philosophiae was known in England before the late ninth century” (ML p 47). According to Lapidge, the Winchester list “presumably (but not necessarily)” refers to the Consolatio.

One of the earliest MS copies of the Consolatio now extant did make its way to Anglo-Saxon England and may have been there by Alfred’s time. The Vatican MS, written in the Loire region in the mid ninth century, has Latin glosses added from the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century by several scribes. The earliest hand is Welsh, Cornish or Southwestern English (although it conceivably has been written on the Continent). Tromvarelli (1981 p 204) has suggested that this MS was used by Alfred for his translation and that some of the glosses it contains were written by AMER; but there is no firm evidence to support this hypothesis (Wittig 1983 p 165 note 20). The MS was almost certainly in southern England by mid tenth century along with other copies of the Consolatio: among several tenth-century glossing hands is one identified as ST DUSTRAN’s, and a gloss by this hand indicates that Dunstan was comparing the text of 3363 with that of other copies of the Consolatio available to him (Parker 1981).

Because it is generally agreed that the Old English metrical version of the meters (Met), whether by Alfred or not, was based on the Alfredian prose translation rather than on the Latin Consolatio, it does not attest to independent knowledge of the Latin text.

The fifteen surviving MSS of the Consolatio written in Anglo-Saxon England amply demonstrate knowledge of the text in the later tenth and eleventh centuries: two are from the second half of the tenth century, nine from around the turn of the eleventh century, and four from the eleventh century. Canterbury has been identified as the source of seven of them (at least two from St Augustine’s, two from Christ Church), and two were written at Abingdon. Failure to identify the MS of the Consolatio used by Alfred, together with the chance survival of two MS copies in very fragmentary form (BL Egerton and Oxford Merton) and the migration of other MSS from England (Antwerp, El Escorial, Paris), indicate the likelihood that other copies of the Consolatio owned or made in Anglo-Saxon England have not survived.

As Glauche (1970) has shown, the Consolatio became a “school text,” and the surviving English copies argue that this must have been the case in Anglo-Saxon England as well. With one exception (Paris 6401), they all contain at least part of the (Latin) Remigian commentary, some with distinctively English revisions indicating an active process of grappling with the text (see D. Bolton 1970 and see Remigii of Auxerre), a process further illustrated by Corpus Christi College, Cambridge 214 which has, in addition to Remigian glosses, interlinear lexical glosses in late West Saxon (BeC2).}

Joseph S. Wittig

PS Boethius

Ars geometricae et arithmeticae [ANON. Geom. Lib.PS.BEOETH]. CPL 855; see also Boethius, Geometriae.

CYPRIANUS GALLUS


List—Refs: none.

The Art geometriae et archimetricae (Geoml), a treatise in five books, is generally attributed to BOSMUS in the MSS. As preserved in the 26 extant copies (see Folkerts 1982 pp 93-102), it is an unskilled and sometimes uncomprehending compilation which draws on the geometric corpus adapted for school use and on the Latin translation of Euclid's Elements, combining these with extracts from Boethius' Arithmetica, Apollonius' Synthetica, CONDAMNUS' Institutiones, and the Roman Columella (Folkerts 1984 p 190, and 1982 p 87). It served as a geometry textbook for studying this aspect of the quadrivium.

There is no modern edition of the whole treatise. Migue (PL 63.1352D-1564) printed the first two books of Geoml immediately after Geoml2, apparently from the Basel edition of 1546 or 1570, without clear indication that a new work was beginning. CPL 895 refers the reader to Roshoh (1899), whose outline of all five books allows one to reconstruct the entire work by page references to Migue and the gnomonic and Euclidean texts as printed by Lachmann (1848). Folkerts (1982 pp 88-90) provides a similar outline and reconstruction which also relies on Lachmann for the geometric texts, but which refers the reader to his own critical editions of the Euclidean translation (Folkerts 1970 pp 173-217) and the "alteratio duorum geometricorum" (Folkerts 1982 pp 105-13). In the Trinity College copy (tenth century, St. Augustine's Canterbury, Geoml1 (68a 3-14)) is followed by extracts of other gnomonic-geometric material, including excerpts from Isidore and Cassiodorus; the Douce MS (eleventh century, Old Minster Winchester) contains just Geoml. Moreover as Folkerts reconstructs the transmission of Geoml (1982 p 102), the two copies belong to two separate branches of the textual tradition and so were made quite independently of one another.

Joseph S. Wintig

CYPRIANUS GALLUS

Virtually nothing is known about the composer of the most expansive versification of the Old Testament from Late Antiquity. Scholars judging from internal evidence generally maintain that the poet was from Gaul and wrote during the first quarter of the fifth century, but even these de- tails have been disputed. This uncertainty notwithstanding, numerous quotations by early English writers are extant.


The attribution of the Heptateuchos to a Cypriano does not appear to have been made before the end of the ninth century: ALDHELM and REDIUS, for example, cite the work but do not make the attribution. Aldhelm refers to the poet once but only as "dubius author" (MGH AA 15.157). The library catalog of St Riquier, dating from the early ninth century, retains this anonymity. The poem is connected with the name Cypriano, however, in the catalog of the library at Lorsch dating from the ninth century and in later MSS, including the eleventh-century MS of Canterbury. Herzog (1975 pp 53-60) therefore believes that the name was added in order to give the work greater respectability through association with St. Cypriano.

In his metrical vita CHEREBERT, BEEF echoes this work in the following lines: 152 (Genesia 308); 189 (Genesia 572); 236 (Genesia 206); 516 (Judicius 469); and 528 (Dexterventorum 54). He also draws on it in lines 62, 459, 545, 662, 729, 736, and 921. Ahlefeldt also echoes this work in his De oblatibus: 147 (Genesia 327); 280-81 (Genesia 189-90); 413-14 (Exodus 312-13); 418 (Exodus 310); 419-28 (Exodus 317-18); and 496-47 (Exodus 3022-35); see Traube (1888 pp 17-24). Strecker, the editor of the anonymous Milieus Neuit Epicope, cites Exodus (827 and 881) for the usage "elefantos" (MGH PLAC 4:210). M. Roberts (1985 pp 94-95) presents a useful summary of the textual history of the Heptateuchos in Medieval England as well as on the Continent.


The so-called heptateuchos originally treated all the historical
books of the Old Testament. The library catalog of Lorsch, dating from the tenth century, lists the poem of Cyprian on the Heptateuch as well as on Kings, Esther, Judith, and Maccabees. The twelfth-century Cluniac catalog attributes the Heptateuch to Alcidimus and also lists verifications of Kings, Psalms, Proverbs, Esther, Judith, and Maccabees.

Alcidimus provides the sole quotation from Regnum III; and the CSEL edition of Cyprian also refers to the metritis (64.1) for a line from Job (21.2).

Daniel Noden

BLOSSIUS AEMELIUS DRACONTIUS: IES 3.1706-1; see also ALCUIN, FLORILEGIA; ANTHOLOGIA LATINA; AND ESSAYUS OF TOLEDO, MEX-AKREMEN.

Dracontius was a North African poet of the late fifth century. He received a literary education, then studied and practiced law in Carthage. One of his poems from this early period, addressed to a foreign ruler, brought upon him the disfavor of Gensamnan, king of the Vandals in North Africa (484-96). His release came with the help of friends but not before he was interned long enough to write his two Christian poems, the satisfactive and the laudes Dei.

These works were well known to English writers. Additionally, in the seventh century a 635-line portion of the first book of the Laudes Dei was detached from the work and published separately by Alcidimus or Toledo in a version showing numerous alterations of the original. In the Middle Ages, this recession became more popular than the original on which it was based and was widely used in the European schools. Columban, the sixth-century Irish abbot and missionary, also knew Dracontius and quotes amply from his works; see Mommsen and Cambria (1893 pp 102-03).

Satisfactive [DRACONTIUS;Satisfactive.]: C.P.L. 1011.

MSS—A-S like none. Quot/Cit ANON. Mss. 113: DRACONTIUS;Satisfactic. 53. Ref none.

Dracontius wrote the Satisfactive of Gensamnanus as a reparation for the offense he committed against the Vandal king. In the work the poet explains what caused the offense was Dracontius’ celebration of a foreign king in another poem.

In addition to the quotation of a full line in the anonymous Miracula S. Nyssae, Alcidimus echoes two lines of this work (5 and 9) in his Carmen de virginitate (274-75). Camus (Mommsen and Cambria 1893 pp 103-04 note 3) notes that line 5 of the Satiricon imitated by Alcidimus is omitted in Egenus’ reversion of that work. The CSEL edition of Alcidimus also provides a cross-reference to the Satiricon 5 for aerologia (p 214).

Laudes Dei [DRACONTIUS;Laudes.Dei]: C.P.L. 1509.

MSS—Ref none.

The Laudes Dei is a didactic poem in three books totalling over 2,700 hexameters. It treats of God’s goodness and merciful forbearance, drawing examples from the Creation, the Incarnation, and God’s dealings with the human race.

Alcidimus and Bede appear to have imitated the Laudes Dei frequently. Vitellius’ edition (398 AA 14) copies Alcidimus’ Carmen Ecclesiastica IV,7 with Laudes Dei II.554. The CSEL edition (vol 133) of Alcidimus’ kathmat lists echoes of Laudes Dei III.200, and III.137 in kathmat-XXXIX,1, and XCI.1.

Among Bede’s works the mentrval vita Cuthberti (201, 246, 309, 582, and 874) contains echoes of the Laudes Dei (II.576, I.516, III.630, I.650, and II.654). De natura rerum (20.4) echoes Laudes Dei II.372. Also, according to Vitellius (p 9 note 14), in Bede’s syriam 14 (De die indi) verses 49, 115, 133, and 134 echo Laudes Dei II.559, I.14, I.17, and I.16. Romano (1595 p 92 notes 245-44) endorses these identifications.

Evans (1968 p 140) cites the listing of Laudes Dei in a catalog of the monastic library at Reichenau as evidence of the accessibility of this work to the Continental author of the Old Saxon original of Genesis B (Gmb. A.11). Vitellius also connects Laudes Dei III.1 with alcum, carmina CXXI.1, and Laudes Dei III.20 with a letter from Coena (Egelbert) archbishop of Lux to Loy (MOH ES II.282 line 5; see EHDB 181). Alcuin composed a Deisign, preserved in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. Pacz 17 (BII.10), which presents excerpts from books 2 and 3 of Laudes Dei. Glauce (1970 p 15) notes the importance of Alcuin’s anthology for our knowledge of the use of Dracontius’ poems in medieval schools.

Bonula [DRACONTIUS;Bonula.]: C.P.L. 1513.

MSS—Ref none.
The *Remusa* in Vollmer's MGH edition (AA 14) is a collection of ten separate poems on mythological themes. The collective name is derived from a reference to fragments of these poems contained in the Florilegium Veronense (Biblioteca Capitularis CLXVIII (159)). The ten poems are extant together only in this one MS; it is not generally held that Dracontius himself considered the poems as a unit.


Orestis tragodia [DRACOST:OrestTrag.]: CPL 1514.

**MISS—Ref. note.**

The Orestis tragodia is a series of short epic pieces, totalling 974 hexameters, on the theme of Orest's revenge against Clytemnestra for the murder of Agamemnon.

Grunewald's metrical *Vita Curtiss* (302, and 364) echoes Orestis tragodia (639, and 156).

Daniel Nodis

**GRAMMARIANS**

[This generic entry provides a general introduction to grammatical writings in Anglo-Saxon England, and in the final version will include entries on anonymous grammatical works. In this draft version, only the entries under ALCOVIN and Frician have been included. S.N.]

The evidence for the use of Latin grammars in Anglo-Saxon England falls into two distinct periods: an earlier one, coinciding with the first flowering of Anglo-Latin literature around 700, and a later one which commences with the Benedictine reform movement and covers the latter part of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. In the earlier period our chief source of information is the writings of Anglo-Latin teachers—ALCOVIN, TAWINE, BONIFACE, and BRED. In the later period the evidence is more varied, including manuscripts and booklets as well as grammars by Anglo-Saxon authors. For the intervening period, extending from the second third of the eighth century to the opening of the tenth, source material is scarce. Alcoven's writings are an uncertain guide, for they may well have been compiled on the Continent (as his *De Grammaticis et Saxonibus de Octo Partibus Gratiani* alone certainly was), and are more likely to reflect the resources of Frankish rather than those of Anglo-Saxon libraries. (Adro of Fleury's *Quaestiones grammaticae* raise similar difficulties, for Adro spent only two years at Ramsey, and his replies to the questions put him by the monks are likely to depend upon knowledge he acquired at home. Or are we to imagine that he walked into the library at Ramsey and looked up answers to the questions in books the monks could have consulted for themselves? It is to be hoped that work on the *Fons* of Anglo-Latin works from this period on subjects other than grammar will help to fill in this gap.

The following discussion surveys the distribution of works dealing with grammar narrowly defined, i.e. with the eight parts of speech. It does not take into account texts on metrics, orthography, or rhetoric.

The *Introduction* of Christianism brought with it the need to learn Latin, the language of the Church. Although the grammars written under the later Roman Empire were themselves diverse and varied, they provided nothing directly designed to help beginners master Latin morphology, a lacuna which medieval teachers filled in many ways. Only a few grammars were widely available in Anglo-Saxon England during the earlier period: DONATUS' *Arnae Monde* and Arnae Major, *Fructu's Institutione de Nomine*, and the first book of *Hrothgar's *etymologias*. Various combinations of works by the following authors could be found at individual centers: ASPER/ASPASOR, ADRIANUS, CHABRIUS, CONSENTILUS, DIOMIDES, EUTYCHEUS, MARTIANUS CAPPELLA (Book III), PHOCAS, POMPITUS, FROCEIN'S INSTITUTIONES GRAMMATICAES AND PARTITIONES, SERGIUS (OS CASSIDODORUS), SERGIUS (OE LITTERAE), VICTORINUS, VULGARIUS MARSOS GRAMMATICAUS, THE ANONYMOUS BRUNNEUS, and a host grammar ascribed to JULIANOS. To provide a more straightforward introduction to Latin declension and conjugation, Anglo-Saxon teachers made use of compilations of noun and verb paradigm accompanied by copious lists of examples (Delinuones synonymum) and composed their own introductory grammars (TAWINE, BONIFACE). Taken to the Continent during the eighth century, these works and most of the ancient grammars studied by the Anglo-Saxons enjoyed a brief vogue until a few decades into the ninth century. The Carolingian renaissance brought with it a change in grammatical and pedagogical fashion. Of the ancient texts, those which were based on material similar to Donatus' grammars, the so-called Slavonic glosses—AUDAX, CHARTIAN, CONSENTILUS, DIOMIDES, VICTORINUS, ANONYMOUS BEHUIUS—dropped out of favor, as did the commentaries by POMPTUS and SERGIUS (OS CASSIDODORUS), along with early medieval attempts at providing instructional material better suited to beginners (ASPER/ASPORUS, DELINUONES SYNONIMUM, the elementary grammars). Grammars of ogulæ type (that is, works which set out rules for the identification of particular grammatical forms) like those by POCCAS and EUTYCHYES, pseudo-PALENEON and pseudo-AUGUSTINE, retained or increased their popularity. But the biggest change
The Romaia in Valerius' MGH edition (AA 14) is a collection of ten separate poems on mythological themes. The collective mass is derived from a reference to fragments of these poems contained in the Florilegium Veronense (Biblioteca Capitolare CLXVIII [155]). The ten poems are extant together only in this one MS; it is not generally held that Deaconian himself considered the poems as a unit.


Orestis tragodia [DRACONT/Orest/Trag]: CPL 1514.

MS—Rex: none.

The Orestis tragodia is a series of short epic pieces, totalling 974 hexameters, on the theme of Orestes' revenge against Clytemnestra for the murder of Agamemnon.

Beda's metrical vita cuthberti (102, and 588) echoes Orestis tragodia (639, and 158).

Daniel Node

GRAMMARIANS

[This generic entry provides a general introduction to grammatical writings in Anglo-Saxon England, and in the final version will include entries on anonymous grammatical works. In this RM, only the entries under Alcuin and Priscian have been included S.N.] The evidence for the use of Latin grammars in Anglo-Saxon England falls into two distinct periods: an earlier one, coinciding with the first flowering of Anglo-Latin literature around 700, and a later one which commences with the Benedictine reform movement and covers the latter part of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. In the earlier period the chief source of information is the writings of Anglo-Latin teachers—Alcuin, Tewine, Boniface, and Bede. In the later period the evidence is more varied, including manuscripts and booklets as well as grammars by Anglo-Saxon authors. For the intervening period, extending from the second third of the eighth century to the opening of the tenth, source material is scarce. Alcuin's writings are an uncertain guide, for they may well have been compiled on the Continent (as his Dialogus franciae et saxoniae or octo partibus orationum almost certainly was), and are more likely to reflect the resources of Frankish rather than those of Anglo-Saxon libraries. (Addo or Pleyer's questiones grammaticales raise similar difficulties, for Addo spent only two years at Ramsey, and his replies to the questions put him by the monks are likely to depend upon knowledge he acquired at home. Or are we to imagine that he walked into the library at Ramsey and looked up answers to the questions in books the monks could have consulted for themselves? It is to be hoped that work on the texts of Anglo-Latin works from this period on subjects other than grammar will help to fill in this gap.

The following discussion surveys the distribution of works dealing with grammar narrowly defined, i.e. with the eight parts of speech. It does not take into account texts on metrics, orthography, or rhetoric.

The introduction of Christianity brought with it the need to learn Latin, the language of the Church. Although the grammars written under the later Roman Empire were themselves diverse and varied, they provided nothing directly designed to help beginning master-Latin morphology, a lacuna which medieval teachers filled in many ways. Only a few grammarians were widely available in Anglo-Saxon England during the earlier period: Donatus' Ars minor and Ars maior, Priscian's institutio de nomine, and the first book of Iohannes' etymologiae. Various combinations of works by the following authors could be found at individual centers: Asper/Aspilus, Audax, Chariarius, Consensus, Dionysius, Euthyches, Marianus Capella (Book III), Priscus, Pompilius, Priscian's institutiones grammaticae and partitiones, Sergius (non Casiodorusus), Sergius (de letteris), Victorinus, Virgilius (maro grammaticus), the anonymous roethius, and a lost grammar ascribed to Iohannes. To provide a more straightforward introduction to Latin declension and conjugation, Anglo-Saxon teachers made use of compilations of nouns and verb paradigms accompanied by copious lists of examples (Definitiones nominum) and composed their own introductory grammars (Tewine, Boniface). Taken to the Continent during the eighth century, these works and most of the ancient grammars studied by the Anglo-Saxons enjoyed a brief vogue until a few decades into the ninth century. The Carolingian renaissance brought with it a change in grammatical and pedagogical fashion. Of the ancient texts, those which were based on material similar to Donatus' grammars, the so-called Scholasticae genre—Audax, Chariarius, Consensus, Dionysius, Marianus Capella—dropped out of favor, as did the commentaries by Pompilius and Sergius (Ps Casiodorusus), along with early medieval attempts at providing instructional material better suited to beginners (Asper/Aspilus, Definitiones nominum, the elementary grammars). Grammars of single type (that is, works which set out rules for the identification of particular grammatical forms) like those by Phocas and Euthyches, pseudo-Palemon and pseudo-Augustine, retained or increased their popularity. But the biggest change
was the dissemination of several works by Priscian which had not previously been widely available, notably the Institutiones grammaticae and the Partitivae. Much pedagogical activity from the ninth century on was devoted to the problem of making the doctrine of the Institutiones accessible, whether by explicit comparison of it and Donatus, or by incorporating materials from it into commentaries on Donatus, or by preparing abridged versions. At a lower level a new genre, the parsing grammar, permitted the teacher greater flexibility, while the commentaries by Swintowius, the Soisippeyn, and an anonymous Scriptorium elucidated the text of currently fashionable grammarians — Donatus, Etzcychus, Priscian. The evidence from tenth- and eleventh-century England corresponds closely to the Continental pattern, implying that English grammatical instruction was heavily influenced by imports from the Continent in the wake of the Benedictine reform movement. Parsing grammars and abridgements of Priscian's Institutiones grammaticae (as well as the real thing) are well attested, along with works by Donatus, Etzcychus, and Remigius. Erleto's grammar breaks with the Carolingian tradition, substituting a textbook in the vernacular for the Latin-medium intermediate grammars in circulation previously.

The reader should note the following outstanding problems and warnings:

(a) Several texts preserved in English MSS (Anonymus ad Caesarem [editions in preparation by B. Bischoff], Amnis que par, binasque par) or mentioned in an English booklist (Terra que par) have not yet been definitively localized, nor have their sources been studied. Data from them is not included in these entries. Note also that only a little information from Alcuin's grammars and Binas qui de eclus has been included at this stage, and none at all from the Quantenses grammaticae of Abbot of Fleury.

(b) Given that every Anglo-Latin writer had by definition a training in Latin grammar, it is very likely that grammarians are mentioned or quoted in texts or subjects other than grammar. I have not attempted to locate such passages, but would be glad to receive notification of them, and/or to help in their identification. Evidence of this kind is needed most urgently for the period between roughly 790 and 850, for which direct sources are few.

(c) As stated above, I have tried to cover only those ancient works which deal with the parts of speech. In the case of most authors this is unproblematical, with Bede, however, difficulties have arisen. He used a large number of sources, including not only the ancient grammata, but also metrics, orthographia, rhetoric, and glossaries. Without checking all these possible sources one cannot always ascertain whether a grammarian rather than a writer

on rhetoric, say, was the source for a particular passage. Consequently, my policy has for practical reasons been as follows: in the De eruditione I have checked all the passages attributed to the grammaticum (and checked them against other possible sources, except for glossaries); thus, where BEdA-Orth. is included under Quota Cita in the entry for a particular grammarian, this means that that grammarian was in my opinion known to Bede. Where reference to BEdA-Orth. is lacking, this means that (again in my judgment) that grammarian was not used by Bede. (Thus, the absence of this entry under Priscian's Institutiones grammaticae is not accidental.) I have not, however, attempted to draw up entries for sources used by Bede other than the grammata narrowly defined. In the case of De schematibus et tropis, except for a few obvious cases it seemed best to leave this text to a specialist in metrics.


V. Law

HIBERNO-LATIN AND IRISH-INFLUENCED BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES, FLORILEGIA, AND HOMILY COLLECTIONS

Under this heading are grouped three kinds of texts. The first group includes the mostly anonymous or pseudonymous biblical commentaries identified by Bischoff (1976) as Irish or Irish-influenced. Certain major Hiberno-Latin exeges, notably glosses tobertienses and medium scotorum, are not included here but will be found as separate entries under each author's name. Several commentaries not in Bischoff's list are included: one (number 13) was too late for Bischoff's ninth-century limit; and several others (numbers 2, 6, 9, 16, 19, 27, 80, 93, 97) have been identified by other scholars as possibly Irish in origin. Two items which are mostly in Irish (numbers 12 and 23) are included for reasons explained in each entry.

The second group includes a number of anonymous catachetical dialogues and florilegia of biblical and moral extracts that have been identified by Bischoff and other scholars as Hiberno-Latin or Irish-influenced. Pendential and canonical collections, such as the Pendentiales Commediae, the Collectio Canoniwm Missarum, and the Liber de Libro Movorum, are not included here. Nor are such unified ethical or theological treatises such
was the dissemination of several works by Priscians which had not previously been widely available, notably the Institutiones grammaticae and the Prefaces. Much pedagogical activity from the ninth century on was devoted to the problem of making the doctrine of the Institutiones accessible, whether by explicit comparison between it and Donatus, or by incorporating material from it into commentaries on Donatus, or by preparing abridged versions. At a lower level a new genre, the parsing grammar, permitted the teacher greater flexibility, whilst the commentaries by Marcius, the Scuoli glossarius, and Anonymus ac Creditor elucidated the text of currently fashionable grammarians—Donatus, Eutyches, Priscian. The evidence from tenth- and eleventh-century England corresponds closely to the Continental pattern, implying that English grammatical instruction was heavily influenced by imports from the Continent in the wake of the Benedictine reform movement. Parsing grammars and abridgements of Priscian's Institutiones grammaticae (as well as the real things) are well attested, along with works by Donatus, Eutyches, and Remigius. Elpe's grammar breaks with the Carolingian tradition, substituting a textbook in the vernacular for the Latin-medium intermediate grammars in circulation previously.

The reader should note the following outstanding problems and warnings:

(a) Several texts preserved in English MSS (Anonymus ad Customem [edition in preparation by B. Bischoff], Anno qua par, Bascia qua par) or noticed in an English booklist (Terra qua par) have not yet been definitively localized, nor have their sources been studied. Data from them is not included in these entries. Note also that only a little information from Alcuin's grammars and Biscia quod ut has been included at this stage, and none at all from the Quadrimus grammaticus of Abbé of Fleury.

(b) Given that every Anglo-Latin writer had by definition a training in Latin grammar, it is very likely that grammatists are mentioned or quoted in texts on subjects other than grammar. I have not attempted to locate such passages, but would be glad to receive notification of them, and/or to help in their identification. Evidence of this kind is needed most urgently for the period between roughly 750 and 950, when direct sources are few.

(c) As stated above, I have tried to cover only those ancient works which deal with the parts of speech. In the case of most authors this is unproblematical, with Bede, however, difficulties have arisen. He used a large number of sources, including not only the ancient grammata, but also matrix, orthographic, mosaic, and glossaries. Without checking all these possible sources one cannot always ascertain whether a grammarians rather than a writer on rhetoric, say, was the source for a particular passage. Consequently, my policy has for practical reasons been as follows: in the De ortographia I have included under Quota Citis in the entry for a particular grammarian, this means that that grammarians was in my opinion known to Bede. Where reference to BEDA Orhoge, is lacking, this means that (again in my judgment) that grammarians was not used by Bede. (Thus the absence of this entry under Priscian's Institutiones grammaticae is not accidental.) I have not, however, attempted to draw up entries for sources used by Bede other than the grammata narrowly defined. In the case of De schemata et tropi, except for a few obvious cases it seemed best to leave this text to a specialist in metrics.


V. Law

HIBERNO-LATIN AND IRISH-INFLUENCED BIBLICAL COMMENTARIES, FLORILEGIA, AND HOMILY COLLECTIONS

Under this heading are grouped three kinds of texts. The first group includes the mostly anonymous or pseudonymous biblical commentaries identified by Bischoff (1976) as Irish or Irish-influenced. Certain major Hiberno-Latin exegetes, notably glossators whose and medium occurs, are not included here but will be found as separate entries under each author's name. Several commentaries not in Bischoff's list are included: one (number 15) was too late for Bischoff's ninth-century limit; and several others (numbers 5, 10, 12, 18, 20, 27, 28, 33, 37) have been identified by other scholars as possibly Irish in origin. Two items which are mostly in Irish (numbers 12 and 23) are included for reasons explained in each entry.

The second group includes a number of anonymous catechetical dialogues and florilegia of biblical and moral extracts that have been identified by Bischoff and other scholars as Hiberno-Latin or Irish-influenced. Penitential and canonical collections, such as the PONTENTIAE COMMUNIAE, the COLLECTIO CAMPION Hibernensis, and the LIBER DE LOBO MORI, are not included here. Nor are such unified ethical or theological treatises such
Many of these Hiberno-Latin texts are still unedited, but several commentaries have appeared in CCSL 108B and 108C (for detailed reviews of these volumes see Bieder 1978a pp 96-99 and 1978b pp 284-87 and Duke et al. 1977). A project is currently underway to edit the remaining commentaries for the CCSL. For a description of this project, see the Hiberno-Latin Newsletter 1 (1986/87 pp 3-4) and 2 (1987 p 2); some editions in progress have been listed in volumes 1 (1986/87 pp 10-12) and 2 (1987 pp 16-18). Excerpts from several Hiberno-Latin gospel commentaries are printed in W. Huber (1969 sec pp 90-95). A full catalog of Irish exegetical texts by Joseph F. Kelly is scheduled to appear in a forthcoming volume of Irish Studies. Surveys of the field include McNally (1969), McNamara (1972; 1973b; 1984, and 1989) and Kelly (1980b and 1982a).

