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ABSTRACT

JOSHUA ALLAN WESTGARD: Dissemination and Reception of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* in Germany, ca. 731-1500: The Manuscript Evidence
(Under the direction of Richard W. Pfaff)

Today, the Venerable Bede’s (672/3-735) *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* (*HE*) is widely considered one of the great works of early medieval historical writing. In the Middle Ages, it was widely known and also greatly admired, but for very different reasons. This dissertation examines two aspects of the *HE*’s popularity in the medieval period: First, it is a study of the transmission of the work in medieval Germany, a region where the text enjoyed great success. Second, it is an analysis of the manuscript evidence for the text’s reception in the German-speaking world. After a brief introduction in Chapter One, Chapter Two surveys the history of the study of the manuscript tradition of the *HE*, and groups the manuscripts of the German “textual province” on the basis of test collations. The test collations are given in full in Chapter Three. In Chapters Four and Five, the focus shifts to the reception of the text, first (in Chapter Four) with an analysis of the text’s manuscript context (including mise-en-page, marginalia, and associated works), as a way of getting at its readership. In Chapter Five, the focus is on the text’s library context, that is, it is an examination of the libraries known to have held copies of the *HE*, and the ways the text seems to have fit into those collections, based primarily on the evidence of medieval library catalogues. Finally, Chapter Six provides a brief concluding summary that emphasizes how the interests of the medieval readers of the *HE* differed from those of its modern readers, and particularly how the medieval German audience of the work was most interested in the “universal” Christian elements in Bede’s text, especially the lives of popular saints, their miracles, and otherworld visions. The Appendices include a manuscripts finding-list, and a transcription of two hitherto unrecognized copies of the so-called *Continuatio Bedae* from Prague and Vienna.
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archiv</td>
<td><em>Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde zur Beförderung einer Gesamtausgabe der Quellenschriften deutscher Geschichten des Mittelalters</em>, 12 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 1819-22 and Hannover, 1872-74).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASE</td>
<td><em>Anglo-Saxon England</em>, 1- (Cambridge, 1971- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>London, British Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque nationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCM</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum, continuatio mediaevalis, vols. 1- (Turnhout: Brepols, 1966- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSL</td>
<td>Corpus Christianorum, series latina, vols. 1- (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td><em>Caedmon’s Hymn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clm</td>
<td><em>Codices latini monacensis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbr.</td>
<td>Description and Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, vols. 1- (Vienna, Leipzig, and Prague, 1866- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNB</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of National Biography</em>, 63 vols. (London: Smith, Elder, &amp; Co., 1885-1901) [see also ODNB below]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR</td>
<td>Bede, <em>De natura rerum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Bede, <em>De temporibus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTR</td>
<td>Bede, <em>De temporum ratione</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEMF</td>
<td>Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, vols. 1- (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1951- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHR</td>
<td><em>English Historical Review</em>, vol 1- (1886- )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAA</td>
<td>Anonymous, <em>Historia abbatum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Bede, <em>Historia abbatum</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* [unless otherwise indicated, cited in the Colgrave-Mynors edition]

Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports (1870-)


K. W. Humphreys and Alan S. C. Ross, “Further Manuscripts of Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica,' of the 'Epistola Cuthberti de Obitu Bedae,' and further Anglo-Saxon Texts of 'Cædmon’s Hymn’ and ‘Bede’s Death Song,’” *Notes and Queries* 22 (1975): 50-55


Monumenta Germaniae historica (Berlin, Hannover, and Leipzig, 1826- ) [cited by series and volume]


National Library of Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OMT</td>
<td>Oxford Medieval Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÖNB</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td><em>Patrologiae cursus completus... series Latina</em>, 217 vols. (Paris 1844-55); index, 4 vols. (Paris, 1864)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td><em>Regula Benedicti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolls Series</td>
<td><em>Rerum Britannicarum mediæ ævi scriptores, or Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages</em>, 250 vols. in 253 (London: Longman, 1858-1911)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following system of sigla has been created with future studies of the transmission of the HE in mind. A siglum has been assigned to each known copy of the HE, whether or not it is referred to directly in the present study. In choosing the abbreviations, the basic principle has been to use the first three letters of the city where the manuscript is located, or the first two or three letters followed by a number, in cases where more than one manuscript is found in a single collection. It was necessary to diverge from this principle in cases where the three letters could refer to more than one city (e.g., Berlin/Bern and Leiden/Leipzig), and in cases where multiple relevant collections are found in a single city (Oxford is the most extreme example). In cases of the latter, the first letter refers to the city, and the second and third to the collection. These are followed by a number if there is more than one manuscript in a single collection.

Finally, two points of clarification are necessary: First, the sigla are not given here in perfect alphabetical order, so that instead all the manuscripts of a single collection might be listed consecutively. For example, the Leiden MS (Ldn) is listed before the manuscripts in the British Library, rather than in its proper alphabetical location between the MSS of the Cotton (LC) and Egerton (LE) collections. Strict alphabetical order of sigla seemed less important than maintaining the integrity of individual library collections, and in any case, the resulting slight variance in order seemed unlikely to cause much confusion. Second, the sigla used by Plummer and Mynors in their respective editions have, for convenience of cross-reference, been given in brackets in the middle column. To maximize the compatability of my system of sigla with Plummer's, I have assigned equivalent numbers wherever possible (thus Plummer's A₁₋₅ are my LA₁₋₅, even though this does not follow the numerical order of their shelfmarks. Similarly, his Ca₁₋₃ are my CT₁₋₃, though the correspondence breaks down with his Ca₄₋₇, which are my CSS₁₋₂, CEC, and CSJ₁). Also in the middle column, I have marked those manuscripts that are fragments of a few leaves or less (frag.), and those that are translations (trans.) or excerpts (exc.) from the

1 A siglum has also been assigned to the first printed edition of the HE, the 1475 Strasbourg edition of Heinrich Eggestein (= Egg).
text. One might question whether translations and abbreviations ought to be assigned sigla at all, but since some of these manuscripts have already entered the scholarly discourse by virtue of their inclusion in past discussions of the tradition, it seemed useful to assign them sigla here, even though they are not proper witnesses of our text. For the same reason, certain well-attested MSS that have since been destroyed are listed here, and these are marked with an obelus (†).

<p>| Ab1 | Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 21245 |
| Ab2 | Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth 381 |
| Ad1 | Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 326 |
| Ad2 | Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 552 |
| Asc | Aschaffenburg, Hofbibliothek 39 |
| Aug | Augsburg, Bischöfliche Ordäriatsbibliothek 43 |
| Bam | Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Hist. 3 |
| Blg | Boulogne-sur-mer, Bibliothèque municipale 103 |
| Blo1 | Bloomington, Lilly Library 47 |
| Blo2 | Bloomington, Lilly Library, Ricketts 177 |
| Bn1 | Bern, Burgerbibliothek 49 |
| Bn2 | Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363 |
| Br1 | Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 2295 (VDG 1353) |
| Br2 | Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 8245-57 (VDG 3116) |
| BS1 | Berlin, Staatsbibl. Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Phillipps 1873 |
| BS2 | Berlin, Staatsbibl. Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hamilton 70 |
| BS3 | Berlin, Staatsbibl. Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Lat. fol. 378 |
| CC1 | Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 264 |
| CC2 | Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 270, flyleaf |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>Cambridge, Emmanuel College, I. 1. 3 (James 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF1</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF2</td>
<td>Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Bradfer-Lawrence MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Cambridge, Pembroke College 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSJ1</td>
<td>Cambridge, St. John's College, B. 5 (James 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSJ2</td>
<td>Cambridge, St. John's College, S. 6 (James 254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS1</td>
<td>Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Δ. 2. 8 (James 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSS2</td>
<td>Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Δ. 5. 17 (James 102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT1</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 27 (James 717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT2</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22 (James 722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT3</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 5 (James 743)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT4</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 3 (James 741)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Cambridge University Library, Kk. 5. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dev</td>
<td>Deventer, Athenaeumbibliotheek, I. 94 (1781)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dij</td>
<td>Dijon, Bibliothèque publique 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dou</td>
<td>Douai, Bibliothèque publique 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr1†</td>
<td>Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, J 44 (destroyed, 1945)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr2</td>
<td>Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, J 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dub</td>
<td>Dublin, Trinity College, E. 2. 23 (492)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dur</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Library, B. ii. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNC</td>
<td>Durham, North Carolina, Duke University Library, lat. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edi</td>
<td>Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates 18. 5. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg</td>
<td>Heinrich Eggestein’s <em>editio princeps</em> (Strasbourg, ca. 1475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL1</td>
<td>Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana, Ashburnham 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Library/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN1</td>
<td>Florence, Bibl. Nazionale Centrale, Conv. Soppr. A.1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN2</td>
<td>Florence, Bibl. Nazionale Centrale, 2671 C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gla</td>
<td>Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian T. 4. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got</td>
<td>Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, memb. I 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hei</td>
<td>Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her</td>
<td>Hereford Cathedral Library, P. v. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka1</td>
<td>Kassel, Landesbibliothek, 4° MS theol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka2</td>
<td>Kassel, Landesbibliothek, 4° MS theol. 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ldn</td>
<td>Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus lat. Q. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA1</td>
<td>London, College of Arms, Arundel 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA2</td>
<td>London, College of Arms, M 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA1</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 18150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA2</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 14250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA3</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 10949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA4</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 33371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA5</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 25014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA6</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 38130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA7</td>
<td>London, British Library, Add. 38817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAr</td>
<td>London, British Library, Arundel 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB1</td>
<td>London, British Library, Burney 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB2</td>
<td>London, British Library, Burney 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCV</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCT1</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCT2</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>London, British Library, Egerton MS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xvii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH1</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 4978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH2</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 4124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH3</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 3680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR1</td>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 13 B. xviii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR2</td>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 13 C. v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR3</td>
<td>London, British Library, Royal 13 C. vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>London, British Library, Stowe 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lpz</td>
<td>Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek, I 58a (CLXV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>Madrid, Real Biblioteca MS [olim 2 C 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma1</td>
<td>Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma2</td>
<td>Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. frag. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Manchester, John Rylands Library, lat. 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil</td>
<td>Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C 72 inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC1</td>
<td>Monte Cassino, Archivio della badia 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC2</td>
<td>Monte Cassino, Archivio della badia 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mtp</td>
<td>Montpellier, École de Médecine 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü1</td>
<td>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü2</td>
<td>Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nam</td>
<td>Namur, Musée des arts anciens, Fonds de la ville 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nap</td>
<td>Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, VIII C 10 (no. 49?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>New Haven, Yale University Library, MS 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nür</td>
<td>Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. III 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, M 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Oxford, All Souls College 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>Oxford, Balliol College 176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBa [=O_{10}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 39 (SC 6462)
OBo1 [=O_{2}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 163 (SC 2016)
OBo2 [=O_{9}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 302 (SC 2086)
OBo3 [=O_{9}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 712 (SC 2619)
ODi1 [=O_{11}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101 (SC 1702)
ODi2 [=O_{9}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (SC 1812)
ODO [=O_{4}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 368 (SC 21943)
OMu1 Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Museo 93 (SC 3632)
OMu2 [=O_{2}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Museo 115 (SC 3537)
OFx [=O_{3}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax 12 (SC 3892)
OHa [=O_{/0}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43 (SC 4106)
OHO Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7
OLA1 [=O_{1}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 243 (SC 1301)
OLA2 (trans.) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 610 (SC 1132)
OR1 [=O_{13}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B 189 (SC 11550)
OR2 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C 162 (SC 12026)
OTA [=O_{12}] Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 348 (SC 10, 175)
OCh Oxford, Christ Church 99
OCO [=O_{16}] Oxford, Corpus Christi College 279
OLC [=O_{14}] Oxford, Lincoln College, lat. 31
OMA [=O_{7}] Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 105
OME [=O_{15}] Oxford, Merton College 95 (K. 3. 6)
ONC [=O_{18}] Oxford, New College 308
OPC Oxford, Pembroke College 3
OSJ [=O_{20}] Oxford, St. John's College 99
P1  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5226
P2  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5227
P3  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5227A
P4  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5228
P5  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5229
P6  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5230
P7  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5230A
P8  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5231
P9  Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5232
P10 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5233
P11 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5234
P12 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5235
P13 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5236
P14 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5237
P15 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 10184
P16 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 12942
P17 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 12943
P18 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 16078
PA1 Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 982
PA2 Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 989
PA3 Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal 1154
Pra Prague, Strahovská knihovna, DF III 1
Pri Princeton University Library, Kane MS
Rei Rein, Stiftsbibliothek 59
Rms Reims, Bibliothèque publique 1429 (olim 873)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Rome, Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Vittorio Emanuele 1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rou1</td>
<td>Rouen, Bibliothèque publique 1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rou2</td>
<td>Rouen, Bibliothèque publique 1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch</td>
<td>Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek, min. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>St. Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, xi. 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG2</td>
<td>St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM1</td>
<td>San Marino, Huntingdon Library, HM 27486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM2</td>
<td>San Marino, Huntingdon Library, HM 35300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, Public Library, Lat. Q. v. I. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tou1</td>
<td>Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville 134 (destroyed, 1940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1</td>
<td>Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1195/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr2</td>
<td>Trier, Stadtbibliothek 1993/647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utr</td>
<td>Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliothek 735 (4. F. 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val</td>
<td>Valencia Cathedral Library 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ven</td>
<td>Vendôme, Bibliothèque municipale 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL1</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Ottoboni lat. 877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL2</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL3</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL4</td>
<td>Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi1</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi2</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi3</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi4</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 3157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi5</td>
<td>Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 13707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win</td>
<td>=W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wol</td>
<td>=U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wür</td>
<td>=E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zür</td>
<td>(exc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In A.D. 731, as the Venerable Bede sat in his cell at Jarrow and set about composing the brief *curriculum vitae* that concludes the fifth and final book of his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, he may well have had the feeling that he was completing the last of his major works.¹ Of course, we know from the description of his death by the monk Cuthbert that he did in fact continue to write up until his final moments.² Indeed, it seems as though he felt compelled to continue his scholarly activities, producing in his last years a corrected version of Isidore’s *De natura rerum* for his students, and the hortatory letter to Egbert of York (r. 732-66), not to mention his English translation of the Gospel of John, which he is said to have worked on practically to the moment of his death.³ But in spite of what we know about these continued scholarly activities, as one reads his account of his life and works at the end of the *HE*, it is difficult to escape the feeling that these are the words of a man who was taking stock of his life’s work, and bringing his literary career to a close.


² Cuthbert’s letter is edited and translated in Colgrave-Mynors, 579-87; Plummer also gives a complete translation of the letter in vol. I, lxxii-lxxviii.

³ Neither the abridged version of Isidore’s *DNR* nor Bede’s translation of John’s Gospel has survived; both are known from Cuthbert’s letter. The Latin text of the *Epistola ad Ecgbertum* is printed by Plummer, I, 405-23, with commentary in II, 378-88; a translation can be found in McClure and Collins, *Ecclesiastical History*, 343-57. This letter is dated “Nonas Nouembris, indictione tertia” (p. 423, ll. 9-10), by which Bede could only mean November 5, 734, a little over six months before his death.
From our perspective nearly thirteen centuries on, however, we recognize that Bede’s literary star was only just beginning to rise when he completed the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Some of his works were already in circulation during his lifetime, but as far as we know, this was for the most part locally, to nearby ecclesiastical centers such as Hexham, York, and Lindisfarne, where Bede had correspondents to whom he dedicated certain works.⁴ Perhaps some of his works traveled more widely already in the early days, for example to London, or even as far as Rome.⁵ But this was nothing compared to the wide dissemination and fame they would achieve in subsequent generations. In the centuries following Bede’s death, his works would become widely known both in England and on the Continent, and would become standard components of book collections throughout Europe. His scientific and didactic works would become standard textbooks in the Carolingian schools, and the fame and influence of his many Biblical commentaries would lead to his being considered a theological authority on a par with the Fathers of the Church.⁶ In subsequent centuries, he was variously referred to as the “most skillful investigator of the scriptures,” or a “new sun” that had arisen in the West.⁷ By at least the

---

⁴ A lucid account of the evidence for this early circulation is in Dorothy Whitelock’s “After Bede” (Jarrow Lecture, 1960), 4-6; more recently, David Rollason has treated the reception of Bede’s works among the Anglo-Saxon missionaries in “Bede in Germany” (Jarrow Lecture, 2001); and Rosamond McKitterick has provided a thorough examination of the manuscript evidence for Bede’s works in the East Frankish territories during the Carolingian period: “Kulturelle Verbindungen zwischen England und den fränkischen Reichen in der Zeit der Karolinger: Kontexte und Implikationen” in *Deutschland und der Westen Europas im Mittelalter*, ed. Joachim Ehlers (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke Verlag, 2002), 121-48.

⁵ Bede composed his metrical *Life of Cuthbert* as a *consolatio* for a certain priest named John who was traveling to Rome, and thus this work may have been carried there by him. See Whitelock, “After Bede,” 5. Bede’s early reputation was not exclusively positive as is clear from his letter to Plegwin, in which he defends himself against a charge of heresy. This letter is translated by Faith Wallis in *Bede: The Reckoning of Time* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999), 405-15; the original Latin is found in *Epistolae ad Plegvinam, Helmvvaldum, et Vvitchedum*, ed. C. W. Jones, CCSL 123C, 615-26.


⁷ The former quotation is from a letter of Boniface, in *English Historical Documents*, vol. 1, no. 180, p. 825 (as quoted by Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, p. 98), while the latter is Notker Babulus, quoted in Michael
tenth century he was not only described as “the Venerable,” but was also venerated as a saint. He was renowned as a historian; William of Malmesbury, for example, considered him a “uir maxime doctus et minime superbus,” who had done a great service to the English by recording their history. This assessment foreshadows the admiration for Bede characteristic of more recent times. Today, the popular understanding of Bede’s legacy is focused on him as a historian, and in particular one whose approach to source materials is more critical, and who had a much greater respect for the integrity of his sources, than is usually reflected in works from the pen of a medieval author.

