SOURCES OF ANGLO-SAXON LITERARY CULTURE

George Hardin Brown and Frederick M. Biggs

Bede

Part 1, Fascicles 1-4

Amsterdam
University
Press

Bede – Part 1, Fascicles 1-4

Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture

Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture (SASLC) is a longstanding collaborative project by numerous scholars to map the sources that influenced the literary culture of Anglo-Saxon England. Taking inspiration from Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English*, it aims at a comprehensive, descriptive list of all authors and works known in England between c. 500 and c. 1100 CE.

While the focus is Anglo-Saxon England, evidence of knowledge of sources by Anglo-Saxons residing on the Continent is also taken into account. The sources themselves are largely Western European. Most entries concern classical, patristic, and medieval authors, works, or traditions.

Bede

Part 1, Fascicles 1-4

George Hardin Brown and Frederick M. Biggs

Amsterdam University Press

Cover design: Coördesign, Leiden
Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

Amsterdam University Press English-language titles are distributed in the US and Canada by the University of Chicago Press.

ISBN 978 90 8964 714 6
e-ISBN 978 90 4852 441 9 (pdf)
DOI 10.5117/9789089647146
NUR 684

For my wife Phyllis, fine medievalist scholar and my best critic and support

For Margaret Ashton Biggs, my mother and fifth-grade teacher of medieval history

Table of Contents

Preface 9
Charles D. Wright

Guide for Readers 11
Frederick M. Biggs

Introduction 17

Educational Works 39

Histories 123

Poetry: De die iudicii 207

Poetry: Epigrams 217

Poetry: Hymns 241

Saints' Lives 263

Preface

Charles D. Wright

The two magisterial fascicles on *Bede*, by George H. Brown and Frederick M. Biggs, are the first in a series to be issued by Amsterdam University Press for SASLC in a new model that combines print and online publication. No longer tied to publication of print volumes organized by the alphabet, SASLC will now publish all entries freely accessible online – without waiting for all entries in a given letter to be completed. Selected major entries, however, will first be published as print fascicles (four per year). These fascicles may be devoted to major individual authors such as Bede, or to multiple related authors, or to major textual genres. After print publication, each fascicle will later become available as an online publication. SASLC online will initially contain previously published entries, including those in the *Trial Version*,[1] in volume 1 of the letter *A* (including E. Gordon Whatley's monumental *Acta Sanctorum* generic entry),[2] in *Liturgical Books*,[3] in *Apocrypha*,[4] as well as previously unpublished entries that had been submitted over the years but were awaiting print publication of complete individual letters. We gratefully thank Simon Forde and Erin T. Dailey, acquisition editors of Amsterdam University Press, for their confidence in and support for the project, as well as Patricia Hollahan, former managing editor of Medieval Institute Publications, for allowing us to upload pdf files of the volumes published by MIP for online access.

The fascicles on Bede, the single most prolific and important Anglo-Saxon author, and one of the most important sources for Anglo-Saxon literary culture, fittingly mark SASLC's relaunch in partnership with Amsterdam University Press as well as George Brown's decades of distinguished scholarship on Bede. Special thanks go to Thomas N. Hall, former SASLC Director, for

1 *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach with the Assistance of Karen Hammond, Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies 74 (Binghamton, NY: CEMERS, 1990).

2 *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture, vol. 1: Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of St. Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, Paul E. Szarmach, and E. Gordon Whatley, with the assistance of Deborah A. Oosterhouse (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2001).

3 *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Richard W. Pfaff, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 23 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1995).

4 *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia 1 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2007).

preliminary editing of the *Bede* entries, as well as to David F. Johnson, general editor of what was originally planned as a print volume on the letter B, whose entries as completed will now be published individually either directly to SASLC online or initially in other print fascicles. Fascicles on *Pseudo-Bede* (by Brandon W. Hawk) and the *Old English Bede* (by M. Breann Leake and Sharon Rowley) are in an advanced state preparation, as is a fascicle on *Benedict's Rule* (by Shannon Godlove, Stephanie Clarke, and Amity Reading). Additional fascicles in preparation include a revised and updated *Ambrose with Pseudo-Ambrose and Ambrosiaster* (by Charles D. Wright)[5], *Caesarius of Arles* (by Joseph B. Trahern), and *The Cotton-Corpus Legendary* (by E. Gordon Whatley).

The SASLC Board currently consists of four members: Frederick M. Biggs (University of Connecticut); Stephanie Clark (University of Oregon); Brandon W. Hawk (Rhode Island University); and Charles D. Wright (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign). The initiative for relaunching the project was due to Fred, who worked with Amsterdam University Press to establish our new publication model, and who collaborated with George Brown in the preparation of our inaugural *Bede* fascicles. Without Fred's vision and leadership, SASLC would now be moribund, but it is instead redivivus with a vengeance.

The new SASLC continues the work begun in the 1980s by Paul Szarmach and Thomas D. Hill (with J. E. Cross as tutelary spirit), and continued in recent years by Thomas N. Hall (who had nearly completed editing a C-volume, whose entries will now likewise be published individually or as part of themed fascicles). On their behalf and our own we thank the many contributors who have submitted SASLC entries over the years, and we assure those whose entries had been held hostage by the alphabet that they will now be released expeditiously to the custody of SASLC online or to print fascicles. And we encourage our Anglo-Saxonist colleagues to participate in SASLC by contributing new entries (see SASLC online for the Master List of Projected Entries, which still includes many that have not yet been assigned).

We turn to Bede for an epigram for these volumes and for the SASLC project.

> Haec de re difficillima prout nobis intellexisse uisi sumus strictim explicare curauimus parati ueriora in his discere si qui nos docere uoluerit. (Bede, *De tabernaculo* II.iii)

5 First published in Old English Newsletter, Subsidia 25, ed. Dabney Anderson Bankert, Jessica Wegmann, and Charles D. Wright (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1997).

Guide for Readers

Frederick M. Biggs

As part of the *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture* [*SASLC*], the following entries on Bede conform to the structure of the reference work as a whole. Since they represent, however, the writings of only one author, fewer issues need to be addressed here. The minimal unit of *SASLC* is the entry, each of which discusses a particular text known in Anglo-Saxon England. Elsewhere in *SASLC*, entries may be gathered into larger, generic sets (such as **APOCRYPHA**; on the use of cross-references, see below), or they are, as here, found under a single author. While the structure of *SASLC* is alphabetical, individual entries within a major-author or a generic grouping may be organised in different ways, which will be explained at the beginning of these sections.

Each entry starts with a title and an abbreviation. For Anglo-Latin works, these are drawn from Michael Lapidge's *Abbreviations for Sources and Specification of Standard Editions for Sources* (1988; the bibliography at the end of the second fascicle is referenced by the author's name and the date of publication); for vernacular works, they are drawn from the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English* [*MCOE*]. As a result, *SASLC* is, on the whole, consistent with *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* and the Toronto *Dictionary of Old English*, although at times we refer to more recent editions than the ones used in those works. Titles and abbreviations are then followed by references to standard scholarship on the text (see the list of abbreviations at the end of this *Guide*), using item numbers if available (for example, *CPL* 1343 refers to the entry on **De natura rerum** in the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*) and page numbers if not. The next line designates the edition, which will be used throughout *SASLC*, that best represents what Bede wrote. So, for example, *De natura rerum* is edited on pages 180-234 of volume 123A of the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina*: *CCSL* 123A.180-234. References to the **Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum** are to Michael Lapidge's *Beda: Storia degli Inglesi* (2010), and so to the third edition of volume 1 and the first edition of volume 2. On occasions when a work circulated in more than one version (for example, the metrical **Vita Cuthberti**) each is given its own entry.

Headnote
Much of the evidence for the knowledge of a work in Anglo-Saxon England is summarised in the headnote, which covers manuscripts, booklists, Anglo-Saxon versions, quotations or citations, and references. Each category of evidence requires some comment.