Few of these works survive in MSS written or owned in England, and few have been proven to be direct sources for Anglo-Saxon texts, but many have been cited for parallels or analogues for specific themes and ideas which were especially popular with, if not unique to, both Irish and Anglo-Saxon authors. The evidence for the Irish contribution to Anglo-Saxon literary culture is thus not limited to specific Hiberno-Latin works which were direct sources for an Anglo-Saxon text, but includes themes and ideas which can be identified as characteristically Irish (or better, 'Sasulish') in formulation or dissemination if not in origin. However, as Riggs has pointed out, "work in this area remains somewhat problematic both because much of the evidence is not readily available and because what is available has not always been adequately compared with the larger Christian Latin tradition" (1986 p 4). Since there is no comprehensive survey of the subject, in order to consolidate recent work, and to facilitate future study, I have included not only those Hiberno-Latin commentaries, florilegia, and homilies collections that were clearly known to the Anglo-Saxons by evidence of the categories of the headnote, but also those that have been cited by scholars for parallels of themes and ideas which may have been disseminated to the Anglo-Saxons through Irish compilations. In such cases I have made no entry in the headnote for Quots/Cita, but mention in body of the entry the themes and ideas for which the work has been cited in connection with an Anglo-Saxon text. (I have generally omitted references when the work is cited merely as a representative example of a widespread patriotic theme.) Although the homilies of St. Pere or Charter or "Penbrok Homiliation" (see homiletics) is probably of Continental origin, it has definable Sasulish connections, and was an important source for Anglo-Saxon homiliists, so I have included references to motifs in this work. I also include three recently-discovered texts (numbers 52, 43, and 44) so far cited only in connection with this homiliation. The reader is therefore cautioned not to assume that a Hiberno-Latin text in the following list was known in Anglo-
Saxon England, unless specific indications are given in the headnote.

For general comments on the influence of Hiberno-Latin texts on Old English literature, see Cross (1981b; 1986a pp 77-83; and 1987a pp 614), and Cross and Hill (1982 pp 9-11). Kelly (1983b) provides a bibliographical survey on the study of Medieval Ireland for Anglo-Saxons.

Charles D. Wright

Biblical Commentaries—Old and New Testaments

1. Pausch problematica de eminatibus ex tomis canonici (Reference Bible) (ANON. Paus.prob.). Bischoff (1976 number 1A-C); RCLL 762, RBMA 1048-11, 1167, 9580 (IA); and 10206-19, 10321-22 (1B).
MESS Salisbury, Cathedral Library 115: HHG 721.
Lis—Ref: none.

The "Reference Bible" is a commentary on the entire Bible, surviving in a complete version (IA), excepts (1B) and a recension in dialogue form (1C). For a survey of its contents and sources see, in addition to Bischoff, McNamara (1987a) and Kelly (1987). An edition is in preparation by McNamara, Gerard McGinley, and John Cummins. McNamara (1972a pp 291-398) edited the introduction to the Psalter.

Cross (forthcoming in Hiberno-Latin Naudeiter 5; see also McNamara 1989 pp 80-87) reports the discovery of a manuscript in the library of Salisbury Cathedral, that MS 115 contains on folio 20-40v extracts from the Reference Bible, corresponding most closely to Bischoff's version in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 614A. According to Cross, two of the three sections of the Paris MS identified by Bischoff as extracts from the Reference Bible correspond with parts of the selections in Salisbury 115. Cross concludes that "these are variant texts but that Salisbury 115 is not a direct descendent of the earlier manuscript. Paris 614A." For another Hiberno-Latin commentary in a Salisbury MS, see number 35.

Hill (1977b p 218 note 3) cites the Reference Bible, along with *PB BEDE, COLLEGEANDA* and *PARIS 472*, EXPONIT in QUATUOR EVANGELIAE (number 1B) for the translation of the four evangelists with other quantities in connection with the "Marcishot Gwysaru" (McNamara 1, A43; cf. McNally 1971).

The Reference Bible has been cited by Cross (1986a pp 77-83) for analogos of "five distinct ideas" in Old English texts:

1. The conception of seven heavens, in *Hand* 27 (B3.2.27, ed. Lees 1995).
2. The number of days, with respect to *Hand* 25 (B3.2.25, ed. Lees 1995).
3. The number of apostles, in *Hand* 27 (B3.2.27, ed. Lees 1995).
4. The number of apostles, in *Hand* 42 (B3.2.42, ed. Lees 1995).

1982; see pp 58 and 61, note 13). On this theme, which occurs also in the *Liber de numeris* (number 39), see Willard (GR 6235, pp 1-30). Stevenson (1982), and the *Aposkryphi Persiculiennatica* (under *APOKRYPHI*). Reynolds (1983 p 126 and note 172) notes that an Anglo-Saxon MS, London, BL Royal 1C.iii [HG 475], fol 62v, has a Latin dialogue on the seven heavens beginning "De septem sparsis celorum Virgilius dicit . . ." This may be an extract from a version of the Reference Bible, which introduces the list of seven heavens with the words "tuo septem sunt septem celii ut alti discunt sed septem spacia celiorum. Virgilius dicit . . ." (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 1156), fol 8v col 2).

2. The age of Adam, in the prose *Salomon et Salome* (Sal I, B5.1), *Mees 10.2* (B24.10.2), and *Heyne* (B8.1.4.7); see also Cross and Hill (1982 pp 70-72).

3. Eve's creation from Adam's left side, in *Abis and Ribake* (Ad 5.B.2); *Hand* 54 (McNally 19, B3.2.34); see Basset and Cross (1982 p 8), Cross and Hill (1982 pp 129-30) and Cross (1987a p 99).

4. The Tree of Knowledge as a fig tree, in *Sal* I (B5.1) and *Hand* 54 (McNally 19). B3.2.34; see Basset and Cross (1982 p 8); this information is omitted in the *VERDIUS* book text of the sermon, but is included in the other three witnesses; see also Cross and Hill (1982 pp 127-29). The idea occurs also in the Hiberno-Latin *VIBIBORB*, *LIBER DE ORENO CREATURARUM*.

5. The speaking ex in Eocene, in the Old English *Monteag* (Matt 19.4); see also Cross (GR 6568, pp 248-54) and Cross (1987a p 21).

Some of this information, as Cross noted (1986a p 79; see also Basset and Cross 1982 p 36), occurs also in the "CALL COMMENTARY ON THE CREATION AND FALL" number 8. For further discussion of several of these themes see C. Wright (1987 a p 128-29). Cross concludes that "the common factor" for these ideas is "The Irish Reference Bible, which now becomes important to Anglo-Saxonists" (p 89). Cross also cites the Reference Bible as a possible source of dissemination for the conception of the descent of monsters from Cain in *Beowulf* (Bne, A4.1; see Cross 1986a pp 82-83, with an edition of the relevant section of the commentary in an Appendix, pp 92-100).

Cross elsewhere (1977b p 65, and 1987a p 69; see also Cross 1985b p 110) cites the Reference Bible (number 1C) as one of several (but not the closest) Irish analogs for the number of the Innocents in item 11 of the homilyary of ST PETER DE CHARTRES; the number of the Innocents is specified also in numbers 20, 21, 24, 48 and 50.

O'Neill (1981 pp 29-30) cites the comment on Ps 1 from the Reference Bible, together with other Irish works on the Psalter (see numbers 9, 10, 11, and 118) to show that the author of the Old English introductions to the prose translations of Psalms 2-50 in the Paris Psalter (B8.2.3) "derived the
basic fourfold structure of his Introductions, with their second historical interpretation, from an Irish plan for psalm commentaries. . . .

Biggs (1986 p 6 and forthcoming in Thisio) cites the Reference Bible as one of several Irish analogs (including numbers 18, 21, 24, 25, 43, 44, and 45) for the motif of Judgment occurring at midnight in Obad 1 (A3.1). Biggs (Thisio) also cites the Reference Bible for the motif of Mt. Sinai as the place of the congregation of the saints and of Judgment (cf. number 18).

C. Wright (1987a pp 129-30; cf. C. Wright 1984 pp 158-63) cites the Reference Bible and other Hiberno-Latin commentaries (numbers 6, 7, and 8) for analogs of a geographical conception concerning the ratio of dry land to water (based on IV Est 6:42) in the "Theban Anachorite" legend in Hesych 4 (Westph 9, B.3.2.4). Hesych 15 (Rehakins, B.3.4.15) and Hesych 27 (Nap 30, B.3.4.27).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) also cites a parallel from the Reference Bible for the enumeration of three characteristics of the Caesarean text in Hesych 1 (Westph 5, B.3.2.1); cf. *46.

2. Questiones sancti Hysidori tam de nouo quam de utere testamento [ANON:Quotest.hol.lat.text/PS.EEL1SVD]: RBMA 5932; CPE 1194; ISLMAH 154; BCLL 779; KYL 18 test.

MISS none.

List: None.

A S Ref: None.

Lapidge remarks that the entry in the Exeter booklist, "Liber Iisdori De nouo et utere testamentis" may refer either to Church's programm of the books of the Old and New Testaments, or to this text.

Cross and Hill (1987) cite the work for a parallel for a question on the number of canonical books in the prose Solomon and Saturn (Sol I, B.5.1, see p 123), and for a question asking "who first prophesied" in Adam and Ribah (Ad. B.5.7, see p 145).

*3 Inventiones nominum [ANON:Invent.nomin.]: CPE 1155d and Addenda, KYL AN inc.

MISS: See Gall, Stilhishthbrothek 913: see below.

List: Ref: None.

The purpose of this work is to collect, for the convenience of students of the Bible, instances of persons mentioned in various parts of the Scriptures, who bore the same name, and to discriminate between them (James, Bibliography Part 1 p 216; an earlier edition by Ameli 1897a pp 9-16 is reprinted in PLS 4.907-15). Of the four surviving MSS, St Gall 913, the so-called Hesychastus Sancti Galli, containing a fragment of the work, is an Anglo-Saxon missionary MS from the second half of the eighth century, and "by a scribe trained in the Anglo-Saxon tradition." (CLA 7.576; cf. Barbecher 1933). James (pp 23-9) noted that at two points the text agrees with the Spanish text of IV Est, as well as a prolongue to IV Est in a Leon MS, in making the author of that work the son of Chus. Dumville (1973 p 317), who discusses the work in connection with Irish transmission of apocrypha, concurs with James' conclusion that it is not possible to determine the date or origin of the work, but Dumville points out that three of these MSS contain works with Insular connections," and states that "one is bound to point to the evidence indicating Spanish and Insular influences."

In another of the MSS (St Gall, Stilhishthbrothek 153, CPE 7.911) the work is followed by a pair of Hiberno-Latin texts, Virtutum Haelia et Virtutum Helia (CPE 1155e and Addenda, KYL AN Hel I-II), which are also incorporated in the Reference Bible (number 1).

The Albi BM 29 MS of Inventiones nominum (CLA 6.795) contains additional notes on the identity of persons in the Bible, assigning names to some of the named. James (p 245) points out that the names given to the two thieves are similar to those in Mut 12.1 (Nap, B.24.12.1 and PS 96, collectanea; on these names see further C. Wright (1987a p 139 note 85). Names are also given to the wives of Noah and his sons, but these do not agree with the names in Solomon and Saturn (Sol I, B.5.1) or in Hesych (B.1.4.7); cf. Liber de numeris, number 39.

*4. Dies dominica [ANON:Dies.dom:Rec.I-III]: Bischoff (1796 number 59); RBMA 9.0060.1 (Recension I); 9.1560.9 (Rec. II), and 9.1562.1 (Rec. III); BCLL 903-5; cf. CPL Addenda 1155e.

MISS: See Vatica, Pal. lat. 220: see below.

List: Ref: None.

McNally (Bibliography Part 1 pp 177-79) distinguishes three recensions of this text, which lists biblical and apocryphal events that occurred on a Sunday. McNamara (1979 p 65, number 52C) follows McNally in designating these Hiberno-Latin; the BCLL assigns them to Brandy, since the MSS of two of the three recensions come from there. The Vatican MS (first half of the sixteenth century, Rheimsard), written in Anglo-Saxon script, contains the Recessions II (as well as the longer version of Apocalypse of Thomas and a unique redaction of Visio sancti Paulli; cf. C. Wright 1970b p 553 note 15). Other copies of Recension II, unknown to McNally, occur in Kells, Aug. Coll. IV, fol 18 (eighth century; for the incipit and explicit, see RBMA 9.1491 [not cross-referenced as RBMA 9.11550]) and St Gall, Stilhishthbrothek 682, pp 330-34.
Leca (1963a pp 146–50) discusses the *Die dominus* as examples of the "Sunday Missa" or "Benedictiones of Sunday" (*Orestia dei dominus*), including examples in Irish vernacular texts and Old English "Sunday Letter" homilies (for details see *Sunday Letter, under APOCRYPHA*). See also Leca (1966 pp 156–33), White (1962 p 59), and Teitze (GR 6345, p 127).

**Biblical Commentaries—Old Testament**


**MSS—Ref. none.**

The commentary on Genesis has been very tentatively considered Irish by McNally (1969 p B3, 1976 pp 201–7, and 1973 p 149 note) and O’Cléir (1976 p 321). A remark by Laisnez (1976 p 328 note 10) that "its author sometimes copies Hibbanus" is termed "misleading" by Gorman (1982 pp 178 note 27). Cross (1987a p 76) suggests independently that the commentary "certainly includes ideas found elsewhere in anonymous texts with definable Irish influence" (cf. also Cross 1987b p 64 note 26). For a further Irish symptom in the commentary, see C. Wright (1987a pp 142–43, note 94).

MacLean (GR 5217) cites a number of general parallels from the Genesis commentary for *alcuini in Genesim*, but see O’Keefe (1978 p 146 note 2).

Dohane (1978) cites the Genesis commentary at several points in his notes on Genesis A (Gen 4, A1.4), mostly illustrating commonplace interpretations, but also (p 224) for the Jewish legend that the serpent was created with feet, which may be reflected in Gen 3.9a.

Cross (1987a pp 76–77) cites several parallels from the commentary for passages in the homilies of St Æthelwold (item 30).


**MSS—Ref. none.**


The commentary has been cited by C. Wright (1984 p 156; cf. C. Wright 1987a pp 149–50) for an analog for a geographical conception concerning the ratio of dry land to water (for details, see number 3).


**MSS—Ref. none.**

On this commentary Bischoff remarks: "Perhaps of continental origin, it was certainly formed under Irish influence" (p 106; cf. Bischoff 1961, rpt 1966–67, p 385 and note 94; cf. also Cross 1987a p 11 and 77). A commentary with the same title and lociput was in Chartres, Bibliothèque Municipale 63 (125), fol 50–67 (destroyed in 1944). An edition is in preparation by Thomas O’Loughlin. For another possibly Hiberno-Latin text in the second part of the two-part MSS (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 10457 + lat. 10616), see the *interrogatio de singularibus quaestionibus*, number 43.

The commentary has been cited by C. Wright (1984 pp 159–60; cf. C. Wright 1987a pp 149–50) for an analog for a geographical conception concerning the ratio of dry land to water (for details, see number 1); here combined with the cosmological theme of the earth as a point as in the "Theban Anchorite" legend.

*8. St Gall Commentary on the Creation and Fall (Stiftsbibliothek 909) [ANON.Comm.Gen.(StGall.909)]* Bischoff (1976 number 4); RBMA 11954; BCLL 1260.

**MSS—Ref. none.**


The commentary has been cited by Cross (1986a) and C. Wright (1987a) for analogs of certain "distinct ideas" in Old English texts: the age of Adam; Eve’s creation from Adam’s left side; the Tree of Knowledge as a big fig tree; and the ratio of dry land to water (for details, see number 1). The information concerning the Tree of Knowledge is part of a citation from a lost "Sedulius in tractatwm Masulii," for which see Bischoff (1976 number 19 pp 119–20) and BCLL 646. C. Wright (1987a) shows that other texts in the same MS transmit apocryphal lore known in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England.

*9. Laicenn Mac Baith, Egloga de Morallibus in Iob* [LAIDC.Egl.Mor.Iob] Bischoff (1976 number 5); RBMA 5565; 5394; GPZ 1715; BCLL 293; KVS LATH. See also LAIDCENN, LORICA.

**MSS Cambridge, Pembroke College 88; HG 135. Lists—Ref. none.**
For the Cambridge MS, from Bury St Edmunds, see Thomson (1972 p.623, note 27). The commentary is an abbreviation of Gregory's Moralia. In addition to the studies cited in the BCLL, see McNamara (1973c).

10. *Glossa in psalmus* (39.11-151) [ANON.Glosa.psalm.(Ps.lat.60)]; Bischoff (1976 number 6A); BCLL 1261; SEH1 465.

MSS Vatican, Pal. lat. 68; HG 909.

Cite — Ref. none.

The Vatican MS (CLA 1.78) was written by the Northumbrian scribe Edlibericht. McNamara (Bibliography Part I) argues that "the work originated in an area where there were both Irish and Northumbrian scholars, i.e. either in Ireland or Northumbria," and that it "belongs to the Irish (and Irish-Northumbrian) tradition of exegesis ..." (pp. 73-74; cf. McNamara 1979 and Stace-Birch 1975 p.365). The MS contains several scholia in Old English and Old Irish; for the Old English glosses (Psidosac, B8.3) see McNamara (pp. 24-25) and the literature cited there. The so-called Palster of Charlemagne (edition in preparation by Padraig P. Ó Néill) contains introductory material to each psalm, closely related to that of Var. Pal. lat. 68 (Hiberno-Latin Nundert 2 p.16).

Ó Néill (1981 p.30) cites the Gloss on Ps 1 as a further witness to (but not the actual source of) the 'Irish fourfold scheme' of psalm exegesis adapted by the author of the Introductory to Ps 2-50 in Ps (B8.2.1); cf. numbers 1, 12, and 14.

For a full survey of Irish Psalter texts and commentaries see McNamara (1973a; see pp. 218-19 for the Glossa); see also McNamara (1984b).

11. *Eclogae tractatorum in psalterium* [ANON.Ecl.tract.psalt.;]; Bischoff (1976 number 88); BCLL 783.

MSS — Ref. none.

McNamara (1973a p.235) states that for the sections be examined "virtually the sole source is the Milan commentary in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C.301 inf. (for which see McNamara 1973a pp.221-25). An edition is in preparation by McNamara; for extracts see McNamara (1973a pp.285-90).

The commentary is cited by Thomas Hall (forthcoming in Medium Aes geom for an analog of the twelve-fold division of the Red Sea in Homil 53 (NapsunEpsin, B3.4.53) and Omnia (Or, B9.2; book 1); cf. numbers 15 and 20.

12. *Old-Irish Treatise on the Psalter* [ANON.Ol.Treat.psalt.;]; SEH1 516.


MSS Cambridge, St. John's College C.9; HG 148.

Cite — Ref. none.

Ramsey (1921b p.471) believed that the Latin glosses in this Psalter derived from a Hiberno-Latin commentary translated in the Old-Irish Prayer on the Psalter (see preceding entry). On this Psalter see also McNamara (1973a pp.241-42). Only the Irish glosses (in Stokes and Strachan 1904-05 vol 1 pp. 4-6) and a few Latin glosses (in Ramsey 1921b pp.672-73) have been published. An edition is in preparation by Padraig P. Ó Néill.

A Latin gloss from the Psalter has been cited by Thomas Hall (forthcoming in Medium Aes geom for an analog of the twelve-fold division of the Red Sea in Homil 53 (NapsunEpsin, B3.4.53) and Omnia (Or, B9.2; book 1); cf. numbers 11 and 20.

14. *Ps Bede, De titulis psalmarum, Argumenta* [ANON.Arg. psalm./PS.BEDA]; RBMA 1665; CCL 1384; cf. 607a.

MSS — Ref. none.

Cite Introductions to Ps 2-50 in Ps (B8.2.1); see below. Ref. none.
According to Fischer (1971 p 95) the argumentum for each psalm consists of three sections: a comment on the historical situation of the Psalm, mostly based on THEODORUS MOPSISTHES' series I of the Thud psalmarum; and a brief moral interpretation, frequently based on JEROME'S COMMENTARII, or on AERENICI. He suggests that the Argumenta sections of this composite work may be associated with an Irish milieu (p 107). See also McNamara (1973a, pp 216-18).

O'Neil (1981 pp 308) accepts Ramsey's (1912a and 1912b) and Bright and Ramsey's (1912) evidence that the Argumenta (together with the Explanatio from the same composite text, which Bright and Ramsey call in Psalmar Librum Eugeni) were a source for the author of the Introduction to Ps 2–50 in Ps (BII.2). Ramsey thought that the influence was indirect, though the Irish commentary represented by the OLD IRISH TREATISE ON THE PSALTER (number 12). O'Neil concludes that the Old English paraphrase "followed a structure of four-fold interpretation developed and used by the Irish commentaries on the Psalms [numbers 1, 10, and 12]; for the matter of this scheme he drew mainly on the Argumenta and Explanatio, though not nearly to the extent proposed by Bright and Ramsey" (p 38). See also Whithlock (1996 pp 94-95).

Dempsey (1987) provides a detailed examination of the dependence of the Introductions upon the Argumenta, and the dependence of the latter upon THEODORUS MOPSISTHES, EXPOSITIO IN PSALMOS. Dempsey (who seems to have overlooked O'Neil's study) argues that the Anglo-Saxon author "had access to a fuller Theodorean commentary" than the Argumenta (p 375), or at least a "more ample" form of the Argumenta than survives in De incho psalmarum (p 384). He suggests further that that source may have been an Irish work (though not the Theodorean commentary in Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C. 301 inf., formerly attributed to Columbanus). Following a tenuous chain of associations concerning the cultivation of Antiochenian exegesis by the Irish and by THEODORE OF CANTERBURY, Dempsey ultimately speculates that Theodore and Alcuin may have had a hand in the putative source.

15. Ps. Jerome, BREUARIUM IN PSALMOS [ANON Ber. psalm.: PS. HIER.]: RBMA 3333; CPL 629; RCLL 343; RBM 427; XVS PS-HI bre.

MSS.

2. Vatican, Reg. lat. 338: HG 916.

Lists—A S: None.

Quot./Citi. 1. ? ALDH, Epist. A.462: see below.

2. ALCVIN Exp. psalm.: see below.

Ref. none.

For the Irish origin (seventh-eighth century) of this work see McNamara (1973 p 225 note 39, citing Fischer 1971 p 93 and Frode 1966 p 76, note 6; cf. XVS p 371). On the Vatican MS see Gneuss (GR 6248 p 44 note 13). There has been considerable confusion regarding two other MSS. Gneuss (HG 425) lists the BREUARIUM among the contexts of Royal 4.A.xiv (cf. CLA 2.216), but Ogilvy (RKE 1984 p 304) notes that Steinmüller lists it under psalm. TRACTATUS IN PSALMOS (RBMA 3333; CPL 592; RBM 220), dated to the eighth century (although Steinmüller also lists it, as tenth century, under the apocryphal BREUARIUM). The MS in fact contains Jerome's Tractatus (RBMA vol 2, p 304) from Ps 109-49, but with interpolations from the BREUARIUM; see Morin (CSS 78.xvi-vii) and Warner and Gibson (1921 vol 1, p 80). Ogilvy (RKE 1984 p 181) says that the selections in Cambridge, Pembroke College 91 "may be from either" Jerome or Ps Jerome. Gneuss (HG 156) lists the work as BREUARIUM IN PSALMOS, but Lambert lists this MS under Jerome's TRACTATUS (RBMA vol 2, p 303). Lambert's index also lists entry number "437" for this MS, but there is no such number in Lambert's catalogue, and one suspects a misprint for 427, the number of the BREUARIUM; but Lambert does not list the Pembroke MS there, either in the main entry or in the Addenda.

The parallel cited by Ewald in the apparatus to his edition of ALCUIN, epistola 4.812 (cf. PL 68.1026) is slight (both works identify the damus of Ps 62.2 as the Church, an interpretation that occurs elsewhere). Ogilvy (RKE 1983) states that the work was "much used by ALCUIN in his commentary on the gradual psalms and elsewhere," but Alcuin used the BREUARIUM in his commentary on the penitential psalms (RBMA 1089), and not in the commentary on the gradual psalms (RBMA 1090); I do not know what works are meant by "elsewhere."

*16. Marburg Commentary on the Song of Songs (fragment) [ANON. Comm. Cr. (Marb. Hr. 21,11)]: Bischoff (1976 number 7); RCLL 1262.


List—Ref: None.

The Marburg MS (beginning of the ninth century, "perhaps from Fulda," Bischoff 1976 p 106), is written in Anglo-Saxon script, but from an Irish original according to Bischoff.

17. Josephus Scottus, Abbreuiatio commentarii Hieronimi in Issaiam [IOS.COC.Ontusb. HIER. Comm. text.: Bischoff (1976 number...
Biblical Commentaries—New Testament

In his catalog, Bischoff (1976 number 18, p. 119) refers to a compilation Questiones super Evangeliorum et dictis Augustini [ANON,Quest.visueng,dict.AVG.] (RBM 9004 and 9045) found in several MSS, including Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 9054-75, fol. 1-98v, which includes two Anglo-Saxon glosses, Cod XII 33 (Ker, D33; see NRK 1957 p 476). Bischoff concludes, however, that "it is probably early Carolingian."

18. Ps Jerome, Expositio quattuor evangeliorum [ANON,Ex-
post.quat.evangel.1PS.BIBKIER.]; Bischoff (1976 number 31A-G); RBMA 3424-27 (Reconstruction I), 3429-31 (Reconstruction II), 3433, 3435 (Reconstruction III); CCL 633; BCKL 941; BBM 576-72; RVS PS 1-50 Exe.

MSS—dS only none.
Quo/Cita 1. 1 BEDES Comm Luci.: see below.
2. ? Or 5 (B9.2.6): see below.
3. ? Soll 5 (B9.4.4): see below.
Ref none.

Ogilvy (RKE p 183) states that St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 125 "may have English connections," and Lowe (CLA 7.999) makes no such suggestion. Beeson (1913 p 103) merely says that the abbreviations "seem insular English."

Kelly (1986 pp 68-69, cf. Kelly 1981b p 60) adduces two parallels with BEDE, in Lucan which suggest "that Bede knew either the Expositio or the Irish tradition which stood behind it."

The commentary on Luke may have been used in Onorio (Or, B9.2, ed. Batsy 1980, 100.30-151.23) on the Beatitudes in the Augustinian reign, specifically the allusion to the golden ring around the sun (PL 30.587-88); see Batsy

(1971 p 249), citing Whitelock (1956 p 91), on these paternae see also Cross (1973) and the catachernes celtica (number 44).


Hill (1977a pp 213-23) cites Ps. Jerome, along with ps. BEDE, COLLECTIONES, and the reference BIBLE (number 1) for the association of the four evangelists with other quantities in connection with the "Aberchaf Charm" (MCCL 1, A33.1, cf. McNab 1871).

Cross (1987a p 82) refers to Ps. Jerome among other commentaries, both Irish and non-Irish, on the interpretation of the gifts of Magi in the homily of on fere de drachmas item 13 (cf. numbers 24 and 48). The commentary is cited by C. Wright (1988a pp 225-26) for parallels for two passages in Homer 10 (FRH), 2.32.10; see also numbers 21, 24-26, 31, 44, and 50.

Biggs (forthcoming in Tidsskr; cf. Biggs 1986 p 6) cites the commentary for the motif of Judgment occurring at midnight in Christ (A3.1; cf. numbers 1, 24, 25, 42, 44, and 45). Biggs (Tidsskr) also cites the commentary for the motif of Mt. Sinai as the place of the congregation of the saints and of Judgment (cf. number 1). (A reference by Hill 1986 p 22 to Ps. Jerome on Matthew is properly to another Hiberno-Latin commentary on Mark, number 29.)

19. Aileran Sapiens, Kanon evangeliorum rhythmicum ("Quam in primo speccio quadrige") [AIL,Kan.evangel.]; Bischoff (1976 number 13); RBMA 843; CCL 121; BBM 300; SEITH 107 (6); KFS AI 1. Exe.

MSS 7 Augsburg, Universitätsbibliothek (cmln. Harburg, Fürstlich Ortenburg-Walletscheidische Bibliothek) 1.2,4c.