It is in keeping with this admiration for Bede’s historiography that of all Bede’s works, it is the HE that has enjoyed the longest-standing popularity. Unlike his scientific works, for example, the popularity of which declined rapidly after the twelfth century, the HE continued to be copied frequently into the fifteenth century. It was the first of his works to be printed (already in ca. 1475), but copying of manuscripts of the text continued until well after that date. Today it is the HE alone among all of Bede’s works that can still be considered well known and widely read outside of the realm of specialists.

It is Bede’s historical legacy and, in particular, the legacy of his most famous work, the HE, that is the subject of the following dissertation. Specifically, the focus is on its circulation during the Middle Ages, from the time of the work’s completion in A.D. 731 until ca. 1500 (or, more precisely, until A.D. 1549, when the last manuscript included here was copied). As has been noted above, Bede’s fame in the medieval period was based on much

---


10 To name just two statements indicative of the modern admiration for Bede the historian and scholar: Plummer (Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, vol. 2, p. cxiii; and Venerabilis Bedae Opera Historica, vol. 1, p. lxxvi) considered him the “father of historical writing,” (at least in the North of England), while J. D. A. Ogilvy (Jarrow Lecture, 1968, p. 9) referred to him as the “father of the footnote.”

11 It is not that copying of the scientific texts stopped completely, but compared to the number of ninth- and tenth-century copies, those from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are few. See Laistner-King, pp. xx (on the scientific works) and pp. 139-53 (on the HE).

12 See Mynors, “Textual Intro.,” p. lxx.
more than just his historical writings, and yet the \textit{HE} was one of his most widely disseminated works, and so if one is to assess Bede’s influence in general and the relative importance of his various works one must naturally come to terms with the \textit{HE}’s popularity. To do so, some of the questions for which answers must be sought out include: Why was a work of English ecclesiastical history of such wide appeal? Who, specifically, was reading it? And what parts of the text were they most interested in? These questions, and others, will be addressed in the following chapters. A more detailed discussion of how these problems will be attacked will be undertaken at the end of this chapter (under the heading “Aims, Scope, and Method”), but before turning to that discussion it seems appropriate to review briefly what is known of the author’s life and the \textit{HE}’s inception.

\textbf{Bede’s Life and His Historia}\textsuperscript{13}

The story of Bede’s life is well known, but for the sake of convenience it is perhaps worthwhile to recount briefly the most important facts of this familiar story. Bede was born in either 672 or 673 in Northumbria, near modern Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on lands that in his adult life would be in the hands of his monastery.\textsuperscript{14} At the age of seven, he was given to Benedict Biscop, the noble founder of the monastery at Monkwearmouth, “to be


\textsuperscript{14} For Bede’s birth we must work back from his own statement in the \textit{HE} that he was in his 59th year of life (i.e., that he had passed his 58th birthday, or perhaps his 58th winter). Since he is likely to have written his statement in 731, when the \textit{HE} was completed, he must have been born in either 673 (if his birthday in calendar year 731 had already passed), or 672 (if it had not). I cannot follow Ward’s assertion that the uncertainty about the exact year rises from an ambiguity in Bede’s use of the phrase “usque ad”; \textit{Venerable Bede}, p. 17, n. 5.
educated” and he remained part of that community for the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{15} After the foundation of Jarrow (in A.D. 682) as a sister house a few miles to the north, he may have been transferred there, and certainly according to the surviving tradition he was believed to have lived primarily at Jarrow.\textsuperscript{16} He was ordained a deacon at the age of 19, and a priest at the age of 30. Besides these important events, his life from day to day was shaped by his monastic vocation and the life of his community. Although it would be anachronistic to refer to Monkwearmouth and Jarrow as “Benedictine,” it is likely that the Rule of St. Benedict was highly influential in shaping the customs of the twin monastery.\textsuperscript{17} Even though he is said to have devised a mixed rule for his twin foundation, it is probably no coincidence that Biscop Baducing had taken the cognomen Benedict when he entered the monastic life. Nor does it seem likely to have been wholly fortuitous that Bede chose to quote book two of the Dialogues of Gregory the Great (the life of Benedict of Nursia) when describing Biscop’s manner of life.\textsuperscript{18} Perhaps the strongest evidence, however, for the likely importance of Benedict’s Rule in Bede’s monastery is the invocation of it as an authority for the practice of free election of the abbot.\textsuperscript{19} For all these reasons, it seems

\textsuperscript{15} This would have been an appropriate age to give a child as an oblate, though Bede only says he was given into Benedict’s care for educational purposes, and this may mean that only later did he voluntarily choose to remain permanently in the community. The fate of his family, and their status (whether noble or more lowly), are questions that we cannot answer definitively.

\textsuperscript{16} McClure and Collins (pp. xiii-xiv) have recently called into question the reliability of evidence for Bede’s being at Jarrow in particular, but their arguments are hardly conclusive. For example, they claim that as a boy of 12 or 13, Bede would never have been described as a “puerulus” by the author of the HAA, and therefore he must not have been at Jarrow, since only Ceolfrith and one “puerulus” are reported to have survived an outbreak of the plague there in the mid-680s; the use the diminutive in this context, however, might well be explained as a rhetorical device to arouse the sympathy of the reader.

\textsuperscript{17} For a detailed discussion of the rule and customs of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, see Patrick Wormald, “Bede and Benedict Biscop,” in Famulus Christi, 141-69; and Peter Hunter Blair, “The Regular Life,” chap. 19 in The World of Bede, 197-210.

\textsuperscript{18} The name Baducing is known only from Stephen’s Life of Wilfrid, ch. 3; see The Life of Bishop Wilfrid by Eddius Stephanus, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press, 1927), pp. 8-9; Bede occasionally refers to his founder abbot by the interesting name ‘Biscopus’ (for example in the opening line of the HAB), but more often calls him simply ‘Benedictus.’ The quotation from Gregory’s Dialogues is in HAB, ch. 1.

\textsuperscript{19} The Rule is explicitly invoked as an authority on two occasions in the HAB, both times to justify the practice of free election of the abbot by the monks (RB, 64.1). In ch. 11 of the HAB, Benedict directs the community that in the future they should freely elect their abbot from among their own number, rather than following the practice of hereditary succession, “iuixta quod regula magni quondam abbatis Benedicti.” In his farewell address, described by Bede in ch. 16, Abbot Ceolfrith reiterates the same sentiment, namely that the
probable that Bede’s daily life followed a routine very much like the one described in the
*Rule of Benedict*.

According to Bede’s own statement, the community of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow was
a large one, with 600 “fratres,” and it is therefore easy to imagine that there would have
been a certain division of labor within the community that would have allowed Bede to
devote more time to his studies than he otherwise might have been able to do.²⁰ It is clear
from his own statements that he served the community as a teacher, and many of his
works were in fact written to fill the needs of his students.²¹ In addition, for the more
learned members of his community, as well as for his learned friends and correspondents,
Bede provided an array of exegetical writings to supplement the ample library that had
been assembled by Benedict Biscop.²²

These and his other literary efforts clearly grew out of his monastic vocation, and
can be broken down into the following genres (in the order in which they were presented
by the author himself in *HE* v.24): exegesis and other writings on the Bible, letters, history
and hagiography, verses and hymns, scientific works and *computus*, and finally the didactic
works, or what we might call textbooks. As has been noted by scholars many times, he
probably considered himself first and foremost an exegete, but when viewed as a whole
this corpus of works in various genres seems to reflect an educational program that is
perhaps best described as one of “vocational education” for monks.²³ Historical writings of
various kinds (including hagiography, his martyrological notes arranged according to the
calendar, and his two chronicles, as well as his more traditional historical works, the *HE*
and *HAB*) were part of that program for the same reasons the historical parts of the Bible

---

²⁰ *HAB*, ch. 17; it is not inconceivable that this number included some of the agricultural laborers who
lived on monastery lands.

²¹ For example, *De temporibus*, *De natura rerum*, *De orthographia*, and *De schematibus et tropis*.


1947), 5-15.
were important: God’s plan was revealed and future salvation was being worked out through the course of human events.

As noted above, Bede is likely to have seen the *HE* as the culmination of his literary career. He probably had at least two main historiographical models, the titles of which he brought together in the title he chose for his *magnum opus*: Eusebius’ *Historia ecclesiastica* (in the Latin version of Rufinus), and Gregory of Tours’ *Historia Francorum*. As has been noted often, Bede’s choice of title, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, neatly integrates the church- and national-historical elements that are so skillfully brought together by him in the text itself. At the same time, even though Gregory’s work may have inspired and influenced Bede’s inclusion of “national’ elements in his history, Bede seems to have been consciously emulating Eusebius much more than Gregory, and as R. A. Markus has pointed out, the basic framework and goals of his work remained those of an ecclesiastical history.²⁴ Kings (and hence their wars and politics) figure more prominently as protagonists in Bede’s story simply because, unlike the emperors of Eusebius’ history (with the exception of Constantine), many of them were Christians.²⁵ Thus, the narrative focuses much more on conversion and the creation of Christian unity than on persecution.

We have a number of clues as to whom Bede envisioned as the audience of his work. In addition to his likelihood of his having shared the work with his students (for whom we know he wrote a number of works) and some of his regular correspondents (for example, Acca of Hexham, to whom he dedicated certain other works), we know that he also sent a copy of this work to his king, Ceolwulf. The prefatory letter Bede addressed to him and attached to the *HE*, however, was clearly intended to be more than just a simple cover letter for that particular copy, but rather an open letter to all readers and a genuine preface in which Bede discusses his aims and methods in compiling his history.²⁶ Many of the correspondents whom Bede mentions in this preface are also to be understood as part

²⁴ R. A. Markus “Bede and the Tradition of Ecclesiastical Historiography” (Jarrow Lecture, 1975), 3-5.
²⁵ Ibid., 9.
²⁶ Besides the content of the letter itself, the best evidence of Bede’s intention that the preface addressed to Ceolwulf be an open letter is its attachment to (as far as it can be determined) all surviving copies of the text; unless we are to assume that the entire transmission of the work is descended from the copy that was sent to Ceolwulf, we must conclude that Bede intended the letter to circulate with the text.
of his intended audience. There is even a letter from Bede to one of them, Albinus of Canterbury, that—though now surviving only in a transcription of a lost manuscript—is considered genuine.\footnote{See Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, p. 78 and n. 45 (on p. 129).} In addition, from the *HE* itself, and even more clearly from his letter to Egbert, we know that Bede was reform-minded, and deeply concerned about the direction in which the Northumbrian Church seemed to be headed.\footnote{Plummer, I, 405-23, with commentary in II, 378-88; a translation can be found in McClure and Collins, *Ecclesiastical History*, 343-57.} It therefore seems likely that members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Northumbria were among his intended audience. At the same time, given his own sense of the broad sweep of history and concern for the spiritual health of the church, he may well have envisioned his audience as including Christians far into the future, just as he himself was 400 years removed from Eusebius. Whether he ever imagined the longevity his work would later go on to have is a matter of speculation.

**THE EARLY CIRCULATION OF THE *HISTORIA***\footnote{A foundational study of cross-Channel relations in this period is Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946; repr. 1998); more recent studies relevant here are those of Whitelock, “After Bede,” and McKitterick, “Kulturelle Verbindungen,” and Rollason, “Bede in Germany,” cited above (n. 4); the fundamental treatment of the manuscript evidence for the circulation of the *HE* remains Mynors, “Textual Introduction.”}

Over the course of his career, Bede had at times issued corrected versions of works, or otherwise updated them after their initial release, which is further evidence of their wider circulation during the author’s lifetime. This was true of his *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, for which he eventually issued an accompanying *Retractio*, and for his commentary on Genesis, which survives in an earlier, shorter form as well as in the final version issued by Bede in 720.\footnote{Whitelock, “After Bede,” 4.} Similarly, it seems that the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* was already in circulation before Bede had put his final touches on it. In the prefatory letter to King Ceolwulf already mentioned, he refers to having submitted an
earlier version to the king for “perusal and criticism.”

Furthermore, the manuscripts of the HE themselves would seem to indicate that at least two distinct versions of the text were “published” (that is, the C-type and M-type manuscripts, which will be discussed in detail in chapter two), or, perhaps better to say, that copies were being made of one or more Jarrow copies while the author was still working on the text. The differences between the two types seem to represent the author’s own late revisions to the work, which suggests that the text was being copied before the final revisions had been completed.

And so we know that the HE was circulating in Northumbria already in the 730s. We also have some indication that it made its way to the South of England in the eighth century, when LCT2 was copied. Furthermore, in the same century the HE had already found an audience on the Continent, as seems to be the case with a number of Bede’s works. It passed there by several lines of transmission: First, the Northumbrian mission led by Willibrord, about whose activities Bede writes in the HE, may have served as a connection for the spread of Bede’s works to the Continent.

We certainly know that the other major missionary movement emanating from Britain, that of the West Saxon Boniface, was making use of Bede’s writings, as letters of Boniface and Lull attest. And though they do not mention the HE directly, it seems that they did eventually gain access to a copy of Bede’s list of his works in v.24, since Lull quotes from it, and so the chances are good that they had a copy of the whole HE. We furthermore know that a Northumbrian copy of the text found today in Kassel (Ka1) in all probability comes from the library of the

---

31 HE, Preface (Colgrave-Mynors, pp. 2-3): “ad legendum ac probandum.”

32 It is possible, though far from proven, that the manuscripts of the so-called Continuatio Bedae (discussed below in Chapter Two) are to be connected with this missionary effort; the lateness of the surviving witnesses makes it difficult to say much with certainty about this text, other than that it seems to be of eighth-century origins.


34 The letters are Tangl, nos. 125-26, and are referred to by Whitelock, “After Bede,” p. 7. We must keep in mind, however, that in later periods Bede’s autobiographical sketch did circulate separately, and so such a copy could be what we are dealing with here as well.
monastery at Fulda. And the Fulda copy, though somewhat unique in its text-type (being a rare example of a Continental C-type MS), was far from unique among Carolingian library collections. We also have evidence of copies at Würzburg, Reichenau, Lorsch, St. Gall, and Murbach.

By ca. 800, yet another line of transmission had been opened by which HE made its way to the Continent. As Bernhard Bischoff has shown, the manuscript known as the Moore Bede (CUL) was almost certainly in the court library of Charlemagne around this time, where copies of it were made and distributed to nearby ecclesiastical centers. Like Ka1, CUL is Northumbrian in origins, and most likely dates from A.D. 737. Circumstances would seem to point to Alcuin as a possible connection for this manuscript’s moving to the court. The St. Petersburg manuscript (my SP; formerly known as the “Leningrad Bede”), which is one of CUL’s closest textual relatives, likewise made its way to the Continent sometime before the twelfth century.

The text was by no means neglected in England in the early period, even though the manuscript evidence for its circulation there is less striking. It seems likely that many early Northumbrian copies did not survive the Viking attacks of the ninth century and the subsequent decline in monastic life (and consequent neglect and loss of monastic libraries). The deficiencies of the manuscript record can at least in part be made up by other evidence of the text’s presence in England. As Dorothy Whitelock has shown, we know that Offa of Mercia had a copy of the text. Furthermore, even though scholars have eliminated the

35 Rollason, “Bede and Germany,” 8.
36 For a convenient table illustrating the presence of Bede’s works in Carolingian libraries, see Mckitterick, “Kulturelle Verbindungen,” 145-46.
39 A date which can be inferred from the fact that a copy (PA3) was made in France in the twelfth century, as has been pointed out by Mynors, “Textual Introduction,” p. lx.
40 Whitelock, “After Bede,” 11.
Old English Bede from the canon of King Alfred’s own writings, it still should be counted among the works connected to his program of literary renewal.\(^1\) Certainly the translation of the text into the vernacular and the translation’s survival in five manuscripts (and a sixth containing brief extracts) from the tenth and eleventh centuries are significant evidence of English interest in the text in a period when relatively few Latin copies were being made.\(^2\) The compilers of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, moreover, made ample use of the *HE*, as would nearly every English historian thereafter who wrote about the time period covered by the *HE*.

These and other details concerning the early circulation of the *HE* have been well documented in the past studies of the text’s *Nachleben* that have been cited above. But none of the aforementioned studies has included an attempt to trace, in detail, the transmission of the text beyond the eleventh century, particularly on the Continent.\(^3\) Even Mynors’ survey of the surviving manuscripts does little more than list the later manuscripts in the Continental branches of the tradition.\(^4\) Until a more detailed investigation is undertaken, our understanding of the transmission of this important text, not to mention its influence and reception, will remain incomplete.

**AIMS, SCOPE, AND METHOD**

The purpose of the following dissertation is twofold. First, and perhaps foremost, it is to investigate the manuscript tradition of the *HE*. As noted above, our understanding of the transmission of the text is incomplete, particularly when it comes to the relationships


\(^{2}\) An overview of the temporal and geographic distribution of surviving copies is given in Chapter Five below.


\(^{4}\) He himself admits that his is “only a preliminary survey, and likely over-simplifies” (p. lixiv; the statement is in reference to his treatment of the French family, but it seems that it could be applied equally to the discussion of the other Continental families as well).
between Continental manuscripts from after the ninth century. These later manuscripts, while they have little potential to improve our understanding of the text of the HE, can serve as indicators of the ways the text was being read and understood in the Middle Ages. It is this readership and reception that will in turn be the object of the second part of this investigation. Each manuscript contains clues to its origins and intended purpose, and frequently also retains the marks left by subsequent generations of readers. By examining these clues, I hope to shed some light on the nature of the reception of what is today considered Bede’s most important work.

The problem of the transmission and reception of the HE is not one that can be easily compartmentalized. Particularly with textual matters, the assessment of any given manuscript depends on one’s knowledge of the other branches of the tradition. Because the collations of manuscripts that underlie Roger Mynors’ discussion of the tradition were never published, it is often impossible to know on what basis he formed many of his conclusions about their relationships. He built upon the manuscript groups that had already been established by Plummer, but he also postulated the existence of larger families within the tradition, which he referred to as “textual provinces.” As the name suggests, the textual provinces were based on both textual and geographical criteria. Thus his “German” province includes German manuscripts as well as others that originated in Italy or the British Isles; at the same time, there are still other manuscripts that clearly originated within the borders of what is today Germany which Mynors places into the French textual province. At times it is apparent that a great deal of detailed knowledge led him to his conclusions about individual manuscripts, while at other times his assertions seem to be based solely on intuition.