MSS: *Manuscripts*. The inclusion of a work in a relevant manuscript provides firm physical evidence for its presence in Anglo-Saxon England. *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* [*ASM*] by Helmut Gneuss and Lapidge is the essential reference work here. We have, of course, consulted other sources as needed, including, for example, Lapidge's "Surviving Eighth-Century Manuscripts from the Area of the Anglo-Saxon Mission in Germany," in *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (2006 pp 155-66). Manuscripts not in *ASM* (including those written in Anglo-Saxon script on the Continent, which are potentially relevant but do not in themselves constitute evidence for the work's knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England) are preceded by a question mark in the headnote, and are discussed in the body of the entry.

Lists: *Booklists*. 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" Lapidge [ML] edits the remaining catalogues of manuscripts from our period, and identifies, whenever possible, the work in question.

A-S Vers: *Anglo-Saxon Versions*. Like the manuscript evidence, an Anglo-Saxon translation into Old English, or adaptation in Anglo-Latin, indicates that the source was known to the English at some time during the Anglo-Saxon period. The abbreviations for Old English texts are again from the *MCOE*, and those for Anglo-Latin from Lapidge (1988). In order to make our work self-contained, these abbreviations are expanded later in the bodies of the entries where they occur and the designated editions specified. We have, of course, exercised judgement when deciding whether to represent the information as a translation or adaptation rather than as a series of quotations.

Quots/Cits: *Quotations or Citations*. The source-notes of modern critical editions and other secondary scholarship often establish 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. The abbreviation for the source, that is the work being discussed in the entry, is on the left of the colon; the abbreviation for the work that uses this source is on the right. They are again drawn from Lapidge (1988) and the *MCOE*, but may be extended, for reasons that will become clear in a moment, to designate some part of the work in question.

Since our aim is to identify precise passages as simply as possible, we use the line numbers provided by editors whenever possible. If a work is continuously lineated, the abbreviation for the title is followed by line numbers. So "BEDA.Carm.Iudic., 1-11" refers to the opening eleven lines of Bede's **De die iudicii** (since this example would only appear in the Bede entry as a source and so to the left of the colon, we omit "BEDA"). In contrast, since Lapidge lineates individual chapters of his edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, "Hist. eccl., V.xxiv, 185-88" refers to lines 185-88 of book 5, chapter 24, Bede's closing prayer.

If an edition begins with new line numbers on each page or if it does not provide them, the last numbers in these sequences are a combination of pages and lines. So, "BONIF.Epist. 75, 158.8-12" refers to lines 8-12 on page 158 of Michael Tangl's edition of Letter 75 in the correspondence of **BONIFACE** and **LULL** (*MGH* ES); the work in question is his **Epistola** 75. Similarly, Christine Rauer has not lineated her edition of the **OLD ENGLISH MARTYROLOGY**, and so "Mart (B19.1; John of Beverley), 100.5-8" refers to lines 5-8 on page 100, the entry on John of Beverley. It is worth noting here that we count the lines of text, not all the lines of print, which might also include running titles or notes. Users who track down these references will notice further refinements, but we expect this is enough information for all to navigate the system.

Refs: *References*. Although always open to interpretation, a specific reference to a work by an Anglo-Saxon writer may indicate its presence in England during our period. Line numbers are referred to in the same way as explained above under Quotations or Citations.

Body

The body of the entry usually begins with a brief discussion of the work in question, indicating other titles by which it has been known and considering its likely date of composition. We then consider any information in the headnote that requires clarification or amplification. It is here that the

abbreviations used in *Quots/Cits* and *Refs* are expanded, and the designated editions of the writers who have used Bede's works are identified. Readers will notice that references to quoted passages in *Quots/Cits* differ from those that provide information about the designated edition. As just explained, in the headnote "ALCVIN.Epist. 29, 71.14" identifies line 14, which appears on page 71 of Alcuin's Letter 29. In the body, "*MGH* ECA 2.71" refers to the same page 71, but adds the information that the line in question appears in the second volume of the Epistolae carolini aeui, part of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Entries often conclude with a discussion of bibliography.

Cross-references

Readers are directed to other entries (written or projected) in *SASLC* by names in bold: large capitals are used for those that figure into the alphabetical scheme of the project as a whole (that is, known authors and the names of generic sets, as well as the titles of anonymous works not gathered into these larger groupings); small capitals for any division within a major-author or generic set. Thus **AMBROSE** and **De fide**. Names in small bold capitals need not, however, always refer to individual texts since some major-author and generic sets are further divided into sections (for example, **Apocryphal Apocalypses** in **APOCRYPHA**).

An author or the title of a work is placed in bold the first time (and only the first time) it appears in an entry or in an introductory section of a major-author or generic set. Names, such as **APOCRYPHA** and **Apocryphal Apocaclypses**, that refer to major-author or generic groupings or to divisions within them are always in bold; the names of authors and titles of works will not be after their first use. This practice also means that when the first occurence of the name of an author whose work was known in Anglo-Saxon England is in a quotation, we change the immediate author's usage to conform with that of our volume. So, for example, in the discussion of Boniface's correspondence, Wilhelm Levison's "Egbert" becomes "**ECGBERHT**" even though we are quoting from his *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (1946). We have not, however, regularised other names in quotations. These references will eventually lead to entries where the differing names will be explained; had there been any ambiguous cases we would have discussed them in their immediate context. In cases such as "Ecgberht," where there are differing spellings of a name, we have followed the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England (*PASE*). This research tool has also proved useful in sorting out individuals who share the same name.

Standard Editions and Abbreviations of Standard Research Tools
Some editions and research tools (listed below) are referred to by abbreviations without further bibliographical elaboration. As noted already, when items in a research tool are numbered individually, references are to items (or to volume and item; for example, *CLA* 9.1233); otherwise, references are to pages (or to volume and page; for example, *OTP* 2.249-95).

References to the Bible are to the *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*, 3nd ed., editio minor, ed. R. Weber (Stuttgart, 1984).
References to Anglo-Saxon Charters are to the Electronic Sawyer (esawyer.org.uk) by Sawyer number.

ASM	*Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge (Toronto, 2014)
ASMMF	*Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile*, ed. A.N. Doane et al. (Binghamton and Tempe, 1994-)
ASPR	*Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, ed. G.P. Krapp and E.V.K. Dobbie, 6 vols (New York, 1931-53)
BaP	*Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa*, ed. Christian W.M. Grein, Richard P. Wülker, and Hans Hecht, 13 vols (Kassel, 1872-1933)
BHL	*Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*, 2 vols, Subsidia Hagiographica 6 (Brussels 1898-1901); *Novum Supplementum*, ed. Henrik Fros, Subsidia Hagiographica 70 (Brussels, 1986)
CAO	*Corpus antiphonalium officii*, ed. René-Jean Hesbert, 6 vols (Rome, 1963-79)
CCSL	*Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (Turnhout, 1953-)
CLA	E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1934-66); Supplement (1971); 2nd ed. of vol 2 (1972)
CPL	Eligius Dekkers, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, 3rd ed. (Turnhout, 1995)
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (Vienna, 1866-)
CSLMA	*Auctores Galliae 735-987 = Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi, Auctores Galliae 735-987*, ed. Marie-Hélène Jullien and Françoise Pereleman (Turnhout, 1994-)
EEMF	*Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 29 vols (Copenhagen, 1951-2002)
EETS	*Early English Texts Society* **ES** Extra Series **OS** Original Series **SS** Supplementary Series
HBS	*Henry Bradshaw Society* (London, 1891-)
ICL	Dieter Schaller and Ewald Könsgen, *Initia Carminum Latinorum Saeculo*

Undecimo Antiquiorum (Göttingen, 1977); *Supplementband* continued by Thomas Klein (Göttingen, 2005)

MCOE *A Microfiche Concordance to Old English: The List of Texts and Index of Editions*, compiled by Antonette diPaolo Healey and Richard L. Venezky (Toronto, 1980)