Liz.—Ref none.

Aileran's poem on the Eurabian canon is included among the prefatory matter in the Augsburg MS (Mashina Gospels, eighth century, CLA 8.1235), written in Anglo-Saxon script. See McGuir (1961 pp 60-70), who gives the origin as "Eschernach-The/Veurnthe/Luxembourg," Bischoff says "aesec DX, West-German" (1976 p 160, note 33). The MS contains Old English scratched glosses, OCS 51.5 (Hofmann, CS1.2; see NRK 287). Bischoff notes that fol 1 contains another poem, in prino eto canone/quatuor concordant ordines (RBMA 844), which "may also be an Irish production..." (p 160, note 138).
Schönbach (1903 p 78) remarks that Almeyr's *Interpretatio mystica progenitum Christi* and *Interpretatio muntuli progenitum Christi* (Bischoff 1976 number 25; CPF 1120; BLL 2099 ed. FL 86 327-42 with PL 9 3662-15) corresponds closely to ALCOIN'S *Interpretationes nominum Hiberniarm prophetae* . . . *Christi* (FL 100 729-34), but declines to draw any conclusions concerning the relationship of these works to each other and to the interpretationes in *MAURUS* MAEGER'S Commentary on Matthew. Kelly (1975 p 45) argues that *Alcuin* follows Alcian in choosing the prophets according to Matthew rather than Luke and perhaps also in his selection of certain biblical passages.

In addition to the text in Meyer (Bibliography Part 1), the poem is also edited in De Bryne (1920 p 185) and FL 104 729.

*20. Gospel Commentary of Miel Brigue [MAEL,Comm,exang:] SEGH 483; see BCLL 350 and 351.

MSS—Rej. none.

Ritmüller (1981, 1982, 1983, 1984) argues that the interlinear and marginal glosses (mostly on Matthew 1-27) in London, BL Harley 1802, written by Miel Brigue at Armagh in AD 1136, are based upon both patristic and Hiberno-Latin sources (especially numbers 1, 21, and 24), "dating back at least to the eighth century" (1983 p 166). Imbodded within the commentary are several glosses ascribed to "M. "Macr.," or "Manchus," an Irish exegete Ritmüller would place in the seventh century. Bischoff (1976, Appendix, pp 145-49) argues for a later date for the "Manr" glosses, ninth or tenth century. BCLL 350 assigns them to the tenth or eleventh century. On the MS see also Flower (1926 pp 430-31). Oídea (1925 pp 328-44) prints extracts from the glosses.

Cross (1987a p 69, cf. also Cross 1987b pp 62-64) cites from James (1927 p 109) a gloss from this MS on the number of innocents as a parallel for the homily of St Père de Chartres item 11 (cf numbers 1, 21, 24, 748, and 50).

Biggs (1986 p 20) cites a "Manr" gloss on the appearance of the Cross in the sky at Judgment in Christ; (A3 1).

Thomas Hall (forthcoming in Medium etrum) cites a gloss for an analog of the twelve-fold division of the Red Sea in *Hend* 53 (NaspunLepis, B3.4 53) and Oídea (0, B3.2; book 1), cf. numbers 11 and 13.

21. Ps Alcuin, Liber questionum in evangelis [ANON Lib,quest, euang/PSALCVIN]: Bischoff (1976 number 163); RBMA 1100, and 9.10 348; CPF 1168; BCLL 764; V73 PS-ASC Mt.

MSS—Rej. none. 

The Fulda MS (dated to the end of the eighth century, CLA 4.1181), a fragment, is written in German-Anglo-Saxon script (for a fragment of another recension of the same commentary in an English MS, see following entry).

C. Wright (1988a pp 134-36) points out that portions of the commentary on the Temptation correspond to the *Cathecismus* celticus (number #44). Bischoff (1976 number 20, pp 122-33) also noted similarities to a then lost Matthew commentary by a Hiberno-Latin exegete named "Frigulus" (known through quotations in *Smartin* and *Smaragdus*, see p 58: "Unesentlich ist die mögliche Identität mit VIRKS [Virgil of Salzburg]"). On its connections with the present commentary see further Kelly (1988a pp 367-72) and Cross (1987a p 15).

Kelly raises but dismisses as "a decided lesser argument" the possibility of Anglo-Saxon connections for Frigulus. Frigulus' commentary has recently been discovered by Bischoff (see BCLL 645). An edition of the Frigulus commentary is in progress by Jutta Fliege. An edition of the Liber quesionum in evangelis is in preparation by Jean Rittmüller. For printed excerpts and fragments see Bischoff (1976).

The commentary has been cited by C. Wright (1988a pp 133-36), together with closely parallel comments from *Cathecismus* celticus (number #44) as a possible source for several brief passages in *Hend* 10 (BCLL 3); cf. numbers 18, 24-26, 31, and 50.

Cross (1987a) cites this commentary in connection with the homily of St Père de Chartres item 11 on the fall of the idols during the flight into Egypt (pp 23, 74-76; cf. number 24, and compare GOSPEL OF PS MATTHEW under APOCRYPHA), and on the number of the Innocents (p 69; cf. also Cross 1987b pp 62-64, and numbers 1, 20, 24, 48, and 50).

Biggs (1986 p 6, and forthcoming in *Thumba*) also cites the commentary as one of several Irish analogs (numbers 1, 18, 24, 25, 49, "44 and 45") for the motif of judgment occurring at midnight in *Christ* (A3 1), and also (1986 p 25) for the description in the poem of the biblical "goats" as "foul."

*22. Ps Alcuin, Liber questionum in evangelis (Recensio altera) [ANON Lib,quest, euang/PSALCVIN]: Bischoff (1976 number 163); BCLL 1267.

MSS—Rej. none.
On the Hereford MS, written in Northumbrian uncial, see *CLA* 2.158. This fragmentary commentary shows "extensive verbal agreement" (Bischoff 1976 p 114) with Ps Alcuin, Liber Ques[ionum] Evang[eliorum] (see preceding entry). Ritmuller (1986 p 6) states that it represents "a separate recension" of the Ps Alcuin commentary, Ogilvie (BKE p 201, under the heading "IN MATTHAEUM") wonders whether this fragmentary commentary is related to the glosses on Matthew in Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud MS. 520 (SC. 1194; apparently not, to judge by the incipit and explicit given by Cosse 1856-85 fasc 2, col 376); or to the fragmentary commentaries in Dresden B25um and Paris Bibliothèque Nationale Int. 12292 (the latter is *CLA* 5.642, not *CLA* 8.1281, which is rather the Dresden fragment); or perhaps to the Ps Alcuin commentary. The last two shots in the dark somehow hit the same mark: the Dresden and Paris fragments are in fact both from Ps Alcuin—the other recension of the present commentary!

23. Lambeth Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount

[ANON.Comm.serm.Dom.mont.]: BCLL 347.

*MS* ? London, Lambeth Palace 119, flyleaves (now "Fragments 1225," fols 7 and 8).

List—Ref: none.

These fragments, from the tenth century, were used as fly-leaves for a late twelfth-century English MS, but there is no evidence for their place of origin. The fragmentary commentary, mostly in Irish with some Latin, is considered early eight-century by its editors (Bibliography Part 1).

24. Vienna Commentary on Matthew (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 940) [ANON.Comm.Math.(Viec.940)]: Bischoff (1976 number 87); BCLL 772.

*MS*—Ref: none.

On the Vienna MS, see Cross (1987a p 13), who comments: "Cros (1983b p 121-22) cites a similar applied by Mary's conception through the Holy Spirit "sicut in arbore et terram descendit ut florecat terra ut fructiferer arbore" as a rough parallel for a similar in Amb (B189:3): "ava jas trowa bone h bi blomeia ferd jen windes hied." C. Wright (in a forthcoming study) notes a similar comment in the *Linde Homily Collection* (number #46). Cross (1987a) cites this commentary for parallels for the homily of st rēs de charitēs item 11 on the apocalyptic story of the fall of the idols during the flight into Egypt (pp 23, 73-74; cf. number 21, and compare *Gospel of St Matthew*, under *Apocalypse*), and on the number of the Incensory (p 69; cf. also Cross 1987b pp 62-63, and cf. numbers 1, 21, 20, 48, and 40), as well as for echoes of commentaries on the Magi in item 13 (p 245; cf. numbers 18 and 48).

C. Wright (1986a pp 132, note 7; 133, note 12; and 135-36) cites parallels in the commentary for brief passages in *Hed[us] 10* (*Bildem 3*, B3.2.10); cf. numbers 18, 21, 25-26, 31, *44*, and 50.

Biggs (forthcoming in *Sudh*) cites the commentary for exegiological motifs in *Christ* (A3.1), including the saints and angels in the company of Christ at Judgment and Judgment occurring at midnight (cf. Biggs 1986 p 6, and numbers 1, 18, 21, 25, 42, *44*, and 45).

25. Würzburg Commentary and Glosses on Matthew (Universitätsbibliothek M.puh.l. 6) [ANON.Comm.Glos.Math.(Würzb.6)]: Bischoff (1976 number 27A-B); *RIMA* 11756-11760; BCLL 768; SEHH 462.

*MS*—Ref: none.

The commentary (with longer explanations on Mt 1-27, and interlinear glosses on Mt 1:1-16:18) has been cited by C. Wright (1986a p 133, note 12, and 135 note 50) for parallels for brief passages in *Hed[us] 10* (*Bildem 3*, B3.2.10); cf. numbers 18, 21, 24, 26, 31, *44*, and 50.

Biggs (forthcoming in *Sudh*; cf. Biggs 1986 p 6) cites the commentary for the motif of Judgment occurring at midnight in *Christ* (A3.1; cf. numbers 1, 18, 21, 24, 42, *44*, and 45).


*MS* ? Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 6233.

List—Ref: none.

The Munich MS (second half of the eighth century, South Bavaria) has corrections in a contemporary Anglo-Saxon hand; see *CLA* 9.2122 and Cross (1987b pp 62-63). For possibly Irish homilies in the same MS, cited by Cross for extensive parallels with several homilies in the homilies of st rēs de charitēs, see number #48. According to Bischoff (1976 p 127) the commentary "probably did not originate in Ireland." An edition of the commentary is in preparation by Denis Bradley.

The Munich commentary is cited by C. Wright (1986a pp 151-32, note 7) for a minor parallel for a phrase in *Hed[us] 10* (*Bildem 3*, B3.2.10; cf. numbers 18, 21, 24, 25, 31, *44*, and 50).

27. Ps Bede, Expositio in Matthei evangelium [ANON.Expos.Math.(PB.BEDA)]: *RIMA* 1678 and 7060; BCLL 1269.
HILL (1986 p 22) cites the commentary on Mark (indidentally identified as Ps Jerone on Matthew) for an analog for the motif of the bleeding trees at Christ's Crucifixion in Chronic (A3.1). The commentary is here quoting 4 Esr 5:3, but the application of the motif to the Crucifixion instead of the more common use as one of the "Fifteen Signs of Judgment" (see APOCALYPSE OF THOMAS under APOCRYPHA) is apparently attested only in Chronic, Ps Jerome on Mark, and an Old Irish poem of Blathmac. See Hill (pp 16-33) and Biggs (1986 p 24).

Kelly (1986 p 69) suggests on circumstantial grounds that the commentary "would have been an attractive source" for Sera's commentary on the gospel.

50. Praefatio secundum Marcum [ANON.Prae.Marc.:] Bischoff (1976 number 28); RBMA 9.9916.2; BCLL 775.

MSS—Refi none.

Cross (1987a pp 80-99) states that the commentary "has not yet been considered by Hiberno-Latin scholars, but its structure often has correspondences with that in Pseudo-Jerome" (number 18). The possibility of Irish connections is supported by its context in the MS, which also contains the COLLECTION OF COMMENTARIES, as Cross pointed out. It should be added that the sermon immediately following the commentary correspond to items in the reputedly Irish CATHAGINE CROCEOSERIES (number 45). The MS is tenth-century and Breton, according to Bischoff (private communication reported by Cross, p 11). The commentary is uncut.

29. Ps Jerone, Commentarius in evangelium Marci [ANON. Comm.Marc:PS.HIER.:] Bischoff (1976 number 27); RBMA 9.9266; CPR 632; BCLL 345; RBMA 473; KFIS CU-D MC.


Refi none.

The provenance of London, BL Harley 3213 (continental script, tenth century; see RBMA vol 38, p 378), mentioned by Ogilvie (RKE p 179) is unknown; it is not listed in HG. A Worcester MS of this commentary, dated to tenth century by Turner (1916 p 50, cf. CPR), and to the beginning of the eleventh century by Gilson (1933 p 313), is from the second half of the twelfth century according to Lamberti (RBMA vol 38, p 380). Bischoff's attribution of the commentary to Gummern, author of the letter DE CONTROVERSIAS PARCHALI (parchial letter to Ségéne), dispensed by Standfliess (1975 pp 501-70), has been supported recently by M. Walsh (1987 pp 223-29), and in greater detail by Walsh and Ó Cróinín (1988 pp 317-23); it is accepted by Krebs (KFIS p 284). For an earlier suggestion that it is by REMIGIUS OF AUVERGNE, under Irish influence, see Gilson (1933 pp 314-15).
Quot/Ctis: ALCV3N. Comm. Joh. see below. 
Refj none.

According to Brearley (Bibliography Part I p 152) the two MSS listed by Lamberti (BDM 674) in addition to Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale 275 (edn 250) "contain separate commentaries unrelated beyond theirincipi." On the commentary see also Brearley (1996). Brearley (Bibliography Part I p 157) states that there are similarities between this commentary and two other Hiberno-Latin commentaries (number 18 and the Vienna commentary on John, Bischoff 1976 number 31; BCLL 774), but that "there are surprisingly few parallel discussions...and the three writers have often selected different lemmata for comments." Brearley (Bibliography Part I p 159) states that Alcuin "may have read this commentary along with the more widely circulated" Ps Jerome, Expositio quattuor evangeliorum (number 18); but Brearley goes on to say that Alcuin's commentary "was of a quite different character," and his footnote (52) gives only a parallel between Alcuin's commentary and Ps Bede, in S. Ioannis evangelium expostul., with reference to Michel and Schwarz (1978 pp 168).

*33. De questione apostoli [ANON/Quaest. apost.].

MSS: Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F 4.32 (SC 2176); H 538. 

List: Refj none.

The Quaestio on Col 2.14 occupies fol 21r in part III (the so-called "Libri Commentorum") of the composite Oxford MS, which was owned by St Dunstan. The text is uncoloured but can be consulted in the facsimile edition by R. W. Hunt (1961). According to Hunt (p ii), "the treatment of the 'chrysographum' as a document to be divided into two parts suggests that the piece belongs to the Irish exegetical tradition brought to light by B. Bischoff" (citing Bischoff 1955 p 299 [1966-81, 1, p 120] and 1954 p 268 [1976 p 159]; Hunt also compares the title with Bischoff number 26, De questione psamtuan). Bischoff traces the custom of the Chirotomograph document, which first appears in England in the ninth century, to Irish exegesis of Col 2.14, as attested in a Hiberno-Latin commentary on the Pauline epistles (Bischoff 1976 number 33) and a commentary on Luke (Bischoff 1976 number 25).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) cites the Quaestio for an analog of the theme of the three deaths in Hymn 4 (NcTlom 9, B3.2.4), which appears in other Hiberno-Latin compilations, including the Ps Bede, Collectanea and the Pseudepigrapha de melioribus exemplis (number 42).

34. Karlsruhe Commentary on the Catholic Epistles (Bodleian Landesbibliothek Aug. CXXXIII) [ANON/Comen.epist.cath. (Karlsru. 233)]; Bischoff (1976 number 55); RBMA 1958-67; BCLL 340; SEH! 105; RTS AN cath.

MSS: Refj none.

On the date and provenance of this commentary, and its relationship to number 33, see Brenn (1924). According to Kelly (1896 p 68), McNally (Bibliography Part I) concluded that Bede used this work in his commentation in epistolas septem catholicae. However, although McNally does state that both Bede and another Hiberno-Latin commentary on the Catholic Epistles, that of Ps Hilary, "depend upon" the anonymous Irish commentary (p x.), his argument seems to be that the influence upon Bede is through Ps Hilary (see following entry). The parallels McNally adduces between this anonymous commentary and Bede's work (p viii) are in fact all mediated through Ps Hilary. McNally's conclusion is rather that "the Reichenseau commentary of the anonymous Scitus is basic to Pseudo-Hilary's work and reflects an older exegetical tradition, while Bede's Expositio, later in origin, depends at least partially on Pseudo-Hilary..." (p xiv). Thus by his earlier (unfortunately ambiguous) statement about Bede's dependence McNally appears to have meant that the anonymous commentary influenced Bede through Ps Hilary, not that Bede knew the earlier work directly. In any case he cites no parallel between Bede and the anonymous work that is not present in Ps Hilary.

Cross and Hill (1982 pp 131-4) cite the work, along with the Pseudepigrapha secundum marcum (number 30) for a parallel for the question "Who first named the 'name of God' in Sophia and Saturn (Sol I, B5.1) and Adrian and Rabeua (Ad, B5.2). The motif also occurs in the reference work (number 1)." Bigges (1806 p 13) cites this commentary and the following for parallels for the motif of the destruction of the heaven, earth, and sea in Creasin (A3.1).

35. Ps Hilary, Expositio in VII epistolas catholicae [ANON/Expos.epist.cath./PS HILAR.(ELAT)]. Bischoff (1976 number 36); RBMA 5325-31; CPI 508; BCLL 340; RTS PS-HIL/A.


List: AS Ver none.


On the date and provenance of the Ps Hilary commentary and its relationship to number 34, see Berecz (1984).

Cross (forthcoming in Hiberno-Latin Newsletter 5) reports the discovery of Tessa Wébere, in an Oxford D.Phil. thesis on the MSS of Salisbury Library, that MS 124 contains on folio 42v-49r the beginning of the commentary of Ps Hilary (corresponding to CCSL 108B,33-79/55). For extracts of another Hiberno-Latin commentary in a Salisbury MS, see number 1. For the Irish character of the work, see McNally (Bibliography Part I pp x-xvii).

Bischoff (1976 p 143) states that Bede, in his commentary in epistolae septem catholicae must have had this commentary (or in any case, one very like it) before him . . . since with the words referre quern . . . interpresator he criticizes the attempt of the Irishmen to render inspiration through the Holy Spirit intelligible by means of the comparison non futu- bile (on II Peter 1:21). McNally (Bibliography Part I p xiv) says that Bede's commentary was written "partially under the influence" of Ps Hilary. He cites textual parallels between the two works (pp xiv-xv), and cites Bede's commentary for other parallels in his notes at various points. See further Kelly (1986 pp 67-68) and Bieler (1976 pp 217-28). For Bede's indirect dependence, through Ps Hilary, upon an anonymous Hiberno-Latin Karlisches Kanonisches Kommentar auf die Katholischen Briefe, see the preceding entry.

Ambrosius translates the commentary on James 2:13 in ASCI 2:1 (BL I,123); the Latin text is also quoted in one MS (Cambridge, University Library Gg.3.28: HG I). For the identification see Cross (GR 5532, pp 77-78), citing the text of Anselmi (1897b pp 207-60 at p 216, rpt in JLS 13:9-131). Bischoff translates the quotation with a remark expressing doubt as to the work's authenticity ("In quodam tracto, qui auctorem Sancti Hilarii fuisse . . .").

Bigs (1996 p 15) cites this commentary and the preceding for parallels for the motif of the destruction of heaven, earth, and sea in Orphic (A,3). 36. Ps Jerome (Ps Isidore), Commentarius in Apocalypsin [ANON-Comm.Apc./PS.HIER.]. Bischoff (1976 number 37); RBMA 5271 [= 1661]; OPL 1121; ISLAM 154; BCLL 781; RBMA 496; RSV AN Apoc. MSS - 4,5 lit. none.


On this commentary see also Frede's revised commentary (KTS 1984 p 23): "von einem von der Mitte des 8.Jh., oder eher um 600 in Vivalpinto von einem Schiller des Caesarianus".

Kelly (1982a pp 402-86) notes "fourteen passages where the Irish commentary and Bede agree with one another but do not depend on an earlier patristic source." He admits that six of these parallels are slight, but argues that taken together they "indicate the existence of a common, if limited, insular tradition of Apocalypse exegetes" (p 403). Because the priority of the Irish commentary cannot be firmly established, Kelly prefers to believe that "both drew from a third, possibly oral, source or tradition which was probably Irish . . ."

The edition specified in the Bibliography, Part I is reprinted from G. Lo Mondo Rapicetta (1967); the work is also printed in Hartung (1954).

37. Ps Alcuin, De septem sigillis [ANON.Sept.sig./PS.ALCVIN]; RBMA 496; RSV (1984) AN sig.

MSS - Ref. none.

This short treatise associates the seven seals of Apoc 5:1-5 with seven events in Christ's life, each of which is associated with one of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit; the seven gifts are in turn associated with seven patriarchs. In a recent edition of this work, M. Bibliography Part I also edited in KB 101.1969-70) dismisses the possibility that Alcuin wrote the treatise and suggests on stylistic and other grounds that it could either be a sixth-century Visigothic work or an eighth-century Irish one (p 152). She concludes in favor of Spanish origin, however, largely on the basis of the liturgical linkage of the seven seals with the ministry of Christ in the Mozarabic rite at Easter (pp 129-137). The problem of a Visigothic or an Irish origin for the treatise may require reconsideration, since Matter was unaware of the many parallels in Irish and Insular sources for the linkage of the seven seals with the events of Christ's life and for the association of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit with the seven patriarchs. Both themes are found in the Liber de numeris (number 39), and other Hiberno-Latin sources, as McNally showed (1985 pp 108-9 and 137-8). Regarding the theme of the seven gifts exemplified in the patriarchs, McNally concluded that the attestations of theme in Hiberno-Latin sources (including Ps HEBZ, collectsanta and the catachresis culpa, number 44) "lacks such, wenn nicht direkter ursprungs, so doch wenigstens Zusammenhang mit direkteryenes vermuten" (p 199). The linking of the seven seals with the events of Christ's life also occurs in the homilies in homiliae del numinis (number 47), although early Spanish dissemination of this theme is indicated by its occurrence in Apocryphal, Rota and Apocalypson, Epistola de Toledo, Liber de quaternio baptismae, and Heremias and Beatus de Librorum, Epis- sa ad aedem Elipandro (see Matter, p 121, de Lubac 1959 vol 1 p 132; cf. Doboslaitos 1912 pp 236-41 for possible patristic sources). Finally, although Matter speaks of "the Spanish connection" of one of the MS families (on the basis of the presence of excerpts from Isidore and Eucherius)
in the two MSS), and notes that "there is no evidence for a Celtic transmission of De septem sigillis" (p. 137), one of the two MSS of Family A (apparently copied from the other, cf. Matter p. 122, citing Bischoff 1900 pp. 242-43, especially note 1) is in fact written in an Irish hand (Lamberts, _BRM_ vol. 3B, p. 399, lists another MS). At the very least, the Irish played an important role in transmitting the two major themes that make up De septem sigillis (on cultural and literary transmission from Spain to Ireland see Hillgarth 1954, 1962, and 1965). Frede (KFS 1984 p. 30) follows Matter: "zwischen 500 und 650, Spanien." Cross (1987a pp. 19, 82-83) refers to the treatise, as well as to the Irish examples gathered by McNally, for the theme of the seven gifts exemplified in the patriarchs in the _homily of st. pierre de chandes_ item 1 (cf. numbers 39 and 44). Cross (pp. 242-44) prints a close analog for the description in the homily from a Munich MS, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 14351. Delbeau (1988 p. 256) has since shown that this sermon exists in a collection surviving in several other MSS, including Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 2175, from which it had been edited by Dufourcq in 1910.

C. Wright (in a forthcoming study) points out that the theme of the seven gifts and the patriarchs occurs in _Brynhild's Manual_ (Brym 1, Crawford 20.21.0).

Florilegia and Dialogues

"38. Ps Isidore, Liber numerorum [ANON.Lib.nun.I/Ps.ISID.]: _BRMA_ 5174; CPL 1193; _ISLAMH_ 107; _BCLL_ 1254; KFS (1984) Ps-IS nu I.

MSS: _AvS_ 45b.

Quot/Cit: 1, ALDH Metr. 63.15-72: see below.

2. _Brym_ (Crawford, B20.20.1): see below.

Ref: none.

The work is included in the CPL among the genuine works of Isidore, but Bischoff (1958 pp. 98) considered it an Irish production; see also McNally (1961 pp. 314-15), Lapidge and Herren (1979 p. 187, note 7), Tristram (1985 pp. 52 and 88), and Frede (KFS 1984 p. 65: "unsichtig, wohl irisch, 7.Jh"). Lapidge and Herren (1979 p. 32; cf. pp. 187, notes 4-7 and 190, note 27) have shown that Aldhelm's treatise on the number seven in the _De metricis_ is based primarily on the _Isidorianus_ or pseudo-Isidorian Liber Numerorum._ Although Ewald ( _ANGL AA_ p. xix) noted that Aldhelm drew on other authors as well, Lapidge and Herren state that "it would be fairer to say that Aldhelm's work was an elaboration of the Liber Numerorum than it would be to call it a composite work drawing on the Liber Numerorum as one of its sources."
bers 37 and 44, and in no REC, Collectanea, and the theme of the "Seven Joys of Heaven," in items 89 and 91 (pp 41-42; cf. pp 83, 122, 125, 152-53, 164, 172, 193, and 236, and see numbers 40 and 44). For other examples of the Seven Joys of Heaven theme in Old English, see Hill (GR 3333). C. Wright (1984 pp 62-63), Tristram (1985 p 145) Biggs (1986 pp 39-40), and Lees (1986 p 127). Cross also cites the Liber de numeris for the seven sons of Eleazar and Felicitas in the homily of Et Fæte of Charters item 47 (pp 56, 94), and for a list based on Prov 6:10-19 in item 91 (pp 62 and 165).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) cites the Liber de numeris for examples of numerical themes and apocryphal lore known in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England, including the conception of the seven heavens (1987a p 129, so too Cross 1986a pp 78-79, for details, see the reference bible, number 1) and the "Thought, Word, Deed" triad (for the tried see Sims-Williams 1970).

Tristram (1985) cites the Liber de numeris in connection with the Sex octon mundi theme in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England (see especially pp 32 and 88), and adds a portion of the text (pp 294-295).

Biggs (forthcoming in, Tadhig) cites the Liber de numeris for an example of the invarial theme of the four-fold division of souls in connection with Christ (A31; cf. numbers 44 and 45).

According to Lapidge (ML p 90), "that the work was known in late Anglo-Saxon England is clear from the fact that the names of Noah's wife—Perceva—and of this three sons—Ola, Ollver, and Ollivana—were interpolated into the Old English poem Genes (lines 1547-48), apparently from this source..." (cf. Bammesberger 1984 p 85). The information, however, circulated independently of the Liber de numeris (cf. Utley 1941 p 436; McNally 1957 pp 127-28; Tristram 1986 p 120), including in the bibli- cal glosses connected with the school of THEODORE OF CANTERBURY (see Bischoff 1976 p 121) and in books, in nuncius in context (number 5); see McNally 1969 p 15, and cf. number 5). The Liber de numeris need not have been the interpolator's immediate source, though it is certainly a likely source. The names also appear, with slight variation, in other Anglo-Saxon texts: Salome and Salome (Vol I, B5; 1; see Cross and Hill 1992 pp 10, 84-87) and Hopiana (B8, 1.47; see Bischoff 1976 p 121).


The Munich MS (end of the eighth century, Friesing, CLA 9,1283) was written by the Insular (Northumbrian-trained) scribe Peregrinus (see Bischoff 1969 pp 61-63, 75; and Keenser 1985 pp 64-77). The editor of the florilegium characterizes it as "eine fast durch und durch von irischen bereinflussten Volaren abhängige Sammlung," on the basis of extensive parallels with other Irish works including the Liber de numeris (number 59), Proemium (number 47), and the homilies in nomine dei enaun (number 47); see Lehner (Bibliography Part 1 p xiii-xvii). Fricke (KVS 1988 pp 22-23) refers to Lehner's characterization of the work but adds: "oder führen die Quellen und das Vorbild DEF [Deissner] eher nach Gallen." The florilegium includes extracts from pelagius and the grammarian virgiliius maro. The MS also contains a version of the three uteritances sermons (see under aposrophus).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) cites the florilegium for an example of the Seven Joys of Heaven motif (see number 39 for further examples).