While the entire manuscript tradition would be of interest in assessing the nature of Bede’s fame, to examine some 160 copies of the text would hardly be feasible within the limits of a single dissertation. It has, therefore, been necessary to narrow the focus of this project. Mynors’ textual provinces, because they reflect some degree of a cultural unity as

---

45 Mynors’ treatment of the tradition will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two below.

46 Working closely with the “Textual Introduction,” one quickly becomes aware of the prodigious knowledge of manuscripts that lies behind Mynors’ deceptively laconic treatment of a vast subject.
well as a certain degree of textual closeness, are one logical way to narrow the scope of the investigation. Among the textual provinces he identified, the so-called “German” group offers a number of advantages for this study. As noted above, the Continental manuscripts (with the exception of those of the eighth century) have received much less detailed attention than the English ones. Further, given the longstanding ties between England and Germany, a project focusing on the transmission of the work of an English author in Germany has the potential to further illuminate the cultural connections between these two regions from the time of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries up to the Reformation.

As the starting point for the detailed analysis of the manuscript tradition I have therefore taken Mynors’ German textual province, rather than—what might at first seem more logical from a historical perspective—concentrating only on those manuscripts known to have been written or owned in the East Frankish or German-speaking regions of the Continent. Because Mynors’ treatment of the subject has often been afforded an almost absolute authority by scholars working on this text, it seemed logical, in the philological portion of the study, to build upon what he had already established (or what is often taken as established fact, even though Mynors had considered his survey only preliminary). Thus, to cite a few examples, manuscript BS1 comes from St. Maximin’s, Trier, and therefore might logically be included in this study as another example of a manuscript from a German-speaking region. Because the manuscript is a descendent of CUL, however, and therefore part of the French textual province, I have not included it among the manuscripts to be collated at this time. Conversely, LR1, which is clearly of insular origin—not to mention quite idiosyncratic—is treated here because it seems that Mynors recognized in it characteristics of the German family of manuscripts. To put it another way, the criterion for inclusion of manuscripts in the group to be analyzed through test collations is philological, not cultural. When we turn to questions of reception and influence in Chapters Four and Five, on the other hand, the German-speaking cultural region will mark the boundaries of the study. The following two chapters, however, will be based on the evidence of those manuscripts listed by Mynors as
part of the German textual province.\textsuperscript{47} It is my intention that this dissertation will serve as a prolegomenon to a more comprehensive study of the tradition of the \textit{HE}, and in that fuller study it will be possible to correct any infelicities that have arisen as a result of the need to limit the number of manuscripts that would be collated and examined in person.

In the context of this study, the manuscripts will be approached as artifacts of medieval intellectual culture, by which I mean objects that offer a variety of clues as to their origins, uses, and readers through the centuries. The examination of the \textit{HE}'s transmission and reception will be organized on the basis of what I call the contextual layers surrounding the text. On the most basic level (which will be the focus in Chapters Two and Three), this involves examining the relation of the various copies of the text to one another. As has been indicated, this will be accomplished by means of a series of test collations and the application of the principles of textual criticism. The purpose of this part of the investigation is to establish the relationships between the manuscripts in the German branch of the tradition.

The next contextual layer is manuscript context, which will be treated in Chapter Four. By manuscript context should be understood the text in relation to other texts transmitted alongside it in manuscripts. This includes marginal and interlinear notations, which are perhaps the most direct evidence of the text's reception; supplementary texts, which may continue or elaborate on the \textit{HE} (examples include the OE version of \textit{Caedmon's Hymn} and the epitaph of the Roman missionaries to England found in P5); and finally associated contents, which may or may not reflect the purposes for which the text was originally copied and the ways the text was understood and used from day to day by its later readers and owners. Also included under the heading “manuscript context”—and relevant to understanding the text’s function and medieval reception—are its physical

\textsuperscript{47} Because limited resources were available for purchasing microfilm (let alone traveling to libraries), it has been necessary to further reduce the number of manuscripts included in the test collations; I have therefore eliminated from consideration here three manuscripts that were included by Mynors in his German Province, but which he also believed might have connections to the Italian branch of the tradition: Bamberg E. iii. 14 (Hist. 3), and Monte Cassino 181 and 177 (respectively, my Bam, MC1, and MC2). I have, furthermore, not collated the manuscript now in the Yale University Library as MS 330 (my NH), as it is, according to Mynors, a hybrid of the French and German types. With the exception of these four manuscripts, the text collations take into account all manuscripts listed by Mynors under the heading “The Text in Germany” (pp. lxxv-1xvii).
appearance (that is, its script, format, layout and design, and decoration). These physical characteristics likewise reflect the reception of the text and its intended use.

Finally, Chapter Five will consist of an examination of the library context of the *HE*. The evidence for library context includes both the known medieval locations of the surviving manuscripts, and references to the *HE* in German medieval library catalogues. Such evidence of the text’s distribution (both geographical and temporal) can help us to understand the extent of its dissemination, and also to see what sort of institutions and individuals were interested in the text. In addition, the references in library catalogues can, to the extent that they are classified, further illuminate the text’s place in medieval intellectual culture.
CHAPTER 2
THE TRANSMISSION OF THE HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA IN GERMANY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this and the following chapter is summed up in the word recensio, or a survey of the surviving manuscript witnesses of the text of the HE (in this case one family of them) with the immediate goal of establishing their mutual relationships, and of grouping them into families of closely related or derived copies.\(^1\) Normally, such a survey would be followed by an attempt to establish an authoritative text, first by reconstructing and then analyzing the common ancestor of the manuscripts (if in fact there is a single common ancestor), and second by emending the reconstructed text where it seems necessary. These latter steps, however, are not part of my purpose here. As has often been noted, the HE is preserved in several authoritative manuscripts of the eighth century, and these have enabled two highly capable past editors, Charles Plummer and R. A. B. Mynors, to reconstruct a version of the text that is, in all probability, quite close to the author’s intention when he finished his work in A.D. 731.\(^2\) In fact, the surviving early witnesses are so good and so close to the author himself (in both date and place of origin) that they may


\(^2\) Charles Plummer, Venerablis Bedae Opera Historica, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896; repr., 2 vols. in 1, 1946); Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969; corr. repr., 1991); as is made clear in the preface of the latter edition (p. vii), the Latin text and the “Textual Introduction” were the responsibility of Mynors, and they will be referred to as his in what follows.
even offer a glimpse of Bede’s subsequent emendation of his text in the years between its initial circulation and the his death in A.D. 735.³

Because these early witnesses are so good, it is not likely that the manuscripts surveyed here have great potential to alter our understanding of what the author intended, although according to the principle of recentiores, non deteriores, it would also be unwise to assume that they could not do so without having examined them first. Furthermore, to say that the later manuscripts are unlikely to alter radically our understanding of the established text is not to negate their value, for they have an interest all their own, as evidence of the HE’s audience and reception over the course of the Middle Ages.⁴ Audience and reception, however, are subjects reserved for Chapters Four and Five below. In the present chapter, I will begin by reviewing the overall transmission of the text as established in previous studies, as well as the place of the German textual province in that transmission. Then, I will present a summary of the groups of manuscripts that I have identified within the German family, followed (in Chapter Three) by the test collations that have enabled me to establish those families.

SCHOLARSHIP ON THE TRANSMISSION OF THE HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA

To date there have been four serious attempts to survey the transmission of the HE. The first was undertaken by Thomas Duffus Hardy, and appeared as part of his three-volume Descriptive Catalogue of Materials Relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland.⁵

³ Cf. the remarks of Plummer (pp. xcvi-xcvii) and Mynors (p. xli) on this point. Despite the high scholarly standards of the editor and translator of the OMT edition, it may yet be possible to improve upon it through a fuller integration of readings found in the St. Petersburg MS (SP); the MS was used by Mynors, but perhaps not as fully as it might have been. Certainly an edition with a full critical apparatus, which would be invaluable in studies of the later use of the HE, remains a desideratum, since what Bede wrote was obviously not necessarily exactly what his readers throughout Europe over the course of the Middle Ages were reading. For an example of how the readings found in an individual manuscript can be traced in the work of a later author, see David Rollason’s edition and translation of Symeon of Durham, Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis ecclesiae, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), where numerous readings characteristic of Durham Cathedral Library, B. ii. 35 (Dur) can be observed in Symeon’s quotations from the HE.

⁴ Cf. the remark of Mynors and Plummer in their respective surveys of the tradition, in Plummer, pp. lxxxv-cxxviii; and Mynors, “Textual Intro.,” pp. xlvi-lxx.

Hardy’s list of *HE* manuscripts contains altogether 133 items, but some of these are false references, a number of others are duplicates, and very many of the dates given are not even approximately close. Undoubtedly many of these errors are the result of the deficiencies of the sources that Hardy relied upon, and there would be little to be gained from any systematic interrogation of his list here. Nonetheless, a few examples of the ways it can be misleading are perhaps useful. Though it has at times been treated as such, the list is not, it seems, so much a list of manuscripts (that is, organized as one might expect, with each MS listed as a single item), as it is a repertory of published references to manuscripts containing the text. Thus, single entries in Hardy’s list sometimes refer to multiple manuscripts (as for example the single-line references to the collections of the Bibliothèque publique de Strasbourg and the Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, which refer, respectively, to two and three MSS). At the same time, individual manuscripts are sometimes referred to in multiple, even consecutive, lines. These duplications, while confusing at times, are not in themselves that difficult to sort out. And in spite of both the duplications and the errors mentioned above, Hardy’s survey is impressive, especially when one considers that it was compiled as part of a much larger work surveying the transmission of texts relating to the history of the entire British Isles over the course of the Middle Ages. Thirty-four years later, when Charles Plummer published his edition of the

---

6 The eleventh item in the list (p. 435), for example, refers to a manuscript in Schaffhausen from the 8th century, though the only surviving Schaffhausen MS (my Sch) is actually of the 12th century.

7 Plummer makes a number of corrections to the list in the introduction to his edition (vol. I, p. lxxxvi, n. 1).

8 The references to the collections in Strasbourg and the Arsenal are both found on p. 441 (these are, by my count, the 112th and 118th items in the list). In both cases, Hardy has indicated the number of manuscripts to which each line refers in parentheses; in the reference to a “MS. Vienna” on the same page, however, one must go to the footnote to discover that Hardy is referring to three manuscripts in the Vienna collection (n.b.: today the ÖNB has five manuscripts containing the entire text, or significant portions thereof).

9 Examples of multiple references to the same manuscript include two consecutive references on p. 435 (the seventh and eighth in the entire list), both of which almost certainly refer to SG1 (St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 247), and two consecutive references to “MS. Bodl. 163” on p. 436. In the latter case, because he gives the exact shelfmark in both cases, it seems impossible to conclude that he thought he was referring to two different manuscripts.
HE, Hardy’s list remained a basic point of reference as he began his discussion of the text’s transmission.\(^{10}\)

Plummer’s edition, now well into the second century since its appearance, remains invaluable for both its critical apparatus and its commentary. His detailed discussion of individual manuscripts of the text was based first and foremost on his own direct examination of them, and therefore is vastly more reliable than Hardy’s list. Nonetheless, Plummer was not attempting to create a complete list of the surviving manuscripts, nor to offer a complete sketch of the many lines of transmission of the text. In terms of enumerating manuscripts, it would not have been practicable for him to have added much to Hardy’s list without traveling widely on the Continent. Instead, he was content to mention Hardy’s list, and to make some corrections and additions to it (pointing out Hardy’s erroneous inclusion of MS Laud 78 and two Arras MSS; and adding notice of nine additional copies of the text: LA1, LA4, Bn1-2, CP, LCA1, Rou1-2, and Utr).\(^{11}\) The number of manuscripts Plummer examined directly for his edition was large (at least 41), but unfortunately, with the exception of the Namur MS, these were exclusively in British collections, which means that many ancient and valuable Continental MSS were not taken into account by him.\(^{12}\) Four MSS (CUL, LCT1-2, and Nam) formed the basis for his edition, while another 37 were collated in parts for the purpose of establishing their relationships. To this day, Plummer’s grouping of manuscripts into two recensions (C-type and M-type) and a number of families (Durham, Winchester, etc.) remains the foundation of our understanding of the manuscript tradition.\(^{13}\) His findings will be discussed in more detail below.

\(^{10}\) Plummer treats the manuscript tradition in vol. 1, pp. lxxx-cxliv.

\(^{11}\) See p. lxxvii, n. 1.

\(^{12}\) Of the 53 manuscripts listed in his table of manuscripts on pp. cxliii, it seems that Plummer did not examine the seven Cambridge copies (my CT1-3, CSS1-2, CEC, and CSJ1, for which he refers to the edition of Mayor and Lumby), the two copies at Monte Cassino (my MC1-2, on which cf. p. ci), or his MSS O13, O21, and R3 (my OR1, OAS, and LR3).

\(^{13}\) It is indicative of the high standard of Plummer’s scholarship on this subject that a manuscripts scholar of M. R. James’ stature had little to add to what Plummer had previously established when he contributed an article on the subject to the 1935 Bede memorial volume (“The Manuscripts of Bede,” in BLTW, ed. Thompson, pp. 230-36). Cf. the remarks of Richard W. Pfaff, Montague Rhodes James (London: Scolar Press, 1980), p. 396, where James’ article is described as a “simple culling” of the introduction to Plummer’s edition.
The next significant advance in the study of the transmission of Bede’s works came with the publication of M. L. W. Laistner’s and H. H. King’s *Hand-list of Bede Manuscripts*. The *Hand-list* appeared during the Second World War, when many of the collections that housed the manuscripts described were in danger of being lost.\(^{14}\) Because the war made travel to the collections impossible, Laistner and King were, much like Hardy, working from published descriptions. For the *HE*, they list 159 manuscripts that are complete (or nearly so), or that may once have been complete copies. In addition, they list an additional 116 manuscripts that contain extracts from the text.\(^{15}\) Given that even today the published descriptions of the manuscripts in many collections are not so detailed as to mention short extracts, the latter list is undoubtedly far from complete. The list of complete copies, on the other hand, does come reasonably close to an accurate count of the surviving manuscripts, despite the presence of a number of errors and omissions (for an up-to-date finding list of the complete or nearly complete MSS, see Appendix A below). In the sixty years since the publication of the *Hand-list*, a number of articles and reviews have appeared correcting some of its errors. For the study of the *HE*, the most important of these are the review by N. R. Ker (which adds two *HE* MSS omitted in the *Hand-list*, LCV and OHo) and the important research of K. W. Humphreys and Alan A. C. Ross, which will be discussed in detail below.\(^{16}\) Even after the appearance of Mynors’ narrative survey of the manuscript tradition, the Laistner-King *Hand-list* remains an important point of reference because of the fact that they present the MSS systematically.\(^{17}\)


\(^{15}\) *Hand-list*, pp. 94-102 (“Manuscripts”), and 103-111 (“Extracts”); they also list two “doubtful” cases and three “untraced” manuscripts on p. 103, as well as the six known manuscripts of the OE Bede on pp. 111-12.


\(^{17}\) Mynors’ “Index of Manuscripts” (pp. lxxv-lxxvi) is useful, but not a substitute for a systematic handlist for studying the tradition of the text.
The next major advance in our understanding of the manuscript tradition came with the publication of Bertram Colgrave and Roger Mynors’ facing-page edition and translation of the text. Mynors’ “Textual Introduction” to that edition remains the most detailed treatment of the transmission of the text that has appeared to date. Excluding one false reference to be discussed below, he treats 171 manuscripts altogether, including not only known surviving manuscripts, but also certain untraced or destroyed copies. 149 of the manuscripts he mentions are complete or nearly complete copies, while an additional five are fragments that may once have been complete copies (Blo2, CC2, Ka2, LE, NY). Two further fragments were detached from surviving copies (Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Museo 93 [= detached from Her], and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E. vii [= detached from LCV]). Another four manuscripts were never complete copies of the Latin text; instead, two (Bn2 and Zür, which contain, respectively, parts of book 1, and the Libellus responsionum) are copies of only part of the text, another (FL) is described as an “epitome,” the exact contents of which are not specified by Mynors, and yet another (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud misc. 610 [OLA2]) is a translation into Middle Irish. Eleven of the copies referred to by Mynors are known only from references in medieval booklists or early scholarship, and likely do not survive today, while an additional four copies were almost definitely destroyed (Tou¹, Dr1¹, and two relatively poorly documented copies from Strasbourg).¹⁸

As noted already, Mynors’ treatment of the manuscript tradition remains the best and most detailed available. His establishment of manuscript groups and what he calls “textual provinces” will be discussed below, but a few comments on his listing of manuscripts are appropriate here. While his treatment clearly reflects a deep knowledge of the overall transmission of the text and of many of the manuscripts described, there

¹⁸ The untraced copies are the copy given by abbot Seiwold of Bath to the community St. Vaast, Arras (Mynors, p. xlvi); four Yorkshire copies attested in various booklists of s. xiii-xv (p. lv); a copy given to Pembroke College, Cambridge in s. xv (p. lvii); a lost Merton College MS recorded by John Leland (p. lix); a copy from the 15th-c. catalogue of the library of Melk (p. lxvii); one of the copies from the Papal library at Avignon recorded in the so-called Peniscola list (p. lxvii); a Colmar copy attested in Migne’s Dictionnaire des Manuscrits (p. lxvii); and a copy from the library of Poggio Bracciolini (p. lxx). In discussing these untraced MSS, Mynors was not attempting to be systematic and there are, of course, many additional references besides these to copies of the HE in medieval library catalogues and booklists. Of these many references, those in German, Swiss, and Austrian catalogues are discussed systematically in Chapter Five below.
remains a handful of errors and omissions in his discussion. First, there are five manuscripts listed by Laistner-King that Mynors silently omits from his discussion (BS3, FN2, Mad, Mü1, VL2), but which do, it seems, contain the *HE*.