MGH *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*

- **AA** Auctores antiquissimi
- **CAC** Concilia aeui carolini
- **ECA** Epistolae carolini aeui [vol. 1: Epistolae merowingici et carolini aeui]
- **ES** Epistolae selectae
- **PLAC** Poetae latini aeui carolini
- **SRM** Scriptores rerum merovingicarum

ML Michael Lapidge, "Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England," in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp 33-89

NRK N.R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (1957; reprinted with a supplement, Oxford, 1990)

ODND *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. David Cannadine; oxforddnb.com; first published as 60 volumes, ed. H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford, 2004)

PASE Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England, Janet L. Nelson, Simon Keynes, Stephen Baxter, and others; pase.ac.uk

PL *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne, 221 vols (Paris, 1844-64)

RBMA Friedrich Stegmüller *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols (Madrid, 1950-80)

RS "Rolls Series": *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* (London, 1858-96)

Introduction

In any account of the literary culture of Anglo-Saxon England, Bede must loom large. While only one of many distinctive voices for whom we have a written record, Bede stands out as the author who turned a lifetime of study into the widest-ranging corpus of writings, many of which continued to influence later generations. **THEODORE**, archbishop of Canterbury, and **HADRIAN**, abbot of St Peter's Canterbury, may have been better educated and more able teachers. **ALDHELM**, the **BEOWULF**-poet, and, to choose one more example from among many, **CYNEWULF** may have written better verse. **BONIFACE**, archbishop and martyr, may have changed more lives through his mission. **ALCUIN**, abbot of Tours, may have carried English scholarship more effectively to the Continent. **ALFRED THE GREAT**'s support of education may have occurred at a more crucial moment in English history. **DUNSTAN**, archbishop of Canterbury, **ÆTHELWOLD**, bishop of Winchester, and Oswald, bishop of Worcester and archbishop of York, may have instituted a more significant reform. **ÆLFRIC**, abbot of Eynsham, and **WULFSTAN**, archbishop of York, may have preached better sermons. Bede, however, left writings that demonstrate his skills and influence in all these areas, writings that those who followed him would have almost certainly known, as these entries and the ones that will complete this survey in the next volume of *SASLC* show.

Evaluating Bede's place in this literary culture is sometimes complicated because, as these works demonstrate, his own reading, which was both wide and deep, appears often in his writing. When in the well-known autobiographical passage at the end of the **Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum** (V.xxiv) he spoke of having been sent at the age of seven by his kinsmen to enter the monastery of Monkwearmouth, it was not in order for him to become a monk, although this was their intention, but specifically for him to be educated: "cum essem annorum VII, cura propinquorum datus sum educandus reuerentissimo abbati Benedicto, ac deinde Ceolfrido" (ed. Lapidge 2010 2.480; "when I was seven years of age I was, by the care of my kinsmen, put into the charge of the reverend Abbot Benedict and then of **CEOLFRITH** to be educated," trans. Colgrave and Mynors 1969 p 567). His writings suggest that, in the following clause, "scripturis" should be understood not only as indicating that he valued his **Biblical Commentaries** most highly but also as reflecting the view that many kinds of writing, which radiated out from his central interest in the Bible, reveal God's presence in this world: "cunctumque ex eo tempus uitae

in eiusdem monasterii habitatione peragens, omnem meditandis scripturis operam dedi, atque inter obseruantiam disciplinae regularis, et cotidianam cantandi in ecclesia curam, semper aut discere aut docere aut scribere dulce habui" (ed. 2.480; "from then on, I have spent all of my life in this monastery, applying myself entirely to the study of the Scriptures; and amid the observance of the discipline of the Rule and the daily task of singing in the church, it has always been my delight to learn or to teach or to write," trans. p 567). This same interpretation may also apply to the comment that immediately precedes the list of his works: "Ex quo tempore accepti presbyteratus usque ad annum aetatis meae LVIIII haec in scripturam sanctam meae meorumque necessitati ex opusculis uenerabilium patrum breuiter adnotare, siue etiam ad formam sensus et interpretationis eorum superadicere curaui" (ed. 2.480; "From the time I became a priest until the fifty-ninth year of my life I have made it my business, for my own benefit and that of my brothers, to make brief extracts from the works of the venerable fathers on the holy Scriptures, or to add notes of my own to clarify their sense and interpretation," trans. p 567). While there will be more to say about these passages, they call attention to the close connection between Bede's reading, which must have begun at an early age, and his writing, which continued, according to **CUTHBERT**'s **Epistola de obitu Bedae** (ed. and trans. Colgrave and Mynors 1969 pp 580-87) by dictation up to the final moments before his death. When a later Anglo-Saxon writer used a passage from, say, **ARATOR**, **AUGUSTINE**, **PLINY**, or **VERGIL** it may well be either because they knew it from Bede or, in a more complex literary way, because they knew how he had used it.

As we will discuss in a moment, while derived most fully from the identification of the works Bede used, our image of his libraries – since Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, although presented by Bede as a single institution (see Grocock and Wood 2014 pp xxix-xxxv), must have had their own collections – is made more vivid both by the accounts of the assembling of their volumes by Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrith (see **Historia abbatum** I.vi, I.ix, and II.xv; and the anonymous *Vita Ceolfridi* ix-xii and xx, both ed. and trans. Grocock and Wood 2014 pp 34-37, 42-45, 56-61, 86-93, and 98-99), and by the survival of manuscripts produced in their scriptoria. One remarkable book that plays a part in both stories, as Paul Meyvaert (1996, 2005, and 2006) has reconstructed them, is the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Amiatino 1; *ASM* 825). Inspired by **CASSIODORUS**'s lost pandect, the Codex Grandior, which he had acquired in Rome, Ceolfrith decided to create three similar, single-volume Bibles, one for each altar of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow's churches, and one to be brought

back to Rome as a gift to St Peter's. Bede's likely participation in this work allows us to consider his direct relationship to the books around him and to his brethren. There can be little doubt that if not the leading voice in determining the text of the new Bibles – the Codex Grandior contained the *Vetus latina*, while the Codex Amiatinus follows the *Vulgate* (see **BIBLE**) – Bede would have strongly supported this decision since in his own work he championed **JEROME**'s translation, which for the Old Testament relied on Hebrew sources, leading him to refer to it as the "hebraica ueritas" (see the **Epistola ad Pleguinam** in **Letters**).

This incident provides further insight into Bede as a discriminating reader of texts who used his library to answer questions. According to Meyvaert (see, however, 2006 p 302, where he draws back from this view), when the decision was made to enhance the presentation volume with an opening decorative quire that would include an illustration modelled on the Cassiodorus-portrait in the Codex Grandior, it was Bede who turned to the book of Ezra, perhaps beginning his commentary on it, to make sense out of an image whose real meaning eluded him. Because Bede's brethren found the Cassiodorus/Ezra portrait obscure, it was also Bede who wrote an epigram to be placed over it (Meyvaert 2005 p 1115; see **Codicibus sacris hostili clade perustis** in **Poetry: Epigrams**). Finally, the rearrangement of folios in this first quire indicates that he was, according to Meyvaert (2006), in conflict with the monk who ran the scriptorium. While Bede must have had ample access to the books he used, they were shared by the community as a whole. We have reason to believe that he kept with him for many years a copy of the calendar that he used when teaching *computus* to novices (see **Kalendarium ad usum computandi** in **Educational Works**), and yet Cuthbert's silence on the subject of any drafts/personal copies of his other writings when he described Bede's final gifts to his brethren ("some pepper, and napkins, and some incense," trans. Colgrave and Mynors 1969 p 585) reinforces this view, suggesting that even when he went back to revise his own works, Bede did so from the house copies.