On the Munich MS (from the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century), written by Anglo-Saxon or Irish scribes, see Bischoff (1969 p 229), and Lehner (Bibliography Part 1 pp 44-48). Bischoff considers the MS "ein Produkt der Berührung keltischer und karolingischer Kultur im westlichen England, in Wales oder Cornwall... oder allenfalls in Bretagne zu sein." Lehner distinguishes three phases in the compilation of this work: an original Spanish compilation, including the Testimonia scripturae patrum but with only part of the patristic section; a reduction with the complete patristic section, from Gaul, and finally a form which incorporated Irish and other material transmitted in the Munich MS. For the connections with Irish texts, including the PROVERBIA GRASCOMBM, see Lehner (pp 50-51).

The extracts in Chapter X of this florilegium (De ordo se et De deo) are in other florilegia with Irish connections, including ps Brede, Collectanea, the Karlruhe MS Aug. CCLIV, and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 22053, the Weswoubrunh Gebet MS (see McNally 1964 pp 315-14, and C. Wright, forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies). McNally believed this piece "was written in Ireland as early as 700" (p 211). Half of it (De deo) appears in an English MS, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 326: HG 93 (information from J. E. Cross).

42. Prebubium de multiorum exemplaribus [ANON.Preb.mult.exempl.]: RBMA 9:9916,5; BCLL 777; KVS AN ex.
The Pseudepigrapha is a question-and-answer dialogue consisting of miscellaneous motifs; many numerical. McNally (Bibliography Part I p 158-59) states that it is closely related to the Liber de Numeris (number 39), and like that work probably originated in the circle of Virgil of Salzburg.

Cross and Hill (1982 p 9) cite the Pseudepigrapha for parallels for five items in Adrian and Rebeka (Ad, B5.2): item 12 on the son who avenged his father in his mother's womb ("the son of the serpent," see pp 157-58); items 26 and 27 on the two feet and four wings of the soul, see pp 149-50; item 38 on the four mute things ("Paralyzed elsewhere only in Collectanea rena.") see pp 154-55; and item 44 on the dearest and most hateful thing ("will," see p 150).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) cites the Pseudepigrapha for a parallel for the theme of the three deaths in Hom 3 (Hom 3 9, B3.2.4); cf. number 33 and Perseus, Collectanea, which has both the three deaths and the three lives as in Hom 3 4.

Biggs (1986 p 6; cf. Biggs, forthcoming in Religions) cites the Pseudepigrapha as one of several Irish analogs (numbers 1, 18, 21, 24, 25, 44, and 45) for the motif of Judgment occurring at midnight in Osoc (A.3).

Cross and Hill (1982 p 9) state that "we may surely assume that the Pseudepigrapha is only one representative of its kind." C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) draws attention to two similar question-and-answer dialogues in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 19410 and clm 5257, both having extensive parallels with the Pseudepigrapha and other Hiberno-Latin texts. These dialogues have versions of the three deaths theme as in Hom 3 4, and of the four mute things as in Adrian and Rebeka (Ad, B5.2) item 38. Clm 19410 has a sequence of triads (the three ways the devil lures man into false security); three things that lead to hell: three things that lead to heaven (three things not forgiven) parallel to Hom 3 16 (Navas B3.4.46); this same sequence occurs also in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 16354 and clm 22053 (for details, see C. Wright). Clm 19410 also has the Seven Joys of Heaven theme (see number 30) and a variant of the list of virtues of the soul as in Hom 13 (Hom 13 B3.5.13) through the homily of St Ffere de Charters item 90; see Stammach (1986c pp 4-6) and Cross (1987a p 146), who shows that the theme is ultimately from Sts. Peter and Paul's Emblems spiritualia; for Stammach's translation of this passage see Edelmoson (B3.9.3, pp 38-40). Clm 5257 has the pair of "Thought, Word, Deed" triads discussed by Sins-Wilkinson (1978).

*43. Interrogatio de singulis quaestiones (BN lat. 10616) [ANON: Interrogating questions:]- see Bischof (1976 number 3); not in RB4A.
C. Wright (1984 pp 56-59, and forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies) shows that the theme of "hieroxide" of hell (and heaven) occurs in bishop Patrick, de tribus hæresibus, and in several Irish vernacular sources, including Aggsro Oscaefrid (cf. Ó Laoghaire 1987 p 157).

Cross (1985a p 233 and 1985b p 12) cites the work for an example of the enumeration of Christ's ten appearances after the Resurrection in Anti-Bibl. This theme, ultimately from Augustine, de consensi evangeliarum, occurs also in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 6235, the MS containing the præambulus secondum marcum (number 30) and another Hiberno-Latin commentary on Luke (Bischoff number 29).

Cross (1985b pp 112-13 note 31) cites the Catachisis obisca and the catachecesi cracovianesi (number 45), along with several non-Irish sources, as parallels for the list of four manifestations of the Godhead in Christ in Anti-Bibl.

Cross (1987a pp 63-64, 66-67, and 90) shows that the homily of st thurbe de charters items 26 and 27 for Palm Sunday used four pieces from the Catachisis, while item 29 "is a variant text" of a fifth piece. Cross concludes that the homily "drew on a variant manuscript of the sole extant witness of Catachesis obisca in Vat. Reg. lat. 49 ..." For details, see pp 28-29 for item 26, p 29 for item 27, and p 30 for item 29. Cross also cites the work for two themes which appear to persist in insular texts (p 82): the gifts of the Holy Spirit exemplified in the patriarchs, and the Seven Joys of Heaven (see number 29 for details).

Biggs (1986) cites the Catachisis as one of several Irish analogs for motifs in Crouc (A3.1), including Judgment occurring at midnight (p 6; cf. Biggs, forthcoming in Rationale, and numbers 1, 18, 20, 24, 25, 42, and 45) and the angelic fear at Judgment (p 17). Biggs (Thaddeus) also cites the work for the insular theme of the fourfold division of souls (cf numbers 39 and 45) and for the interpretation of the biblical image of the "last" as the devil (cf. Biggs 1988a pp 153-155) cites the Catachesis, together with closely parallel comments from the liber quæstionum in evangelium (number 21) as a possible source for several passages in Rationale (bulk 5, B3.2.10), cf. numbers 18, 24-26, 31, and 50.


MISS — Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 129 (SC 1575) see below. Linn — High note.

The discussion of this collection by David (Bibliography Part I) is based on Cracow, Cathedral Library MS 140 (olim 43, C3A 15.1593). Raymond Budy has since identified four more witnesses: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 15408 and 15769; Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. CXCVI; and Orleans, Bibliothèque Municipale 341. Two more partial witnesses are Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 20222, and the Oxford MS (from the first quarter of the ninth century, Main region, written in Anglo-Saxon script; see Crow 1858-83 fac 2, ool 129) contains part of one homily on the Sermon on the Mount (or another Hiberno-Latin sermon in this MS, see the lino homily collection, number 44). According to Bischoff (1976 p 159, note 124), "although Irish elements can be traced in the collection, "the language is, to a considerable degree, romanised. In my opinion it is Italian, after 800, not French." See also Frede (XTS p 91) on one of the items of the collection: "von einem Irren, Mitre des 8. Jh." An edition of the collection is in preparation by Thomas Amos of the Hill Monastic Microfilm Library.

Cross (1979/b p 28, and note 101) notes a passage from the collection that expands the etymology of "Assandres" — "demonus et ferris in corpore et anima" — in a way that corresponds to a phrase in Anti-Bibl.

For parallels for the list of four manifestations of the Godhead in Christ in Anti-Bibl. see the catalachesis catalica (number 44).

Bazire and Cross (1982 p 66) refer to an unpublished passage on the minora crimina and suo principali ete in connection with the distinction between major and minor sins and the purgatorial fire at Judgment in Hans 33 (B3.2.35) and Hans 44 (B3.2.44), ADRW 11, 45 (B3.2.89), and Hans 26 (Nap 29, B3.46.26).

Cross (1987a pp 29 and 67), who notes certain "Celtic Latinitas" in the collection, cites a passage from the MS (also found in the catalachesis catalica, number 44) which is "verbally close" to a passage in the homily of st thurbe de charters items 26. See also C. Wright (1988a p 134 note 15).

Biggs (forthcoming in Rationale) cites homilies in the collection for etiological motifs in Crouc (A3.1), including Judgment occurring at midnight (cf. Biggs 1986 p 6, and numbers 1, 18, 20, 24, 25, 39, 42, and 45) and the Insular theme of the four-fold division of souls at Judgment.

with Frederick M. Biggs

*46. Linn Homily Collection [ANON Hom.Linn].

MISS — Oxford, Bodleian Library Laud Misc. 129 (SC 1575) see below. Linn — High note.

Linn, Bibliothèque de Philosophisch-Theologisches Hochschule der Diözese A 1/6, fol 71-101 (from the beginning of the ninth century, Bavaria, according to Budy, citing Bischoff), contains a collection of sermons whose
contents have been analyzed by Plante (1975) and Était (1981). Of the thirteen items in this part of the MS, Était states that eight "paraisent être formés d'un aboutissement établi sur le continent" (p 125; for the incipits and explicit, see pp 129–30). Était edits one of these pieces, a sermon on Mt 7.24–27, from the Lina MS and three other witnesses, including the Oxford MS (from the first quarter of the ninth century). Main region, written in Anglo-Saxon script; see Cross 1987a, 62.3.10), which also contains part of one sermon from the Catachesis cracoviensis (see preceding entry). Était suggests Irish authorship on the basis of parallels with ps 23:30, *Ex peribane in qua verbo evangelizorium* (number 2), the Vienna commentary on Luke (number 31), and the Catachesis cracoviensis (number *44*), in addition to the style of the sermon ("particulièrement rocailleux et hérétique," p 13).

C. Wright (forthcoming in Cambridge Medieval Catholic Studies) cites a parallel from a Lini homily for the enumeration of the three characteristics of the Coeranian tax in *Homil* 1 (Vercell 5, 5.2.1); cf. number 1.

C. Wright (in a forthcoming study) cites a similar theme in the Holy Spirit in connection with Matt (819.139), for details see number 24.

47. Homilies in nomine Dei summii [ANON.Hom.nom.Dei.summii]:

BCLL 803; XVS AN McNally.

MSS * Vatican, Pal. lat. 220: see below.

List:—AS none.

Qua/Ot * Homil* 14.2 (B3.5.14.2; ed Lusielli Padda 169.72–171–83):

ANON.Hom.nom.Dei.summii 14.5–22.

Ref: none.

McNally edited the seven sermons rubricated in *nomine Dei summii* from a larger collection of homilies in two Vatican MSS, Pal. lat. 212 and 220; the latter MS (from the first quarter of the tenth century, Middle Rhineland) is in Anglo-Saxon script. A third MS of the collection, unknown to McNally, is in East Berlin, Philippi 1716 (ninth century); see C. Wright (1987a, 255 and 1998b, p 452, note 6), and Cross (1996a, p 84).

C. Wright points out that this homily collection "transmits a core of texts used in some form in Old English homilies in Oxford, Bede's *Life of St. Junius* 85/86 (C), London, BL Cotton Faustina A In (J), and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 302 (K). These include the so-called *Three Utterances sermon*, of which three versions exist in Old English, though none descends directly from the text in this collection (for details on the *Three Utterances sermon*, see under *APOCRYPHA, MISCELLANEOUS*). One of these Old English versions, *Homil* 5 (Willard, B3.5.5) conflates the Three Utterances exemplum with an excerpt from *Ps. Augustinum*, sermo 24 (see Cross 1982) which appears as the initial item in a three MSS of the Latin homily collection, although it is not one of the sermons McNally edited as *Hiberno-Latin* (see G. Wright 1987a, pp 135–37 and 1987b, p 453). Luiselli Padda (1977, pp 2–5) pointed out that the same Old English homily contains a theme on the food of the soul that appears in the *Apocrypha praecalligraphica* (see under *APOCRYPHA*), but the theme occurs in other contexts, including the homilies *in nomine Dei summii*. C. Wright (1987b) also shows that a passage contrasting the teachings of God and of the Devil was used in *Homil* 14.2 (B3.5.14.2), which was in turn adapted by the composite *Homil* 6 (Aax 14; B3.2.6; 167.102–168.115). Finally, one of the MSS, Pal. lat. 220, also contains *Recension III* of the *Hiberno-Latin* *Codes Dominicalia* (number *4*), and an interpolated version of the *Apocalypse of Thomas* (see under *APOCRYPHA*). Wright concludes that "although the Latin collection in the Vatican and Beato MSS was not itself a direct source for the Old English homilies in C, J, and K, it is an important witness to the kind of florilegium that must have been available to the Old English homilists" (p 453).

To the evidence cited by C. Wright may now be added Cross' statement that *Ps. Augustinum*, sermo 64 (*PL* 40.1347), a source for passages in the homilies of the *St. Ælfhere* *chartes* item 20, appears in Pal. lat. 220, fol 338f, in a variant form "generally much closer in word" than Migne's text (*Cross 1987a, pp 245–47.


MSS * Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek inc 6233: see below.

List — Ref: none.

On the Munich MS (second quarter of the eighth century, South Bavarian, with connections in an Anglo-Saxon hand; *CL 5.1252*, which also contains a *Hiberno-Latin* commentary on Matthew (number 26), see Cross (1987a, pp 10). On the homilies in the MSS see Cross (1987b, 1987a, p 42, 62–63 and 68–70). Cross states that the collection is "compiled from diverse areas," including one item from the homilies of Alcuin of York (867, p 60). However, Cross also argues that there are "Irish symptoms" in some of the homilies (p 10), notably a homily on the Holy Innocents (edited by Cross 1987b), and a homily for the Epiphany (see Cross 1987a, pp 69–70). An edition of the homilies in inc 6233, together with the corresponding items in the homilies of the *St. Ælfhere* *chartes*, is in preparation by Cross and Denis Bradley.

Cross (1987a) cites the sermons in inc 6233 for parallels for passages
in several homilies in the homiliary of St. Père de Chartres, including item 1 on the Holy Innocents (see Cross 1987b, and 1987a pp 23 and 68, and cf. numbers 1, *20*, 21, 24, and 50); item 13 on the gifts of the Magi (Cross 1987a pp 69 and 81-82, and cf. numbers 18 and 24); and item 14 on water and wine miracle at Cana and Baptism of Christ (Cross 1987a pp 24, 83-84). Several other sermons in this homiliary represent selections from homilies in clas 6235, including items 43, 45, 46, and 50 (see Cross 1987a pp 34-37), while item 44 has a phrase from the collection (Cross 1987a p 35).

*49. Vatican Homily Collection* [ANON. Hom. (Pal.lat.556)]. RFS PSI AU Pal.

MSS: Vatican, Pal. lat. 556; see below.

List—Ref: none.

A collection of eighteen homilies has been edited from the Vatican MS by S. Teresa (Bibliography Part I), who designates the collection "of Bardegio pseudoeugetiniano palatinus." The Vatican MS (from the beginning of the ninth century), which Bischoff (1977 p 112) assigns to "Deutsch-angelschleichsches Gebiet," is written in Anglo-Saxon script. Among the items several have points of contact with the Gatachness certica (number *44*; see S. Teresa ps 196 and 204, and cf. Frede, RFS p 160).

Wack and Wright (forthcoming) cite a pair of triads in item 4 of the collection (ed. pp 219-20), which occur also in paculae of aquila, liber excitationis, as a source for an abbreviated version of the three utterances sermon in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 29835; this abbreviated Latin version is in turn the source for the Old English version of the exxemptus in Homs 5 (Willard, B3.3.5; for details, see the entry on the three utterances sermon under apologia, miscellanea). Cross, in the preface to the forthcoming reprint of Basse and Cross (1982), cites an image in item 17 of the collection (man lives in the world as if in another's house) as a parallel for a passage in Homs 31 (B3.2.3).
in several homilies in the **HOMILY OF ST PÈRE DE CHARTRES**, including item 1 on the Holy Innocents (see Cross, 1987b, and 1987a pp. 23 and 68, and cf. numbers 1, 20, 21, 24, and 30); item 13 on the gifts of the Magi (Cross 1987a pp. 69 and 81-82, and cf. numbers 18 and 24); and item 14 on water and wine miracle at Cana and Baptism of Christ (Cross 1987a pp. 24, 83-84). Several other sermons in this homiliary represent selections from homilies in clm 6235, including items 43, 45, 46, and 50 (see Cross 1987a pp. 34-37), while item 44 has a phrase from the collection (Cross 1987a p. 35).

*49. Vatican Homily Collection* [ANON. Hom. Pol. lat. 556]; *KFS PS- AU* Pal.

**MS**? Vatican, Pol. lat. 556: see below.

**List**—Ref. none.

A collection of eighteen homilies has been edited from the Vatican MS by S. Teresa (Bibliography Part 1), who designates the collection "il forcellino pseudomontaniano palatino." The Vatican MS (from the beginning of the ninth century), which Bischoff (1917 p. 112) assigns to "Deutsch-angelschichtisches Gebiet," is written in Anglo-Saxon script. Among the items several have points of contact with the *Catachresis Celtsica* (number *44*; see S. Teresa pp. 196 and 204, and cf. Fede, *KFS* p. 160).

Wack and Wright (forthcoming) cite a pair of triads in item 4 of the collection (ed. pp. 219-20), which occur also in *Paullus of Aquileia, Liber Exhortationum*, as a source for an abbreviated version of the three utterances sermon in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek clm 29135; this abbreviated Latin version is in turn the source for the Old English version of the exorcism in *Humb 3* (Willard, B.3.2.3; for details, see the entry on *Three Utterances Sermon under Apocrypha, Miscellaneous*).

Cross, in the preface to the forthcoming reprint of Bazaire and Cross (1982), cites an image in item 17 of the collection (man lives in the world as if in another's house) as a parallel for a passage in *Humb 3* (B.3.2.3).


**MS**—Ref. none.

**Leabhar Breac** contains homilies in Irish with interpersed Latin passages, and some items in Latin believed to date back to the eleventh century; for a general study see MacDonncha (1975), and for an outline of the contents, see Tristram (1985 pp. 43-45). The Irish portions have been attributed to Mad. Iona Ni Bhrolcháin (see MacDonncha, and the works by Muireann Ni Bhrolcháin cited by McNamara 1987b p. 593 note 107); but for objec-

**HOMILIAIRES AND HOMILIES**

[Mary Clayton will provide an introduction to the topic, and separate entries on the Latin collections will follow. See, however, Hiberno-Latin...
Anonymous Old English Homilies

A strong tradition of vernacular composition and transmission of homilies and sermons developed in the late Anglo-Saxon period. Within that tradition is the work of a few named writers (Ælfric, Byrhtferth, and Wulfstan), but a large proportion of the surviving corpus is anonymous. It is not clear how early the vernacular tradition began: some critics have placed many of the surviving Vercelli and Blickling pieces in the ninth century on linguistic and stylistic grounds (see GR 5443 and 6207), while others suggest the end of the tenth century, close to the date of the earliest surviving MSS (see Gatch 1977 pp 4-11). The truth probably lies somewhere between these two extremes.

From the beginning of the tradition as it survives now, writers quoted earlier sermons extensively and often verbatim. One long item in the Vercelli Book (which is palaeographically the earliest surviving MS) has incorporated within it a large part of another item in the same collection. This is a pattern which is repeated throughout the eleventh century as sermon writers quoted existing books for material. The difficulty of establishing a chronology for items recorded only in the eleventh century or later precludes the investigation of indebtedness among them, and this entry is therefore largely confined to the two earlier compositions. These are the Vercelli Homilies (Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII, edited in GR 6200 and Szarmach 1981a), which draw upon the resources of a Canterbury library and which are therefore often quoted in later homilies created from Canterbury books, and the Blickling Homilies (Princett, Scholae Library 71, edited in GR 6699), which probably represent material that survived in a Mercian library and are therefore not as frequently used in other surviving homilies (see Scrugg 1985). It should be noted that it is extremely unlikely that the eleventh-century items cited were drawn directly from extant copies such as those in Vercelli and Blickling, which themselves may be composite (see the comments on Vercelli Homily II below).

For a survey of the whole corpus of anonymous homilies in Old English, and for details of possible indebtedness not discussed here, see Scrugg 1979. Fuller analysis of the Vercelli items, together with a text of all the relevant Old English material, will appear in the forthcoming Early English Text Society edition of the Vercelli Homilies (edited by Scrugg).
3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 357, Part II: HG 100; NRK 63.10.
List—A-S Hari none.
Quote/Ref 1. Homd/27 (B3.4.27): see below.
2. Homd/55 (B3.6.55): see below.
Ref none.

Vercelli Homily 8 is also eschatological and has at its heart one of the most dramatic addresses of the soul to the body in Old English literature (see APOCYTHRA, VISO SANTI PAULI). It opens, however, with a heavily rhetorical and often conventional exhortation to repentance, parts of which found their way into four composite homilies during the eleventh century: Homd/51, which was itself selectively used in the composition of Homd/41 (see Scragg 1977), and Homd/55, which was drawn upon by the author of Homd/70 (see Scragg 1979).

Vercelli Homily 9 (Homd/4)

MS 1. Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CVXII: HG 941; NRK 394.11.
List—A-S Hari none.
Quote/Ref 1. Homd/35 (B3.4.35): see below.
2. Homd/35 (B3.4.35): see below.
3. Homd/59 (B3.5.9): see below.
4. Homd/27 (B3.4.27): see below.
5. Cap1.10.3 (B1.10.3): see below.
Ref none.

Vercelli Homily 9 is another eschatological homily drawing on a variety of Latin sources, some of which have been identified as Hiberno-Latin (see HIBERN-LATIN, . . . NOBLEY COLLECTION, CATACRISIS-CITICA, NUMBER 94). The two surviving copies have slight but significant differences (see the edition in GR 240). The version recorded in the Vercelli Book gave rise to the extracts in the composite pieces Homd/9 and Homd/27. That recorded in Bodley 340 was drawn on by the compiler of the composite confessional text, Cap1.10.3. A markedly different (and probably earlier) version of Vercelli 9 that has not survived was used by the authors of two distinct items subsumed under the AC designation Homd/15, and from this line came two brief (and different) extracts incorporated separately into the two surviving versions of Homd/35 (see Scragg 1979; the relationship of the two versions of Homd/35 is described in GR 6528, pp 250–32). That the two MS versions of Homd/15 constitute two (related) items and not two copies of one (as suggested in AC) is clear from a comparison of the edited texts, Robinson (GR 6229) for that in Cotton Tiberius A.iii, and Linzelli Fadda

for that in Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 115, but verbal parallels between them show that they both descend from a version of Vercelli Homily 9 different from that preserved in the Vercelli Book and Bodley 340; for detailed evidence, see my forthcoming edition of the Vercelli Homilies.

Vercelli Homily 10 (Homd/40)

3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 421: HG 198; NRK 69.9.
List—A-S Hari none.
Quote/Ref 1. Homd/7 (B3.2.7): see below.
2. Homd/33 (B3.4.33): see below.
3. Homd/27 (B3.4.27): see below.
4. Homd/33 (B3.4.33): see below.
5. Homd/15 (B3.4.15): see below.
Ref none.

This popular (to judge from the number of surviving MSS) eschatological homily has three principal Latin sources—PX AUGUSTINE HOMILY 30b, and PROCOBUS SEVERUS—and consequently can be seen to divide into three parts. Eleventh-century writers utilized these divisions, the author of Homd/7 taking the last two (verbatim) to form an independent piece, the author of Homd/13 adding only the last to the other material to create a new item (edited as number 12 in GR 6219). Homd/27 is a composite homily that draws on other Vercelli items (see Scragg 1977). It may also be noticed that an introductory sentence found only in the Vercelli Book version of Vercelli 10 is verbally similar to sentences in Homd/55 (both versions) and Homd/15 in Oxford, Bodleian Library Hatton 115.

Vercelli Homily 15 (Homd/6)

MS 1. Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CVXII: HG 941; NRK 394.17.
List—A-S Hari none.
Quote/Ref 1. Homd/6 (B3.2.6): see below.
Ref none.

Vercelli 15 is one of a number of Old English homilies that have as their principal source the APOCALYPSE OF THOMAS (see APOCYTHRA). Homd/8 is a composite homily (edited as item 14 in GR 6225) made up entirely of extracts from other surviving vernacular homilies (see Scragg 1979 pp 245–46). Its conclusion is taken from that of Vercelli 15.
Vercelli Homily 19 (Hom 34).

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162: HG 50; NRK 38.35.
3. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303: NRK 57.43

Lists—A-S Her: none.

Quot/Cita. 1. Sel 1 (B5.1): see below.
2. WGen 1.2 (B13.1.1): see below.
3. Hom/1 15 (B3.4.15): see below.
Ref: none.

Vercelli Homilies 19, 20, and 21 are uniform sets prescribed for the three Rogation Days, deriving largely from the homilies of St. Pierre de Chartres (see Cross 1987a, who prints the texts and sources). Probably all three were composed by one writer (a suggestion made in Scruggs 1973 p 204, but developed in Szarmach 1978 p 248, denied in Bazire and Cross 1982 p 25, but admitted in Cross 1987a p 126). The appearance of otherwise unique wording, and occasionally consecutive sentences, in more than one of these three pieces is therefore taken as a sign of an author repeating himself, although it is impossible to know in what order the pieces were originally composed. (Fuller consideration of these correspondences will be given in my forthcoming edition of the Vercelli Homilies.)

Vercelli Homily 19 begins with the Trinity and then goes on to a succinct account of the creation of the world, the fall of the angels, and the story of Adam and Eve. The calculation of Adam’s life and his time in hell appears in Vercelli 19 and its principle Latin source (see the homiliaries of St. Pierre de Chartres, and similar sources … Regional commentators, number 1, the reference Bible). The compilation Salomon and Saturn has the English in virtually the same wording, where it is unlikely to be drawn independently from the source. A third version in English, in wording even closer to Vercelli 19 than Salomon and Saturn, was added as Note 10.3 (B24.10.3) to Oxford, Bodleian Library Har ton 115 in the twelfth century. The probable history is that the sentence was culled from the vernacular homily and preserved in the form of a note like that in Hatton 115 or in a commonplace book. The text is also associated with Wulfstan’s Caena of Edge. WGen 1.2, and the BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii text of Hom/1 15 (variously called “The Devil’s Account of the Next World” and “The Thibaud Legend” see Scruggs 1986) are late pieces both of which incorporate sentences from Vercelli 19.

Vercelli Homily 20 (Hom 39).

MSS. 1. Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII: HG 941; NRK 394.25.
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162: HG 50; NRK 38.36.

Lists—A-S Her: none.

Quot/Cita. Hom 39 (B3.2.49): see below.
Ref: none.

As well as compiling Vercelli Homilies 19, 20, and 21, the same anonymous author may be responsible for other surviving pieces. Hom 39, edited in GR 5290 as number 2, has a passage in common with Vercelli Homily 20. At the same time, Hom 49 was thought by Jost (GR 6328, p 396) to have been written by the same author as Hom 39 and Hom 16, both of which draw extensively on the homilies of St. Pierre de Chartres used by the author of Vercelli 20 (see the text and sources in Cross 1987a pp 206–231, and a brief discussion of the authorship question at pp 252–255). The precise relations of all of these pieces need further study.

Vercelli Homily 21 (Hom 35).


Lists—A-S Her: none.

Quot/Cita. 1. Hom/1 27 (B3.4.27): see below.
2. Hom/1 12 (B3.4.12): see below.
Ref: none.

Vercelli 21 is a composite homily drawing on both Latin sources (see Vercelli 35) and English ones (see Vercelli 35). It provides the longest of the extracts from the Vercelli Homilies incorporated in the composite Hom/ 17 (see Scruggs 1977). There is also a brief overlap with Hom 12 where the Latin source, used elsewhere in Vercelli 21, suggests that Hom/1 12 is the later piece. Cross (1987a pp 149–150) argues that the poem Exeterian (A18), which has been regarded as a source for the prose homily (GR 6527, and 6533), might be seen as derived from it.