In addition, at least one reference given by Mynors is a false reference taken over from Laistner-King (on p. lxvii, he refers to Klosterneuberg 685, which does not contain the *HE*, but rather certain of Bede’s scientific works).

Thus, though in many ways Mynors’ treatment of the subject represents a significant improvement over Laistner-King, it cannot be treated as definitive.

Finally, it should be noted that subsequent to the publication of Mynors’ survey, an important search for additional manuscripts was undertaken by K. W. Humphreys and Alan A. C. Ross. In all, their search turned up a large number of previously unknown manuscripts containing excerpts from the *HE*, as well as three previously unrecognized copies of the complete text (Dev, Nür, and FN1). They correct a number of the errors in Laistner-King, but as is to be expected in any study dealing with such a complex

---

19 Of these five, I have seen BS3 and Mü1. Until the other three can be verified, we must reckon with the possibility that Mynors purposefully omitted them because he knew they were false references, but if that were indeed the case it seems likely that he would have given some explanation for their exclusion.


21 Nor did Mynors himself intend that it would be his last word on the subject. As he indicates on p. xli, n. 1, he was planning an edition with full critical apparatus for the Corpus Christianorum. The edition had not yet appeared when Mynors died tragically in a car accident in October 1989, and the full and definitive critical edition, such as a scholar of his stature is likely to have produced, remains a *desideratum* to this day.

22 Cited above, n. 16.

23 Why they chose to list the last of these among manuscripts containing excerpts is unclear, as it does in fact (to judge by the published description) contain the complete text. See Gabriella Pomaro, “Censimento dei manoscritti della Biblioteca di S. Maria Novella, Parte I: Origini e Trecento,” in Memorie Domenicane, n.s. 11 (1980) [=Santa Maria Novella, un convento nella città: Studi e Fonti]: 325-470, at 337-39.
manuscript tradition, their own list of manuscripts is also not perfect. Nonetheless—particularly for its findings regarding the various copies containing the Old English Caedmon’s Hymn—their survey of the surviving manuscripts is highly valuable, as is much of the scholarship on that poem, as will be discussed in more detail below in Chapter Four.

Overview of Textual Transmission and Manuscript Filiation

Mynors did not himself attempt to graphically represent the relationships of those manuscripts that he considered essential to the reconstruction of the text of the HE, but he did describe their relationships in some detail. With the help of his descriptions of those textual relationships, it is possible to create a provisional stemma codicum as a means of visualizing the relationships between the surviving witnesses (see Fig. 1 below). Mynors considered eight manuscripts to be significant for the reconstruction of Bede’s text, and these—plus another MS that was used by Plummer—are the ones depicted in this stemma.

24 On p. 53, Humphreys and Ross state that the Namur manuscripts were destroyed (including the famous Namur copy of the HE [my Nam]), but this is, fortunately, not the case. Today this important MS is in the Musée des arts anciens du Namurois, under the shelfmark Fonds de la Ville, 11. On the same page, they indicate that Laistner-King’s reference to a manuscript at Rome (Laistner-King, p. 111) is false, but the manuscript is in fact in Rome, and bears the shelfmark given by Laistner-King; see Marco Palma, Sessoriana: Materiali per la storia dei manoscritti appartenuti alla biblioteca romana di S. Croce in Gerusalemme, Sussidi Eruditi, 32 (Rome: Edizioni de Storia e Letteratura, 1980), no. 56. Also on p. 53, three manuscripts that are listed by Humphreys and Ross as untraced have by now made their way into research collections: The former Phillips 9428 (H&R, p. 53, s.v. “London, p. 103”) is now San Marino, Huntington Library, HM 27486 (my SM1), and has been in the Huntington since 1964; the Quaritch MS (H&R, p. 53, s.v. “CM, p. lxvii”) is now in the Yale University Library as MS 330 (my NH); finally, the former Ashburnham MS they mention on the same page in n. 16 (s.v. “Ashburnham, p. 103”) is now in the British Library as MS Stowe 104 (my LS). The confusion surrounding the Ashburnham MS is perhaps the result of Laistner-King’s conflation of two of the three Ashburnham HE MSS: on p. 103 of the Hand-list, they refer to Ashburnham S 863 as a twelfth century MS containing the HE and Gregory’s Dialogues; but those are in fact the contents of the former Ashburnham L 991 of the fourteenth century (my FL1, now Florence, Biblioteca Laurenziana, Ashburnham 991). It seems that Laistner and King probably misread the index of A Catalogue of the Manuscripts at Ashburnham Place (London: Charles Francis Hodgson, 1853), s.v. Beda Venerabilis, where the phrase “With Gregorii Dialogi” runs over to a second line in a way that could be confusing to a reader working quickly. Incidentally, the third former Ashburnham HE, the late ninth-century copy that was formerly no. 103 among the so-called “Appendix” MSS, is now Brussels, Bibliothèque royale II 2295 (VDG 1353).


26 Plummer did not use Ka1, SP, Wol, or Wür, but he did make use of one additional MS: a burnt Cotton MS that he called B (Cotton Tiberius A. xiv; my LCT1). Mynors eliminated B from consideration in the reconstruction of the text, because he considered it to be a direct copy of SP; nonetheless because of its importance for Plummer’s edition, I have included that MS in this stemma.
The stemma may be summarized as follows: The manuscripts fall into two major types, known as C-type and M-type after the sigla Plummer used to refer to the oldest known copy of each type: Cotton Tiberius C. II (my LCT2) and Cambridge University Library Kk. 5. 16 (the “Moore Bede,” which is my CUL). These two types are distinguished by a number of characteristic readings, several of which seem to reflect authorial additions or changes to the text, but the question of which of the two types better represents the author’s final intention remains unresolved, and perhaps unresolvable.\(^{28}\) Even though the tests that Plummer and Mynors used to distinguish the C-type from the M-type are well known, for the sake of convenience they are summarized in Figure 2 below.

---

\(^{27}\) MSS given in italics are hypothetical (c2 is a designation used by Mynors, while m2 and m3 are my creations based on a close reading of his description of the tradition). For the sake of convenience, I have given Mynors’ sigla for extant MSS in parentheses following my sigla. The Italian and so-called “Continuatio” Groups of MSS are not accounted for here, as their relationships to the rest of the tradition remain to be determined. Though both groups might be connected to the German family, it has not been possible in the context of the present study to further investigate the relationship.

\(^{28}\) Plummer believed that the archetype of the C-type was later (pp. xcvi-xcvii), while Mynors favored the M-type, although he did not feel that the established differences gave clear primacy to manuscripts of either type (pp. xl-xl).
## Textual Differences between Manuscripts of the C-type and M-type

| A) Prologue:  
[= Plummer, no. 1; Mynors, “a”] | “Praeterea omnes . . . etc.” comes at the end of the prologue in M-type; end of the whole work in C-type. |
|---|---|
| B) iv.14:  
[= Plummer, no. 2, Mynors, “b”] | This chapter (which recounts a miracle of St. Oswald) appears only in MSS of the M-type [in CUL, 13-15 are one chapter, but in the MSS of the German family they often appear to be three distinct chapters.] It opens “In quo tunc monasterio nonnulla caelestis gratiae dona specialiter. . .” |
| C) iv.18 (16):  
[= Plummer, no. 3, Mynors, “c”] | The phrase “cuius supra meminimus,” referring to Benedict Biscop, is not found in C-type MSS. In this case, the reading of the C-type seems more accurate, since in manuscripts of both types this is the first reference to Benedict. This may be evidence that in revising the text, Bede eliminated an earlier reference to him. |
| D) iv.30 (28):  
[Mynors, “d”; also noted by Plummer on p. xcvii] | “Sed et in hac historia quaedam, quae [C-type = “unum, quod”] nos nuper audisse contigit, superadicerem commodum duximus.” The M-type is better here, as both versions give two miracles, in iv.31-32. In addition, at the beginning of the book, C-type MSS have the capitula for iv.31-32 in reverse order. |
| E) v.24:  
[= Plummer, no. 4; Mynors, “e”] | Within the chronological summary, C-type MSS end with 731 (“. . . archiepiscopus”) and insert annals for 733-34 not found in M-type MSS. The C-type reads: “. . . archiepiscopus. Anno DCXXXIII ecypsis facta est . . . coopertus. Anno DCCXXXIIII luna sanguineo . . . propriam reversa.” The M-type, on the other hand, ends: “. . . archiepiscopus obiit. Anno eodem Tatuini consecratus archiepiscopus nonus Dorouernensis Ecclesiae, Aedilbaldo rege Merciorum quintum decimum agente annum imperii.” |
| F) v.24:  
[= Plummer, no. 5, Mynors, “f”] | In the summary of Bede’s works, the C-type omits the Capitula on the prophets: “In Isaiam, Danihelem, duodecim prophetas, et partem Hieremiae distinctiones capitulorum ex tractatu B. Hieronymi excerptas” (M-type only). |

---

29 These are the differences as given by Plummer (pp. xcv-xcv) and Mynors (p. xlii). The references in column one refer to the way Plummer and Mynors number the tests in their respective lists. In addition to their tests, I have included an additional test that is referred to by McClure and Collins, *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History* (p. xxi), and one difference that was noted by both Plummer and Mynors in their respective editions, but which was not considered by them to be a major test. This difference, which consists of two annals that are included in the chronological epitome (v.24) of M-type MSS, but which are not found in those of the C-type, will be discussed below (in the treatment of the MSS containing *Caedmon’s Hymn*) in more detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G) v.24: [Plummer, p. 358, n. 2; McClure and Collins, p. xxi]</th>
<th>The C-type gives (correctly) VI rather than the M-type’s VII as the number of books in Bede’s commentary on the Song of Songs. “In Cantica Canticorum libros VI” (C-type).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Manuscripts of both types survive from eighth-century Northumbria, but the earliest copies of the M-type, though written in Northumbria (CUL, SP), were preserved in Continental libraries. The oldest surviving C-type manuscript that remained in England (LCT2, Plummer’s C), comes from the South, and contains OE glosses as well as certain readings that are characteristic of the “English” type of text in the later Middle Ages. Another early C-type copy (Ka1) made its way to the Continent, and by the early ninth century to Fulda, but it seems not to have been widely copied, and the later Continental manuscripts are of the M-type. The fact that MSS of the C-type tended to be English and those of the M-type Continental probably contributed to Mynors’ decision to organize his discussion of the text’s Überlieferungsgeschichte on the basis of groups called “textual provinces.” He postulated five major lines of transmission, four of which he named for the regions where the manuscripts represented of each of them tended to be found: England, France, Germany, and Italy; a fifth “province” was made up of the copies containing the Continuatio, which seems to have circulated primarily in Northern Germany and the Low Countries. Membership in the textual provinces was based, primarily, on textual criteria, but it is important to note that Mynors sometimes placed manuscripts he had not collated into a textual province solely on the basis of its place of origin, and therefore his groups are not to be treated as definitive.32

---

30 As indicated on the stemma, certain other characteristic “English” readings are found in OHa; thus, it is the hypothetical common ancestor of LCT2 and OHa that serves as the progenitor of the common “English” type (c2).

31 See CLA, no. 1140; and McKitterick, “Kulturelle Verbindungen,” p. 140.

32 He signals this fact, for example, on p. lxvii, where he notes that “no details are yet available” about a number of manuscripts he had placed in the context of his discussion of the German textual province.
As noted above, the basis of the English textual province is a group of readings characteristic of c2 (cf. the stemma, above). Mynors further divided the English province into a number of sub-groups, several of which had first been identified by Plummer in his edition. These sub-groups include the so-called Durham group (descended from Dur), manuscripts of which contain additions to v.24 reflecting interest in St. Wilfrid, and which often pair the HE with a life of Bede and the HAB; the Winchester group (descended from Win), which shares some of the same Wilfridian additions; a “corrected C-type,” which shows contamination with material from manuscripts of the M-type, and which contains a sub-group related to a former Gloucester manuscript (LR2); a Yorkshire group of manuscripts that share a defective ending in v.24; as well as a handful of “pure” C-type manuscripts and other unattached copies. As is not at all surprising, the manuscripts of this textual province have received by far the most detailed scholarly attention.

In contrast to the English manuscripts, the French manuscripts are of the M-type, and according to Mynors are descended from CUL and SP. Despite its many minor errors, CUL achieved a certain measure of prominence among copies of the HE by virtue of its presence in the court library of Charlemagne by around the year 800; it was frequently copied in the ninth century with some brief excerpts from Isidore of Seville (the so-called “De consanguinitate”) attached to the end of the text. Besides this grouping of seven descendants of CUL and two that seem to be descendants of SP, the relationships of the eighteen other manuscripts Mynors places in the French family remain to be worked out.

According to Mynors, the German textual province is likewise descended from a pair of related copies (Wol and Wür), with a third (Nam) that is somewhat more distantly connected to the others. He identifies one manuscript (SG1) as a possible direct copy of Wol, and another seventeen copies that share what he calls “characteristic readings” of

Had he examined these manuscripts, he certainly would have recognized that Klosterneuburg 685 does not even contain the HE. Furthermore, he would have quickly established that the Prague (Pra) and Vienna lat. 13707 (Wi5) ought properly to be discussed with the other Continuatio manuscripts.

33 “Textual Intro.,” pp. xlvi-lxi.

these manuscripts, but he does not specify what those readings are. Furthermore, he places a number of other manuscripts tentatively into the German family, and even speculates that a sub-set of them from Austria might prove to be a closely related group, but as noted above (n. 31), he had apparently not examined these copies. Including the fragments and medieval and modern references to untraced copies, there are 38 manuscripts in Mynors’ German textual province.

Two relatively small lines of transmission round out Mynors’ treatment of the HE’s textual provinces. The first is represented by the eight manuscripts that include a continuation of the annalistic epitome that opens HE v.24 (the so-called Continuatio Bedae). This continuation will be discussed in more detail below, when two newly-identified manuscripts containing it are examined. The second is the Italian textual province, which Mynors argues may eventually prove to be an off-shoot of the German branch of the M-type recension. Besides the two Monte Cassino copies, which he had also listed among the German manuscripts, Mynors places a mere six manuscripts into this family (four extant, and two attested in fifteenth-century sources).

Through the assignment of manuscripts to textual provinces, Mynors established a framework for future studies of the transmission of this widely-read text. Among the surviving branches of this tradition, the Continental families are those about which we know the least, despite the fact that the majority of the eight manuscripts that are useful in the reconstruction of the text have been preserved on the Continent. It follows that the Continental traditions do have the potential to yield significant discoveries. As noted above, because of the long-standing relations between England the German-speaking territories of the Continent, the German branch of the Continental tradition seems particularly important in contemplating the nature of Bede’s influence and the success of his works. It is this branch of the tradition that will be examined in detail now.

35 “Textual Intro.”, p. lxv.
Manuscript Groups within the German Textual Province

One of the first goals of this study, the establishment of a firm textual basis for the so-called German textual province (that is to say, the identification of textual variations common to the manuscripts of the German family) has remained relatively elusive. As noted above, Mynors hypothesized that the German province was ultimately descended from the common ancestor of his MSS U (my Wol) and E (my Wür), which is the manuscript I have called m3 in the provisional stemma. Since Wol and Wür were used by Mynors in the establishment of the text, he must have collated them carefully, but in the published edition—where he treats m as the base text, with variants from c and c2 given in the notes—he does not give any indication of specific readings that distinguish these MSS from the others of the M-type. Thus, his placement of thirty-five other manuscripts, besides Wol and Wür, into the German textual province, while plausible, remains little more than a hypothesis, impossible to verify or expand upon without knowledge of its characteristic readings. To remedy this situation, it has been my goal—in addition to establishing evidence of the relationships between the manuscripts within this group—to uncover readings that distinguish these manuscripts from the others of the M-type, and to make all of this textual evidence available in the form of test collations, so that others might compare them with corresponding passages in other manuscripts not included in this study.

Unfortunately, such characteristic readings of the German family have proven to be relatively few. In the passages collated (Preface; iv.14-15; and v.24, from “Haec de historia. . .” to the end) three distinctive readings have been found that distinguish these MSS from the M-type text as given by Mynors, all of which are located in the Preface. In two cases the difference is one of word order (“Gregorii papae” for “papae Gregorii”; and “Orientalium Saxonum simul et Occidentalium” for “Orientalium simul et Occidentalium . . .”

36 Furthermore, it seems likely that those MSS he refers to as MSS “of which no details are yet available” (p. lxvii), which includes most of the MSS of the Austrian Group discussed below, had not been examined by him, let alone collated. His inclusion in this group of Klosterneuberg 685 (which does not contain the HE at all) and the lost Breslau MS (Wro†), with no indication that it had been lost, are further proof that these textual provinces ought to be treated as no more than provisional.
Saxonum”). In the third case, the difference is in verb tense ("potuerunt" for "poterant").
All three of these readings are shared by Wol and Wür, and by a number of the later manuscripts of the German family. Admittedly, they are a rather narrow basis upon which to establish a separate line of transmission, but in cases where all three are present, they can serve reasonably well as provisional indicators of likely descent from m3. Besides Wol and Wür themselves, of the thirty-two other copies of the text included in this study, sixteen contain all three readings: these are SG1-2, LA1, Asc, P4, P8, P5, P12, Aug, Rei, Nür, Mü1, P14, and BR2, as well as the editio princeps from A.D. 1475 (which, as noted in the list of sigla above, is here referred to as Egg, for its printer Heinrich Eggestein) and the Tegernsee MS designated Mü2, which (as will be seen below) is a copy of the printed edition. In addition, the seven manuscripts that comprise what I have designated as the Austrian group (also discussed in detail below), though defective in the passages containing the first two tests, do agree with the German group in the third. Wi2 agrees with the German MSS in only the first reading; Wi5 and LR1 in only the second. Of the remaining five manuscripts, Sch, Pra, and Got do not contain any of the characteristic readings, while LA4 and Wi3 lack the entire preface and therefore cannot be checked for these readings.