The holdings of the libraries assembled by Benedict Biscop and Ceolfrith and subsequently enlarged by the monasteries' scribes is illuminated most clearly by the sources Bede used in his writings, as established by M.L.W. Laistner (1935) and confirmed with new detail by Michael Lapidge (2006 pp 107-15 and 191-228). The concern of the following entries is, of course, Bede as a source rather than his use of sources; and yet the question of which books were available to him is worth raising here since the volumes at hand influenced not just individual passages in his works but also his choice of the subjects on which to write. The *Epistola de Obitu Bedae* again

provides a telling example. In addition to a translation of John's Gospel into English, Bede hoped in his final days to complete "a selection from Bishop **ISIDORE**'s book On the Wonders of Nature" since, as Cuthbert explained in Bede's voice, "'I cannot have my children learning what is not true, and losing their labour on this after I am gone'" (trans. Colgrave and Mynors 1969 p 583; see the discussion in Kendall and Wallis 2010 pp 13-20). According to his friend and colleague, Bede cared deeply about what others would find in the library.

For their time and place, the collections of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow were impressive. Lapidge increases Laistner's estimate that they held 150 volumes to 200 (2006 p 127), a number supported by his list of quotations from earlier writings (pp 174-274). Moreover, this connection between quotations and the library as a whole points to a significant feature of Bede's own writing, recalling his comment that he was completing in his final days a "selection" from Isidore's work and his characterization of his method as making "brief extracts from the works of the venerable fathers on the holy Scriptures." The identification of each new source relationship is valuable, which is why the correspondences in *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* and the *apparatus fontium* of modern editions have been consulted in writing the following entries and why future entries in *SASLC* will record the sources Bede used. Similarly, Bede's respect for his sources, seen for example, in his identifications of passages from each of the four fathers, **AMBROSE**, Augustine, Jerome, and **GREGORY THE GREAT**, in his **Commentarius in Marcum** and **Commentarius in Lucam**, or in his unwillingness to emend even obvious mistakes in the documents he included in the *Historia ecclesiastica* (see Lapidge 2008a p 88 note 179) commands our esteem.

To focus only on the quotations and Bede's faithfulness to his sources, however, would be to miss what the patterns reveal about not only the shape of the library but also Bede's genuine originality. The **Collectio ex opusculis Augustini in Epistulas Pauli** can illustrate this point. The work is, to paraphrase Bede's description in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, a careful transcription of Augustine's explanations, taken from various works, of particular passages from Paul's *Letters* placed in the order of the Pauline Epistles ("in Apostolum quaecumque in opusculis sancti Augustini exposita inueni, cuncta per ordinem transscribere curaui," ed. Lapidge 2010 2.482). What could be more derivative or indeed useless since Augustine's interpretations of individual verses must have been shaped to some degree by the context of the argument he was making? Perhaps Bede believed that Augustine's interpretation of these Epistles held steady across his life, or perhaps he gathered the passages in order to find out. In either

case, the project reveals a genuine insight into the importance of Paul in Augustine's thought and the significance of Augustinian interpretations of Paul for ecclesiastical teaching. In an unrelated but also significant way, these extracts contributed to François Dolbeau's (1996a and 1996b) identification of sermons in a fifteenth-century German manuscript as indeed by Augustine. Bede's works, derived from his library's treasures, added significantly to them.

Considering the chronological order of Bede's corpus suggests, in contrast to, say, a similar examination of that of the just-mentioned Augustine, more continuities than new departures. Lapidge (2010 1.xlviii-lviii), who focuses on certain, historical information, identifies half of Bede's thirty-nine works as unable to be precisely dated, and yet many can be, including the four that provide internal evidence for a particular year (see Lapidge and the following entries for the details): **De temporibus** (703), **De temporum ratione** (725), the *Historia ecclesiastica* (731), and the **Epistula ad Ecgberctum** (734). Others, as Lapidge explains, can either be placed within chronological limits by their references to people or external events, or be located by internal references or borrowings in relation to Bede's other works. From this information some trends emerge. It would, of course, be wrong to interpret Bede's statement, quoted above, that, from the time he was ordained a priest in 702 or 703 until he was fifty-nine (731) he wrote only commentaries on the Bible. Faith Wallis (2014 p 43) has argued that Bede composed his **Commentarius in Apocalypsim** to counter the fear that, as of 701, there was only a century left until the end of time, thereby dating the work to around that year (see also Kendall and Wallis 2010 pp 6-7). In any case he certainly produced other works after being ordained. A distinctive "mature period" in Bede's life as an author has become increasingly hard to sustain.

Since both poetry and hagiography seem to have occupied his attention already as a young man, these genres offer an opportunity to look for changes in his thinking over the course of his career. Developing the work of Neil Wright (1981-82), Lapidge (2006a pp 107-15; see also 2005a) demonstrates a strong Vergilian influence in his metrical **Vita Cuthberti** (dated to 705-10), adding that he also "certainly" knew **LUCAN** and **CLAUDIAN**, and that he "probably" knew **OVID** and **PERSIUS** (p 115). As Lapidge recognises, these borrowings stand in sharp contrast to Bede's reliance on Christian Latin poets for most of his examples in **De arte metrica** and on Scripture for all his illustrations in **De schematibus et tropis.** Indeed in book 2 of his **Commentarius in primam partem Samuhelis** he warned against the "secular fables and teachings of demons" found in "the dialecticians,

rhetoricians, and poets of the gentiles" (lines 1854-56; ed. *CCSL* 119.112). Lapidge (2010 1.lvii) lists the two **Educational Works** as among those that cannot be dated firmly, and assigns this book of the *Commentary* to 710-16. Perhaps a younger Bede was sufficiently impressed by the aesthetic qualities of classical verse to embellish a verse hagiography with Egyptian gold, while later in life he worried more about its seductive potential to lead one back to Egyptian fleshpots. His account of **CÆDMON'S** *Hymn*, a miracle even though Cædmon himself was not a saint, in the *Historia ecclesiastica* might support this interpretation if indeed, as Biggs (1997) has argued, Bede paraphrased the poem in Latin to divert attention from its ties to traditional Germanic verse. Like **De orthographia**, another undated classroom text that is now considered to have been completed late in Bede's life, *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis* could then be assigned to after this change of heart, when he was concerned to prove the superiority of Christian writings. Vergil, however, seems to have commanded greater respect for Bede than other pagan authors, for even in the late *De orthographia* he retained many of **AGROECIUS**'s quotations from him, while eliminating almost all those from Cicero, Horace, and other pagan authors.

To sort these woks on the basis of the degree to which they incorporate quotations from pagan authors risks overstating the evidence. Bede revised the metrical *Vita Cuthberti* around 716, and he offered to send a copy of it to Eadfrith and the congregation at Lindisfarne after he had written the prose **Vita Cuthberti**, which can be assigned to between 720-25. Indeed, in an essay that emphasises Bede's willingness to reach his own conclusions even if they disagree with authorities such as Jerome, Roger Ray (2006 pp 21-24; see also Ray 1987) explicates a later passage in the commentary on 1 Samuel discussing Jonathan's mistaken eating of honey proscribed by his father as showing that "pagan rhetoric, though it can be dangerous, can arm the church for verbal battle." And Bede's lost translation of John's Gospel, mentioned above, suggests that he moved easily between the Latin of his reading and writing, and the vernacular of the wider world that surrounded him. There must have been crises in Bede's life: the accusation of heresy that emerged out of *De temporibus*; Ceolfrith's abdication of the abbacy of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow and his departure for Rome; and Bede's perception, later in life, of a need to reform the Church and society around him (see Thacker 1983 and DeGregorio 2002, 2006c, and 2014). The balance, however, perhaps achieved by attempting throughout his life to express the miraculous in human form, opened for Bede a remarkably consistent voice.