Bickling Homily 5 (Hom 17).

MSS. Princeton, University Library, Scheide Library 71: HG 905; NRK 380.5.

Lists—A-S Her: none.

Quot/Cita. Hom/1 26 (B3.4.26): see below.
Ref: none.

This is one of many examples of the conclusion of a homily being abstracted and used for a different piece. Bickling 5 is a Lection homily. Its conclusion, containing the “Seven Joys” motif found frequently in Old English (see Hill GR 3335), is repeated in the composite Hom/1 26.
Blickling Homily 8 (HomU 19).

MSS Princeton, University Library, Scheide Library 71: HG 905; NRK 392.8.
List—A S Ivre none.
Quo/Chr HomS 6 (B.3.6.2): see below.
Ref. none.

Blickling 8 is a powerful eschatological homily which, in a reduced version, forms the longest section of the composite HomS 6 (edited as number 16 in GR 6215; see VERCELLI HOMILY 15).

Blickling Homily 10 (HomL 20).

MSS Princeton, University Library, Scheide Library 71: HG 905; NRK 392.10.
List—A S Ivre none.
Quo/Chr Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198, item 62 (listed in AC under B 3.4.20): see below.
Ref. none.

The second half of another Blickling eschatological homily has been added to an ALPHRIC piece, AEdmonse 5 (B.1.9.6), to create a new item.

Junius 86, Item 2 (HomM 14).

MSS Oxford, Bodleian Library Junius 86: HG 642; NRK 596.2.
List—A S Ivre none.
Quo/Chr HomS 6 (B.3.6.2): see below.
Ref. none.

The second item in Junius 86 is a late copy of the third of three early pieces used to create the composite HomS 6 (see VERCELLI HOMILY 15, and BICKLING HOMILY 8).

D. G. Scragg


Hrabanus Maurus (also Rabanus) spent his early years at the monasteries of Fulda and Tours, where he became one of ALCHU's favorite students.

Hrabanus Maurus was elected abbot of Tours in 822, but about twenty years later he was forced to retire to Petersberg, near Fulda. In 847 he was appointed archbishop of Mainz, where he died in 856. Hrabanus' many writings attempt to help his fellow monks and priests in their normal roles as teachers and preachers. He held the great pastoral writers—Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Theodore, and Isidore—in high esteem and preferred to extract long passages from their works to use in his own works. His methodology has sometimes caused modern readers to dismiss him as a plagiarizer, with scant consideration of the originality he showed in adapting and arranging his material. More than a thousand MSS survive of his writings, dating from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries, clearly attesting to his popularity during the Middle Ages. An English summary of his life and career by McCulloch appears in CCCM 44; see also Köpke and Zimmermann (1982), and Bilzke (1989).

Hrabanus' writings were never as popular in Anglo-Saxon England as they were during the later English Middle Ages. Those works that did become known were introduced during the Benedictine reforms of the tenth century. Generally speaking, it is only the earlier works, themselves the most popular of his writings during the late ninth and tenth centuries, that are attested in England in one form or another, and evidence for knowledge of the later works before the twelfth century is generally slight and circumstantial. One booklet, Aæbbeld (ML 5.1), includes a reference to Hrabanus, but does not specify a work. None of his works were ever translated in their entirety (though sections of some were). Gneuss (1978) notes that Dunstan must have been an attentive reader and user of De laudibus cucaci. Bertharius (GB, 653, p 131) remarks that Wulfstan was "widely read in ninth-century literature, and borrowed... from Rabanus (among others)," and recent scholarship has tended to support this view. On the other hand, Hermanus' (372 p 3) contention, that Hrabanus' writings "deeply influenced the Anglo-Saxons," while an attractive one, is difficult to substantiate, if only because Hrabanus himself borrowed so much from his predecessors. One of the chief obstacles to a proper search for Hrabanus' influence is the almost total absence of critical editions.

[For this Real Verisim, only Hrabanus' didactic works will be discussed.]

De computo [HRAB.MAVR.Comp.].

List. see headnote.
Blickling Homily 8 (HomL 19).

MSS: Princeton, University Library, Scheide Library 71: HG 905; NRK 382.8.
List: A S Ves none.
Quote/Cite: HomS 6 (B3:2.6): see below.
Ref: none.

Blickling 8 is a powerful exhortational homily which, in a reduced version, forms the longest section of the composite HomS 6 (edited as number 14 in GR 6215; see VerGelli Homily 15).

Blickling Homily 10 (HomL 20).

MSS: Princeton, University Library, Scheide Library 71: HG 905; NRK 382.10.
List: A S Ves none.
Quote/Cite: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198, item 62 (listed in AC under B3:4.20): see below.
Ref: none.

The second half of another Blickling exhortational homily has been added to an ALPHRIC piece, AlphRic 3 (B1:9.6), to create a new item.

Junius 86, Item 2 (HomL 14).

List: A S Ves none.
Quote/Cite: HomS 6 (B3:2.6): see below.
Ref: none.

The second item in Junius 86 is a late copy of the third of three early pieces used to create the composite HomS 6 (see VerGelli Homily 15, and Blickling Homily 8).

D. G. Scaife


Hrabanus Maurus (also Rabanus) spent his early years at the monasteries of Fulda and Tours, where he became one of Alcuin’s favorite students.

He was elected abbot of Tours in 822, but about twenty years later he was forced to retire to Petersberg, near Fulda. In 847 he was appointed archbishop of Mainz, where he died in 856. Hrabanus’ many writings attempt to help his fellow monks and priests in their normal roles as teachers and preachers. He held the great patristic writers—Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Isidore, and Bede—in high esteem and preferred to extract long passages from their writings to using his own words. His methodology has sometimes caused modern readers to dismiss him as a plagiarizer, with scant consideration of the originality he showed in adapting and arranging his material. More than a thousand MSS survive of his writings, dating from the ninth to the sixteenth century, closely attesting to his popularity during the Middle Ages. An English summary of his life and career by McCulloch appears in CCCM 44; see also Kortje and Zimmermann (1982), and Bibner (1980).

Hrabanus’ writings were never as popular in Anglo-Saxon England as they were during the later Middle Ages. Those works that did become known were introduced during the Benedictine reforms of the tenth century. Generally speaking, it is only the earlier works, themselves the most popular of his writings during the late ninth and tenth centuries, that are attested in England in one form or another, and evidence for knowledge of the later works before the twelfth century is generally slight and circumstantial. One booklist, Alswald (ML 3.1), includes a reference to Hrabanus, but does not specify a work. None of his works were ever translated in their entirety (though sections of some were). Gneuss (1978) notes that Dunstan must have been an attentive reader and user of cœlia 5. p. xvi. cœlia. Betham (GR, 650L, p. 137) remarks that Wulfstan was "widely read in ninth-century literature, and borrowed ... from Rabanus (among others)," and recent scholarship has tended to support this view. On the other hand, Hermann’s (1972 p. 3) contention, that Hrabanus’ writings "deeply influenced the Anglo-Saxon," while an attractive one, is difficult to substantiate, if only because Hrabanus himself borrowed so much from his predecessors. One of the chief obstacles to a proper search for Hrabanus’ influence is the almost total absence of critical editions.

[For this Real Veran, only Hrabanus’ didactic works will be discussed.]

De computo [HRAB.MAYR.Comp.].

List: see headnote.
According to the dedication, Hrabanus wrote this work in response to questions from a monk named Marcellinus, it discusses the divisions of time, and explains how to determine the date of Easter. The Vitellius copy is from Salisbury; it also contains a calendar with some clear Continental associations; see Ker (1976 p 39). According to Ker, the text of De emplamo is derived from the Easter copy, though not directly. The copy in the St John’s MS is actually a summary of part of the work, perhaps by Byrhtferth himself; see Baker (1962 p 126 note 19). Hart (GR 5972 and 6196) has suggested that the MS was copied at Ramsey, and was later sent to Thorney.

Crawford (GR 5959) notes that most of the material in Byrhtferth’s Memoria concerning the division of time (112.6–120.7) is drawn ultimately from Hrabanus’ work. Baker (1962 pp. 156–37) has shown that the long glosses in the Oxford MS is the immediate source for much of the section.

**De disciplina ecclesiastica** [HRAB.MAVR.Discep.ecl.]

**MS—AS HR** none.

**Quot/Ctms** 1 When 7 (B2.2.2) 93–95: see below.

**Rfl** none.

Written for missionary activity, the De disciplina treats in simple terms basic tenets of the faith. Bethurum (GR 6503) thinks Wulfstan may echo this work (112.1226.41–43) in his homily on the Creed. The sentence following the one she cites in her note (p 308) may, she thinks, furnish another of Wulfstan’s ideas.

**De institutione clericorum** [HRAB.MAVR.Insinit.cler.]

1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 196: HG 59; see below.
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 265: HG 73; see below.
3. Cambridge, Pembroke College 25: HG 121; see below.

**Lati** Peterborough: ML 13.03.

**AS HR** Lib 7 (B2.7): see below.

**Quot/Ctms** When 6 (B2.2.5) 59–62: see below.

**Rfl** none.

This work, intended as an elementary guide to the duties of priests, probably became known in England during the Benedictine reforms of the tenth century. The Corpus MSS 190 and 265 contain extracts from the second book of the De institutione clericorum. Feder (GR 6255, p 338) argues that the extracts were made by Alfric and sent to Wulfstan; Bethurum (GR 6522), however, connects MS 190 with Wulfstan; see also Clemoes (GR 6256). Ure (GR 6250) has shown that MS 190 is the source for the prose parts of the Old English Benedictic Office (Ludon 7, B12.7) ascribed to Wulfstan. A number of passages from De institutione were probably known earlier in Anglo-Saxon England through their inclusion in the homilies of Æthelwold, De diversis decem scripturis (see homeliny), represented by Penke 25; Cross (1987a) lists passages drawn from books 2 and 3 in his items 22, 31, 32, 43, 46, and 78–80.

In her note on lines 59–63 of Wulfstan’s Homily VIII’s, Bethurum (GR 5503, p 316) notes that Hrabanus’ De institutione (312.15–26) may underlie the passage. She also suggests that Wulfstan may have known Augustine’s De doctrina through Hrabanus’ summary in book 3 of De institutione (GR 6503, p 67 note 7), and she cites this work elsewhere in her edition (see index).

William Schipper

**LAURENCE OF NOVARA**

**Homilia de cleemosyna** [LAUR.NOV.Hom.eleem.]: CPL 645; DS 9.1002–04.

**MSS** Dublin, Trinity College 174 (B.4.3) HG215.

**Lati—Rfl** none.

Laurence, a 6th-century bishop of Novara, wrote two homilies or treatises (CPL 644, 645) on penitence and on alms. His work on alms, printed PL 66.105–16, appears on folio 99–103v in a MS otherwise containing psalms, and sermons on saints; see M. Collier’s forthcoming catalog of MSS of Trinity College, Dublin.

J.E. Cross
LAWs

[The entire section will be under the direction of Patrick Wormald.]

Lex Salica [ANON. Lex.Salic.

• MSS: A–A' Hes. none.
• Quo/Clus. Laws/1 (B14.4.4) section 9.2: see below.
• Rpti. none.

The Frankish law code Lex Salica is a collection of folk and personal laws in Latin, surviving in six major recensions dating from the reigns of Clauvis. Frankish kings, ending with Charlemagne, added their own provisions (McKitterick 1999 pp 25–24). Although no known MSS of English origin or provenance survive, circumstantial evidence indicates that the earliest English royal codes, beginning with Æthelberht I of Kent, are indebted to this code, the most authoritative of the Germanic barbaric codes in the sense that at least three recensions emanated from the royal chancery (Wormald 1977 p 110; and McKitterick 1983 p 99).

The evidence is of several types. In the Historia ecclesiastica H.V. Bede tells us that Æthelberht issued legislation inus exempla Romanorum, a phrase implying written law codes in Latin as the model. Since there is no trace of Roman law in Æthelberht’s legislation, Bede probably had Germanic materials in mind, although these certainly had been developed under Roman influence (Wallace-Hadrill 1962 pp 3–10; and Wallace-Hadrill 1977 pp 32–37). Of Æthelberht’s ninety chapters, as many as nineteen are parallel to statements in the Lex Salica (Wallace-Hadrill 1971 p 38). Moreover, at least one specialized term surviving in the so-called Malberg (Frankish) glosses to the Lex Salica—inde, which yields the Kentish inde—seems to have been borrowed into Æthelberht’s code (Lauds/H, B14.1; section 64), and into Wulfstan’s code (Lauds/W, B14.3.2, section 27), on this borrowing see Wallace-Hadrill (1971 p 38), and for information on inde and its Frankish variants, see Rivers (1986 p 226).

Alfred’s laws, too, seem to have been influenced by the Lex Salica. The list of compensations for injuries in Laws/II sections 44–77 bears close resemblance to similar lists contained within the Lex Salica (sections 22–25, and 47) and Laud’s sections 53–72. More importantly, Laud’s 1 section 9.2 refers to exceptionally large fines for particular offenses, including horse theft and bee theft, which now are to be made equal to fines for all types of theft except kidnaping. These offenses carry the highest fines in the Lex Salica (sections 9 and 62) but are not mentioned in any of the surviving Old English laws prior to Alfred’s code. Recent studies of Alfred’s Continental connections demonstrate the context within which he and his advisers may have been influenced by the Lex Salica; see Wallace-Hadrill (1975 pp 212–13), Wormald (1977 pp 152–34), and Nelson (1986).

Mary P. Richards

LITURGY

[The entire section will be under the direction of Richard Piltz, and based on Helmut Gneuss “Liturgical Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology” in Lapidge and Gneuss (1985) 91–141.]

W. Prayers: C.P. 2035–27; see also Augustine, Bede, Columba, Epiricus, Latinius, Eulogius of Toledo, Hilary of Poitiers, Isidore of Seville, Aurelius Prudentius, Rupertus of S. Gall, and Cædwalla Sedulius.

Latin prayers for private devotion, as opposed to liturgical use, were common in both early and late Anglo-Saxon England. Following this introduction to the evidence for private prayers in general are separate entries for the four early collections, which are most likely to have influenced later Anglo-Saxon literary culture. Not included in this Tres Horæ are entries on certain individual prayers.

In early Anglo-Saxon England, prayers are found in four English anthologies dating from about 750–825: the Royal Library Prayer Book, the Book of Kinfangminster, the Harley Prayer Book, and the Book of Cerne. These anthologies, which do not appear to rest on Continental models, might include litanies, hymns, psalms, and extracts from the Gospels on the Passion. The prayers themselves come from a variety of sources, including the liturgy and hagiography. The prayers are sometimes attributed to authors (most frequently to such fathers as Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory), but usually they are anonymous. They are addressed to the Trinity, Christ, and God the Father, and less frequently to the Virgin, angels, and saints. In general, the early prayer books reveal Irish or Celtic influence as well as being indebted to the Latin ecclesiastical culture of the continent; see the BCLL 1286–99, W. Meyer (1917), and K. Hughes (1970).

There is one devotional miscellany from late Anglo-Saxon England, London, BL Cotton Galba A.xiv (edited by Moir 1980), but most prayers or collections of prayers from this period are found in psalter MSS. The later collections (almost all dating from the eleventh century) borrow prayers
LAW

Lex Salica [ANON. Lex. Salica.]

Miss-A-S Var none.

Quo/Cita Lawoff 1 (B14-4.4) section 9.2: see below.

Ref none.

The Frankish law code Lex Salica is a collection of folk and personal laws in Latin, surviving in six major recensions dating from the reign of Clovis. Frankish kings, ending with Chlothar II, added their own provisions (McKitrick 1980 pp 23-24). Although no known MSS of English origin or provenance survive, circumstantial evidence indicates that the earliest English royal codes, beginning with Athelberht I of Kent, are indebted to this code, the most authoritative of the Germanic barbaric codes in the sense that at least three recensions emanated from the royal chancery (Wormald 1977 p 108; and McKitrick 1983 p 99).

The evidence is of several types. In the HISTORIA ISLEBAPTICA II.v, Bede tells us that Athelberht issued legislation iustas eampli Romanas, a phrase implying written law codes in Latin as the model. Since there is no trace of Roman law in Athelberht's legislation, Bede probably had Germanic materials in mind, although these certainly had been developed under Roman influence (Wace-Hadrill 1982 pp 3-10; and Wallace-Hadrill 1971 pp 52-57). Of Athelberht's ninety chapters, as many as nineteen are parallel to statements in the Lex Salica (Wallace-Hadrill 1971 p 56). Moreover, at least one specialized term surviving in the so-called Malberg (Frankish) glosses to the Lex Salica - ludus, which yields the Kennish leod - seems to have been borrowed into Athelberht's code (Lauder, B14.4; section 66), and into Whitfried's code (Lawoff 1, B14.3.2; section 25); on this borrowing see Wallace-Hadrill (1971 p 58), and for information on dued and its Frankish variants, see Rivers (1986 p 226).

Alfred's laws, too, seem to have been influenced by the Lex Salica. The list of compensations for injuries in Lawoff sections 44-77 bears close resemblance to similar lists contained within the Lex Salica (sections 22-23, and 47) and Lawoff sections 35-73. More importantly, Lawoff 1 section 5.2 refers to exceptionally large fines for particular offenses, including horse theft and bee theft, which now are to be made equal to fines for all types of theft except kidnapping. These offenses carry the highest fines in the Lex Salica (sections 9 and 62) but are not mentioned in any of the surviving Old English laws prior to Alfred's code. Recent studies of Alfred's Continental connections demonstrate the context within which he and his advisers may have been influenced by the Lex Salica; see Wallace-Hadrill (1975 pp 212-13), Wormald (1977 pp 152-34), and Nelson (1986).

Mary P. Richards

LITURGY

[The entire section will be under the direction of Richard Pfeff, and based on Holmea Gunwae "Liturgy Books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English Terminology" in Lapide and Gunwae (1985) 91-141.]

W. Prayers: CPL: 2035-27; see also AUGUSTINE, BEDe, COLUMBIA, SPOHARD LATINUS, EUGENIO OF TOLEINO, HILARY OF POITIERS, HEDOBE OF POITIERS, AURELIUS PRUDENTIUS, RAPPER DUFT GALL, and GALEBAI SEDOLUS.

Latin prayers for private devotion, as opposed to liturgical use, were common in both early and late Anglo-Saxon England. Following this introduction to the evidence for private prayers in general are separate entries for the four early collections, which are most likely to have influenced later Anglo-Saxon literary culture. Not included in this Trial Version are entries on certain individual prayers.

In early Anglo-Saxon England, prayers are found in four English anthologies dating from about 750-825: the ROYAL LIBRARY PRAYER BOOK, the BOOK OF STAMBRUMISTH, THE HARLEY PRAYER BOOK, and the BOOK OF CEBNE. These anthologies, which do not appear to rest on Continental models, might include litanies, hymns, psalms, and extracts from the Gospels on the Passion. The prayers themselves come from a variety of sources, including the liturgy and hagiography. The prayers are sometimes attributed to authors (most frequently to such fathers as AUGUSTINE, SERMON, and GREGORY), but usually they are anonymous. They are addressed to the Trinity, Christ, and God the Father, and less frequently to the Virgin, angels, and saints. In general, the early prayer books reveal Irish or Celtic influence as well as being indebted to the Latin ecclesiastical culture of the continent; see the BCL 1286-99, W. Meyer (1917), and K. Hughes (1970).

There is one devotional miscellany from late Anglo-Saxon England, London, BL Cotton Galba A.xiv (edited by Muir 1980), but most prayers or collections of prayers from this period are found in psalters. The later collections (almost all dating from the eleventh century) borrow prayers
drawn from Continental devotional anthologies of the ninth and tenth centuries (see Wilmart 1940 for an edition of representative examples, and Salmon 1976-80 for a repertory of MSS) as well as those from the earlier English anthologies which may have been reintroduced to England from the Continent; see Bestul (1988) for a general discussion. The later collections also occasionally include Old English glosses or translations of Latin prayers.

The influence of Latin devotional prayers on Old English narrative has been examined by Redfyl (1982) in reference to Aelfric’s Lives of Saints and post-Aelfric manuscripts, and to the Old English poems Andreas (And, A2.1), Juliana (Jul, A3.5), and Judith (Jud, A3.2). Hill (1981) suggests the influence of the “lorica” (a Celtic form of prayer for spiritual or physical protection) on the Old English poem Judith, ChristB (A3.5), and Amuric (Am, A3.3), and GudruthA (Gud, A3.3). The influences postulated by both scholars are general rather than specific. General influence of private prayer on another Old English poem, Requeteon (Rq, A3.25), is suggested by Bestul (1977 pp 19-20) and Stanley (GR 1000, p 631). The Old English poem titled d Prayr (Pr, A28) may also be indebted to this body of material. Redfyl (1977) traces the sources of Aelfric’s Old English devotional prayers (AELDev II [Prayers], B1.2.50) in Cambridge, University Library Gg 3.28 (NRK p 20, article 94) to prayers in Anglo-Saxon liturgical books and to the Bible. In addition to London, BL Cotton Galba A.xiv (mentioned above), and the four collections discussed in separate entries below, the other principal collections of private prayers are the following (see also Gneuss 1985 pp 137-39, and Bestul 1986 pp 134-36):

14. London, BL Royal 2 A.xx: HG 450; NRR 248; see the ROYAL LIBRARY PRAYER BOOK.
15. London, BL Royal 2 Bv: HG 451; NRR 249; GsGf 9.3 (Bls1.3.5), Lt 4.4.3 (Bls2.4.3.5), Lt 4.5.3 (Bls2.4.5.3), and Lt 4.5.3 (Bls2.4.5.3).
17. Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 180 (Sc 2679): NRR 305; Lt 4.7 (Bls1.4.7).
18. Salisbury, Cathedral Library 150: HG 740; NRR 379; AstPoGf 3 (Sars, C23.3).

For further bibliography, see GR 154, 5939, 6250, 6261-74, and 6437.

Lent-Reft: none.

This MS, from the second half of the eighth century, contains a very early body of devotional prayers, along with extracts from the Gospels, a creed, a litany, the Gloria, canticles, and hymns. Included are the popular hymn of CHRISTUS PATERNUS "A SOLIS ORTUS CARMEN" as well as two metrical prayers, "Me similum cineris" (the prayer begins "O deus uterque mundus" in its complete version; see CslL 122.444-445, and CPL 1357), and "Quam deflecta tua fulgent" (CGSL 122.445, and CPL 1357b), both of which, according to W. Meyers (1937 pp 614-20), are quite likely original.

This MS also includes a prayer, "Mane cum sursum" (found also in the BOOK OF CERNE), a version of which is in the later English collections London, BL Cotton Galba A.xiv and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391 (the Portifortum of Wulfstan, edited by A. Hughes 1958-60), but there are Continental analogues as well.

According to NRR (p 318), the Anglo-Saxon glosses in the MS can be dated "probably" to the first quarter of the tenth century.

BOOK OF NUNNAMINSTER [ANON.Lib.precum.Nunnaminster]: BCLL 1280.
Mss London, BL Harley 2965: HG 432; CLA 2.199.
Lent-Reft: none.

This anthology, from the late eighth or early ninth century, begins with the accounts of the Passion of the four evangelists, preceding a collection of private prayers that includes a series organized according to events in the life of Christ, with twenty-five brief prayers devoted to the Passion. As in the book of cerne, there is a text of the LORICA LAEDECRIS; the Nun-
naminster version seems to have influenced that found in London, BL Harley 585 (HG 421), of the late tenth or early eleventh century, which has an Old English gloss; see NRR 331, and Herren (1987 pp 4-10). Another prayer also in the Book of Cerne, beginning "Dominator dominus deus omnipotens," is in the eleventh-century collections London, BL Cotton Galba A.xiv, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391 (the Portifortum of Wulfstan). This prayer, often attributed to Augustine or Gregory, was dis-
seminated throughout Western Europe by the eleventh century. The prayer, "Sancta Michael archangela qui veni," is found in the Book of Cerne and in the eleventh-century collection in London, BL Arundel 155, where it has a continuous Old English gloss, and in London, BL Arundel 60 (HG 304).

Master added to the MS shows that it was certainly at Winchester in the tenth century, and probably belonged to Alfred's queen Ealhswith (d. 909). It is possible that the collection in the Portifortum of Wulfstan, com-
piled at Winchester, may have been inspired in a general way by it; see Beazley (1986 pp 173-180).

HARLEY PRAYER BOOK [ANON.Lib.precum.Harley]: BCLL 1279.
Mss London, BL Harley 7653: HG 443; CLA 2.204.
Lent-Reft: none.

The collection is a fragment of seven leaves written in the eighth or ninth century, possibly as a book of private devotions for a woman (see NRR 244). It begins with a litany, and includes the morning prayer, "Mane cum sursum," also in the book of cerne, and the ROYAL PRAYER BOOK. Certain phrases from a petition of the litany appear to have influenced a prayer found in the eleventh-century London MSS, BL Cotton Nero A.xii and BL Cotton Galba A.xiv; see Muir (1988 pp 21).

NRR (340) comments that the Old English gloss is "perhaps in the same hand as the glosses" in the Royal Prayer Book, which he dates to the first quarter of the tenth century (p 316).

Mss Cambridge, University Library LL1.110: HG 28.
Lent-Reft: none.

This large anthology in an early-ninth-century MS includes extracts from the Gospels on the Passion as well as a collection of private prayers. Irish or Celtic influence is shown prominently by the presence of the LORICA
found in Cockayne (GR 6570). For general overviews of the subject, see Grattan and Singer (GR 6586), Talbot (1965), Talbot (1967), and Cameron (1983). [For this Paul Bingen, only the entry on Cassius Felix has been included.]

Cassius Felix, De medicina [CASS.FEL. Med.].


Cassius wrote the De medicina as gregis lapcio sector auctoris liber translatus in the mid fifth century, and the work was used by later writers, such as Isidore of Seville, and particularly by glossators because Cassius often provides Greek terms for his Latin ones. In commenting on Act 28.8 in his Rec. Act., Bede explains dysentery by quoting from this work.

M.L. Cameron

OROSIUS: GODC 1012.

Historiae aduersus paganos [OROS.Hist. adus pag.: CIL 571].

2. Cambridge, Clare College 18 (Kk 4.5): HG 32.
Lists 1. ? Alcuin: ML 1.3.

A S Ver. Or (R2.2).

2. ALDH.Ped.reg. 174.27-75.1: OROS.Hist. adus pag. 464.16.
3. BEDA Hist. excet.: see below.
5. BEDA Comm. Gen.: see below.
6. BEDA Chron. mai.: see below.
7. BEDA, Num. reg.: see below.
8. ALCVIN Epist. 397.10-12: OROS.Hist. adus pag. 54.15-54.3.

Lists none.

Orosius' Historiae achieved great popularity in the Middle Ages, and some 250 MSS, containing all or part of this work, are still in existence. These can be subdivided into a number of clearly defined "families," more than one of which was represented in England by the twelfth century; see Bate ly (GR 5657) and Bate ly (980 pp lv-lx). It is thus somewhat surprising

MEDICAL TEXTS

The surviving medical records in Old English are the oldest in any European language other than Greek and Latin. Sources, therefore, can be found only in Latin works, or in Greek works translated into Latin.

All of the Old English medical texts considered in this article can be
found in Cockayne (GR 6370). For general overviews of the subject, see Gratston and Singer (GR 6386), Talbot (1965), Talbot (1967), and Cameron (1983). [For this Triad Hiers, the only entry on Cassius Felix has been included.]

Cassius Felix, De medicina [CASS.FEL.Med.].

MSS—A S Her. none.

Quot/Cita. BEDA.Retract.Act. 28.6-17; CASS.FEL.Med. 122.13-17.

List none.

Cassius wrote De medicina as a work of legal nature and it was translated by the mid-fifth century, and the work was used by later writers, such as Cassius of Seville, and particularly by glossators because Cassius often provides Greek terms for his Latin ones. In commenting on Act 28.8 in his *Retractio*, BEDA explains dysentery by quoting from this work.