Thus, while the majority of manuscripts Mynors had placed into his German textual province do in fact seem to be descendants of m3 (at least according to these relatively narrow criteria), others stand somewhat apart. Furthermore, within the German textual province, it has been possible to establish a textual basis for a number of groups of closely related or derived manuscripts. Each of these groups will be discussed in turn below, beginning with those that seem most closely connected to Wol and Wür themselves.

37 As indicated in the test collations (Chapter Three) below, nn. 139, 144, and 213.

38 Or perhaps of m2; I have not yet had opportunity to examine Nam, which may or may not contain these readings. The next logical step toward fortifying this body of evidence for the German family, would be to complete full collations of Wol and Wür in order to uncover additional readings that distinguish them from the other M-type MSS. The manuscripts provisionally included in the German family could then be checked against those passages. While I do intend to complete such collations eventually, they are beyond the scope of the present inquiry.

39 An additional MS now in Berlin (BS3, s. x-xi, of unknown origin, but by s. xii in Wroclaw) was omitted by Mynors without comment, and it has not been possible to include it in the present study. I have, however, checked it for the three characteristic “German” readings, and it does not have them, and therefore seems not to be related to Wol-Wür. Perhaps it is related to m2, or to Mynors’ “French” textual province.
THE ST. GALL GROUP (SG1, SG2, LA1, ASC)

Mynors believed that the ninth-century MS SG1 was derived from Wol, a conclusion which is not called into question by any of the evidence gathered in the test collations. Nonetheless, in the course of the collations several readings have been revealed that distinguish SG1 from Wol, and a number of these characteristic readings can also be observed in three later manuscripts, which suggests that they, in turn, are descendants of SG1. For this reason, I refer to these four manuscripts as the St. Gall group. The oldest of SG1’s descendants is LA1, an eleventh-century copy from St. Georgenberg in the Tyrol, the affinities of which to SG1 were also recognized by Mynors himself. The other two are likewise of Southern origin: SG2, a historical compilation MS probably put together at St. Gall; and Asc, which may be connected to the Carthusian house of Mons Sancti Johannis in Freiburg im Breisgau, though a flyleaf would seem to connect it to Speyer.

THE AUSTRIAN GROUP (Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe)

Another discrete group of MSS that may well be descended from m3 (its representatives share one of the three characteristic readings, and are defective where one would expect to find the other two), is distinguished from the other manuscripts by a large number of readings found only in manuscripts of this group. All of these manuscripts seem to be of Austrian origin, and six of them date from the twelfth century. They are: Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4 (of s. xv), and Zwe. A sample of their characteristic readings includes: the insertion “et” before “ecclesiasticam” (n. 14 in the test collations); the omission of “trans-” from “transscribendum” (n. 19); the omission of “huius” (n. 67), though Zwe has it inserted above the line; the reading “esse” for “sibi” (n. 292); the omission of the particle “a” (n. 347); the reading “ubi” in place of “in quo” (n. 371); “autem” for “enim” (n. 380); “uoca” for “clama” (n. 406); omission of “Deo” (n. 438); “autem” for “et enim” (n. 452); “sicut” for “ut”

40 “Textual Introduction,” p. lxv.
41 Ibid., p. lxvi; this MS was the most faithful MS of the German family used by Plummer, though he did not recognize it as distinct from the other M-type MSS.
42 The evidence connecting this MS to both Speyer and the Mons Sancti Iohannis in Freiburg will be discussed fully in Chapter Five below.
(n. 511); and finally the omission of “ex” (n. 660). All of these readings are shared by all seven manuscripts, and are unique to them among the manuscripts here surveyed. More notable than even these correspondences, however, is the omission of approximately one-third of the preface, skipping from “intimare curabo” (Mynors, p. 2; Plummer, p. 6; and n. 75 in ch. 3 below) to “Quae autem” (Mynors, p. 6; Plummer, p. 7; and n. 201 in ch. 3 below). Bede here is closing one section of the prologue and introducing the next with the words “. . . I will make it my business to state briefly from what sources I have gained my information.”

The fact that the text breaks off at the end of a sentence, and picks up again with the beginning of a new thought suggests that this is a case of intentional omission on the part of a scribe, and not one of eye-skip or mutilation of the manuscript. Whatever the scribe’s reasons for making this omission, its effect on the prologue is significant, in that Bede’s discussion of his own historical method, which has aroused such admiration among modern scholars, is all but completely eliminated. The scribe did preserve, however, Bede’s statement about the reliability of his oral witnesses.

With respect to the origins of this family of MSS the manuscripts do not offer any definitive clues. Zwe is superior to the others in a few passages (that is, closer to the received text of the HE), which suggests that it probably lies closer to the archetype of this

---

43 “. . . breviter intimare curabo” (below, Chapter Three, n. 75); sentences 7-16 in the test collations are omitted in these MSS.

44 In the Latin text this is the passage beginning “Quae autem Nordanhymbrorum provincia . . .” (below, Chapter Three, n. 201).
family than the other MSS. Regardless of where the archetype of this family may have originated, that it was an intentional abridgement of the preface seems almost certain.

A sub-group among the manuscripts of this family is marked by a number of readings that set Hei, SF, and Wi4 apart from the others. For example, all three MSS place “omnia” before “puer” rather than at the beginning of the sentence (nn. 491 and 492). In Bede’s autobiographical sketch, they all omit “famulus xpi” (n. 669), “aetatis meae” (n. 711), “patris” (n. 801), “Sancti Iohannis” (n. 836; though this omission is corrected in Hei), and three instances of the word “et” (nn. 804, 926, and 938). They share the alternate readings “atque” for “simul et” (n. 888); “adnotaui” in place of “adnotare studui” (n. 918); and “metrico” for “metro” (n. 925). In some ways the later (and extremely poorly written) Wi4 is more corrupt than the other two MSS, but at least one omission shared by Hei and SF but not by Wi4 (of the words “cetera libros II”; see n. 753) suggests that Wi4 is not derived directly from either of the others.

Ad1 and Ad2 likewise seem to be a subgroup among the manuscripts containing the abridged prologue. Contrary to the dating suggested in the published catalogue of the Admont collection (where Ad1 is placed in the twelfth century and Ad2 in the thirteenth), both of these manuscripts seem to be of the twelfth century, and neither seems notably older than the other. Textually, the two share a number of common variations from the other MSS of this group (“sic” for “siue” [n. 340]; “uultu” for “uultus” [n. 500]; and the transposition of the words “numquam ante” [n. 504]). In other places, Ad1 varies from the

---

45 The key passages are both in v.24. In the list of Bede’s works, Zwe does not omit his commentary on Mark and his Homiliary as do the other manuscripts in this group (n.b.: Wi1 is defective here and cannot be checked). Later on, the phrase “et prius heroico metro et postmodum” is omitted by the all six of the MSS that contain this chapter (again excluding the defective Wi1), including Zwe, though the latter has supplied the missing text in the margin. See nn. 816 and 893 in Chapter Three below.

46 This omission seems to be the result of a scribe having overlooked a case of runover.

47 The description in question is that in the hand-written catalogue of Jakob Wichner, dated October 11, 1887, preserved in Admont; this catalogue was microfilmed as part of the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library’s microfilming project, and is available in the collection Catalogues of Manuscripts in Austrian Monasteries, microfilm, 54 reels (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1972). One might speculate that the presence of material relating to Thomas Becket in Ad2 influenced Wichner to assign it the later date. On the other hand, Wichner was surely aware that these materials were later additions. He may have known of some other evidence that I have overlooked, but judging by the script, the manuscript seems to be of the twelfth century.
main tradition in ways that Ad2 does not, and in at least one case Ad1 incorporates into the main text a word that is an interlinear insertion in Ad2 (n. 349), and which is not found in any of the other manuscripts of this group. Conversely, in the passages collated, Ad2 does not contain any textual variation that is not also found in Ad1, except for one case of word transposition, and that transposition has been corrected by marks indicating the usual order of words. Together, this evidence would seem to point to Ad1 being derived from Ad2.

**The Augsburg Group (Aug, Rei, Nür)**

There is another twelfth-century Austrian manuscript (Rei) that is not part of this so-called “Austrian Group” but rather shows affinities to two manuscripts of (apparently) somewhat more northerly origins, which today are found in Augsburg and Nuremberg (Aug, Nür). Both Rei and Aug are of the twelfth century, whereas Nür dates from the fifteenth. Distinctive readings shared by these MSS include “atque” for “ac” (n. 501); “prima parte” for “primam partem” (n. 742); “cantico” for “canticum” (n. 779); and, perhaps most distinctive, “libros Regum libros xxx” for “in Regum librum xxx questionum” (n. 756). They also share transpositions of “huius oratoria” (n. 473), and “verbis eius” (n. 564). Finally, they seem to share evidence of a case of runover being incorporated into the text in the wrong place: in Bede’s list of his works—in which runover is quite common as the individual items in the list were begun on new lines, frequently leaving blank space at the end of the previous line—the word “Iudicium” has been omitted from the end of the notice of Bede’s first set of capitula (“in pentateucum Mosi, Iosue, Iudicum” [n. 796]), and inserted, quite ungrammatically without the accompanying word “librum,” at the end of the notice of his so-called capitula on Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs (n. 806).

Within this group of three manuscripts, Aug and Nür seem to be closer to one another textually, while Rei stands somewhat apart. Aug and Nür share a few distinctive common readings: both Aug and Nür (but not Rei) omit the phrase “meae meorumque necessitati” (n. 717), and the word “Iosue” (n. 796). Alone these would suggest only that Aug and Nür are closer to each other than to Rei, but the fact that in the passages collated Aug has virtually no distinctive readings that set it apart from Nür—besides a later addition
of the word “et” (n. 83), and an instance of “libro” for “librum” (n. 782)—leaves open the possibility that the latter might be a direct copy of the former.

**French Manuscripts (P4, P5, P8, P12)**

Although it tended to circulate in the German-speaking regions, the type of text characteristic of Mynors’ German family also made its way further west, into southern France, perhaps by way of Italy. There are four French manuscripts in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris that Mynors included in the German group: lat. 5228 (A.D. 1093, La-Chaise-Dieu), 5229 (s. xi, Moissac), 5231 (s. xi, Lagrasse), and 5235 (s. xiv, Avignon). Textually, all four meet the three tests for probable descent from m3, and they seem to fall into two related pairs. First, 5228 and 5231 (my P4 and P8) share these distinctive readings: “uigilantius sane” for “uigilantissime” (n. 59); “proferemus” for “promeremus” (n. 134); “in” for “ut” (n. 150); “acta” for “uita” (n. 174); “cognomenabatur” for “cognominatur” (n. 179); “ciuitate” for “uita” (n. 331); “predicationis” for “deprecationis” (n. 477); one insertion of “autem” (n. 72); and omissions of “simplicis” (n. 382), “propitius” (n. 413), and the entire item beginning “De ratione bissexti. . .” in Bede’s list of his works (n. 858). Both manuscripts reflect the influence of the vernacular in the way they treat initial “h”, but neither manuscript seems to be clearly superior to the other. There are a few readings that they share with the defective MS LA4 (cf. nn. 423, 434, 502, and 642), but there are also a number of distinctive readings in LA4 (cf. nn. 543-44, 575, 632, 645, 676, 778, 782, 832, 844, and 902) that would seem to indicate that the relationship is a relatively distant one.

Paris, BN, lat. 5229 and 5235 (my P5 and P12) seem likewise to be a pair. First of all, they share the distinctive incipit “Incipit anglorum Bedae descriptio gentis” (n. 9). In addition, they share a variant word order (n. 26); one omission of “quod” (n. 221); three cases of reading “que” or “quia” for “quod” (n. 248, 287, 517); “ille” for “et Ini” (n. 621); “Tingiruium” for “Ingyruum” (n. 676); and one insertion of the word “et” (n. 809). More striking than any of these correspondences, however, are several places where P12 seems to follow P5, only to have been corrected later to agree with the main tradition. These include one of the above mentioned instances of “que” for “quod” (n. 287), where P12 has been corrected to read “quod”; a case where both P5 and P12 read “duce” for “dulce,” but where P12 has had the missing ‘l’ inserted above the line (n. 697); instances where both
MSS originally read “quae” for “quem” and “degessi” for “digessi,” but again where P12 has been corrected to agree with the common reading (nn. 386 and 661). Other cases where P12 seems to correct readings in P5 are found in nn. 365, 367, 437, 576, and 613–14. Together the correspondences suggest that P12 may have been a copy of P5 or another closely related manuscript, but that it was subsequently carefully corrected.

**THE TEGERNSEE COPY (MÜ2) AND THE EDITION PRINCEPS (EGG)**

The *HE* made its way into print at an early date. Though the first edition lacks any indication of its date or place of publication, scholars have suggested that the type used appears to be that of Heinrich Eggstein, a printer active in Strasbourg in the 1470s. In Mynors’ discussion of the printed editions of the text, he notes that a reference in the sixteenth-century catalogue of the library of the Vienna Dominicans (which is included below in the discussion of medieval libraries, in Chapter Five) probably referred to a printed book, because it was listed there as breaking off with the words “in dedicionem accepit” (which words are found near the beginning of the chronological recapitulation in *HE* v.24), just as Eggstein’s *editio princeps* does.\(^4\) Furthermore, Mynors had earlier suggested that a copy of the text referred to in the 1483 catalogue of the library of Melk may likewise have been a printed book because, like the Vienna book, it contained Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* in addition to Bede’s.\(^4\) The former text had been printed around the same time and in the same type by Eggstein, and later the two editions would be reprinted together.\(^5\) Mynors gave the period 1475–80 as the probable timeframe for Eggstein’s edition. But this date must be revised to no later than 1475, because a copy in the Włocławek Seminary Library copy contains a rubricator’s date of that year.\(^5\)

\(^{48}\) “Textual intro.,” p. lxx, n. 5, citing MBKÔ, I, 335.15.

\(^{49}\) Ibid., p. lxvii, citing MBKÔ, I, 227.10.

\(^{50}\) The two texts were subsequently reprinted in a single edition, as Mynors indicates (pp. lxx–lxxi), in 1500 by Georg Husner in Strasbourg, and again in 1506 by Heinrich Gran and S. Rynman in Hagenau. That it was reprinted twice in such a short span of time suggests that there was significant demand.

Clearly the defective ending of the copy of the Vienna Dominicans indicates that it must be related to the Eggestein edition, but it does not necessarily prove that their copy was in fact printed. It may, instead, have been a manuscript copy of the edition, similar to a manuscript now found in Munich. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1207 (Mü2) is a copy of the HE from the Bavarian monastery of Tegernsee dated 1477, bound together with a copy of Otto of Freising’s Chronicon de duabus civitatis dated 1479. In Clm 1207 the text of the HE breaks off early in v.24 at exactly the same point as in Egg, with which it even shares the same explicit: “finiunt libri historie ecclesiastice gestis anglorum.” The conclusion that these two versions are textually related is supported by a whole host of minor correspondences, too numerous to repeat here, but which can be found in chapter three below. Some of the more striking examples of textual variation common to Mü2 and Egg are “acta” for “Acca” (see n. 289); “multitudine” for “nutu diuinae” (see n. 319); and the omissions of “epistulas” (n. 121) and “contigit” (n. 362). That the scribe of Mü2 was a better Latinist than Eggestein may account for a number of the instances where Mü2 seems to be superior to Egg.

The phenomenon of manuscript copies of early printed books has been documented previously, and, as several scholars have noted, was probably much more common than is often recognized, in part because the disciplinary divide between the fields of manuscript studies and early printing often prevents scholars from making the necessary connections. That Mü2 cannot be the exemplar from which the edition Egg was made is

52 Egg, p. 199 (counting from the opening page of the text); Mü2, fol. 112ra. The latter reads “gentis” for “gestis” and adds, “anno lxxvii° pro quo sit deo laus et honor in secula seculorum amen.”

53 Cf. n. 46; in n. 146, Mü2 may simply have recognized that Egg’s nonsensical “reuerentis si michi” ought to be “reuerentissimus.”

clear from their respective dates, but of course it remains possible that Mü2 is a copy of the manuscript from which Egg was made, or another manuscript related to it. Perhaps a closer comparison of Mü2 with a copy of Egg than was possible in the context of this study can shed further light on this question. With respect to the Vienna and Melk copies attested in the library catalogues mentioned above, we must reckon with the possibility that they, too, were manuscript copies of the printed edition. Or, what is perhaps even more likely, given the well-known connections between Tegernsee, Melk, and Vienna during this period, either of them may have been the printed copy from which Mü2 was made.

The Continuatio Bedae Manuscripts (Pra, Wi5)

The so-called Continuatio Bedae is a set of nineteen annals for A.D. 732-766 that were appended to the chronological epitome found in HE v.24. Prior to the present study, the Continuatio was held to have survived in eight manuscripts of the HE, originating in the Low Countries and northern Germany and dating from the 12th-16th centuries (Dre, Lzg, and Man of s. xii; Pri of s. xiv; LA3, Ldn, and Utr of s. xv; and Gla of A.D. 1515). To these eight copies can now be added Pra (of s. xii) and Wi5 (of s. xv), both of which contain a version of the Continuatio that corresponds in general, though not in all particulars, to the versions published by Plummer and Mynors. The origins of this collection of annals remain obscure. It seems plausible that they were written down contemporaneously, or at least in the eighth century, and they may be related to the so-called “Northern Annals” that have left traces in a number of later historical works, including the “Northern Recension” of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Symeon of Durham’s Tract on the Progress of the Church of Durham.

Whatever the origins of this collection may ultimately prove to be, it is clear from their presence in Pra and Wi5 that these two manuscripts cannot be direct descendants of

---

55 On the manuscripts see Mynors, “Textual Introduction,” lxvii-lxiv; and the text and translation printed on pp. 572-77. Plummer also printed a text, which, according to Mynors (op. cit., p. lxviii), was based on that printed by Henry Petrie in the Monumenta Historica Britannica, p. 288, and which includes variant readings from his MS A, (my LA3).