Even if we had a fixed chronology for all of Bede's works, it would still make sense for this entry to group them thematically (as he himself did in his list in the *Historia ecclesiastica*) since this approach allows us to write separate introductions for the various genres in which he wrote. Indeed, Bede's groupings are sometimes useful in determining where works that straddle categories belong. Following him, we have included *De temporibus* and *De temporum ratione* with the other **Educational Works** even though each concludes with a chronicle, referred to as the *Chronica minora* and the *Chronica maiora*, which might have suggested their placement among the histories. Similarly, his metrical *Vita Cuthberti* appears with his other **Saints' Lives**, although it is related to his **Poetry**. Moreover, the division into two fascicles is intended to be useful rather than definitive. As just discussed, hagiography and poetry were, apparently, two genres that came together in his early metrical *Vita Cuthberti* and so offered a place to begin. Of these two, Bede's poetry is more complicated because his **Hymns** and **Epigrams** seem better suited for separate entries. A third section includes only his **De die iudicii**, which stands apart from his other works. Sorting out Cuthbert and, more generally, hagiography led to the *Historia ecclesiastica* and thus **Histories**, with its second entry on the *Historia abbatum*. Given this confluence of texts, the obvious final piece to this fascicle is the section on **Educational Works** since it includes Bede's treatises on poetry and rhetoric already mentioned as well as his masterpiece on time, *De temporum ratione*. The core of fascicle 2, then, becomes Bede's writings on the Bible: most significantly for him, the **Commentaries**, but also his **Homilies**, which Ælfric mined in writing his **Homilies**. Linked to the Bible are sections on **Aids to Biblical Study** and **Chapter Divisions**. Three more sections then complete the second fascicle: **Letters**, **Lost Works**, and **Martyrology**. It also includes cumulative **Bibliography** and **Indices**. A combined table of contents is as follows:

Bible: Aids to Biblical Study
Bible: Chapter Divisions
Bible: Commentaries
Bible: Homilies
Educational Works
Histories
Letters
Lost Works
Martyrology
Poetry: Epigrams

Poetry: Hymns
Poetry: De die iudicii
Saints' Lives

The following entries, then, indicate how later Anglo-Saxons used Bede's work. The five categories of information surveyed in the headnote – manuscripts, booklists, Anglo-Saxon versions, quotations and citations, and references – record the significant discoveries of scholars in each area, opening the way to further discussion of them and of the points at which they overlap. While most of the details can be treated within particular entries, some general orientation is offered here, concentrating on issues that concern the works as a whole.

M.L.W. Laistner's *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts* (1943) establishes the central role that continental copies played in the transmission of Bede's writings. More recent editions and the introductions to translations of individual texts often provide information about newly discovered manuscripts and their relationships. Considering the treatises on metrics and rhetoric together, the two chronicles separately from their original contexts, and most of Bede's poetry as it would have been divided into two now lost volumes, Lapidge (2008a) surveys the relevant information for establishing the texts of thirteen works: *De orthographia*, *De arte metrica* and *De schematibus et tropis*, **De natura rerum**, *De temporibus*, *De temporum ratione*, *Chronica minora*, *Chronica maiora*, *Historia abbatum*, *Historia ecclesiastica*, the metrical *Vita Cuthberti*, *Liber epigrammatum*, *Liber hymnorum*, and (**Poetry:**) *De die iudicii*. Particularly important are his discussions of Bede's lost autograph copy of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, as well as the early transmission of this work in England, and of the two volumes of verse. Our ability to study the manuscripts known in England prior to 1100 has been advanced significantly by the most recent incarnation of Helmut Gneuss's study of this topic, now issued in collaboration with Lapidge as *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A Bibliographical Handlist of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (2014). This work incorporates the views of Bernhard Bischoff about the date, origin, and provenance of many ninth-century manuscripts in his *Katalog* (1998-2014). A new feature of this version is their identification of digitised facsimiles of complete manuscripts in the Parker Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (parker.stanford.edu), the British Library (www.bl.uk/manuscripts), and Oxford's Bodleian Library (digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/index; in the categories "Celtic Manuscripts," "Western Manuscripts," and "Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts"); they identify these resources

(with the item numbers from their catalogue) in their introduction (pp 10-11) but not in the individual entries.

It should also be noted that, while Gneuss and Lapidge (2014) include manuscripts brought from England to the Continent, they exclude those "that were written, or annotated, or decorated, by Anglo-Saxon scribes and artists on the Continent but that were not known to have been in England at any time before 1100" (p 4). This category is especially important during the time of the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon missions. As Lapidge (2006 p 155) writes, "it is obvious that there are severe difficulties in distinguishing between manuscripts written in England and subsequently taken to the Continent (either by an Anglo-Saxon missionary or some other agent), and manuscripts written on the Continent either by Anglo-Saxon scribes or by Continental scribes trained by Anglo-Saxons." Moreover, while no longer reliable sources of information about books "in England," Anglo-Saxon emigrants on the Continent, such as Boniface and Alcuin, might always have been remebering something they had read before leaving home. Since our concern is with "Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture" and not only "Books Known in England," manuscripts from Lapidge's appendix to *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (2006), "Surviving Eighth-Century Manuscripts from the Area of the Anglo-Saxon Mission in Germany," which derives from E.A. Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (*CLA*), have been included (preceded by a question mark in order to flag them as constituting a secondary level of evidence). Lapidge's following appendix, "Ninth-Century Manuscripts of Continental Origin Having Pre-Conquest English Provenance," provides a useful gathering of the books introduced into later Anglo-Saxon England.

One area related to manuscripts still in need of study are the extracts made from Bede's works. The problem becomes most apparent when considering the sections from the *Commentaries* on Mark and Luke, many of which were incorporated into later **HOMILIARIES**. Indeed, the difficulty of distinguishing Bede's genuine homilies from the many others attributed to him was solved by Germain Morin (1892 and 1913), but Morin's list of manuscripts containing Bede's homilies did not include those transmitting extracts, and neither does M.L.W. Laistner's more comprehensive list, as his explanation of its scope implies (1943 p 116): "Since the purpose of this book is to help students of Bede's genuine writings and, in the present instance, some future editor of Bede's homilies, the list of MSS that follows has been confined, first, to those codices that Dom Morin has enumerated and others which seem to contain the fifty homilies on the Gospels more or less intact; secondly, to the one or two homiliaries or lectionaries of early date, which, in addition to sermons by other authors and perhaps *spuria* assigned to Bede

appear from the descriptions in the printed catalogues to preserve also a certain proportion of genuine homilies by him." In some ways similar are sections of the *Historia ecclesiastica* (often concerning particular saints) that also circulated independently. Laistner writes (1943 p 103),

> These are very numerous and of considerable interest; for they illustrate the wide distribution of complete manuscripts of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, from which they must often have been copied. The process, moreover, began early; for example in a Reichenau catalogue compiled in the first half of the ninth century we meet this entry: "nonnullae visiones excerptae de libris gestorum Anglorum Bedae." In some cases it has not been possible from the information given in the catalogues to determine from what part of the *Historia ecclesiastica* the extracts have been taken. Such manuscripts have been grouped together at the end; in other cases approximate references have been given to the Book and chapters from which the excerpts have been selected.

Lapidge (2008a p 112) concludes his discussion of complete (or nearly complete) manuscripts of the *Historia ecclesiastica* by noting that "given that it is possible to reconstruct the text … on the basis of six early manuscripts, collation of the remaining 150 + manuscripts hardly seems a pressing desideratum." The possibility, however, of identifying a later writer's precise source would justify further attempts at this daunting task, and in any case all surviving manuscripts are significant evidence of Bede's continuing influence. In order to support this work, we have included separate entries on individual extracts of the *Commentaries* on Mark and Luke, and the *Historia ecclesiastica*.