M.L. Cameron

OROSIUS: OGGC 1012.

Historiarum aduersum paganos [OROS.Hist.adu.pag.]: CPL 571.


2. Cambridge, Clare College 18 (Nk. 4.5): HG 32.

List 1. ? Alcuin: ML 1.3.


A S Her. Os. (892)


2. ALDH.Pred.reg. 174.27-75.1: OROS.Hist.adu.pag. 464.16.

3 BEDA.Hist.ecl.: see below.


5. BEDA.Comm.Gen.: see below.

6. BEDA.Chron.mai.: see below.

7. BEDA.Num.reg.: see below.

8. ALCVIN.Epist. 359.10-12: OROS.Hist.adu.pag. 544.15-45.3.

Ref. none.

Cassius' Histories achieved great popularity in the Middle Ages, and none 250 MSS, containing all or part of this work, are still in existence. These can be subdivided into a number of clearly defined "families," more than one of which was represented in England by the twelfth century; see Barely (GR 563) and Batey (698 pp lv-ix). It is thus somewhat surprising

MEDICAL TEXTS

The surviving medical records in Old English are the oldest in any European language other than Greek and Latin. Sources, therefore, can be found only in Latin works, or in Greek works translated into Latin.

All of the Old English medical texts considered in this article can be...
to find that only one copy, written in the second half of the eighth century, possibly in Northumbria, has survived—in the form of fragments in Düseldorf—from Anglo-Saxon England. The next oldest, the Cambridge MS, dates from the very end of the period.

In addition to the specific quotations and citations noted above, there are also citations from Orosius elsewhere in his work; for lists, see the indices to the ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY (p 592), the COMMENTARY ON GENESIS (p 505), the CHRONICA MAIORA (pp 783–84), and the REGNUM ROMANUM et REGNI LOCRUM DE ACTIS APOLLINARIUM (p 379). ALTHYME may echo Orosius in his prose or in the AGGREGATE (275–15–16; see also Machen 1979 pp 77–78) as may ALCMON in BISON II (391.5–7).

There are also Orosius references in the ÉPINAL, KERST, LEIDEN, and CORRUS MSS variously (for Épinal-Kerst, see Plath 1974 pp xvi–xvii; for Leiden, see Hasel 1906 pp 38–39; for Corpus, see the discussion in Lindsay 1921b pp 12–14; and Lindsay 1921b passim). As Plath (1987) observes, the arrangement of the Épinal-Kerst glosses and the existence of two adjacent runs of entries suggest that these glosses were extracted by the compiler from a MS containing interlinear and possibly also marginal glosses. They also show that Latin texts were being construed in the vernacular when Épinal-Kerst was compiled in the late seventh century. Bolton (1977b p 330) notes that the commentary by REIMGROS in nothrisen's CONSOLATIO in Cambridge, University Library MS Kh 3.21 (HG 23) includes material probably from Orosius that is not found in the other MSS of this work; see also Bolton (1977b p 47) for a reference to a gloss from Orosius in another Remigius commentary, in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum 190 (HG 770).

The Old English version (O) may well have been written in response to the request by King Alfred (c. 899) for translations of those books that are most necessary for all men to know; see Batey (1890 pp lxxxviii–xcii).

However, connections between it (or the Latin on which it is based) and Alfred's Beowulf (Be. 89.3.24) are not proven, while the authors of the world history annals in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle made use of Latin authorities other than Orosius. For refutation of the claim that Alfred himself translated Orosius, see Kast (1959); Whitehead (1958), Batey (1954), and Liggis (1964). For an Old French poem that seems to have had the Old English version as its source, see Millard (1957 pp 6–18) and Batey (1954).

Crosby (1977) shows that the Historia is the ultimate source for some details about portraits and events at Christ's birth in VERSE ORPHEUS 5 and 6 (Hansl 1, B3.2.1; and Hansl 3, B3.4.40). For bibliography on the Old English Orosius, see GR 5592–5735, Batey (1979), Batey (1986), and Batey (1986). The Latin text on which SWEET (GR 5597) based the excerpts in his edition of the Old English is close neither to the original nor to the lost MS used by the translator. For a list of known Latin MSS, see Batey and Rees (1961; addenda in progress). For further features in a commentary on the early sections of the Historia preserved in Vatican, Reg. lat. 1650, see Lehmann (vol 2 pp 30–31).

Janet M. Batey


2. Salisbury, Cathedral Library. HG 731.
Lit. –A-S yes none.
QuodLit 1 ACHLIN II, 15 (B3.2.18) 159–73: see below.
Ref. none.

AEFRIIC very probably relied on the eucharistic treatise of Paschasius Radbertus—De corpore et sanguine Domini—as his source for two lurid miracle stories found in his Easter homily. In the first, the Eucharist appears as an infant being slaughtered by an angel with a knife; in the second, told of Gregory the Great, the Eucharist is transformed into a bloody finger as Gregory offers it to a woman who harbored doubts about the nature of Christ's true presence in the communion wafer. These two stories are also found, though in reverse order, in chapter xiv of the eucharistic treatise written by Paschasius between 831 and 833 and revised about ten years later. Aefric's use of Paschasius as a source is open to question: he may have used an altogether different source for the two, and the stories in Paschasius may in fact be the work of a later interpolator.

The story concerning the disembodied infant occurs in the VITA PATRUM—a fact pointed out by Aefric—and the story of the doubling woman is found in several early biographies of Gregory. Aefric may have relied on these earlier sources and independently decided to bring the miracles together. It is more likely, however, that he encountered them already joined in chapter xiv of Paschasius.

Although the text in the PL contains both miracle stories, scholars have begun to question whether they were part of the original work. Some have apparently accepted the authenticity of both (e.g. McCracken, in McCrack-
Paulinus of Nola: DS II 592-602; OGD 791; BCP 1054, NCE 11.25.29-29.

Bishop of Nola (near Naples) and Christian poet of the late fourth and early fifth centuries, Paulinus was a student of Ambrose, and corresponded with Ambrose, Augustine, Rufinus, Rufinus Severus, and St Martin of Tours, among others. His poems include an annual salutation in honor of Felix of Nola (see Acta Sanctorum).

Carmina [PVL, NOL, Carm. J.; CPL 203] 305

1. Leningrad, Public Library Qs XV: I. HG 647; CLE II 1622.
2. Vatican, Pal. lat. 235; HG 910; CLI 187.
5. Peterborough: ML 123.
7. AS 621. verte.
9. BEDA Art. mtr. 47: see below.
10. BEDA, Vit. Gussib (mtr.) 797: PVL, NOL, Carm. XXVII 645.


A corpus of six poems (in the order 15, 16, 18, 28, 27, and 17) was known to Bede by the end of the seventh century. Benedict Biscop probably brought the collection from Italy. The two Insular MSS, Vaticano and Leningrad, are the only extant MS evidence of this corpus; see Childs (1980) and the discussion by T. Brown and Mackay (1968). The tenth-century Royal MS contains Carmen 25,1-65 under the rubric "incipit epistulam sancto Paulino." However, it is just one among several extracts from various other authors, and the MS is very complex. The English connections of the MS itself are not clear, and it likely that it originated on the continent; the date of its arrival in England is unknown.

The Bede version refers to a "vita sancti Felicis metrici," presumably the corpus of six poems; and the Peterborough entry, "vita sancti Felicis versificata," undoubtedly refers to the same MS, see James (GR 123, pp 19-20). The reference in the Alcuin list is not to a specific work.

Bede regularly cites the author by name for his quotations in De eri metrica (see CCSL 125C 785 for a list of 17 quotations), and in addition to that he quotes in his historical Lc of Caedwalla he echoes the work elsewhere (143 and 949). At the beginning of his Flula Felix, Bede names the source that he adapts and paraphrases and in the list of his works at the end of the Ecgberhticological he again acknowledges Paulinus as his source; see Mackay (1976 and, with T. Brown, 1980). His paraphrase of Carmen 13 in his Martyrology clearly comes through his early life of Felix, although Quentin (1908 pp 107-8) suggests a direct relationship. In addition to Aldhelm's quotation of an entire line in his De metris, he echoes the work in his verse ex voto: in particular, N. Wright (1983) has demonstrated Aldhelm's intense imitation of word, phrase, and thought or image from the short Paulinus corpus in the first 83 lines (the prologue) of this work. Godman (1982, see the index; but see also N. Wright 1985) indicates Aldhelm's possible echoes of Paulinus' work. In addition to the lines quoted in the anonymous Mvmsala S. Nyssin, this work also echoes Paulinus once (449: Carmen XXVII 104).

There is a reference in the twelfth-century Durham booklist (Mynors 1959 p 2) to a "fiber Paulini Anglicus" (Raisle 1938 p 5; and Becker 1835 p 242); it may refer to an Anglo-Saxon translation of Paulinus, but no MS has been identified.

Thomas W. Mackay
PRISCIAN

PRISCIAN provided his Greek-speaking pupils in early sixth-century Constantinople with a comprehensive account of most aspects of the Latin language, including the parts of speech, the Institutiones grammaticae, a monumental reference grammar in eighteen books, the Institutiones de nomine et pronomine et verbo, a concise text which outlines the principal formal categories of the inflecting parts of speech, the Partitio in qua de reliquis libris appendix principalium, an extended analysis in question-and-answer form of each word in the first line of each of the twelve books of Vergil’s Aeneid, De agrae surnumrun, a guide to terminology relating to numerals, De metrica Terenti, a short treatise on the metres employed by the comic playwright Terence, and the Praecepta lanigrammatis, a Latin translation of a Greek rhetorical treatise. I have found no evidence that Anglo-Latin grammarians were familiar with this last three works (De agrae surnumrun was used by *Alcuin* in his grammar at second hand only; see excerpts in Priscianus), but such evidence may be forthcoming from borrowings in works on subjects other than grammar. Of doubtful authenticity is the De accidentibus, a treatise on the accentuation and prosody of nouns and verbs. These works were not transmitted in a group: the Institutiones de nomine usually traveled independently, along with other grammars for use at the intermediate level; the Institutiones grammaticae either traveled alone (sometimes without its last two books, which in the post-Conquest period were often transmitted separately) or together with the De accidentibus; and the De agrae surnumrun, De metrica Terenti, and Praecepta lanigrammatis formed a small corpus which generally circulated as a unit. In view of these different patterns of transmission—exemplified in Anglo-Saxon England as clearly as on the Continent—it is appropriate to handle these texts separately.

**Institutionum nomine et pronomine et verbo** [PRISCIN, Nom. pron. uerbr.]

**MSS**


**List of Alcuin: ML 1.96.**

ML 1. 653. 28.

**Note:***

Quo/Cita: 1. ALDH, Ped.reg. 174.16-17: PRISCIN, Nom. pron. uerbr. 653. 28. 2. TATYIN, Grammam: see below. 3. BONIFGrammam. II.250 (De uerbo): PRISCIN, Nom. pron. uerbr. 454. 8. *Ref: BONIFGrammam. 44.250.*

This work was widely read by the earlier generation of Anglo-Saxon grammarians, being one of the only four works (along with Donatus, Asper/Aspdirae, and the first book of Chidrade’s *Etymologiae*) shared by *Alcuin, *Tatwine* (used throughout), and *Boniface*. Although there is every reason to suppose that it retained its popularity into the later Anglo-Saxon period, direct evidence is scarce for two reasons. First, the practice in booklets and elsewhere of citing works by author’s name rather than by title often makes it impossible to tell whether this work or the *Institutiones grammaticae* was meant, as in *Alcuin’s* list of the books, or other authors, represented at York. Occasionally, however, the context will provide a clue: Boniface, referring at 44,250 to Priscian’s views on verbal nouns, gives us enough information to locate the source of the discussion in the *Institution de nomine*. Secondly, the widespread distribution of versions of the *Institutiones nominum* and other texts which draw heavily on the *Institution de nomine* means that the likelihood of indirect borrowing (as in *Alcuin’s* grammar and *Boniface’s* text) is high.

*Karlsth¢* Radbodische Bibliothek Fragm, Aug. 122 (Pasqualacqua 1798, number 245; CLA 7.1009 and 8.1009 + Zurich, Staatsarchiv A.G. NC XIII (Pasqualacqua 1798, number 792; CLA 7.1009 and 8.1009; eighth century from an Anglo-Saxon center on the Continent) contains a version of the *Institution de nomine* which is textually very close to that used by Boniface (Law 1981 p. 257). The *Worcester* MS contains the work on fols 49-54.

One Carolingian commentary on the *Institution de nomine* is attested in Anglo-Saxon England: *Boniface’s* commentary, in London, BL Cotton Domitian I (fols 40-51; HG 326). The opening of this text, as yet unedited in its entirety, was printed by *Jevdy* (1902) from Amiens, Bibliothèque Municipale 425. See further *Jevdy* (1972) on the MSS and commentaries.

**Institutiones grammaticae** [PRISCIN, Grammam.]

**MSS**

1. Cambridge, Jesus College 28 (Q.B.11): HG 123; Pasqualacqua 1798 number 79. 2. Cambridge, Trinity College O.2.51 (151): HG 192; Pasqualacqua 1798, number 91. 3. Canonsbury, Cathedral Library Add. 2719 + Maidstone, Kent County Archives Office, PRC 494a and HG 241; Pasqualacqua 1798, numbers 97 + 344.

**List of Alcuin: ML 1.16.**

1. 2. *Worcester: ML 11.10.**

**Ref:***

1. ALCUIN, Ep. 1. 2. ANON.Oxford, St John’s College 17: see below. Quo/Cita: 1. ALDH, Ped.reg: see below. 2. ALCUIN, Grammam: see below. *Ref:***

1. ALCUIN, Grammam: see below. 2. ANON. Beatt, fols 107v. and 110.
This work was little read in England before the later Anglo-Saxon period, being used, it would appear, only by Alcuin (for a list of Borrowings, see MGH AA 15.545). It should be noted that despite the large number of parallels listed in the apparatus fontium to ALCUINI OEconomaporographiæ, Bede did not use the Institutions at all. The evidence at present available suggests that it was popularised on the Continent by Alcuin: his own grammar makes fairly heavy use of it, he compiled the earliest known collection of excerpts from it (CTDonnell 1976), and the first wave of ninth-century copies spread outwards from his monastery of Tours. What we do not know is where he came into contact with it: did he bring a copy with him from York, or did he first encounter it on the Continent? Another vexed question is the role of the Irish in the introduction of the Institutiones grammaticae to Alcuin and to the Continent generally, an issue which might be resolved by a comparison of the readings of the early Irish copy, St Gall 904, with those in (a) Alcuin's excerpts; (b) the early MSS from Tours and the surrounding area; (c) the passages quoted by ninth-century Sveti progræs in Francia: Sédulius Scotus, Murethach, and the anonymous author of the An Lanasaímaí.

The work may be mentioned in two booklists: on the Alcuin list, see above; the Worcester catalog lists "Priscianus maior," which is the name used in some MSS for this work.


Alcuin's excerpts (in which he refers often to Priscian; see PL 101.595C, 873C, 877C, 880D, 895B, and 896B) heralded a flood of reworked versions of the Institutiones grammaticae—Bodleian, abbreviations, versions in question-and-answer form—designed to help the student master its content, which often differed from that of conserva and the other Late Latin grammarians in both terminology and substance. This process of gradually working through and digesting the Institutiones grammaticae, the indispensable preparation for the flowering of speculative grammar in the thirteenth century, is visible in later Anglo-Saxon England in the collection of excerpts from the Institutions in Oxford, St John's College 17 (fols. 150v–175; parts of the contents of the manuscript are associated with Rhyfidos; see Baker 1962) and in the anonymous excerpts of Priscian, Alcuin's principal source for his grammar (AErlic's references to Priscian—94.3; 110.4; 129.14; 135.10; 145.5; 205.12; 262.16; and 263.19—are to this work). Direct study of the Institutions is attested by the three copies from later Anglo-Saxon England. There are also two references to Priscian in the anonymous unprinted grammar in London, BL Harley 5271 (HC 455).

De accentibus [PRISC,Accent.]

MESS 1. Cambridge, Jesus College 20 (Q.B.II) HG 125; Passalacqua 1978, number 79.
2. Cambridge, Trinity College O.2.51 (155): HG 192; Passalacqua 1978, number 84.

Lists—Ref none.

The De accentibus often circulated along with the Institutiones grammaticae, as in these two MSS. See La Conce (1981) for further MSS of the work.

Partitiones [PRISC,Part.]


Lists—Ref none.

This copy of the Partitiones has only recently been recognised as coming from Anglo-Saxon England (Grenou 1988 p. 200). It contains glosses from annotated commentary on Ecclus 1-2. See also Gluck (1967) and Jevudy (1971).

V. Law

PROBA

Cento virgiliianus [PROBA,Cent.]: CPL 1469, LTK 2.993 (under "Cento").

MESS—A S Het none.

Quote/Ref ALDH.PicReg. 188.29-31: PROBA.Cent. 569.1.

Ref none.

PROBA’s Cento, generally believed to date from the third quarter of the fourth century, is one of the earliest adaptations of Scripture to classical verse form, in this case borrowing webstan lines and half lines from vir- ginia’s poetry and rearranging them to approximate the scriptural narrative of Genesis, Exodus and several episodes from the New Testament. In the Middle Ages the work was frequently bound with other verifications of Scripture for use in schools, despite its having received severe criticism by provosts and denunciation in the CRISANEN DECRET (320). The work is bound with texts known for their use in education, such as ALFHELM’s SYMPHORA and AXIMONIA in Continental MSS Vatican, Reg. lat. 251 and 1656. Aldhelm’s citation of the first line of the prologue along with the composer’s name suggests first-hand knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England. The Cento
is also contained in MS Cambridge, Trinity College O. 7. 7, although this dates from the twelfth century. Clark and Hatch (1881) present an English translation of the Cento and a discussion of the poet's identity and the work's principal themes. Herrnog (1975) examines the Cento's role in the formation of the biblical epic as a literary genre. Contremi (1976) discusses the use of Proba in education on the Continent. O'pelt (1964) points to Proba's depiction of Christ as a lawyer in the Epic. This depiction may have influenced a subsequent Germanic portrayal of Christ as a heroic warrior, e.g., in the Dream of the Rood (Dream, A.2.5).

Daniel Noden


Prudentius, a fourth-century Spanish poet, began writing poetry only late in his life. According to the Praefatio to his works, he was born in 348 and began writing in 405. Since in his poetry he does not seem to be aware of the sack of Rome in 410, he appears to have written all his works, i.e., the Cathemerinon, the Apotrophoeis, the Hamaetogonia, the Psychomachia, the two books of the contri symmachia, the Perspectivam, and the Psychomachiae, in fewer than five years.

The first evidence that Prudentius' works were known in England appears with Alcuin's Carmen de virginitate. Though Alcuin does not mention Prudentius by name, the verbal parallels between their works (see Elsdon 1919 passim) indicate his acquaintance with Prudentius. Alcuin's works seem to have remained popular with the Anglo-Saxons, since later Anglo-Latin writers such as Beorh and Alcuin both quote from and echo his poems.

The earliest extant Anglo-Saxon MSS containing works by Prudentius were written in France in the late ninth or early tenth century, and were brought to England in the course of the tenth century (Oxford, Bodleian Library Rawlinson C 697; H. 601, and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223; H. 70). During the tenth century the English produced their first extant MSS with Prudentian works. Only three contain all the poems: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223 (H. 70), the first folio is lost; Durham, Cathedral Library B.V.9 (H. 246); and Oxford, Bodleian Library Auctarium F.3.6 (H. 537).

The extant Anglo-Saxon MSS contain Latin glosses for all of Prudentius' works, suggesting that his poems were studied in the schools. Old En-

glish glosses appear in all poems but the Apotrophoeis and the Psychomachiae. The Psychomachia of four MSS is illustrated. Prudentius' name appears in the Alcuin and Sexbald booklets (ML 1.12, and 8.30), but since no work is specified, they may refer to all, or any, of Prudentius' poems.

Even though Prudentius' works were obviously known and studied in Anglo-Saxon England, they are not explicitly echoed in Old English literature to any great extent. Hermann (1976) argues that the Psychomachia influenced certain images in the poetic Solenem mati and Satan (Asin, A3, Cook (GR 3059, p. 260) notes a parallel between Cutha C (A3.1) and Cathemerinon 6, 85ff. (but see Biggs 1986 p. 34), and Cherns (GR 1073) notes that Satan in Jumale (A3.5) uses imagery "which calls to mind the imagery of . . . Prudentius' Psychomachia" (p. 198). Prudentius influence on Anglo-Saxon literature is strongest in the Anglo-Latin works; his influence on Old English literature seems to be limited to tone and image.

Prefatio [PRVD:Pref.]: CPL 1437.


A-S and see below.

Quote/Cit-Refl. none.

The Prefatio gives a brief autobiographical sketch of Prudentius and introduces his poems. It does not seem to be echoed by any Anglo-Latin writer. There are some Old English glosses in the Boulogne MS (see AC 954.1, but the glosses are attributed there to the Psychomachia).

Cathemerinon [PRVD:Cath.]: CPL 1438.


### Apotheosis (PRVD.Apoth.): CPH 1419.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.

**Lists** see the introduction above.

**A.S Hen:** none.

**Ref.** none.

The Apotheosis (Greek for "deification") is an argument for the divinity of Christ, in opposition to the pagans and certain heretics. ALDELM echoes the work twice in his Carmine Eclesiastica (VII.8.6 Apotheosi 127, and IV.xiii.5. 544); and in his Carman de Virginitate (34: proemium 2; 679: 697; and 853: 127). HERE may echo Apotheosi 74 in his metrical Vita s. Cuthbertti (13). ALDELM echoes Apotheosi 153 in his versus de sanctis eunuchis Eclesiastici (100). Streckenbach (1952 p. 20) argues that the echo of Apotheosi 765 in the anonymous Minnesota 2. Nyrias (395) is due to indirect influence. Ewald lists Aldehelm's Carmina eclesiastica II.7 as echoing Cuthbert 1x.1-9; this should be IX.19 (see Manutius 1886 p. 571); but Apotheosi 602 provides a closer parallel.

---

### Hamarktinae (PRVD.Hamart.) CPH 1440.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.
2. Cambridge, University Library Gg.3.35: HG 12; see below.

**Lists** see the introduction above.

**A.S Hen:** see below.

**Ref.** none.


The Hamarktinae (Greek for "origin of evil") explores the beginnings of sin and evil in the world. The Cambridge University MS contains only lines 931-66, a hymn beginning with "O Deus cunctipotens." This is the closing prayer of the Hamarktinae and was used by ALDELM as an independent prayer in the officium per ferias; this presumably explains its independent circulation. Old English glosses appear in the Bodleian manuscript (AC 3948); but they are attributed there to the psychomachia. ALDELM echoes the work in his Carman de Virginitate (I. Hamarktinae 208: 103: 524-25; and 2740: 171—72; and in his Katalogus—LXXVIII. 340 (see Manutius 1886 p. 571). HERE echoes Hamarktinae 537 in his metrical Vita s. Guthbertti (709); and ALDELM 722 in his versus (932).

### Psychomachia (PRVD.Psych.): CPH 1441.

**MSS**
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.
4. Cambridge, University Library Gg.5.35: HG 12.

**Lists** see the introduction above.

**Exer.:** ML 10:35.

**Worchester:** ML 11:11.

**A.S Hen:** see below.

**Quote/Ref.** 1. BEDA.Arm.metr. L.xxxiii.64: PRVD.Psych. 98.
4. ANONVIII.OWNXII: see below.

**Ref.** none.
The *Psychomachia* describes the allegorical fight of seven virtues against seven vices; the word is coined from two Greek words meaning "soul" and "battle"; hence it means "battle for" or "in the soul." Without doubt it was the best known of Prudentius' poems in Anglo-Saxon England. It is preserved in more MSS than any other of his works (except for Wieland 1987; the Munich MS is a fragment), except for the selections from the *Cathecismus* which became part of the daily office. Old English glosses appear in MSS 1, 2, 4, 7, 6, and 9 (see AC C94.3, 94.4 and Page 1979, 94.2, 94.4, 94.7, and 94.8 respectively).

The *Psychomachia* is quoted and echoed more often than any other Prudentian poem, with echoes in *Alcithoe*, *Beowulf*, *Bonneface*, *Alcuin*, and *Byrhtferth*. The influence of the *Psychomachia* on the tenth-century *Carmina Beowulfica* usually referred to as "*me octo viris principalius"* has both been overstated and underestimated; it does not constitute "*ipseque un plagiat de Prudence*" as Lavarende (1946 p 29) claimed, but neither is it true that it was written "*Prudentii in Psychomachia exemplo non adsit*" (Eibwald *MGH* AA15 p 453). Hermann (1983) is aware that "*certain passages reveal the direct dependence of De octo principalius upon the Psychomachia*" (p 192), but concentrates on the differences rather than the similarities between the two. Ritter, too, acknowledges the verbal parallels, but asks why Aldhelm did not imitate the *Psychomachia* more closely (Lapidge and Roder 1985 p 100). Wieland (1986) suggests that Aldhelm wished to turn his themes into a verse and in doing so used "*echoes and omissions of Prudentius' Psychomachia*" (p 90). The known parallels between the works occur in this section; two are listed in the edition of Aldhelm (*Carmina* 2575: *Psychomachia* 436; and 2582: 790; one (2101: 4) is noted by Ritter in Lapidge and Roder (1985 p 100); and one (2547: 452) by Wieland (1986 p 99) who also suggests the parallel 2534: 96. One further parallel occurs between Aldhelm's *Psychomachia* *CVI* and *Psychomachia* *IVVI*.

There is a verbal parallel between *Bonneface* *eugonia* 15 and the *Psychomachia* 436, but Boniface probably modeled his line on Aldhelm's *Carmina de virginitate* 1, which itself echoes the *Psychomachia* 436. Dümmler (*MGH* PLAC 1 p 14), and following him Ogilvie (*Bede* p 230) see a parallel between Beowulf's *Diagonal 372* and the *Psychomachia* 165, but the resemblance is slight. Beowulf echoes the *Psychomachia* 290 in his metrical *Vita B. Guthberti* (29). Aldhelm echoes the work in his *Versuri* (10: *Psychomachia* 645, 150: 29: 53: 297: 509: 645: 1502: 609). Byrhtferth echoes *Psychomachia* 6 in his *Noveta* 10:7 (Beau, 20:33)., though the editor lists the non-existent *Psychomachia vi, 744* as the place of the verbal echo. Lapidge (1983 p 96) notes a parallel between an elegiac couplet attributed to *Aethelsiud* and *Psychomachia* 675. On the use of the *Psychomachia* 286-99, 769-71, and 785-86 in the *Fin Oswald*, see Hermann (1983 pp 189-90).
the De nuptiis (1583) also echoes Centrum Symmachi II.780; all are listed by Mansi (1886, p. 571). Redd echoes Symmachi in his 1591 inaugural Vita S. Cuthberti (281) and Vita Wilburighor (IV.12). Cuthbert also echoes the work of the Old Testament, and in his Carmina (TX.37: Centrum Symmachus II.114)—neither is noted in the editions. Byblis echoes Centrum Symmachi II.477–78 in his Manual 8.10 (Byblis, B20.20.1).

Ditchoeconom [PRVD.Ditt.]: CPL. 1444.

**MSS**
1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.
2. Cambridge, Trinity College O.2.31 (1152): HG 190.

**Lists** see introduction above.

**A-S** Hose.

**QuoCita**—Refi none.

**Ralph D'Escures** was Bishop of Rochester (1008–14), and later archbishop of Canterbury (1114–22). His homily on the Virgin Mary appears in Worcester F.94 (fol. 1–2v), which is now regarded, with F.93, as a companion volume to Worcester F.92 (HG 763). The F.94 volume includes homilies from Paul in the Deacon's homily, but has many additions of which this late homily is one. It was translated into Old English in the twelfth century: MS Cotton Vespasian D.XLV, printed by Warner (GR 5392). Max Fürst (GR 5222) noted the source of the Old English, and later 1972, referred to take into account Wilmart's (1927) attribution. The homily, with a prologue, is printed among the works of Anselm (Homily 9) in PL 155.644–49 (Bibliography Part I). It also appears without a prologue in PL 95.1505–8.