56 For a list of the texts which may be connected to the Northern Annals, see the description of them by David Rollason, Derek Gore, and Gillian Fellows-Jensen, Sources for York History to AD 1100, The Archaeology of York, 1 (York : York Archaeological Trust, 1998), s.n. S.37.
Wol or Wür, and therefore also not of the hypothetical archetype of this family, *m3*. As noted above in the discussion of the characteristics of the German family, of the three tests distinguishing this family, there is only one reading in one of these manuscripts that agrees with the German type (namely the second test in Wi5, which is a variation that could have come about independently). Besides sharing the *Continatio*, the two MSS agree with one another against the rest of the manuscripts examined here in a number of ways, including the following: the omission of “specialiter” (n. 279); the insertion of “famulus xpi” together with a change in word order (n. 315); several transpositions of words (nn. 329, 354, and 377); and the reading “debes” for “habes” (n. 397). That Wi5 is not a direct descendant of Pra is suggested by a number of independent variations found in each of the manuscripts, including in their texts of the *Continatio*.57

**THE CAEDMON’S HYMN MANUSCRIPTS (P14, BR2)**

The Old English poem *Caedmon’s Hymn*, which was paraphrased in Latin by Bede when he recounted the story of Caedmon in *HE iv.24* (22), is preserved in several distinct vernacular versions that were copied into the margins (or in the case of CUL, at the end of the MS), and sometimes incorporated into the flow of the main text of manuscripts of the both the Latin and Old English *HE*. Two manuscripts included by Mynors in the German textual province are distinguished from the others by the fact that they have a later Northumbrian version of the poem incorporated into the main text. As has been firmly established by previous studies of the poem in these manuscripts, the vernacular version contained in these and one other manuscript (Dij) are all derived from a common archetype known as *Y*.58 The differences in dialect between this version of the poem and

---

57 See below, Appendix B, where these two texts are transcribed in full. I am currently planning an edition of the *Continatio* based on all ten surviving MSS.

the early Northumbrian version preserved in CUL (which, as noted above, was on the Continent by ca. 800) could only have been introduced by a native English speaker (and presumably only a Northumbrian) and this fact rules out the possibility that these manuscripts are direct textual descendants of CUL. It is furthermore unlikely that they are somehow connected to the original migrant to the Continent that was the source of the manuscripts of the German textual province (i.e., it seems that they cannot be descended from the hypothetical manuscripts I have called m2 and m3 above), as was suggested by Daniel O’Donnell.59 While it is true that the poem could easily been left out of an early manuscript in this group, and therefore might not have made its way into the main m3 tradition as represented by Wol and Wür even though it was in fact in their common archetype. This original migrant must have made its way to the Continent sometime in the mid to late eighth century (since Wol was copied in later part of that century), and considering both the poem’s orthography and its dialect, it seems highly unlikely that this version of the poem could have existed at such an early date.60

Another important marker that distinguishes P14 and BR2 from the other manuscripts examined in this study is the presence in these two MSS of the so-called Moore continuations.61 These four annals covering the years 731-734—not to be confused with the set of annals for the years 731-766 that are commonly referred to as the Continuatio Bedae—were added to the end of the Moore manuscript (CUL, fol. 128r) after the main text had already been brought to a close with the formula, “explicit domino iuuante liber v historiae ecclesiasticae gentis anglorum.”62 In the Moore manuscript, the annals


60 The evidence for the HE manuscript that contained *Y being a late migrant from Northumbria to the Continent, and thus for the text of the HE preserved in that MS possibly being representative of an M-type text of the HE available in Northumbria in the later Anglo-Saxon period (and hence, perhaps, available to the compiler of the “Northern Recension” of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, for example, who is known to have used an M-type MS), is treated fully in my article, “Evidence for the Presence of M-type Manuscripts of Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica in Northern England after ca. 800,” which is forthcoming in the 2006 volume of the Revue Bénédictine.

61 Printed both by Plummer (vol. 1, p. 361) and by Colgrave-Mynors (p. 572).

62 Of course it is possible that the explicit (which is in red) was added later, but the fact that a line was left blank for it indicates clearly that the exemplar of CUL brought the main text to a close here. On these annals and the hand that wrote them, see the remarks by Peter Hunter Blair in the preface to the facsimile
were written by the same hand, and probably at the same time as the main text, though their position after end of the entire text—and not at the end of the annalistic recapitulation that forms the first part of the final chapter, preceding Bede’s autobiographical sketch—suggests that the annals may well have been year-by-year additions to the exemplar from which CUL was copied. Besides CUL, P14, and BR2, I know of no other manuscript that contains these four annals together, nor does either Plummer or Mynors mention their presence in any other manuscript. Whether these continuations made their way into any of CUL’s seven direct descendants (perhaps via an intermediate copy made at the Carolingian court) is unclear from any of the published descriptions of those MSS, with the exception of the description of BS1, which clearly indicates that they are not present.63 Furthermore, Plummer examined one of those descendants, LH1, for his edition, and made no mention of it containing the continuations, even though he did recognize a close relationship between CUL and LH1, and it seems likely that he would have mentioned these annals in the context of discussing that relationship.64

In contrast to the position of the annals in CUL after the end of the text, P14 and Br2 both have the four annals incorporated at the end of the recapitulation that begins v.24, just before the beginning of Bede’s autobiographical sketch. This is a logical place to incorporate them in the text, so this alone would not rule out the possibility that these manuscripts were in some way derived from CUL. There are, however, a number of minor errors in CUL that make identification of its descendants relatively easy, and P14 and BR2 do not share these. Furthermore, P14 and BR2 are not, in fact, perfectly of the M-type recension of manuscripts. Though they do fit most of the criteria, they follow the C-type in

63 The description is that of Valentin Rose, Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, I: Die Meerman-Handschriften des Sir Thomas Phillipps (Berlin: A. Asher, 1893), p. 296, which states that the recapitulatio “geht bis a. 731 (wie in der Ausg.),” and which seems detailed enough to have indicated the presence of the annals were they to be found in the same position as they are in CUL. On the evidence for CUL’s presence at the court of Charlemagne and for the existence of an intermediary copy that served as the exemplar of the seven direct progeny of CUL, see Bischoff, “The Court Library of Charlemagne,” pp. 67–68.

64 In vol. 2, p. 344, he notes that all four annals are found in CUL (his M), while those for a.d. 733–734 are in LCT2 (his C); had the annals made their way into CUL’s descendant LH1, Plummer surely would have made note of their presence.
the reading “unum quod” in iv.30 (instead of the M-type’s “quaedam quae”). As Mynors has noted, this is the inferior reading (the plural is more correct, because it refers to two miracle stories that follow in manuscripts of both C-type and M-type), and so the presence of this reading in manuscripts that are otherwise of the M-type is unlikely to have been the result of contamination.\(^{65}\)

The relationship of these two manuscripts to the rest of the tradition is a problem that cannot be fully resolved here. As noted above in the discussion of the German textual province, P14 and BR2 do in fact meet the three tests for inclusion in the m3 family. At the same time, the presence of a late Northumbrian version of Caedmon’s Hymn and the Moore Continuations sets them apart from the other manuscripts examined here in a dramatic way, and would seem to indicate that the archetype of these manuscripts migrated to the Continent much later than the archetype of the German family. The fact that they both follow the C-type reading in a passage that is one of Mynors’ main tests for inclusion in the C-type family, further obscures their relationship to the rest of the tradition, and even though the evidence assembled thus far is far from conclusive, the conclusion that they may be descended from a manuscript that stood somewhere between the C-type and M-type recensions is not far off (a conclusion that is, after all, not that surprising given that the differences between the two recensions may go back to Bede, and that neither recension is clearly superior to the other).

**THE SCHAFFHAUSEN (SCH) AND FRANKENTHAL (WI2) MANUSCRIPTS**

The copies from Schaffhausen and Frankenthal stand somewhat apart from the others in that they do not (with the exception of one reading found in Wi2, which may be a coincidence) meet the tests for inclusion in group of manuscripts descended from m3. They do, on the other hand, share a number of readings that would seem to indicate a close relationship between them. These include changes in word order (nn. 388, 457, 641/643); shared omissions, such as “ergo” (n. 389), “apostoli” (n. 391), “annorum tempore” (n. 630), “ad” (n. 728), and “potui” (n. 911); and at least one shared insertion (n. 869). Both MSS are of the twelfth century, and Wi2 contains several omissions that Sch does not. Conversely,

---

\(^{65}\)“Textual Intro.” p. xli.
where Sch shows a variation not in Wi2, very often the differences are the work of a corrector (see n. 182, 259, 761, 816, and 952). Thus, it remains possible that Sch is in some way an ancestor of Wi2.

**Copies Unconnected to Other Copies in This Study (Got, LA4, LR1, MÜ1, Wi3)**

Several other copies examined in the context of this study cannot be connected to any of the others based on the evidence of the test collations. A few comments on their characteristics must suffice at the present time.

The Gotha MS (Got) is set apart from the other MSS in this study by a number of readings unique to it (see nn. 63, 79, 87, 92, 160, 180, 185, 195, 262, 374, 409, 443, and many others). Occasionally, it corresponds to variant readings in other manuscripts, but it does so neither dramatically nor consistently. As noted above, it (like Pra and Sch) does not follow any of the three tests for descent from m3, and one could perhaps speculate that it might be connected to Nam, though according to the variant readings from Nam recorded by Plummer, this does not seem likely.

LR1 is an eccentric copy of the text containing a large number of errors not duplicated in any other manuscripts. As was noted by Plummer, this copy seems to reflect the dislocation of quires in its exemplar. In addition, this manuscript contains a large number of idiosyncratic readings and scribal errors that would make identifying related manuscripts a relatively easy task (cf. nn. 25, 45, 62, 64, 103, 112, 154, 159, 185, 200, 225, 250, 253, and the many other instances noted in Chapter Three below). This manuscript is also unique among the manuscripts of Mynors’ German family in that it is almost certainly of insular origins.

MÜ1 is a copy dated 1549 from the collection of the Augsburg humanist and book collector Johann Jakob Fugger, likely to be connected to another manuscript not collated here, namely the manuscript that is now located in the Biblioteca nazionale centrale in

---

66 Plummer, I, p. ci.

67 Besides the HE, its contents include two metrical summaries of English history; a letter of Otto, papal legate to England, Ireland, and Wales; and a fragmentary text of Gerald of Wales’ *Topographia Hibernica*.
Florence under the shelfmark MS. Conv. Soppr. A.1.450 (my FN1). FN1 was formerly in the collection of Santa Maria Novella in Florence. Although I have not yet had opportunity to examine the latter in order to establish proof of the relationship, the scribal notice centered on the tile page of the text of the HE in Mü1 (“Historiæ gentis Anglorum per Venerablem Bedam presbyterum. Ex Bybliotheca S. Mariæ Novellæ Florentiæ 1549.”) would seem to be an indication that Mü2 is a copy of a manuscript in the Santa Maria Novella library, and not, as has been previously suggested, a traditional ex libris mark. It is well documented that Fugger acquired many MSS for his collection from Venice and Florence, and that he had manuscripts copied on commission and bound there before being sent back to Augsburg.

As noted by Mynors, LA4 is a defective manuscript consisting of approximately one quarter of the text. As I have indicated above in the discussion of French manuscripts of the German text-type, it does occasionally agree with the P4/P8 pair, though in a number of other places they contain variations that it does not, and in others it varies from the received text in ways that they do not. For the present time, the exact nature of its connection to the other copies remains an open question.

Though it only contains book three, Wi3 was placed by Mynors in the list of manuscripts which shared distinctive German-type readings (p. xlvii), and not among the manuscripts at the end of the discussion of the German type, which he presumably had not

68 I have described this manuscript in detail in “Manuscripts of Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich,” in Angelsächsisches Erbe in München / Anglo-Saxon Heritage in Munich: Angelsächsische Handschriften, Schreiber und Autoren aus den Beständen der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München / Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, Scribes and Authors from the Collections of the Bavarian State Library in Munich, ed. Hans Sauer et al. (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005), 89-100.


examined, but which he nevertheless placed into the German group. Because it does not contain any of the passages that have been used as test collations in this study, it has not been possible to compare it with the other copies in order to determine its textual relationships to the others. It will, however, be discussed briefly in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER 3
TEST COLLATIONS

INTRODUCTION

One could undoubtedly learn a great deal about the transmission of the HE by collating the entire text of all the surviving manuscripts, but it is unlikely that those findings would be of such significance as to repay the amount of labor required to complete such a Herculean task. The HE is a long text, running over 79,000 words, and thus to collate a single manuscript of the complete text would take weeks of labor. Fortunately, a great deal can be learned about the relations of the various manuscripts from well-chosen test-collation passages, and thus this seemed like an efficient starting-point for this investigation.

Through an initial examination of several manuscripts of the text in microfilm, and subsequently in person, and a review of the textual notes provided in the editions of Plummer and Colgrave-Mynors, a number of candidate passages were identified, from which four were ultimately chosen. The first passage, the complete preface, is of interest for a study of the reception of the HE because it is there that Bede discusses his specific methods as a historian and reflects on the purpose of historical writing (admittedly, however, in a rather topos-laden fashion). It was also apparent from preliminary examination of microfilm of manuscripts from Admont that the preface had been abridged significantly in certain copies, which abridgement could thus serve as evidence of textual filiation. The second and third passages, IV.14-15 (miracles of St. Oswald), were selected primarily because they represent a problem-area in the text, having been omitted from manuscripts of the c-type (or, perhaps more likely, having been added to the text after a

---

1 Brown, *Bede the Venerable*, pp. 86-87.
version without the miracles had already made its way into circulation). Furthermore, as is clear from Mynors’ textual notes, the division of these chapters varies significantly from manuscript to manuscript; finally, given that St. Oswald was a popular saint on the Continent, it seemed possible that this section of the text would be liable to being tampered with by later generations of scribes and readers. The fourth passage, Bede’s “bio-bibliography” at the end of the text in v.24, also contains a number of variant readings, including two that are believed to separate manuscripts of the c-type from those of the m-type. In addition, the contents of the passage, primarily a list of the author’s writings, would seem both to lend themselves to later scribal “correction” and annotation, and to be of use for assessing the reception of Bede’s entire oeuvre.

Thus, in each of these four passages—which together are approximately 2,100 words, or just over 2.5% of the full text—there are both textual and content-related reasons to believe that they might prove fruitful ground for test collations. That these assumptions were in fact borne out in the actual examination of manuscripts I hope to make clear in the presentation that follows.

**CONVENTIONS OF COLLATION**

In presenting the collations I have sought to reproduce not just those readings that are significant in my establishment of textual relationships within the German textual province, but all readings which could conceivably prove significant for the establishment of the relationships of these MSS to those in other families. This includes some otherwise insignificant orthographical variation, particularly in proper names, but not differences due to assimilation or duplication of consonants (e.g. inl- vs. ill-, referat vs. refferat), and not the myriad variations in the use of ‘æ’, ‘ae’, and e-caudata, all of which are transcribed here

---


3 The passages in question are the listing of his Capitula on the prophets (omitted in C-type), and the number of books ascribed to his commentary on the Song of Songs (six in the C-type; seven in the M-type). See Plummer, pp. 356 and 358; Mynors, pp. 566 and 568, and McClure-Collins, p. xxi.
as ‘ae’. Abbreviations have been silently expanded. 4 Cancellations and corrections, where visible, have been recorded in the notes, and the nature of the correction explained (with the phrases “changed to” and “corr. from”). An opinion as to whether corrections are contemporary with the main hand or later has been offered only exceptionally, when an the evidence was reasonalby clear. Insertions above the line have been set between two slashes: \ and /. And where significant for understanding the reading, line breaks have been marked with a double slash: //. In cases where multiple manuscripts have been referenced in a single footnote, I have generally arranged them in chronological order, giving the readings attested in older manuscripts first, but I have freely varied from this general priciple in order to juxtapose readings that seemed as though they might be connected to one another in some way.

Manuscript punctuation has been ignored. Capitalization has likewise been ignored (in the passages I have followed the modern convention of capitalizing proper names), but the placement of multi-line or colored initials, occasionally used to mark off sub-divisions within the chapters, has been noted. The punctuation of the passages follows the edition of Mynors, who generally used punctuation much more sparingly than did Plummer. The base text used for the collations follows the edition of Mynors, but it has been checked against Plummer. In these four sections, the two editions differ on only a few minor points, mostly orthographical, and in general Mynors’ edition corresponds more closely to the orthography of the earliest manuscripts.

Plummer’s textual notes are more copious, and provide some individual manuscript readings. 5 Mynors’ notes most often indicate only the variant readings from the reconstructed archetypes of his major recensions (m, c, and c2; the last of these is, essentially, where the other C-type MSS differ from Ka1). Where it seems relevant in my

4 The abbreviations for nomina sacra, however, have been reproduced here, and this requires explanation. Because these abbreviations are employed generally in the MSS into the fifteenth century, and given that they are unlikely to cause the reader any confusion, it seemed as though it would give a truer sense of the manuscripts to retain them in the text of the collations. I have not, however, noted each and every instance where the abbreviations are not used (Mii1, for example, does not employ them at all).

5 Especially for his four main manuscripts CUL, LCT1-2, and Nam, but also the 37 others listed by him on pp. xcviii-cxxviii (It seems that Plummer did not examine all the manuscripts he listed on cxliii-cxliv, including the Monte Cassino MSS, and most of the Cambridge MSS).
collations, I refer to the notes of Plummer and Mynors, most often summarizing them, but occasionally quoting them verbatim. To facilitate the comparison of these collations with the Plummer and Colgrave-Mynors editions, I have given their page numbers in brackets in my text, at the point where new pages begin, marking them with an “M” or a “P” (for Mynors and Plummer, respectively). In compiling these collations, I have been painfully aware of the difficulty of striking a proper balance between providing all relevant data and the usefulness of abstraction, and when in doubt about a specific point, I have endeavored to err on the side of full disclosure.