De temporum ratione provides a third example of the problem of extracts, although here there does not yet appear to be sufficient evidence to justify additional entries. In the introduction to her translation of the work, Wallis (1999 p lxxxviii-lxxxix) explains that "the Carolingian adoption of *computus* into its official educational policy made it a requisite element of every educated man's mental equipment," leading to "high levels of production of manuscripts of *The Reckoning of Time* in the eighth and ninth centuries." She continues (pp lxxxix-xc),

> While Bede's great treatise on the calendar was becoming a cornerstone of the Carolingian curriculum, other forces were at work which changed the way that curriculum was conceived. Carolingian schoolmasters, especially those attached to cathedrals, discovered long-neglected works like

> Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, which introduced them to the idealized ancient curriculum known as the Seven Liberal Arts. Many of these schoolmasters glossed both Martianus and the works of Bede: men like Martin the Irishman (817-875), head of the cathedral school of Laon and his followers Manno of Laon and Heiric of Auxerre. None of these men were computists, and when they read Bede, they were looking for material to fill the category of *astronomia* in their new taxonomy of learning. As we shall see shortly, this had a considerable impact on the way in which *The Reckoning of Time* was glossed in the Carolingian age. It also entailed an approach to *computus* which differed significantly from Bede's. Bede never mentions the Liberal Arts, and as we have seen, his monastic conception of *doctrina christiana* encouraged the dismantling of ancient genres of scientific and didactic literature and the incorporation of their contents into new Christian formats. This tide began to reverse in the Carolingian period. The works of astronomy and natural science which Bede had pillaged on behalf of *computus* were now copied and studied for their own sake. In consequence, Bede himself was mined for astronomical information that could be rearranged in more "classical" formats.

While of limited use to editors, extracts reveal much about changes in literary culture: **BYRHTFERTH**, to take the obvious example, revered Bede, yet his **Enchiridion** is the work of a different intellectual world, exemplified by his use of extracts from Bede's works.

Shifting next to a discussion of references allows us to pick up the story of the transmission of Bede's writings to the Continent. Referring to the correspondence of Boniface and **LULL**, Wilhelm Levison (1946 p 140) describes Bede's growing reputation:

> When Boniface left England, Bede was unknown to him, nor had he seen his *Ecclesiastical History* when, in 735, he inquired about the answers of Pope Gregory and about the date of the arrival of his emissaries, both to be found in this work. But the fame of Bede reached him in his later years; in the forties he requested of **ECGBERHT** of York and Abbot **HWÆTBERHT** of Wearmouth and Jarrow to provide him with some treatises of Bede, that new light shining in the province of York. Ecgberht complied with these wishes, and Boniface asked him later for other writings of Bede, particularly for those which were useful to a preacher. Lullus expressed similar wishes about writing of Aldhelm; but he also sent presents to the tomb of Bede, in return for which Abbot **CUTHBERT**, Hwætberht's successor, sent him Bede's two books on St. Cuthbert; he would have

> provided more, had not the cold winter hampered the hand of the scribe. Meanwhile Lullus acquired the *Ecclesiastical History*, which contains at the end a short autobiography of Bede with a list of his writings; Lullus quoted this list, when he wanted to have other works of Bede, and at least one more of these writings reached Mainz.

Together, these references concern all of Bede's works, and so to avoid repetition a general discussion of them follows here.

Boniface's first reference to Bede occurs in a letter, **Epistola** 75 to Ecgberht, archbishop of York, the person to whom Bede had written some twelve years earlier (Boniface's letter is dated 746-47), urging the reform of the Northumbrian church. Boniface here followed up on an earlier letter written jointly with other missionary bishops admonishing Æthelbald, king of the Mercians, to reform his ways. Having opened the letter thanking Ecgberht for gifts and books, Boniface turned near its end to request works by Bede (ed. *MGH* ES 1.158; trans. *EHD* 824):

> Pręterea obsecro, ut mihi de opusculis Bedan lectoris aliquos tractatus conscribere et dirigere digneris, quem nuper, ut audivimus, divina gratia spiritali intellectu ditavit et in vestra provincia fulgere concessit, et ut candela, quam vobis Dominus largitus est, nos quoque fruamur.
>
> (Moreover, I beseech you to copy and send to me some treatises from the work of the teacher, Bede, whom lately, as we have heard, the divine grace endowed with spiritual understanding and allowed to shine in your province, so that we also may have benefit from that candle which the Lord has bestowed on you.)

If the past tenses that he used in the following paragraph indicate that, when composing these remarks, he had reason to believe that Gregory's letters were available in England, it may point more broadly to the reason Bede had been mentioned to him (ed. 1.158; trans. p 824):

> Interea ad indicium caritatis fraternitati tuae direxi exemplaria epistolarum sancti Gregorii, quas de scrinio Romanę ęcclesiae excepi; quę non rebar ad Brittaniam venisse; et plura iterum, si mandaveris, remittam, quia multas inde excepi ....
>
> (Meanwhile I have sent to you, my brother, as a token of love, copies of the letters of St Gregory which I have obtained from the archives of the

> Roman Church, and which I did not think had reached Britain; and I shall send more, if you require them, for I obtained many from there.)

In any case, in another letter, **Epistola** 76, to Hwætberht, dated to 746-47, Boniface emphasised Bede's role as an interpreter of the Bible (ed. *MGH* ES 1.159; trans. *EHD* p 825):

> Interea rogamus, ut aliqua de opusculis sagacissimi investigatoris scripturarum Bedan monachi, quem nuper in domo Dei apud vos vice candellę ęcclesiastice scientia scripturarum fulsisse audivimus, conscripta nobis transmittere dignemini.
>
> (Meanwhile we ask that you will deign to have copied and sent to us certain of the works of that most skilful investigator of Scriptures, the monk Bede, who, we have heard, has lately shone in the house of God among you with knowledge of the Scriptures like a candle of the Church.)

In a third letter, **Epistola** 91, which is dated between 747 and 754, Boniface asked Ecgberht directly for Bede's writings on the Bible that could be used in preaching, specifying both his *Homilies* and **Commentarius in Prouerbia** (ed. *MGH* ES 1.207; trans. Kylie 1911 p 136):

> Modo enim inhianter desiderantes flagitamus, ut nobis ad gaudium meroris nostri eo modo, quo et ante iam fecistis, aliquam particulam vel scintillam de candella ęcclesiae, quam inluxit spiritus sanctus in regionibus provinciae vestrae, nobis destinare curetis: id est ut de tractatibus, quos spiritalis presbiter et investigator sanctarum scripturarum Beda reserando conposuit, partem qualemcunque transmittere dignemini; maxime autem, si fore possit, quod nobis predicantibus habile et manuale et utillimum esse videtur, super lectionarium anniversarium et proverbia Salomonis. Quia commentarios super illa eum condidisse audivimus.
>
> (We ask with earnest desire, that to bring joy into our sorrow as you have done before, you should take care to send us a tiny gleam from that candle of the Church, which the Holy Spirit lit within the limits of your province; that is, that you should deign to send across some part of the commentaries of Bede, that saintly priest and investigator of the holy scriptures, composed; especially, if it be possible, his *Homilies*, and his *Proverbs of Solomon*, for they will be very convenient and useful to us in our preaching. We have heard that he wrote commentaries on these subjects.)

We do not know which of Bede's writings, if indeed any, reached Boniface: that one of the first may have been the *Historia ecclesiastica* is made more likely, as Levison notes and we will see in a moment, by Lull having quoted from it. In addition to containing practical information about the organisation of a new ecclesiastical structure among a Germanic people that Boniface had sought directly from Gregory's letters to **AUGUSTINE**, archbishop of Canterbury, it would have provided him with an inspiring account of the spread of the Church called to mind by his metaphor of the candle (see Mt 5:15), which he repeated in more elaborate ways in the later letters. Indeed, his increasing respect for Bede can be heard in the change from his first reference to him as a "lector" to the last: "spiritalis presbiter et investigator sanctarum scripturarum."