J. E. Cross

RATRAMNUS: **DS** 13.147–53; **DCT** 15.1780–87; and **NCE** 12.93–94.

De corpore et sanguine Domini [RATRAMN.COR.B.Corp.sang.Dom.].

**MSS** A–S 86.

**QuoCita**—Refi none.

Ratramnus, a monk from the abbey of Corbie, is best known for his eucharistic treatise De corpore et sanguine Domini (written around 850), which challenges the realist or metaphysical interpretation of Christ's presence in the Eucharist put forward by his superior at Corbie, the abbotPascharius Radbertus. Ratramnus makes a distinction between the sacramental and historical body of Christ, arguing that "the bread and the blood that are placed on the altar are placed there as a figure (in figura) or memorial of the death of the Lord" (p. 68). This more figurative interpretation of the
the De virginitate (385) also echoes Contra Symmachum II.780; all are listed by Manilius (1886 p 571). Bede possibly echoes the Contra Symmachum in his mystical vita s. Cuthbert (281: Contra Symmachum I.592; 585: I.600). Alcuin echoes the work in his mystical vita Willibrordi (IV.12: Contra Sym- 
maechum II.449) and in his carmina (IX.37: Contra Symmachum II.1114) — neither is noted in the editions. Byrhtferth echoes Contra Symmachum II.477–78 in his Manual II.10 (Bynum, B29.20.1).

Dittochaeon [PRVD.Ditt.]: CPL 1444.
MSS 1. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.
2. Cambridge, Trinity College Q.2.31 (1133): HG 190.
List see introduction above.
A S Hers none.
Quot/Cita ALCVIN.Epist. 26.44: PRVD.Ditt. 3.
Refl none.

The Dittochaeon consists of 48 teraticha, the first 24 of which present stories or scenes from the Old Testament, the second 24 from the New Testament; the word is coined from two Greek words meaning "double" and "food," since Christians receive sustenance from both Testaments.

Alcuini echoes the work in his carmina ecclesiastica (IV.12: Dittochaeon 150; see Manilius 1886 p 571). Bede echoes it in his mystical vita s. Cuthbert (478: Dittochaeon 138).

Epilogus [PRVD.Epil.]: CPL 1445.
2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 223: HG 70.
List see introduction above.
A S Hers see below.
Quot/Cita ALCVIN none.
Refl none.

In the Epilogus, Prudentius prays that God may accept his poems as a suitable gift. Old English glosses appear in MS 1 (see AC C94.1, but the glosses are attributed there to the scopsarcha). The Epilogus does not seem to be echoed by any Anglo-Saxon writer.

Gernot Wieland

RALPH D'ESCURES

Homily on the Virgin [RALPH.DE.Hom.].

List none.
A S Hers LS 22 (B3.3.22).
Quot/Cita — Refl none.

Ralph d'Escures was Bishop of Rochester (1008-14), and later archbishop of Canterbury (1014-22). His homily on the Virgin Mary appears in Worces- ter F.94 (lols 1-2v), which is now regarded, with F95, as a companion volume to Worcester F.92 (HG 760). The F94 volume includes homilies from Paul the Deacon's homilies, but has many additions of which this late homily is one. It was translated into Old English in the twelfth cen- tury: MS Cotton Vespasian D.iii, printed by Warne (GR 5922). Max Fis- ster (GR 6222) noted the source of the Old English, and later (1932) refined to take into account Wilmart's (1927) attribution.

The homily, with a prologue, is printed among the works of Aneslin (Homily 9) in PL 158.644-49 (Bibliography Part I). It also appears without a prologue in PL 95.1505-08.

J.E. Cross


De corpore et sanguine Domini [RATRAMNUS].

List none.
A S Hers see below.
Quot/Cita ALCVIN none.
Refl none.

Ratramnus, a monk from the abbey of Corbie, is best known for his eucharistic treatise De corpore et sanguine Domini (written around 850), which challenges the realistic or metaphorical interpretation of Christ's presence in the Eucharist put forward by his superior at Corbie, the abbot PASCHALII RABBATRATUS. Ratramnus makes a distinction between the sacramental and historical body of Christ, arguing that "the bread and the blood that are placed on the altar are placed there as a figure (in figuris) or memorial of the death of the Lord" (p 68). This more figurative interpretation of the
Eucharistic presence (of medium idea) may be influenced by Platonic thought (see Fahey 1951), and certainly owes much to Augustinian analysis. The treatise is the principal source for Alfric’s Easter homily (B.II.16), which was noted as early as 1024 by James Ussher, and later in the century by Hopkins (1866). Förster (CR 5909) gives a brief summary of other scholarship on the text, and Leimbuch (1982 and 1986) surveys the history of the controversy raised by Alfric’s synthesis of the opposing views of Ratramnus and Paschasius.

In a recent general study of Ratramnus, Bouhot (1976) argues that Alfric had no direct knowledge of Ratramnus (pp 145–46), but his argument does not take into account the precise nature of Alfric’s translations of Ratramnus. Bouhot’s assertion that Alfric and Ratramnus share “semblances” simply because they share a common subject of interest should be disregarded.

Theodore H. Leimbuch

SULPICIUS SEVERUS: CPL. 474–77; DTC. 1.27.551–52; NCE 1.78.6–88.

Sulpicius Severus, who lived between 365 and 420, was a friend of Martin of Tours and Paulinus of Nola, among others, and was a major Christian intellectual in Gaul. His works on Martin not only had immediate popularity, but also had lasting influence on hagiography.

Old English writers used the Martinius, that is the Vita, Epistolae, and Dialogorum, to construct their lives of St Martin (among other sources). It would appear that Sulpicius wrote the Vita when Martin was still alive, requiring later writers to go beyond the Vita for a full, rounded life of the saint from birth to apotheosis. After the individual biographies, these works will be treated as together in the discussion. There is no evidence for the use of Sulpicius’ other major work, Chronicon libri III (CPL 474; RBMA 7963), in Anglo-Saxon England; see van Andel (1976).

Vita Martini Turonensis [SVLP:SEV:Vit.Mart.]: CPL. 475; BHL 5659.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9: HG 56.


Lisa Peterborough: ML 53.81.
A-S Rev 1. ACHMon II 46 (B.II.42) 1–221, and 228–30.
3. LS 17 (B.III.17) ed Starnach 1891a 6–(Cl–51)–145.
4. Mert (BIII-In).
5. ALCVNV:Vit.Mart.

Ref: AELS 31 (B.II.30) 1–9.

2. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 9: HG 56.
5. Vatican, Reg. lat. 489: HG 915.

Lisa none.
A-S Rev 1. ACHMon II 34 (B.II.42) 270–310.
2. AELS 31 (B.III.30) 845–900, 1306–84.
3. LS 17 (B.II.37) ed Starnach 1891a 166–(Cl–128)–77.
4. ALCVNV:Vit.Mart.

Quaest. – Ref: none.

Dialogorum Libri iii [SVLP:SEV:Dial.]: CPL. 477; BHL 5614–16.
5. Vatican, Reg. lat. 489: HG 915.

Lisa none.
3. Mert (BIII-In).
4. ALCVNV:Vit.Mart.

Quaest. – Ref: none.

Alfric opens his Life of Martin (AELS 31) with mention of Sulpicius “who wished to write about the miracles and powerful works” Martin did, but Alfric does not indicate the precise works he himself followed. The Life of Martin is the longest in Alfric’s collection.
Alfric bases his homiletic treatments of Martin on the Vita, which he abridges, *Didact II et III*, but he also goes to the *Epistulae III*, and *Cambschis deus historica Francorum*. Gervald (GR 5557) sees conscientiousness and narrative skill in both of Alfric's treatments, pointing out as well that Alfric widened the scope of his reading in the years between his two treatments (p 206).

Zettel (1982) argues that Alfric did not go to the original works of Sulpicius and Gregory of Tours but rather drew on "an intermediate source of edited Martialis closely resembling, if not identical with, that now preserved in the *cotton-corpus collection*" (p 26; see *Legendaire*). Before Zettel scholars (e.g., Gairns 1982) readily assumed that Alfric creditably or even artfully followed Sulpicius and other sources directly.

The anonymous Old English version found in Vercelli 18 (and also the Blickling Homilies and Oxford, Junius 66) omits the prologue and chapters 1, 4, 6, 9, 11-13, 16-19, and 21-23 of the 27-chapter Vita, offering judicious selections from the remaining chapters that omit the ecclesiastical-political struggles of Gaul and retain Martin's campaign against heathenism. This work also includes material from the *Epistulae III*. Staarmach (1978), Gairns (1982), and Dalby (1984) offer studies on this heavily making comparisons with Alfric.

Martin is remembered in the Old English *Martyrology* on his feast-day, November 11. In addition to material from the Vita, this entry draws on one incident from the *Didact* III.16.

Alcuin's *Vita s. Martini*, only one of four saints' lives attributed to him, draws on Sulpicius' *Vita* and *Didacti*, while the *Sermon de Trivio Sancti Martini*, coming after the *Vita* in Magoe-Prosbolius, follows the *Epistulae III*.1 Dege-Su (1981) compares Alcuin with Sulpicius, noting as well relations with Alcuin's other saints' lives. Chelini (1962) is disappointed by the absence of originality in Alcuin's *Vita*.

In editorial discussions of this entry, Gordon Whawley writes "Phrases and passages of the *Vita Martini* are echoed, without acknowledgment, in Bede's prose *Vita Guthfridii* 158.11-12; the anonymous *Vita Cuthberti* 52.15-52.1; Felix's *Vita Guthlacii* 60.9-15; 162.17-20; *Ambo, passus Radmundo III.3*, and *Wulfstan of Winchester, vita Athelwoldi XIX.13.*

Paul E. Staarmach

---

**VEGETIUS RENATUS, FLAVIUS: OCD III-IV.**

Epitome rei militaris [VEGETEpit.]


List—AS Mv none.

4. BEDA. V. Cuth. pr. XVII.16-18: see below.
5. ALC. V. Epist. 415.5: *Vitae epist.* 4.4-6, 5.7-8.

Right: none.

This work, also known as De re militari, is the only ancient Roman military manual to have survived intact, and was composed by Vegetius between 383 and 450 AD.

Vegetius provides the earliest known use of Vegetius by an Anglo-Saxon. He quotes Vegetius (with slight adaptations for senses) in chapter 28 of *De temporum ratione: Vegetius 152.10-16 in lines 22-29 and Vegetius 152.18-153.3 in lines 29-32; later in the same work and again in his prose *Liue of Cistern*, Bede defines the Greek word "theuma" by drawing on Vegetius' use of the Latin word "sacrum" (*Epist.* 181.1-14; see Jones 1932 p 248, and Colgrave and Mynors 1969 p 214 and note 24). G. Macdonald (1933 p 124) qualifies Jones and suggests a glossary as an alternate source for Bede's definition of "theuma." Bede also draws on Vegetius in *Retractationes in actus aposolorum* 27, in his definition of the Greek word "mononokalos" in his ecclesiastical history. Bede uses Vegetius in his discussion of Severus, "borrowing a description of a turf wall" (Colgrave and Mynors, 1969, p 25 note); this passage is largely paraphrase, but does contain two direct quotes: lines 6-7 are taken from Vegetius 26.12-15, lines 7-8 from Vegetius 26.20-21 (Jones 1932 p 249).

Alcuin also knew Vegetius, in one of his *Epipeter*, Alcuin draws on the preface of *Epipater rei militaris* in his discussion of Charlemagne (Wallach 1859 pp 50-51 and note). With the exception of one substantial interpolation, Alcuin quotes Vegetius directly, making slight adaptations for sense.

The most recent complete modern English translation of *Epipater rei Militaris* is Clarke (1767).

The most complete contemporary English translation is that of Books I and II by Silvanek (1972). Scherer (1888) is still considered an excellent source for information about Vegetius, more recent studies include Gordon (1947) and Shirecliff (1979). Lester (1888) contains an useful survey of scholarship on Vegetius and an extensive bibliography.

Deborah Mitchell
VITAE PATRUM

The large body of material that is often loosely referred to in modern scholarship as the Plutus patrum was in no sense a single work or even the organized collection that appears in the printed edition of Rawseyde (reprinted in the P.L. 73-74). There is ample evidence that during the Middle Ages the term (often in the form of Plutus or Plutus patrum) was used to refer to almost any work concerned with the lives and sayings of the first monks, the "desert fathers" of Egypt and the Near East. It is true that in time several such texts commonly circulated together; the Life of Antony, the Life of Paul, and the Verba Monum in are typical examples. But Rawseyde's edition was merely a compilation, and inevitably it imposed a false unity on a number of books that often had their own, quite distinct, textual histories. However, the name itself is found from a very early period, for in the 530s it was mentioned in the Benediction Rite, and a little later the title was imitated by Gregory of Tours in his own Liber Vitae Patrum; see Butte (1972).

The appeal that such writings must have had to a monastic audience is obvious, for they offered paradigms of conduct in a way that was both arresting and easy to memorize. Certainly their widespread popularity in the Middle Ages cannot be disputed, for there are over 100 complete MSS of the Hēbā saṃuṣa alone dating from the seventh to the fifteenth century, and MSS of selections or of isolated sayings from it are more numerous still. It would in fact be highly surprising if these books had not been known to the Anglo-Saxons.

There are, however, some difficulties in establishing the use of the Plutus patrum in Anglo-Saxon England that require some comment here. First, as in many other cases, it is quite certain that the early English encountered the work at second hand, by means of intermediate sources. For instance, Exsorsor of Londini's Liber Sanctorum includes over many extracts vaguely attributed to the compiler to the Plutus patrum, though in fact they are drawn from an extraordinary variety of sources, of which the material now thought of as the Plutus patrum is only one (see Richins GOS. 117). Other examples of the use of such an intermediate source, this time by Alcuin and Ælfric, are noted below under the Hēbā saṃuṣa. Second, undefined references to the desert fathers do not in themselves constitute evidence of the use of the Plutus patrum. Such references abound in Old English and Anglo-Latin literature. For example, in Ælfric's Life of Cuthlac (see Acta Sanctorum), it is reported that the saint was inspired to follow an eremitic life "when he read about the solitary life of monks of former days" (16.13-14), and this detail found its way into the Old English prose life (LS 10, B.3.3.10, I.105-10). Bede gives similar information about the monk Ecgbert (Historia Ecclesiastica 349.15-20), and this too was copied into the Old English

hagiography on St Chad (LS 3, B.3.3.3, 195-95). Such reports do no more than indicate a general acquaintance by the authors with the biographies of the first monks. They cannot be used to determine which books the authors—let alone the saints—had actually read. (It is, in fact, well-known from other evidence that Ælfric was greatly influenced by Evagrius' translation of the Life of Antony by Athanasius.)

Finally, there is a problem of definition: which books would an Anglo-Saxon audience have understood by the term Plutus patrum? Here, at least, the evidence is tolerably clear. Many of the references to the term in the Old English and Anglo-Latin texts are too vague to be of use; however, as Cross (1985a) has shown, in the four instances where Alcuin names the work and extracts an anecdote, the material comes from only one source—the fifth and sixth books of Rawseyde's Plutus patrum, the Hēbā saṃuṣa. The only specific evidence that the term could have meant anything other in the Anglo-Saxon period is provided by an inscription in Worcester, Cathedral Library F48, which reads "In nomine Dei summum incipit via patrum" (64 49); this inscription stands at the head of a copy of Rawseyde's Book II, the Historia Monachorum in Aegypto (cf. Historia Hierosolimitana)

In what follows, then, it will be assumed that these two books, and these only, were certainly regarded as "Vitae patrum" by the Anglo-Saxons. Hence there will be no discussion of the so-called "Vitae majors," such as the Egyptian Life of Antony or Jerome's Lives of Paul, Hilarius, and Macarius, which Rawseyde prints in Book I of his edition. The only other book that will be dealt with here is the so-called Paradisi Heralculus, a work whose subject-matter and manner of treatment are so close to those of the Historia Monachorum that it deserves to be considered here rather than in an article of its own.

[For this final section, only the section on the Paradisi Heralculus has been included.]

Paradisi Heralculus [ANON.Pat.Hen.]. CPG 6036; BLH. 6532.

ASS 1. Cambridge, University Library PL.5.27: HG 10.
AS* Hen. none.
Quo* Cuth. ANON.Vit.Cuth. is below.
Refl. none.

The Paradisi Heralculus is the longer of two Latin translations of the Latin History of Palladius of Hælmonapia, a work which was composed about 485-90 and which contains an autobiographical account of encounters with the desert fathers (see Butler 1890-1904, and for a different view Draguet
1978). This longer translation itself survives in two recensions; the second, a considerably revised and expanded version of the first, is printed in the unsatisfactory edition of Rosseride (PL 74:243-342). The wording of the biblical quotations in the original recension suggests that it was composed in Africa some time before the end of the fifth century (see Burkitt in Butler 1898-1904). It is not known who the author was; Rambolla del Tan-daro (1985) points out that in some MSS he is identified as a daemon named Paschasia, but this attribution is authoritatively rejected by Baullé (1961).

The authorship, place of origin and date of the revised recension are all unknown: the Heraclides named in the title is a fifth-century Bishop of Ephesus who is known to have had no connection whatever with the work, either in Greek or Latin.

The two MSS of the Paradisi are both from late in the period. According to Bishop (1954) the Cambridge MS was written at Durham late in the eleventh or early in the twelfth century; there is no evidence of the origin or date of its exemplar. The Hereford MS is of unknown origin, but it is a little earlier than the Cambridge MS, though still probably post-Conquest (Sir Roger Mylners, personal communication).

Indications that the work was known earlier in Anglo-Saxon England are slight and far from conclusive. The most suggestive evidence is to be found in two passages in the anonymous Life of Guthbert and its successors. The first of these (ANON.Vi.Cuthbl. 76:79-78,20) relates how the saint, having unwittingly entertained an angelic visitor, was rewarded by the miraculous gift of three warm loaves. This story was copied into the prose and metrical Lives of Guthbert by Bede (prose 176:7-178:22; metrical 180-22), and into Aelfric's homily on the Deposition of Guthbert (AF2Hym II, 10, B12.11; 63-73). Miracles of this type are of course extremely common in saints' lives; there are examples in the Historia monachorum (PL 21:401 and 451), in the Dialogus of Sulpicius Severus (162:5-163:19), and indeed elsewhere in the anonymous Life itself (70:5-25)—the ultimate source being the feeding of Elijah in the desert (III Rg 17:6). However, the Paradisi (PL 74:54) differs from the Guthbert story—and against the other version—the number of loaves (three), and may provide in its third person narration, under the guise of the miracle having happened to a lifelong companion of the writer, a source for Bede's comment that the saint would tell such stories "as though they happened to another person."

The second case in the anonymous Life of Guthbert—a description of a vision that the saint had concerning the day and hour of the slaying of King Ecgrith (127:2-27)—is less convincing. The story was copied by Bede in both his prose and metrical Lives, but is not found in Aelfric. Colgrave points out that a similar story is told in the Paradisi about Didymus of Alexandria,
Appendix A:
Martyrology

References to the Old English *Martyrology* are to a modified version of the system in the *MCOE*, and so require some comment here. Rather than dividing the material according to the six MSS (as the Toronto Dictionary has done), references in this volume assume a division according to the individual entries in the edition of Günter Koter, *Das altenglische Martyrolo- gium* 2 vols. (Munich, 1988; the text appears in volume 2). This system, designed by Donald Scragg for the *Poetic Angle-Saxon* and changed slightly to conform to the style of the present volume, assigns a letter, or letters for each entry, in order to avoid ambiguity. "f" and "v" are avoided in all cases; "h," "q," and "a" are not used alone; and "li," "ive," and "ise" have been excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B19.a</th>
<th>Mert</th>
<th>25 December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B19.b</td>
<td>The Birth of Christ</td>
<td>25 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.c</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>25 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.d</td>
<td>St Anastasia</td>
<td>26 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.e</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>26 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.f</td>
<td>St Stephen</td>
<td>27 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.g</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>28 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.h</td>
<td>The Holy Innocents</td>
<td>31 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.i</td>
<td>Pope Silvester I</td>
<td>31 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.j</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.k</td>
<td>St Columba</td>
<td>1 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 January</td>
<td>Pope Anatras</td>
<td>Bi9.n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January</td>
<td>St Emillian</td>
<td>Bi9.p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January</td>
<td>Epiphany, Baptism of Christ etc.</td>
<td>Bi9.q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 January</td>
<td>Pope Thelesphorus</td>
<td>Bi9.s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January</td>
<td>St Paul the Hermit</td>
<td>Bi9.u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 January</td>
<td>St Benedict Bishop</td>
<td>Bi9.w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 January</td>
<td>Pope Marcellus</td>
<td>Bi9.zx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January</td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 January</td>
<td>St Marius, Martha, Axelifax, Aboroc</td>
<td>Bi9.ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January</td>
<td>St Agnes</td>
<td>Bi9.aj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January</td>
<td>St Vincent</td>
<td>Bi9.ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 January</td>
<td>St Anastasius</td>
<td>Bi9.am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 January</td>
<td>St Eumenian</td>
<td>Bi9.an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 January</td>
<td>St Babylas etc.</td>
<td>Bi9.ap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>The Conversion of St Paul</td>
<td>Bi9.aq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovery of the head of St John the Baptist; the end of February</td>
<td>Bi9.ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The beginning of March</td>
<td>Bi9.at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.az</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martyr</td>
<td>Bi9.bc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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St Gregory Nazianzen

St Eletherius, Antia

20 March

21 April

23 April

24 April

25 April

25 April

27 April

28 April

28 April

B29.bj

B29.bm

B29.br

B29.bs

B29.bv

B29.bw

B29.bx

B29.by

B29.bz

B29.ch

B29.ci

B29.cj

B29.cl

B29.cm

B29.cn

B29.cp

B29.eq

B29.ex

B29.fx

B29.gy

B29.gs

B29.ea

B29.he

B29.hr

B29.hg

B29.hh

B29.hi

B29.hj

B29.mk

The Third Day of Creation

St Ethelwald

St George

St Wilfrid

 Rogation Day

St Mark

St Alexander(s)

St Vitalis

St Christopher; the end of

April

1 May

2 May

3 May

3 May

May

May

May

May

May

May

May

May

May

May

B29.aj

B29.am

B29.ar

B29.at

B29.au

B29.av

B29.aw

B29.ax

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

St Cuthbert

Martyr

Martyr

St Benedict of Nursia

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

St Theodoret

Martyr

The Seventh Day of Creation

Annunciation Day;

Crucifixion

Christ's Descent into Hell

Resurrection; the end of

March

The beginning of April

St Agape, Chonia, (Irene)

St Ambrose of Milan

St Irene

Seven Women at Sirmium

St Guthlac

St Valerie(s)rus, Tiburtius, Maximus

St Mark

St vine

The beginning of May

St Philip

St Athanasius

Pope Alexander I, St Eusen- tius, Theodulus

The Discovery of the Holy Cross

Rogation Days

The Ascension of Christ

St Eadberht

St John of Beverley

Discovery of St Michael's Church

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr

Martyr
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App. A</th>
<th>St Victor Maurus</th>
<th>9 May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c3</td>
<td>The beginning of Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c4</td>
<td>St Gordianus, Calepodius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c5</td>
<td>St Pancras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c7</td>
<td>St Victor, Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c8</td>
<td>Pentecost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>c9</td>
<td>Pope John I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>St Basilisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cb</td>
<td>Pope Urban I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>St Augustine of Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cd</td>
<td>St Sinianius, Martyrrius, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cg</td>
<td>St Priscus, Nicomedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>St Erasmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ci</td>
<td>St Marcellius, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cj</td>
<td>St Artemiaus, Candida, Paulina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ck</td>
<td>St Columba of Iona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cm</td>
<td>St Barnabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>cn</td>
<td>St Vitus, Modestus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>co</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St Ferreolus, Ferrucio</th>
<th>17 June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>dz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>eg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>eh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>ej</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| St Tranquillus |  |
| B19|ek |  |  |
| B19|eL |  |  |
| B19|el |  |  |
| B19|em |  |  |
| B19|en |  |  |
| B19|eo |  |  |
| B19|ep |  |  |
| B19|eq |  |  |
| B19|er |  |  |
| B19|es |  |  |
| B19|et |  |  |
| B19|eu |  |  |
| B19|ev |  |  |
| B19|ew |  |  |
| B19|ex |  |  |
| B19|ey |  |  |
| B19|ez |  |  |
| B19|eP |  |  |
| B19|eQ |  |  |
| B19|eR |  |  |
| B19|eS |  |  |
| B19|eT |  |  |
| B19|eU |  |  |
| B19|eV |  |  |
| B19|eW |  |  |
| B19|eX |  |  |
| B19|eY |  |  |
| B19|eZ |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B19.ej</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>10 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ek</td>
<td>The Seven Brothers</td>
<td>10 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ezn</td>
<td>St Anastasia, Audax</td>
<td>10 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ez</td>
<td>St Rufina, Secunda</td>
<td>14 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ep</td>
<td>St Phocas</td>
<td>15 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.eq</td>
<td>St Cyprian, Julitta</td>
<td>17 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ex</td>
<td>St Speratus and the Scillian Martyrs</td>
<td>18 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.es</td>
<td>St Symphorosa and her Seven Sons</td>
<td>19 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.et</td>
<td>St Christina</td>
<td>19 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.eu</td>
<td>St Arsenius</td>
<td>21 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ev</td>
<td>St Victor of Marseilles etc.</td>
<td>22 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ew</td>
<td>St Mary Magdalen</td>
<td>22 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ex</td>
<td>St Apollinaris</td>
<td>25 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.sy</td>
<td>St James the Greater</td>
<td>27 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.sz</td>
<td>St Simeon Stylites</td>
<td>28 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fs</td>
<td>St Nazarius, Celsus</td>
<td>29 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fr</td>
<td>St Lupus</td>
<td>30 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fh</td>
<td>St Aldo, Senex, the end of July</td>
<td>1 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fd</td>
<td>The beginning of August</td>
<td>1 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fc</td>
<td>The Machabees</td>
<td>1 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ff</td>
<td>St Germanus</td>
<td>1 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fg</td>
<td>St Eusebius of Vercelli</td>
<td>2 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fh</td>
<td>Pope Stephen I</td>
<td>2 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fh</td>
<td>St Theodora and her Three Sons</td>
<td>3 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fo</td>
<td>Discovery of the Body of St Stephen</td>
<td>5 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fx</td>
<td>St Oswald</td>
<td>6 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fx</td>
<td>Pope Sixtus II</td>
<td>7 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fn</td>
<td>St Donatus, Hilarinus</td>
<td>8 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fp</td>
<td>St Afa, Hilario etc.</td>
<td>9 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fr</td>
<td>St Romanus</td>
<td>10 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fx</td>
<td>St Lawrence</td>
<td>11 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fs</td>
<td>St Tilbiarius</td>
<td>12 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fu</td>
<td>St Euph(ia)</td>
<td>13 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fr</td>
<td>St Hippolytus</td>
<td>15 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fa</td>
<td>St Cassian</td>
<td>15 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fv</td>
<td>Assumption of the Virgin Mary</td>
<td>17 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fw</td>
<td>St Mamas</td>
<td>18 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fx</td>
<td>St Agapitus</td>
<td>19 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fy</td>
<td>St Magnus</td>
<td>22 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.fr</td>
<td>St Symphorian</td>
<td>22 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ga</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>22 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gb</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>23 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gc</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>25 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gd</td>
<td>St. Genesius the Comedian Mart</td>
<td>26 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ge</td>
<td>St. Irenaeus, Abundius Mart</td>
<td>27 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gf</td>
<td>St. Rufus Mart</td>
<td>28 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gg</td>
<td>St. Hermes Mart</td>
<td>28 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gh</td>
<td>St. Augustine of Hippo Mart</td>
<td>29 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gi</td>
<td>The Death of St. John the Baptist Mart</td>
<td>29 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gj</td>
<td>St. Sabina Mart</td>
<td>29 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gk</td>
<td>St. Felix of Thibouca etc. Mart</td>
<td>30 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gl</td>
<td>St. Aidan; the end of August Mart</td>
<td>31 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gm</td>
<td>The beginning of September Mart</td>
<td>1 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gn</td>
<td>St. Priscus Mart</td>
<td>2 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.go</td>
<td>St. Antoninus Mart</td>
<td>3 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gq</td>
<td>St. Arsenius, Paternianus, Felicianus Mart</td>
<td>4 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gr</td>
<td>St. Marcellinus Mart</td>
<td>5 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gs</td>
<td>St. Quintus Mart</td>
<td>5 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gt</td>
<td>St. Bernetius Mart</td>
<td>7 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gu</td>
<td>St. Sinotus Mart</td>
<td>8 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gv</td>
<td>The Birth of St. Mary</td>
<td>8 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gw</td>
<td>St. Omer</td>
<td>11 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gx</td>
<td>St. Proclus, Hyacinth Mart</td>
<td>14 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gy</td>
<td>Pope Cornelius etc. Mart</td>
<td>14 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.gz</td>
<td>St. Cyprian Mart</td>
<td>15 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ha</td>
<td>St. Valerian Mart</td>
<td>15 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hb</td>
<td>St. Maximian Mart</td>
<td>16 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hc</td>
<td>Mart</td>
<td>19 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hd</td>
<td>St. Euphemia Mart</td>
<td>20 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.he</td>
<td>St. Januarius etc. Mart</td>
<td>20 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hf</td>
<td>St. Faustus, Evilarius Mart</td>
<td>21 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hg</td>
<td>St. Matthew Mart</td>
<td>22 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hh</td>
<td>St. Maurice and the Theban Legion Mart</td>
<td>23 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hi</td>
<td>St. Sosius Mart</td>
<td>23 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hj</td>
<td>St. Thecla Mart</td>
<td>24 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hk</td>
<td>The Conception of St. John the Baptist Mart</td>
<td>24 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hm</td>
<td>St. Andochius, Thyrnus, Felix Mart</td>
<td>25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hn</td>
<td>St. Cedethfr Mart</td>
<td>26 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hp</td>
<td>St. Justina, Cyprian Mart</td>
<td>27 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hq</td>
<td>St. Cosmas, Damian Mart</td>
<td>29 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.hr</td>
<td>The Consecration of St. Michael's Church Mart</td>
<td>30 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.in</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>1 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ip</td>
<td>St Cæsarius</td>
<td>1 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.iq</td>
<td>St Benignus</td>
<td>6 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ir</td>
<td>St Winnoc</td>
<td>7 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.is</td>
<td>The beginning of Winter</td>
<td>8 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.it</td>
<td>The Four Crowned Ones</td>
<td>8 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.iu</td>
<td>St Martin of Tours</td>
<td>11 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.iw</td>
<td>St Mennas, Heliodorus</td>
<td>11 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.iy</td>
<td>St Milius, Senenus</td>
<td>15 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.iz</td>
<td>St Hild</td>
<td>17 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.js</td>
<td>St Cecilia</td>
<td>22 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jb</td>
<td>Pope Clement I</td>
<td>25 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jc</td>
<td>St Felicity</td>
<td>25 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jd</td>
<td>St Saturninus</td>
<td>24 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.je</td>
<td>St Chrysogonus</td>
<td>28 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jf</td>
<td>St Chrysanthus, Daria</td>
<td>28 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jg</td>
<td>St Andrew; the end of November</td>
<td>30 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jh</td>
<td>The beginning of December</td>
<td>10 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.ji</td>
<td>St Eulalia</td>
<td>13 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jj</td>
<td>St Lucy</td>
<td>15 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19.jk</td>
<td>St Lucy</td>
<td>15 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:
Projected Entries and Contributors List