**Figure 3**

**Location of the Passages Collated in Each Manuscript**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>IV.14</th>
<th>IV.15</th>
<th>V.24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad1</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>55r-v</td>
<td>55v</td>
<td>79v-80r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad2</td>
<td>1v-2r</td>
<td>102r-103r</td>
<td>103r-v</td>
<td>158v-59v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asc</td>
<td>2r-4r</td>
<td>206r-207v</td>
<td>138r</td>
<td>199v-201r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1r-2r</td>
<td>82r-83r</td>
<td>83r-v</td>
<td>126v-127v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR2</td>
<td>2ra-vb</td>
<td>56rb-57ra</td>
<td>57ra</td>
<td>86va-87rb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg</td>
<td>[pp. 1a-2b]</td>
<td>[pp. 132b-34b]</td>
<td>[p. 134b]</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got</td>
<td>1v-3r</td>
<td>102v-104r</td>
<td>104r</td>
<td>156v-58r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hei</td>
<td>1r-v</td>
<td>91r-92v</td>
<td>92v</td>
<td>140v-41v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA1</td>
<td>1r-2v</td>
<td>117r-18v</td>
<td>118v-19r</td>
<td>183r†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 Obviously, what Plummer and Mynors were doing in their respective editions is far different from what I am attempting here, so their notes ought not be treated as though they were fully compatible with mine in either aims or conventions. Nonetheless, they occasionally offer interesting supplementary information.

7 Passages that are completely lacking in a given manuscript are marked with an obelus (†) set on the line; passages that are only partially lacking due to some defect in the manuscript are marked with the same in superscript.

8 For these collations I have used a facsimile of a copy in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (2° Inc. s. a. 176), which is found in *Incunabula*, ed. Lotte Hellinga, unit 5, no. CH10 (4 fiches). The pages of the Munich copy are not numbered. I have therefore assigned numbers to the pages beginning with the first page of the text and proceeding consecutively from there, and these are the page numbers given.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LA4</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>9ra-vb</td>
<td>9vb</td>
<td>24ra-vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LR1</td>
<td>7rb-8ra</td>
<td>55va-56rb</td>
<td>56rb-va, 64va</td>
<td>100rb-101ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü1</td>
<td>251r-53r</td>
<td>347r-49r</td>
<td>349r</td>
<td>472r-73v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mü2</td>
<td>1ra-vb</td>
<td>72vb-74ra</td>
<td>74ra</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nür</td>
<td>1r-v</td>
<td>66ra-vb</td>
<td>66vb-67ra</td>
<td>102rb-3ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>1va-2vb</td>
<td>82va-83va</td>
<td>83va-b</td>
<td>126rb-vb†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>2r-3v</td>
<td>117v-119r</td>
<td>119r</td>
<td>176r-v†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>3va-5ra</td>
<td>90ra-91ra</td>
<td>91ra</td>
<td>128va-29rb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>3ra-vb</td>
<td>74va-75va</td>
<td>75va</td>
<td>114rb-15ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td>2r-v</td>
<td>64v-65v</td>
<td>65v</td>
<td>99v-100v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pra</td>
<td>1r-v</td>
<td>47r-v</td>
<td>48r</td>
<td>76v†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rei</td>
<td>1v-3r</td>
<td>100v-102r</td>
<td>102r</td>
<td>156v-57v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch</td>
<td>1v-2v</td>
<td>75r-76r</td>
<td>76r-v</td>
<td>127r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1r-v</td>
<td>100v-112r</td>
<td>112r</td>
<td>167v-168v†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG1</td>
<td>pp. 2-5</td>
<td>pp. 197-99</td>
<td>pp. 199</td>
<td>pp. 300-302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG2</td>
<td>pp. 554b-55a</td>
<td>pp. 608b-609a</td>
<td>pp. 609a</td>
<td>pp. 635b-36a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi1</td>
<td>1v</td>
<td>61r-62r</td>
<td>62r</td>
<td>95v†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi2</td>
<td>1va-2rb</td>
<td>59ra-vb</td>
<td>59vb</td>
<td>88ra-va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi3</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi4</td>
<td>1ra-vb</td>
<td>117vb-18ra</td>
<td>118va-b</td>
<td>180ra-81vb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi5</td>
<td>72r-v</td>
<td>117r-v</td>
<td>117v</td>
<td>136r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wol</td>
<td>1r-2r</td>
<td>109v-111r</td>
<td>111r-v</td>
<td>169r-70v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wür</td>
<td>1r-2r</td>
<td>73r-74r</td>
<td>74v</td>
<td>113v-14v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwe</td>
<td>1r</td>
<td>61v-62r</td>
<td>62r-v</td>
<td>93r-v, 109r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PASSAGE ONE: PREFACE

1. [M2-3; P5] INCIPIT PRAEFATIO. 9. 2. Gloriosissimo 10 regi Ceoluulfo 11 Beda famulus xpi 12 et presbyter 13. 3. Historiam gentis Anglorum ecclesiasticam 14, quam nuper edideram, libentissime tibi desideranti 15, rex, et 16 prius ad legendum ac probandum 17 transmisi, 18 et nunc ad transscribendum 19 ac plenius ex 20 tempore 21 meditandum 22 retransmitto 23; satisque

9 According to Plummer, Nam opens with “In nomine Sanctae Trinitatis, Patris scilicet et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, Incipit Praefatio,” which is an incipit I have not found duplicated in any other manuscript. Instead, the manuscripts collated here begin with the following formulae: Incipit Praefatio Wür and possibly Wol (the latter is just barely legible in the microfilm) | Incipit praefatio Bedae presbyteri SG1, LA1 | Incipit præfatio libri ecclesiasticæ gentis Anglorum Beda famuli xpi P4, P8 | Incipit praefatio Bede famuli Dei in historiam gentis Anglorum Ad1, Ad2, SF, Hei, Wi1 (probable, though only partially legible), and Zwe | Incipit prefacio Bede in hystoriam anglorum et ecclesiasticam W14 | Incipit praefatio Bedae presbiteri in ecclesiastica historia gentis Anglorum Got, Wi5 | Incipit praefacio [ . . . ] Anglorum Pra (only faint traces of text are visible here; the published catalogue does not give the full incipit, but suggests that it ends with “de gestis Anglorum”) | Incipit prologus Bede presbyteri in ecclesiasticam historiam gentis Anglorum Aug, Nür, Rei (with “uenerabilis” before “Bede” and reading “ecclesiastica historia” where the other MSS have the accusative), Sch, and Wi2; P14 and BR2 also agree with these MSS, but have historia ecclesiasticam | Incipit anglorum Bedae descriptio gentis P5, P12 | Historia Gentis Anglorum Per Venerabilem Bedam Presbiterum Mü1 | Incipit praefacio in historiam gentis Anglorum Asc | no incipit SG2, Mü2, Egg | LR1 is illegible here | LA4 is defective here and does not contain the prologue.

10 In most MSS, the ‘G’ in “Gloriosissimo” is set off as a multi-line initial, which is sometimes decorated, though rarely elaborately. The initials in these MSS range in relative size from the ten-line initial planned (though not filled in) for Wi4, to the simple three-line initial found in SG1. Mü1 is unique among the MSS here examined in that it sets off (as a five-line initial) the letter ‘H’ in “Historia” (below, sent. 3) instead. These initials are frequently followed by one or more lines of display capitals.

11 Ceoluulfo SG1, SG2 | Ceolwlfþo Asc | Ceolwlfþo Wi2 | Ceolwlfþo LR1 | Ceoluulfo Ad1 | Cheoluulfo Aug | Cheoluulfo Rei | om. Nür | Cheoluulfo Ad2 | Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe | Geoliulfo (?) | W15 | Econulpho BR2 | Celuulpho Egg | Cieluelpho Mü2 | Celuulpho Mü1 | As a result of what appears to be water damage, Pra is illegible from here to the word presbyter at the end of this sentence, and again frequently for brief passages through the word noxiwm (sent. 4 below).

12 famulus xpi xpi famulus Wi5.

13 presbyter salutem LR1.

14 et ecclesiasticam Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.

15 deside[r/anti Wi4.

16 om. P14, BR2.

17 probatum Nür.

18 admisi P14 | trasmisi BR2.

19 corr. from te scribendum Got | scribendum Ad1, Ad2, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
studium tuae sinceritatis\textsuperscript{24} amplector\textsuperscript{25}, quo non solum audiendis scripturae sanctae\textsuperscript{26} uerbis aurem sedulis\textsuperscript{27} accommodas, uerum etiam\textsuperscript{28} noscendis\textsuperscript{29} priorum\textsuperscript{30} gestis siue\textsuperscript{31} dictis\textsuperscript{32}, et\textsuperscript{33} maxime nostra gentis\textsuperscript{34} uirorum inlustrium, curam\textsuperscript{35} uigilanter\textsuperscript{36} inpendis\textsuperscript{37}. 4. Siue enim\textsuperscript{38} historia\textsuperscript{39} de bonis bona\textsuperscript{40} referat\textsuperscript{41}, ad imitandum\textsuperscript{42} bonum\textsuperscript{43} auditor sollicitus\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{20} corr. from et Wür.
\textsuperscript{21} ex tempore\textsuperscript{] mem}oria P14, BR2.
\textsuperscript{22} Plummer notes here that LCT2 (his C) has meditatum.
\textsuperscript{23} \textsuperscript{\textbackslash re/transmitto} Got \| om. \textsuperscript{re-} Egg, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{24} tuae sinceritatis\textsuperscript{] tunc cinceritatis LR1.
\textsuperscript{25} amplector est LR1.
\textsuperscript{26} scripturae sanctae\textsuperscript{] scriptum scientie Egg, Mü2 \| scripturae sanctae audiendis P5, P12.
\textsuperscript{27} sedulis LR1 \| sedulius Egg, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{28} et Sch, Wi2 \| autem Ad1.
\textsuperscript{29} corr. from nocendis P8.
\textsuperscript{30} p\textbackslash r\textbackslash i\textbackslash orum Wür
\textsuperscript{31} seu Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe \| sine (?) Nür.
\textsuperscript{32} om. accommodas . . . dictis LR1.
\textsuperscript{33} ac Ad1.
\textsuperscript{34} gentis nostrae BR2.
\textsuperscript{35} aurem Mü2, Egg \| quam P14.
\textsuperscript{36} uigilantem (?) Nür.
\textsuperscript{37} inpendunt Nür.
\textsuperscript{38} LR1 seems to have “.ii.” here, perhaps the result of confusion of the insular “enim” abbreviation.
\textsuperscript{39} historia Nür \| the ‘H’ has been erased in P4; the same erasure (of the ‘h’ in “historia”) occurs frequently in this MS, though additional instances have not been recorded below.
\textsuperscript{40} om. P8, BR2.
\textsuperscript{41} referit Ad1, Ad2, Hei (?), Mü1, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
\textsuperscript{42} immitandum P8.
\textsuperscript{43} bonus P5, P12.
instigatur;\textsuperscript{45} seu mala commemoret\textsuperscript{46} de prauis, nihilominus\textsuperscript{47} religiosus\textsuperscript{48} ac\textsuperscript{49} pius auditor siue\textsuperscript{50} lector deuitando\textsuperscript{51} quod noxium est ac\textsuperscript{52} peruersum, ipse\textsuperscript{53} sollertius\textsuperscript{54} ad exsequenda\textsuperscript{55} ea\textsuperscript{56} quae bona ac\textsuperscript{57} Deo digna esse cognouerit, accenditur\textsuperscript{58}. \textbf{5.} Quod ipsum tu quoque uigilantissime\textsuperscript{59} deprehendens, historiam memoratam in notitiam tibi simul et eis, quibus te\textsuperscript{60} regendis diuina præfecit\textsuperscript{61} auctoritas\textsuperscript{62}, ob generalis curam salutis latius propalari desideras. \textbf{6.} [P6] Ut autem\textsuperscript{63} in his\textsuperscript{64} quae scripsi uel\textsuperscript{65} tibi uel ceteris\textsuperscript{66} auditoribus siue

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} sollicitius: P4 || sollicitius: P8.
\item \textsuperscript{45} instigatur: LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{46} commemorat: Ad1, Ad2, Hei (?), LR1, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
\item \textsuperscript{47} nihil hominus: Wol, LR1 || nichil omnis: P4 || nichil hominus: P8 || the word is over erasure in Nür, with something (now illegible) in the margin.
\item \textsuperscript{48} religiosus: (?) Wol || tunc religiosus: Egg.
\item \textsuperscript{49} aut: Wi5.
\item \textsuperscript{50} seu: LR1
\item \textsuperscript{51} deuitandum: Got || deuitande: Egg.
\item \textsuperscript{52} atque: Rei.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Got originally had \textit{ille}, but this has been changed to \textit{inde}.
\item \textsuperscript{54} solestius: Egg, Mü2 (but corrected).
\item \textsuperscript{55}\textbackslash ex\textbackslash equ\textbackslash e\textbackslash nda: Wi1.
\item \textsuperscript{56} om. P14, BR2.
\item \textsuperscript{57} a: P4, P8.
\item \textsuperscript{58} accedatur: Wi5.
\item \textsuperscript{59} uigilantius sane: P4 || uigilancias sane: P8.
\item \textsuperscript{60} om. Mü1.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Plummer notes that LCT2 (his C) has \textit{concessit} here.
\item \textsuperscript{62} auctoritas est: LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{63} ergo: Got.
\item \textsuperscript{64} illis: LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{65} om. Wi1, Pra.
\end{itemize}
lectoribus huius\textsuperscript{67} historiae\textsuperscript{68} occasionem\textsuperscript{69} dubitandi\textsuperscript{70} subtraham\textsuperscript{71}, quibus haec\textsuperscript{72} maxime auctoribus\textsuperscript{73} didicerim\textsuperscript{74} breuiter intimare curabo\textsuperscript{75}.

7. Auctor\textsuperscript{76} ante omnes atque adiutor\textsuperscript{77} opusculi\textsuperscript{78} huius\textsuperscript{79} Albinus\textsuperscript{80} abba\textsuperscript{81} reuerentissimus,\textsuperscript{82} uir\textsuperscript{83} per omnia doctissimus, extitit\textsuperscript{84}; qui in ecclesia Cantuariorum\textsuperscript{85} a beatae memoriae Theodoro\textsuperscript{86} archiepiscopo\textsuperscript{87} et Hadriano\textsuperscript{88} abbate,\textsuperscript{89} uiris uenerabilibus

---

\textsuperscript{66} corr. from ceteros SG1.

\textsuperscript{67} om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4 || \textsuperscript{huius}/ Zwe.

\textsuperscript{68} the initial 'h' has been erased in P8.

\textsuperscript{69} corr. from occasisionem Wür.

\textsuperscript{70} dubitanti Wi4.

\textsuperscript{71} corr. from substraham Mü1.

\textsuperscript{72} autem SG1, SG2, LA1 (with uel eam ins. in margin), Asc || autem haec P4, P8 || hoc Nür.

\textsuperscript{73} P14 shows scribal eye-skip here back to auditorbus above in the same sentence; as a result, the words siue . . . historiae have been repeated, and later struck through.

\textsuperscript{74} dedicerim Wol (but corr.), Wür || corr. from didicerim P12.

\textsuperscript{75} The manuscripts of the Austrian Group (Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, and Zwe) share the omission of approximately one third of the prologue here, skipping from curabo through uia uoce didicimus, and begin copying again in sent. 17 below, with Quae autem . . . etc.

\textsuperscript{76} corr. from aductor P12.

\textsuperscript{77} auditor Wol (but corrected), Mü2, Egg.

\textsuperscript{78} opisculi LR1.

\textsuperscript{79} huius opusculi Got.

\textsuperscript{80} Albinas (?) Br2.

\textsuperscript{81} abbas SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Got, LA1, Pra, P5, P12, LR1, Wi2, Wi5, LR1, Egg || abba changed to abbas P8 || abbas changed to abba BR2.

\textsuperscript{82} reuerendissius Mü2 || Wol has what appears to be an ‘l’ with a diagonal stroke (similar to the common abbreviation for ‘uel’) where the ending -us would be expected.

\textsuperscript{83} uir \textsuperscript{ac}/ Wür || in Aug, a later hand has inserted the tironian et after uir.

\textsuperscript{84} extitit\textsuperscript{\sim}/ est LR1 (the nature of the above-line insertion is unclear).

\textsuperscript{85} Cantu\textsuperscript{\sim}a/riorum P12, Wi5 || Cantuorum Nür.

\textsuperscript{86} Theodoro P5.
atque eruditissimis\textsuperscript{90} institut\textsuperscript{91} diligenter\textsuperscript{92} omnia\textsuperscript{93}, quae in ipsa Cantuariorum prouincia uel etiam in contiguis eidem\textsuperscript{94} regionibus a discipulis beati\textsuperscript{95} papae\textsuperscript{96} [M4-5] Gregorii gesta fuere, uel monimentis litterarum uel seniorum traditione cognouerat\textsuperscript{97}, et ea\textsuperscript{98} mihi de his\textsuperscript{99} quae\textsuperscript{100} memoria\textsuperscript{101} digna\textsuperscript{102} uidebantur per religiosum\textsuperscript{103} Lundoniensis\textsuperscript{104} ecclesiae\textsuperscript{105} presbyterum\textsuperscript{106} Nothelmum,\textsuperscript{107} siue\textsuperscript{108} litteris\textsuperscript{109} mandata\textsuperscript{110} siue ipsius Nothelmi\textsuperscript{111} uiua uoce

\textsuperscript{87} episcopo Got.

\textsuperscript{88} The vast majority of the MSS collated have Adriano, though I have not thought it necessary to record every manuscript’s reading.

\textsuperscript{89} ins. above line Mü1.

\textsuperscript{90} corr. from -mus SG1 || haeruditissimis P8.

\textsuperscript{91} corr. from institutis Wür || institutis Got (with what may be evidence of correction), LR1 || institutus P8 || corr. from institutur Mü1 || institut (?) LA1.

\textsuperscript{92} om. Got.