The most evocative reference to Bede's writings in this early correspondence appears in a letter, **Epistola** 116, of Cuthbert, abbot of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow (and so not the author of the *Epistola de obitu Bedae*), to Lull in 764. Since it concerns the metrical *Vita Cuthberti*, it will be discussed more fully in that entry; we quote it here because it shows Lull asking for and receiving specific works (ed. *MGH* ES 1.251; trans. *EHD* p 832):

> Nunc vero, quia rogasti aliquid de opusculis beati patris, cum meis pueris iuxta vires, quod potui, tuae dilectioni preparavi: libellos de viro Dei Cudbercto metro et prosa conpositos tuae voluntati direxi. Et si plus potuissem, libenter voluissem. Quia presentia preteriti hiemis multum horribiliter insulam nostrae gentis in frigore et gelu et ventorum et imbrium procellis diu lateque depressit, ideoque scriptoris manus, ne in plurimorum librorum numerum preveniret, retardaretur.
>
> (Now truly, since you have asked for some of the works of the blessed father, for your love I have prepared what I could, with my pupils, according to our capacity. I have sent in accordance with your wishes the books about the man of God, Cuthbert, composed in verse and prose. And if I could have done more, I would gladly have done so. For the conditions of the past winter oppressed the island of our race very horribly with cold and ice and long and widespread storms of wind and rain, so that the hand of the scribe was hindered from producing a great number of books.)

Lull's own first surviving references to Bede's writings were noted by Levison since they show that he made his request for specific works after having consulted the list near the end of the *Historia ecclesiastica*. In **Epistola** 125,

dated to 767-78, he wrote to **ÆTHELBERHT,** archbishop of York (ed. *MGH* ES 1.263; trans. *EHD* pp 834-35):

> Obsecro, ut quemlibet horum librorum adquiras et nobis mittere dignеris, quos beatę memoriae Beda presbiter exposuit, ad consolationem peregrinationis nostrae; id est: in primam partem Samuelis usque ad mortem Saulis libros quattuor; sive in Esdram et Nehemiam libros tres, vel in evangelium Marci libros quattuor. Gravia forte postulo, sed nihil grave verae caritati iniungo.
>
> (I beseech that you acquire and deign to send us any of those books which Bede the priest, of blessed memory, composed, for our consolation in our exile; namely four books on the first part of Samuel as far as the death of Saul, and three books on Ezra and Nehemiah, and four books on the gospel of St Mark. Perhaps I make heavy demands; but I enjoin nothing heavy to true love.)

Epistola 126, to Cuthbert, abbot of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow, is dated to the same period (764-86), but is probably later if one can assume that Lull would have requested the New Testament commentary before seeking more works on the Old Testament and a collection of verse (ed. *MGH* ES 1.264):

> Petimus etiam, ut ad consolationem non solum peregrinationis, sed etiam infirmitatis nostrae libros istos a beate memoriae Beda expositos mittere digneris: de edificatione templi, vel in Cantica canticorum, sive epigrammatum heroico metro sive elegiaco conpositorum; si fieri postest, omnes, sin autem, de edificatione templi libros tres. Fortassis difficilis petitio, sed nihil arbitror esse difficile vere caritati.
>
> (As consolation not only for our exile but also for our infirmity, we ask that you deign to send us books written by Bede of blessed memory: on the building of the Temple, or on the Canticle of Canticles, or (the book) of epigrams in heroic and elegiac metre. If you are able, send all, if not, the three books on the building of the Temple. Perhaps a difficult request, but I consider nothing difficult to true love.)

Since Lull's identification of these works closely matches Bede's list in book 5 chapter 24, they are included as citations in the entry on the *Historia ecclesiastica* as well as references in the others. **Epistola** 127 (ed. *MGH* ES 1.264-65) from 764-86, confirms that Cuthbert sent Lull Bede's **De templo,**

but not apparently the **Commentarius in Cantica canticorum** or the lost **Liber epigrammatum**; he referred to the author as "clarissimus ecclesiae Dei magister Baeda." Finally, in this context, **Epistola** 124 (ed. *MGH* ES 1.261-62), dated to 767-78, deserves mention since in it Æthelberht, responding to a lost letter from Lull, explained that the work on the earth and tides was unknown to him, and that the books on cosmography that he did have were "very difficult in their pictures and writing" ("picturis et litteris permolesta"). The implication may well be that both libraries already had *De natura rerum* and *De temporum ratione*.

Taken together, the correspondence of Boniface and Lull paints a vivid picture of the spread of Bede's works to the Continent. It also shows the rapid growth of his reputation. Writing in the first volume of the *Cambridge History of the Book*, Rosamond McKitterick (2011 p 335) summarises much of this evidence and then concludes:

> By the ninth century, Bede had been accorded a place by Carolingian library compilers and cataloguers alongside Jerome, Augustine and Ambrose, not to mention the chronologically closer Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville and Cassiodorus. For Bede to be regarded in this manner within a century of his death argues for a very widespread familiarity with his work, but it also raises the question of why he was so elevated. Bede no doubt assisted his own reputation by providing a list of his works. Yet it is one of the ironies of the manuscript distribution that it suggests that Bede's fame, especially for his exegesis and his school texts, was far greater on the Continent than in England in the first two centuries after his death.

As a way of calling attention to this information in the following entries but not burdening them with unnecessary repetition, we include Boniface's general reference to Bede in *Epistola* 75 in all those on major works and his reference to Bede's writings on the Bible in *Epistola* 76 in all of his *Commentaries* and in the first entry on his *Homilies*. The others are included only in the specific works to which they refer.

Turning briefly to booklists, Alcuin's reference to Bede in the section of his **Versus de sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae** (ed. and trans. Godman 1982) that describes the books he was given by Ælberht, archbishop of York, presents a similar problem of representing significant evidence in all of the relevant entries while avoiding unnecessary repetition. Here "Beda magister" (line 1547) and Aldhelm appear among classical authors including **ARISTOTLE** and Vergil, the Latin fathers, the Christian-Latin poets, and the

writers of grammatical texts. Peter Godman writes that this section "is not a catalogue of Ælberht's library but an outline, with explicit omissions (vv. 1558-62), of the major authors whom Alcuin claims to have been available at York" (p 122 note on lines 1536 ff.). Lapidge prints it as the first item in "Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England" (ML), analysing its contents and discussing Alcuin's subsequent references to his books. More revealing of Alcuin's knowledge of Bede's writings is the passage earlier in this work (lines 1306-12) in which he paraphrased Bede's own list of works in *Historia ecclesiastica* V.xxiv:

> This famous scholar wrote many works,
> unravelling the mysterious volumes of Holy Scripture,
> and composed a handbook on the art of metre.
> He also wrote with marvellous clarity a book on time,
> containing the courses, places, times, and laws of the stars.
> He was the author in lucid prose of books on history,
> and the composer of many poems in metrical style.

This passage is discussed in further detail in the entry on the *Historia ecclesiastica* and its likely references to particular works are included in the other relevant entries. The general reference to the booklist is also included in all the major entries, but discussed only here.

Finally, the at times confusing issue, and so worthy of some attention here, of distinguishing an Anglo-Saxon version from a series of quotations/citations also provides an opening to remind users that the daunting lists that can appear in the latter category are not simply facts to be counted but rather the materials from which new interpretations of the literary culture of the period can be made. The summaries that follow the headnotes draw attention to the best, in our fallible judgement, of what has been written on the correspondences; if not simply oversights, those that are not discussed suggest opportunities for new study. To begin with the more technical issue, there are two major Anglo-Saxon versions of works by Bede: the **OLD ENGLISH HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA**, which will be covered in a separate entry, and the poem *Judgment Day II*, a translation of *De die iudicii*. In the case of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, we have considered some other extended borrowings that draw on particular sections of this work to be "versions" rather than a series of quotations. In these cases, later authors, in our opinion, retold Bede's narratives, changing them to suit their particular needs but probably assuming that their audiences would recognise them as such. The "Letter of Protest from the Bishops of Britain

to the Pope," most likely written by Wulfstan, is a good example of how quotations from this work could be used in this way. Drawing on both Bede and Alcuin to support the argument that newly appointed archbishops were not required in the early days of the English Church to fetch their pallium in Rome, the letter opens by identifying its main source: "sicut legimus in historiis Anglorum, scribente Beda, historiographo et laudabili doctore nostro" (ed. Whitelock, Brett, and Brook 1981 p 445; "as we read in the *History of the English*, written by Bede, the historian and our praiseworthy teacher"). Bede's authority, as much as his text, will support the claim. In *An Account of King Edgar's Establishment of Monasteries* (ed. Whitelock, Brett, and Brook 1981 pp 143-54), although Bede is not named, Æthelwold probably began with Bede's description of the conversion of the English (*Historia ecclesiastica* I.xxiii-xxvi and II.i) because it would lend weight to the significance of Edgar's actions (for further analysis, see the entry). The story of the conversion of the English is Bede's, and England's subsequent literary history is richer for it.