(ed. note: current as of October 25, 1989)

xxx = crosslist
inv. = invited

Abbo of Fleury
Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés
De naviculis coenobii (see Alfred)
Acta Sanctorum

xxx

J E. Gross/A. Brown
xxx

G. Whitley + multi
alii. H. Magennis, F.
Biggs, J. Hill etc.
[organized by saints]

Adalbero of Laon
Adalbert (see Speculum Geographi)
Ad of Vicorne
Adomnán
Adrian of Fleury (see Acta Sanctorum)
Adao of Montier-en-Der
Ælfric
Ælfric Bata
Æsmenta
Æsop
Æthelheard (see Chronicles)
Æthelwold
Æthelwulf
Æthelwulf
Acta (see pseusto-Vergil)
Agathobolus
Agroecius (see Grammatical Writings)
Alaric
Alcuin
**Appendix B: Projected Entries and Contributors List**

(ed. note: current as of October 25, 1989)

xxx = crosslist
inv. = invited

Abbo of Fleury
Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Pres
De ascensoribus edens disputatur (see Alfred)  
_Acta Sanctorum_

Adalbero of Laon
Adalbert (see *Suidas Fugazi*)
Ado of Vienne
Adomnan
Adruald of Fleury (see _Acta Sanctorum_)
Ado of Montier-en-Der
Ælfric
Ælfric Bata
Ænigma
Æsop
Æthelward (see Chronicles)
Æthelwold
Æthelwold
Æthelwulf
Ænwulf (see pseudo-Vergil)
Agathobulus
Agrocius (see Grammatical Writings)
Alaric
Alcuin

J.E. Cross/A. Brown
S. Whitby + multi
ali: H. Magennis, F. Biggs, J. Hill etc.
[organized by saints]

D. Dew
D. Dobbs
F. Biggs
M. Godden
P. Lendinara
D. Johnson

XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX
XXX
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caeceilius Cyprianus</th>
<th>J. Thacker</th>
<th>Collectars</th>
<th>R. Pfaff et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cassius Aurelianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquies</td>
<td>P. Lendinara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassarius of Arles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hucce in Galatium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Caesarius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcidius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonienisi Prologus</td>
<td>F. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Callisthenes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Julius Valerius)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commentaria Ante</td>
<td>C.B. Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calpurnius Siculus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculatia Annoe</td>
<td>P. Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Songs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Computational Writings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Centum Gentem</td>
<td>J. Zickowski</td>
<td>Caeceiae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellinus Capella (see Martianus)</td>
<td>T. Jones</td>
<td>Council of Aachen</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capax</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consentiens (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capronius of Carthage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constantius Lugdunensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolingian Commentaries (see Grammatical</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronation Rites</td>
<td>R. Pfaff et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolismus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cosmae Indicopleustes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassian</td>
<td>D. Nades</td>
<td>Aethicus Cosmographius (see Aethicus Inter)</td>
<td>D. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassiodorus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassius Felix (see Medical Writings)</td>
<td>J. Halporn</td>
<td>Crux (see Acts of Peter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthala (see pseudo-Cicero)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cumminian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Cato (see Divinitia Caesarii)</td>
<td>L. Melazzo</td>
<td>Curtius Rufus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Porcius Cato</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrilian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisius (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprianae Gallus</td>
<td>D. Nades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcis (see Magical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caeceilius Cypriana (see Caeceilius)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choricius Fortunatianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprianae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choricius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyril</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrodegang of Metz</td>
<td></td>
<td>pseudo-Cyril</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromatius of Aquileia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysostom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Chrysostom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Cicero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicinian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>R. Babcock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudianus of Turia</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelidonius (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Clement Romanus (see APOCRYPHA, Acts of Peter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codestinius I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectanea Solis</td>
<td>T.D. Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius Thrax</td>
<td>M. Twomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscorides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorotheus</td>
<td>L. Melazzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De divisione temporum (see Computistical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatus (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>L. Melazzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius Claudius Donatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorotheus</td>
<td>P. Lendinara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Dorotheus (hermeneumata)</td>
<td>D. Nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dracontius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncaid (see Marrianus Capella)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungalus Ocellus</td>
<td>D. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De theodori abbasii sancti</td>
<td>T.D. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eadmer</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sancti etiens exposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In sancti etiens discipulina (see Legal Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eirenarchia Institutione (see Legal Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einheil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elias III (see Medical Writings)</td>
<td>D. Sprunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Elias</td>
<td>M. Twomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudoxium (see Honorius of Autun)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ennias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eremodius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libri Enach (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephecerius (see Computistical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Latinus</td>
<td>F. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Ephraem</td>
<td>F. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius</td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiphanius Cyri</td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucius (see Medical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethicus Cosmographus (see Aethicus Inter)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Eucharistia</td>
<td>R. Pfaff et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharius</td>
<td>J. Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Eucharius</td>
<td>J. Erickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius of Toledo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius Pamphilius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutropius</td>
<td>T. Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustochius (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustathius of Constantinople</td>
<td>M. Boudreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evagrius (see Athanasius in Aeta Ssceptrum)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evax (see Lapidaries)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius (see Augustine, Epistolas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptiones de Prisciano (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusecius (see Liturgical Texts)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Eus (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faustus of Riez</td>
<td>D. Nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix I</td>
<td>P. Wallace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feraudus</td>
<td>R. Pfaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De festis in dni anni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fereus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>D. Nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florus of Lyons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folcard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorius Fortunatianus (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venantius Fortunatus</td>
<td>P. Lendinara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focacius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscus Anonymous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freccul of Liaux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fribegod of Canterbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbert of Chartres</td>
<td>R. Pfaff/J. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgentius Ferrandus</td>
<td>H. Sauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgentius the Mythographer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulgentius of Epure</td>
<td>D. Nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galen (see Medical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galienus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaddis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudensius of Bocrenis</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelasian Decree (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td>F. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchi Gelinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS Genesis (see Old Saxon Genesis)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gennadins of Marselles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanicus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gematia</td>
<td>R. Pfaff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gildas</td>
<td>D. Domville (M. Lapidge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorios</td>
<td>J. Pfeifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goliadric Verse (see Cambridge Songs)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Gospel of Nicodemus (see Apocrypha)  xxx
De literis Gecoran  V. Law
Grammatical Writings
Greek Texts
Gregorius Illiberitanus  M. McC. Gatch
Gregorius Nalianzeus  T.D. Hill
Gregory the Great
Gregory of Tours
Halifgar of Caenlens (see Penitentials)  xxx
Harmony of the Gospels
Hymno of Aucerre
Heresippus  J.R. Hall
Pseudo-Heresippus  J.R. Hall
Heliand
Helperic of Aucerre (see Computistical Writings)  xxx
Helvidius
Hieraldus Evestus (see Acta Sanctorum)  xxx
Herbariun (see Medical Writings)  xxx
Hermian (see Computistical Writings)  xxx
Hermas (see Apocrypha)  xxx
Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries
Q. Julius Hilarianus
Hilarianus Ignatus  T. Jones
Hilarianus Papa  T. Jones
Hilary of Poitiers
Hildesberus of Lorsch  T. Hall
Hildulphus of Saint-Denis (see Acta Sanctorum)  xxx
Hincmar of Rheims
Hippocrates (see Medical Writings)  xxx
pseudo-Hippocrates  xxx
Hippocrene Faunus  M. Herren
Historia Britannum  D. Dunville
Historia des ligne croce  T. Hall
Hogier Musica (see Musical Writings)  xxx
Homier (see Greek Texts)  xxx
Homiliaries
Anonymous OE Homilies  D. Scragg
Homilie in Apochroth YMII  F. Biggs
Honourius of Autun  M. Twomey
Horace  T. Mackay

Horus (see Macrobius)  xxx
Hrabanus Maurus  W. Schipper
Hucbald of Saint-Amand
De Hummnibus (see Medical Writings)  xxx
Hwarterhst
Hyginus
Hymnaries  G. Wieland
Hymnus (see Hymnaries)  xxx
Hymnum dicat turbis frumentum (see Hymnaries)  xxx
Idaectus Clarus
Idelfoncns
Innocent I  R. Pflauff
Jesuit S. Crucis (see Acta Sanctorum)  xxx
Irish Biblical Commentaries (see Hiberno-Latin Commentaries)  xxx
Isidore of Seville  M. Herren
pseudo-Isidore (see Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries)  xxx
Isidorus Junior
Ivo of Chartres  J.E. Cross
Janes and Mambres (see Apocrypha)  xxx
Jerome  T. Amos
pseudo-Jerome
Jus  V. Law
Episca Hymnus de usanitis pedum  V. Law
Jesus of Amiens  J.E. Cross
Joca Monachorum  T.D. Hill
Johannes Archichantor (see Musical Writings)  xxx
Johannes Constantopolitanae Antistes (see Chrysostom)  xxx
Johannes Diaconus (see Johannes Levita)  xxx
Johannes Eremita
Johannes Feldenstina
Johannes Leoba (see Acta Sanctorum)  xxx
Johannes Lythus
Johannes Maxentius
Johannes Scottus
Johannes Subdiaconus (see Acta Sanctorum)  xxx
John Scottus Eriugena
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author or Work</th>
<th>Appendix B</th>
<th>Appendix B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homily on the Prologue to the Gospel of John</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas of Orléans</td>
<td>C. Gravis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanes</td>
<td>J.R. Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jovinianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Judean</td>
<td>T. Mackay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian of Elyan</td>
<td>P. Poliaco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julianus Pomerius</td>
<td>F. Biggs et alii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian of Toledo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Africanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junianus Justinian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junilius Africanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenecus</td>
<td>G. Springer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Juvencus (see Cyprianus Gallus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactantius</td>
<td>G. Wieland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanfranc of Winchester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liddemore vs Balth (see Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentary)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapidaries</td>
<td>P. Kinton (inv.)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateran Council (see Concilia)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Verse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence of Novara</td>
<td>J. Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expositiones lexicales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Writings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pope Leo I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius (see Acta Sanctorum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopoldus Gallusian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Lestivam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Salis (see Legal Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Romanus Vigilanus (see Legal Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber de computo (see Comptentialical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber episcoporum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber monasticono</td>
<td>J. Friedman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liber posticales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical Writings</td>
<td>R. Pfaff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelic sec. Locum vitae argumentum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucifer Calaritanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucilius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludovicus Imperator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonius (see Augustine, Epistulae)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macer (see Odo of Meung in Medical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrobius</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Wetherbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magical Writings</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Charmus</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De sexu Animae nulli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malliut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Manfred (see Comptentialical Writings)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manilius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mappa Monii</td>
<td>J. Friedman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellinus Comes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcellinus of Bordeaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianus Scottus</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. Dew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianus Aventicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius Victorinus (see Cicero, de inventione)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maro Poeta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martianus Capella</td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Wetherbee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin of Braga</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. Stammach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrology</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. E. Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvels of the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materas (see Firmusinus Materas)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Matthais (see Hiberno-Latin Commentaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Matthew (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus of Turin</td>
<td></td>
<td>F. Biggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Writings</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Melito (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melito (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De mensuris et ponderibus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Methodius</td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Methodius</td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Tonneley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milo of Saint-Amand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>De mirabilibus oronti</em> (see Marvels of the East)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miracula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Liber miraculorum</em></td>
<td>R. Pfaff et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Expositio Missae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Moritius</em> (pseudo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Musical Writings</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nomius</em> (see <em>Historia Brithronum</em>)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nicerius Remmanienses</em> (see Pseudo-Ambrus. <em>De lauges virginis soavetate</em>)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gospel of Nicodemus</em> (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nomius Marcellus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Julius Obsequens</em></td>
<td>T. Hall / J. Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Odo of Cluny</em></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Odo of Muenx (see Medical Writings)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ostilix (see Acti Sacramum)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Old English Bede</em></td>
<td>E. Cooney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Old Saxon Genesis</em></td>
<td>S. Denke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orifinalis of Christ</em></td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ordoz Romanus</em></td>
<td>R. Pfaff et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orbithus (see Medical Writings)</em></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Origen</em></td>
<td>D. Nokes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pseudo-Origen</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oroseius</em></td>
<td>J. Bately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pseudo-Oroseius</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ovid</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pseudo-Pachomius (see Acti Sacramum)</em></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pachurus</em> (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Palatium (see Grammatical Writings)</em></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Palladius Hellenopolitisus</em></td>
<td>P. Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Papias</em></td>
<td>D. Sprunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Institutio Grammatae (see Grammatical Writings)</em></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascual</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascasimus Lillybitanus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascasimus Diaconus</em></td>
<td>T. Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascasimus Ruperbis of Corbie</em></td>
<td>T. Leinsbough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pascasimus Subdiaconus</em> (see Acti Sacramum)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valerius Probus (?)  
Proclus  
Prognostica  
Propertius  
Prosper of Aquitaine  
Proterius  
Proterius  
In Proverbia expositio  
Pseudo futurum servus (see Julian of Toledo)  
Prudentius  
Sulpicius Severus (see Hiberno-Latin . . . Commentarius)  
Psalters  
Psalmorum hieronymi us. Hildesheim  
Expositio super Psalmorum  
Sermon super quattuor Psalmos  
Punctus (see Medical Writings)  
Quintilian  
Quintus Serenus (see Medical Writings)  
Quodvultdeus  
Ralph d’Escures  
De ratione endormitorum (see Computistical Writings)  
Ratramnus of Corbie  
Ravenna Annals  
Regino of Prun  
Regulorum Gestae  
Remigius of Auxerre  
Rituels  
Romana Computatio (see Computistical Writings)  
Rubrics autore Olumbiano (see Hisperia Romana)  
Rubra  
Sabellius  
Sacramentaries  
Sallust  
Sallust and Saturn  
Saloicius  
Tatian Samuel (see Taio)  
R. Bremmer  
J.E. Cross  
G. Wright  
xxx  
G. Wieland  
R. Pfaff et al.  
xxx  
M. Boudreau  
xxx  
T. Hall  
J. Cross  
T. Leinbaugh  
P. Saarmach  
J. Hill  
R. Pfaff et al.  
xxx  
xxx  
P. Jackson  
R. Pfaff et al.  
T.D. Hill  
J. Erickson  
xxx  
Caelius Sedulius  
Seneca  
pseudo-Seneca  
Sertius minimilus mundi (see pseudo-Bede)  
Sertius (see Grammatical Writings)  
Servius  
Sulpicius Severus  
Sextus  
Sextus Placitas (see Medical Writings)  
Sibylla (see Apocrypha)  
Apollinaris Sidonius  
Sigismund S. Mariae  
De xii signis soledum (see Computistical Writings)  
Actus Silvestrii (see Acta Sacerdorum)  
xxx  
Simeon  
Smaragdus  
Solinus (see Aesopism)  
Stanislaus Augustini  
Stanislaus Gigori  
Sophonius  
Stoics  
Stephen of Ripon  
Successor Dionysii (see Dionysii Successor)  
Suetonius  
Sulpicius Severus  
Sydrages  
Sydrages Tarnovianus (see Sydrages)  
Symphoeneus  
Synaxarium of Constantinople  
Tacitus  
Tao  
Tatwine  
De ratione temporum (see Computistical Writings)  
Terence  
Tertullian  
Theodore of Canterbury  
Theodore of Moponosia  
Theodore  
Theodore Priscianus  
C. Springer  
P. Saarmach  
P. Saarmach  
xxx  
xxx  
P. Saarmach  
D. Ganz  
F. Saarmach  
xxx  
xxx  
F. Saarmach  
J. Hill  
xxx  
J. E. Cross  
J. E. Cross  
xxx  
xxx  
D. Johnson  
D. Johnson  
xxx  
D. Johnson
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malius Theodorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodotus Ancyrae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodulf of Orleans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodorus Presbyter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus Astu</td>
<td>M. Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus of Alexandria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Theophilus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodulphus Italicus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibullus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De s. Trinak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertius Rufus Aterius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyconius</td>
<td>T. Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De naturae usciorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usuard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Valerius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Maximus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Probus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varro (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetius</td>
<td>D. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velleius Longus</td>
<td>D. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede (see Computistical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helo asinorum (see Viae Patrum)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudo-Vergil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Julius Victor</td>
<td>D. Noden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor of Capua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl. Maris Victor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius Victorinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorinus of Pettau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorinus Porta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus Victorinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Victorinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorius of Aquitaine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigilius Thapsensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentius Liriensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinicius</td>
<td>R. Bremner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindicta Slabastie</td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgilius Maro Grammaticus (see Grammatical Writings)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgilius Saliscerbia (see Aethicus Ister)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viae Batoni</td>
<td>T. Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viae Bauml (see Apocrypha)</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viae Patrum</td>
<td>P. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitruvius</td>
<td>D. Mitchell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfen of Worcester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallstan of Winchester</td>
<td>C. Gravis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallstan of York</td>
<td>M. Richards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
SASIC Acta Sanctorum
List of Saints

Below is a preliminary list of saints' lives and hagiographical works known to the Anglo-Saxons up to A.D. 1000, identified where possible by BHL number (Bibliotheca hagiographica latina, 1st ed. & 1911 Supplement only; information from Supplement reassessed, ed. H. Pros (Brussels 1986), not yet incorporated). Cross references to other saints (SS) refer to the other entries in Acta sanctorum; cross references to authors may refer to actual or projected main entries in SASIC, where the work in question is discussed. Other brief references to authors may indicate when a vernacular treatment of a saint's life or passion derives from a larger work, such as Bede's Eclesiastical History, and not from an independent hagiographical text.

The compiler, E. Gordon Whalley (English Department, Queens College, City University of New York, Flushing, NY 11367-0904, USA) would be grateful for information about any other hagiographical works that should be included. The project is ongoing.

Abdon & Sennen, passio: BHL 6. See also M. ACGAVDEN & FERICINUS, SEPTUS & LAURENTIUS & HIPPOLYTUS, LAURENTIUS, ROMANUS

Abraham & Martin, vies: BHL 12.

Aconius. See E. INNINUS.

Achatus (Acacius) & ISC. (10,000), passio: BHL 20. See also ANASTASII BIBLIOTHECOGUS.

Adrianus (Hadrianus) Nicom., passio: BHL 5744.

Aquilus, vies: BHL 93–95.

Aethelredus & Aethelberth m., passio (aut. Bythelfr. Ram.): BHL 2645. See BYTHLETHRI; see also S. MILLIBY.
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Aethelwaldus, vita/brevia (lost): BHL none.

Aethelwoldus, vita/brevia (lost): BHL 2646, 2647. See Alfric (BHL 2646), and Wulfstanus Wint. (BHL 2647).

Afra & soc., passio: BHL 108-9, III.

Agape & Chione & Irene, passio: BHL III. See also ss. Anastasia, Chrysogonus, Theodore.

Agapitus Præm., passio: BHL 125.

Agathia, passio: BHL 133-4.

Agnes, passio (not: Ps-Ambrosius): BHL 156. Also in prudentius, pers. epist. man. 14, BHL 159.

Achabaeus, vita (lost): BHL 181.

Aidus ep. (Aidan), vita: BHL 190. From Beda hist. eccles.

Aelianus, passio: BHL 211a. Also from Beda hist. eccles, BHL 206-10.

Aelius Andeg., vita: BHL 234. See Venantius Fortunatus.

Alexander & soc., passio: BHL 266.


Alexius Edesi, vita: BHL 266.

Amalberga, vita: BHL 323.

Amianthus, vita: BHL 332 (not: Baudemundus), BHL 333 (not: Milo). See Baudemundus, Milo.


Amos (Ammon) Nitria, vita: BHL 6524. See also vitae patrum.

Anastasius & Petrus & Septem Militres, passio: BHL 3977.

Anastasia, passio: BHL 401. See also ss. Agape & soc., Chrysogonus, Theodore.

Anastasius, passio: BHL 406 & 410b, 412.

Anatolia, passio: BHL 417, 418.

Andochius & Thyrnus & Felix, passio: BHL 426. See also ss. Benignus.

Andreas, passio: BHL 428. See Apocrypha, passio Andrae.

Anianus, vita: BHL 473.

Arna, BHL 2.

Antimachus Apaneia, passio: BHL 568-9, 572-3.

Antonius, vita: BHL 609. See Athanasius, Evagrius.

Apollinaris Rv., passio: BHL 625.

Apollonius (Apollo) ab., vita: BHL 646 (= BHL 6524, cap. 7). See also vitae patrum.

Arsenus, BHL 6527. See also vitae patrum.


Ascla, passio: BHL 722.

Athanasius, vita: BHL 728-30. See also exuvius/epiphanes, hist. soul.

Audeonius (Ouenc), vita: BHL 750, vita metrica (lost; not: Frithgodus).

Audomarius, vita: BHL 765. See also ss. Bertinus & Wimago.

Augustinus Cant., vita: BHL 1224. From Beda hist. eccles.

Augustinus Hippe, vita (not: Pasitius): BHL 785.

Babylas, passio: BHL 889-901.
barontius, vīcī: BHL 997.
bartholomaeus, passio: BHL 1002. See a. a. apocrypha, passio bartholomaei.
basilissa, passio: BHL 4329–32. See ss. julians & basilissa & soc.
basilia, passio. See c. eugenia & soc.
batilius (balthildi) reg., vīta: BHL 905.
breda prebs., vīta: BHL 1069. See also cuithertus, ep. de obitu bredak.
benedictus Bisc. ab., vīta. See breda, historia abbati (BHL 8968).
benedictus Bisc. ab., homilia: BHL 1.101. See breda.
benedictus Nurs., vīta: BHL 1002. See gregorius magn., dialogi 2.
benedictus Nurs., sermo (auct. Odilo Cumiacc.). See c. cuniaciac.
benedictus Nurs., & Scholasticus, translatio: BHL 1117.
benedicte, passio: BHL 1133.
bettiens, vīta: BHL 763. See ss. aulamarius, winnocius.
blandina & soc., narratio: BHL 6839 (passio plotini). From eusebius' apudinus, hist. ecclēsia.
blastus, passio: BHL 7.
boswaffius ml. Tar., passio: BHL 1413.
brogida, vīta (auct. Cogitosus): BHL 1457.
britius (brecius), vīta: BHL 1452. See gregorius turon.
castella, passio: BHL 1455.
castarius, passio: BHL 1511.
capelodius, passio. See s. callistus.
callistus & Capelodius & soc., passio: BHL 1523.
carnarius Aug. ep., vīta: BHL 1632, 1633.
carnarius Ludimagister, passio: BHL 1626.
crasa ep. (Chad), narratio: BHL 1.258. From breda, hist. ecclēsia.
crofulenus ab., vīta: BHL 1726. See also breda, historia abbati (BHL 1726 recently attributed to Bede himself).
crinone. See s. salaper & soc.
christina, passio: BHL 1748b, 1751, 1756.
christophon, passio: BHL 1764, 1766.
chrysanthus & David, passio: BHL 1787. chrysoconus, passio: BHL 1795. See also s. anastasia & soc.
cyriacus & Juliitus, passio: BHL 1802–07.
clemens pap., passio: BHL 1848, 1853, 1857.
columba Hien. From breda, hist. ecclēsia.
columba Sen., passio: BHL 1892–94.
conon, passio: BHL 1912.
constantra Filia Constantin imp., narratio: BHL 156–7, 3236–38. See ss. gallus, Johannes & paulus; see also s. agnes.
CORONATI QUATTUOR: See Symphorianius.
COSmas & Damiani, passio: BHL 1967-70.
Cyprianus & Justina & soc. Nicolai, passio: BHL 2047-48, 2050-51?
Cyrilla. See SS. Nixius & Laurentius & soc.
DIONEUS ep., passio: BHL 2175. See Hilduinus; also Fortunatus?
DOMITILLA (Flavia) & soc., passio: BHL 6066.
DONATUS Anc., passio: BHL 2289.
DORMIESTERIUS (Septem), passio: BHL 2316. See also Gregorius Turon., passio: Dorm. Sept. Also in Cæs. mart.
EUSTACHIUS, vita: BHL 2342 (sust. "V"). See Adelardus Blanfoni. for BHL 2343 (MS London Grey's Inn 3).
EDERENFRI LINDSIF. ep., mart. From Beda, vita Cuth. pros.
EDITHA Wint. (Nunnaminster & Penshore), vita (lost): BHL none (cf. BHL 2385).
EDMUNDUS rex & m., passio: BHL 2392. See also Plor. EDOUARDUS, rex & m., passio (lost); mirocula (lost): BHL none (cf. BHL 2418).
KUNNUS Wigorn. ep., vita: BHL 2452. See perviterthi?
ELEUTHEREUS & Anthia, passio: BHL 2451.
ELIGIUUS ep., vita: BHL 2477.
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