The following pages contain many examples of quotations from Bede that play a part in significant literary relationships. Peter Godman's (1982) edition of the *Versus de sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae* establishes its many debts to Bede: to note just one example, Alcuin retold the life of Cuthbert by quoting selected chapter headings of Bede's prose and metrical *Vitae Cuthberti* (lines 688-740). Similarly, a detailed assessment of the sources for **Homily** 10 on Cuthbert in Ælfric's second series of **Catholic Homilies** (B1.2.11; ed. Godden 1979 pp 81-91) leads Malcolm Godden (2000 p 413) to conclude that this work "inspired" Ælfric "to experiment with poetic techniques in his own writing." One additional, seemingly minor example indicates just how deeply rooted Bede must have been in the minds of many literate Anglo-Saxons. Patrizia Lendinara (2001 p 311) has drawn attention to the phrase "coetibus angelicis" in *De die iudicii* (line 58), identifying its use in several of Alcuin's works including his *Epistola* 294 (ed. *MGH* ECA 2.452). In this letter, written to one of his pupils about whom Alcuin had heard rumours of sinful behaviour, it occurs in the final paragraph, which warns of the terror of the coming Judgement. Had the two read *De die iudicii* when the recipient had been a student, the phrase itself might have been enough to recall its context (ed. *CCSL* 122.441; trans. Allen and Calder 1976 p 210):

Tum superum subito ueniet commota potestas,
Coetibus angelicis regem stipata supernum.
Ille sedens solio fulget sublimis in alto;
Ante illum rapimur, collectis undique turmis,

> Iudicium ut capiat gestorum quisque suorum.
> Sis memor illius, qui tum pauor ante tribunal
> Percutiet stupidis cunctorum corda querelis.
>
> (Having surrounded the heavenly King *with its angelic hosts*, the wakened might of heaven will suddenly arrive; sublime, He sits on His high throne, ablaze with light. When the crowds have been assembled from all regions, we are brought before Him so each may be judged according to his deeds. Remember the fear which will strike the hearts of everyone brought to the tribunal, and which will make them plead in vain.)

Born within a year or so of the foundation of Monkwearmouth, Bede and the monastery, his immediate literary context, flourished together. Indeed, if he was the boy who alone in a time of plague at the recently founded Jarrow was able help his abbot, Ceolfrith, sing the Psalms during services (see the anonymous *Vita Ceolfridi*, ed. and trans. Grocock and Wood 2014 pp 92-95, and their notes), his community started small indeed. In contrast, 600 brothers gathered at the Wear to bid farewell to Ceolfrith when he departed in 716 for Rome (see the *Historia abbatum*, ed. Grocock and Wood 2014 pp 62-65, and their notes). During his life, his circle grew dramatically, and so there must have been others who shared his experience of having been immersed from an early age in a literate culture that felt both deeply rooted in time and freshly transplanted in a new place. Yet Bede above all others responded with a body of work that continued to shape those who lived after.

As is fitting given Bede's own meticulous scholarship, scholarship on Bede is extensive and of high quality, which is not to say all has been done. His first major biography, for example, is now being written by Sarah Foot. Two earlier works by one of us, *Bede the Venerable* (Brown 1987) and *A Companion to Bede* (Brown 2009), provide more information on many of the subjects discussed here. They may be supplemented with the collections edited by Stépjhane Lebecq, Michael Perrin, and Olivier Szerwiniack, *Bède le Vénérable entre tradition et posterité / The Venerable Bede, Tradition and Posterity* (2002), and by Scott DeGregorio, *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of the Venerable Bede* (2006) and *The Cambridge Companion to Bede* (2010). All these works contain useful bibliographies. Michael Lapidge has included an extensive bibliography covering all aspects of Bede's life and writings in the first volume of his edition of the *Historia ecclesiastica*, first published in 2008, but referred to throughout this volume in its third edition, published with the second volume, in 2010. Lapidge's edition includes a

translation in Italian by Paolo Chiesa, and indeed the enthusiasm of scholars to make Bede's work available to students in modern languages is a laudable feature of this lively community. Here the Cistercian Studies Series and Liverpool University Press's Translated Texts for Historians deserve special mention; see DeGregorio (2010a pp 247-48) for a list of translations into English.

The primary catalogue of Bede's writings is the list he furnished in *Historia ecclesiastica* V.xxiv (ed. Lapidge 2010 2.480-84), which Michael M. Gorman (1995 Appendix and 2001) has supplemented with valuable notes. Earlier editions of his works, including those by Johann Herwagen the Younger (1563), J.A. Giles (1843-44), and J.-P. Migne (*PL* 90-95), contain a large number of texts not by Bede. The editions published in the *Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina* (*CCSL*), while at times not without flaws, have advanced the study of Bede's works. They are, of course, the basis of the database, the Library of Latin Texts (also known as CETEDOC) made available by Brepols. Concerning the list in the *Clauis Patrum Latinorum* (*CPL*) it should be noted that 1346a, 1352, 1361, 1368, 1369, 2323, 2323a, and 2323b are inauthentic and 1364 is genuine in part (*quaestiones* 1-8). The definitive list of Bede's work is now by Lapidge (2010 1.xliv-xlvii); Richard Sharpe's annotations in *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540* (*HLW* pp 70-74) remain valuable. To Lapidge's list we have added only two minor works, the table **Pagina regularum**, which he wrote to help students determine the position of the moon in the zodiac (see **Educational Works**), and the Old English poem known as **Bede's death Song** (see **Poetry: Epigrams**), which he recited repeatedly at the time of his death. Volumes for *SASLC* by Sharon Rowley and M. Breann Leake on the *Old English Historia ecclesiastica* and by Brandon Hawk on **PSEUDO-BEDE** are in preparation. *The Bedan Legacy*, by Joshua Westgard and George H. Brown, will survey Bede's influence both in England and on the Continent.

Acknowledgements

We have worked together to try to reach the standards set by two masters. The more important, of course, is Bede, whose writings continue to offer new insights even after years of study. The second is *SASLC* itself, created by Paul E. Szarmach and Thomas D. Hill from the perception of James E. Cross that a collaborative project to revise J.A.D. Ogilvy's *Books Known to the English: 597-1066* would bring together scholars committed to understanding

how authors use sources. Neither master might seem too hard, and yet Bede's meticulous attention to detail and *SASLC*'s wealth of material have made us constantly aware that all we offer here is an attempt to represent the work of many scholars. When Bede sent Hwætberht the masterpiece, *De temporum ratione*, he asked that "should you find anything reprehensible in it, you make it known to me immediately so that I can correct it" (trans. Wallis 1999 p 4). With certainty that there is more to amend here, in repeating his request we change only the number of his pronouns. Without the help of Thomas N. Hall and Charles D. Wright there would be much more to do.

We have then to acknowledge only a remaining area of disagreement (the dedications are simply separate): the interpretation of the genesis of Bede's histories, which reflects Biggs's views more strongly than Brown's. We agree that Bede wrote with the certainty that there was, finally, a single truth. While as source-scholars we embrace a similar task of establishing precise relationships, as members of the lively intellectual community that studies Bede and Anglo-Saxon literary history, we recognise that differing interpretations can be a source of new inspiration.