\textsuperscript{93} atque . . . omnia om. Asc.

\textsuperscript{94} eiusdem SG1, SG2, LA1, Asc || eisdem P4, P8, Mü1, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{95} corr. from beatae P5, P8.

\textsuperscript{96} ins. above line Rei, P5.

\textsuperscript{97} audierat P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{98} om. Mü1

\textsuperscript{99} ins. above line Mü1.

\textsuperscript{100} om. Nür.

\textsuperscript{101} memorie Wi5.

\textsuperscript{102} digne Egg.

\textsuperscript{103} religiosum uirum LR1.

\textsuperscript{104} Londonensis P4, P8, Mü1, Mü2, LA1, P14, Egg || Londoniensis Wol, P5, P12, Asc, BR2.

\textsuperscript{105} om. Wi5.

\textsuperscript{106} ins. in margin Mü1 || corr. from presibiterum LR1.

\textsuperscript{107} corr. from Notelmum P4 || Nothelium LR1 || Nothelmum Asc || Nothelimum BR2.

\textsuperscript{108} seu LR1.

\textsuperscript{109} ins. in margin Wi5.
referenda,\textsuperscript{112} transmisit. \textbf{8.} Qui uidelicet Nothelmus\textsuperscript{113} postea\textsuperscript{114} Romam\textsuperscript{115} ueniens, nonnullas ibi\textsuperscript{116} beat\textsuperscript{117} Gregorii\textsuperscript{118} papae\textsuperscript{119} simul et aliorum\textsuperscript{120} pontificum epistulas\textsuperscript{121}, perscrutato eisdem sanctorum ecclesiae Romanae\textsuperscript{122} scrinio, permis\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{123}} eis, qui nunc ipsi\textsuperscript{124} ecclesiae praest Gregorii\textsuperscript{125} pontificis, inuenit, reversusque\textsuperscript{126} nobis nostrae historiae inserendas cum concilio praefati Albini reuerentiissimi\textsuperscript{127} patris adtulit\textsuperscript{128}.

\textbf{9.} A\textsuperscript{129} principio itaque uoluminis\textsuperscript{130} huius\textsuperscript{131} usque ad tempus, quo gens Anglorum

\textsuperscript{110} siue . . . mandata ins. in margin Mü1 || mandanda Wi5.

\textsuperscript{111} Plummer notes that LCT2 (his C) has Nothelmum here || Notheliui LR1 || Nothelini BR2.

\textsuperscript{112} om. LR1.

\textsuperscript{113} Nothelm Wür, Wol, Sch, Pra || Nothelius LR1 || Nothelinus BR2.

\textsuperscript{114} Plummer notes that LCT2 (his C) has postquam here.

\textsuperscript{115} Roma Mü1.

\textsuperscript{116} nonnullas ibi\textsuperscript{]} nonulla sibi SG1 (but corr.), SG2, P4, P8.

\textsuperscript{117} beatae P5.

\textsuperscript{118} Gregori Wol || Gregori\textsuperscript{i/} Wür.

\textsuperscript{119} ins. above line SG1.

\textsuperscript{120} simul et aliorum\textsuperscript{]} aliorumque Got.

\textsuperscript{121} om. Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{122} sancte Romanae ecclesiae Asc, Br2 (but with clear correction marks) || the scribe of LR1 wrote Romanae twice, followed by Gregorii pontificis scrinio . . . praest inuenit.

\textsuperscript{123} perm\textsuperscript{i/s}su Wol || permissa SG1, SG2 || permissum LR1 || per missueri qui Egg.

\textsuperscript{124} ins. above line SG1

\textsuperscript{125} gregori Wol, Wür.

\textsuperscript{126} corr. from reuersusquae Wol || rursusque SG1, SG2, Asc.

\textsuperscript{127} reuerendissimi Mü2, Egg.

\textsuperscript{128} -tulit is runover in Wol.

\textsuperscript{129} The word ‘A’ here is written as a multi-line capital in a number of MSS, seemingly intended to mark a major division within the prologue; it is a two-line capital in Wür, SG1, SG2 (though never filled in), LA1, and Mü2; and a 3-line capital in Egg.

\textsuperscript{130} uolumus Pra.
fidem xpi percepit, ex priorum maxime scriptis hinc inde collectis ea quae promeremus didicimus. 10. Exinde autem usque ad tempora præsentia, quae in ecclesia Cantuariorum per discipulos beati papae Gregorii siue successores eorum, uel sub quibus regibus gesta sint, memorati abbatis Albini industria, Nothelmo ut diximus perferente, cognouimus. 11. Qui etiam provinciae Orientalium simul et Occidentalium Saxonum, necnon et Orientalium Anglorum atque Nordanhymbrorum, a quibus praesulibus, uel quorum tempore regum gratiam euangelii perceperint, nonnulla mihi ex parte prodiderunt. 12. Denique hortatu praecipue ipsius Albini,
ut hoc opus adgredi auderem, prouocatus sum. 13. Sed et Danihel reuerentissimus Occidentalium Saxonum episcopus, qui nunc usque superest, nonnulla mihi de historia ecclesiastica prouinciae ipsius, simul et proxima illi Australium Saxonum, necnon et Uectae insulae litteris mandata declaravit. 14. Qualiter uero per ministerium Cedi et Ceadda religiosorum xpi sacerdotum uel prouincia Merciorum ad fidem xpi, quam nouerat, peruenerit, uel prouincia Orientalium Saxonum

149 illus Sch, Wi2 || ipsius a P12.
150 in P4, P8.
151 opos LR1.
152 adgredi auderem] auderem aggredi Wi5.
153 P4 has prouoca//catus with the -ca- at the end of the first line expuncted.
154 reuerentis si michi Egg.
155 qui/ Wür.
156 According to Plummer, the Moore MS (CUL) omits this word.
158 prouintia LA1 || prouincia Mü2.
159 simul et proxima] et proxime simul LR1.
160 illus Got.
161 secto Egg (or possibly secte?), Mü2.
162 declarant Egg.
163 ergo Mü1 || om. Egg, Mü2.
164 Cedidi Mü2 || Cead P12 || Edidi Nür.
165 Ceadda et P8 || Teadda Nür.
166 Marciorum P8 || Mertiorum Got, LA1, Egg, Mü2.
167 quae SG1, SG2 || qui P5 || quem Asc.
168 ins. above line P8.
169 Scribal eye-skip resulting from confusion of the two proximate instances of the word Orientalium has resulted in the omission of Saxonum fidem . . . prouincia Orientalium in SG1. The missing passage was inserted in the lower margin with a signes-de-revoi, but the scribe of SG2, who was almost certainly copying from SG1, did not notice the correction, and reproduces the faulty text.
fidem, quam olim exsufflauerat, recuperauerit, qualis etiam ipsorum patrum uita extiterit, diligenter a fratribus monasterii, quod ab ipsis conditum Laestingaeu cognominatur, agnouimus. 15. Porro in prouincia Orientalium Anglorum quae fuerint gesta ecclesiastica, partim ex scriptis uel traditione priorum, partim reuerentissimi abbatis Esi relatione conperimus. 16. At uero in
provincia Lindissi quae sint gesta erga fidem xpi, quaeue successio sacerdotalis extiterit, uel litteris reuerentissimi antistitis Cynibercti uel aliorum fidelium uirorum uiua uoce didicimus. 17. Quae autem in Nordanhymbrorum prouincia, ex quo tempore fidem xpi percepserunt usque ad praesens, per diuersas regiones in ecclesia sint acta, non uno quolibet auctore, sed fidelin innumerorum testium, qui

\[191\] Lindinsi SG1, SG2, Asc || Lindensi LA1 || Lindisy LR1 || Lindis P14, BR2.
\[192\] sunt LR1.
\[193\] gesta sint SG1, SG2, Asc.
\[194\] quae uel Aug, Nür, Mü1, Egg, Mü2 || quae P4, P8.
\[195\] litteras Got.
\[196\] reuerendissimi Egg, Mü2, BR2.
\[197\] antestitis Wür, Wol || antistis P12 || antisticis LR1.
\[198\] Cynibericti Mü1 || Cynibercheti Wür || Cuniberecti SG1, SG2, LA1, Asc || Cyniberthi Pra, Sch || Cyniberthi Wi2, Aug || Cyniberecti P4, P8, P12 || Cynibercherti Wol, P5, Mü2 || Cuniberti Rei || Cunibertchii P14 || Cuniberthii BR2 || Chinibercherti Egg || Cuniberti Rei || Cuniberchti Nür || Cuthberti Wi5, LR1.
\[199\] ins. above line Pra.
\[200\] corr. from dedicimus in both Wür, Wol || didissimus LR1.
\[201\] The manuscripts of the Austrian Group continue the text again with this word.
\[202\] cum Mü1 || enim Wi5 || hec Egg.
\[203\] om. Aug, Nür.
\[204\] Nordanhymbrorum SG1, SG2, Asc, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe || corr. from Mordanhymbrorum Got || Nordanimbrorum Mü1 || corr. from Nordamhymbrorum Got || Nordanimbrorum P4 || Nordanlimbrorum P5, BR2 || Northanimbrorum Wi5 || Northanymbrorum LR1 || Nordan Hyberiorum Egg.
\[205\] om. Got, BR2.
\[206\] percepterint P14, BR2.
\[207\] usque . . . praesens ins. in margin Mü1.
\[208\] corr. from sunt Got.
\[209\] a\'u/core Wür, Wol.
\[210\] fidum SG1, SG2, P4, P8, LA1 || fidium P5, P12, Aug, Nür, P14, BR2, Asc, Egg, LR1, Mü1.
\[211\] in/numerorum Wi2.
haec scire uel memississe poterant, adsertione cognoui, exceptis his quae per me ipsum nosse poteram. 18. Inter quae notandum ea, quae de sanctissimo patre et antistite Cudbercto uel in hoc uolumine uel in libello gestorum ipsius conscripsi, partim ex eis, quae de illo prius a fratribus ecclesiae Lindisfarnensis scripta repperi adsumsi, simpliciter fidem historiae quam legebam, [P8]

212 corr. from huius Wür || et P5, P12.
213 potuerunt Wür, Wol, SG1, SG2, Asc, Mü1, P4, P8, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, Aug, Rei, Nür, P5, P12, P14, BR2, Egg.
214 assessione (?) Egg.
215 om P4, P8.
216 meipsum] memetipsum Got, LA1, P14, BR2.
217 nosce LR1.
218 potueram P4, P8.
219 Interque P4, P8.
220 notandum est LR1.
221 om. P5, P12.
222 quod ea] quod de eo Asc.
223 ins. above line SG1.
224 ins. above line LR1.
225 patre nostro LR1.
226 antistite Wol, Wür (but corrected) || antis\ti/te P12.
227 Cudberto Got, Pra, Wi5 || Cuthberecto Wol, Wür, P5, P12, P14, BR2, Mü1 (corr. from Cud-) || Chudberecto SG1, SG2, Asc (corr. from Chudeberecto) || Cutberecto P4, P8 || Cuniberecto LA1 || Cuniberto Aug || Cuthberto Rei (with uel Cuniberto ins. above), LR1 || Cunibercho Nür || Chutberto Wi1, Zve || Chutberehto SF, Ad1 || Cuhtberehto Ad2 || Chutberehto Wi4 || Chutberchto Hei || Cuchberehto Egg || Cuthberehto Mü2.
228 om. SG1, SG2, LA1, Asc || uel in] id in Egg.
229 libro Sch, Pra, Wi2, P14, BR2.
230 elus Wi5.
231 elus Wi5.
232 om. Egg.
233 ecclesiae Lindisfarnensis] Lindisfernensis ecclesiae Wi5 || Lyndisfernensis Aug, Ad1 || Lydisfratiensis Nür.
accommodans, partim uero ea quae certissima fidelium uirorum adtestatione per me ipse cognoscre potui, sollerter adicere curau. 19. Lectoremque suppliciter obsecro ut, siqua in his quae scripsimus, aliter quam se ueritas habet positam repperit, non hoc nobis imputet, qui, quod uera lex historiae est, simpliciter ea quae fama uulgante collegimus ad instructionem posteritatis litteris mandare.

---

234 legam Wi4.
235 historiae . . . accommodans] accommodans historiae quam legebam Sch, Wi2 || historiae accommodans quam legebam Pra || accommodas LR1.
236 ea quae] eaque Nür || om. quae Wi5.
237 me ipse] meipsum Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, LR1, Egg, Mü2, Pra || memetipsum Got || me Wi5.
238 om. Wi5.
239 addiscere SG1, SG2, LA1, Asc, Wi5 || aducere Mü1.
240 Lectorem uero Aug, Nür.
241 simpliciter P4, P8.
242 simpliciter obsecro] supplicitus obsecus LR1 || obsecro] ex oro P14, BR2 || deprecor Wi2.
243 in his om. Egg, Mü2.
244 scripserim Egg || scriptsimi (?) Mü2.
245 abet P5 || haberet Egg.
246 et posita Mü2 || postia ins. above line Got || reposita Mü1.
247 repererat Sch || reper\re/it P8 || reperit Mü2, LR1, Nür || inuenerit Mü1 || posita repererit] repererit posita Asc.
248 qui quod] quia SG1, SG2, LA1, Asc || quia quod Aug, Nür, Mü1 || qui a quod LR1 || qui quid P4 || quicquid P8 || qui quidem Egg, Mü2 || quod quid Wi4 || qui que P5, P12.
249 historiae est || est historiae Mü1
251 corr. from fulgante Wür, Wol || fulgante Wi4 || uigilante Ad1 || uolgante BR2.
252 collegius Wi5.
253 et ad LR1.
254 corr. from mandata Sch || madare Wi2.
studuimus\n
20. Praeterea omnes, ad quos haec eadem\n      historia peruenire potuerit\n      nostrae\n      nationis, legentes siue audientes suppliciter precor, ut pro meis infirmitatibus et\n      mentis et corporis apud supernam clementiam saepius interuenire meminerint; et\n      in suis quique provinciis hanc mihi suae remunerations uicem rependant, ut qui\n      de singulis provinciis siue locis sublimioribus, quae memoratu digna atque incolis grata\n      credideram, diligenter adnotare curauui, apud omnes fructum piae intercessionis inueniam. 21. Explicit Praefatio.

---

255 In C-type MSS, including Ka1, the preface ends here, with the prayer that follows in M-type manuscripts being found instead at the end of the whole work || curauimus Wi2 || studemus Wi5.

256 eademque Egg.
257 poterit Got, Sch (omitted but inserted above line), Pra, Wi2 (perhaps changed from potuerit).
258 deprecor Wi2.
259 ins. above line Sch.
260 om. SG1, SG2, P4, LA1, Ad1, Asc.
261 ad Mü1.
262 patriam Got || supernam clementiam clementiam supernam Asc
263 ut Egg, LR1.
264 corr. from singulis Mü1.
265 quoque Got (but corrected), Mü1.
266 Both Ad1 and BR2 show evidence of eye-skip here, to provinciis siue locis in the following line; Ad1 has siue locis, but this has been struck through and is followed by the usual passage; BR2 shows eye-skip on the same words, and the missing text has been inserted in the upper margin.
267 om. Ad1, Ad2, SF, Wi4, Zwe, P14, BR2.
268 impendant Mü1
269 qui de] quidem Wi5.
270 om. Wi5.
271 curaui apud] curaui ut apud Wi5.
272 ins. above line Got.

273 As at the beginning of the preface, certain patterns can be observed in the way the prologue is closed and the capitula that follow are introduced: Explicit Prologus SG1, SG2, Rei || Explicit prologus. Incipiunt
1. In quo tunc monasterio nonnulla caelestis gratiae dona specialiter ostensa fuisse perhibentur; utpote [P233] ubi nuper expulsa diaboli tyrannide xps iam regnare coeperat.

2. E quibus unum, quod mihi capitula libri primi. Sch, Wi2, Pra (but with primi libri), Wi5 (also with primi libri) || Incipiunt capitula libri primi Aug, Nür || Explicit Praefatio. Incipiunt capitula hystoriarum gentis anglorum. P4, P8 (with the ‘h’ in hystoriarum rubbed) || Incipiunt capitula historiarum gentis Anglorum LA1 || Incipiunt capitula Ad1, P5, P12 || Explicit Prefatio. Incipiunt capitula libri primi. Got, P14, BR2 (but omits explicit praefatio) || Explicit Prefatio. Incipiunt capitula. Wi1, Hei, SF (with “.i.” after capitula), Ad2, Zwe || Explicit praefacio Incipiunt capitula libri primi hystorie gentis Anglorum Asc || Index Capitum Libri Primi Mü1 || LR1 has just Venerabilis Beda Anglo-Saxonus in a later hand.

As noted by Mynors, this chapter (numbered iv.14 in the modern editions) was a later addition to the archetype of the M-type family of manuscripts, and only later in the tradition did it come to be graphically separated from the preceding chapter (by means of multi-line initials and, sometimes, chapter numbers). The manuscripts of the German family show a great deal of variation in how this and the following chapter (normally referred to as iv.15) are divided. With respect to iv.14, in some cases it is not set off in any way from the previous chapter (P4, P8, Rei, LR1 [but a modern hand has labeled it “Cap. 14”], Nür); in others it seems to be set off as a separate chapter by some graphical device, for example a littera notabilior (Wür, Hei, SF, Ad1, Ad2, Wi1, Wi2, Pra, P12, P5, Aug, Got, LA1, Wi4, Zwe); in still other MSS it has been assigned a chapter number: chapter 13 (Wi5), 14 (P14, BR2), 15 (Wol, Got), 17 (SG2, LA1, Egg, Mü2). In Asc, iv.14 was curiously omitted altogether in the initial copying, and has instead been placed at the end of the whole work, as a single chapter, perhaps because the scribe recognized the omission (which may have been present in the exemplar being copied), and supplied the text from elsewhere.

om. Pra || tamen Ad2, Hei, Wi1, Zwe.
\non/nulla P12.
tunc caelestis Mü1.
gratia Got, Egg, Mü2.
om. Pra, Wi5 || spiritualiter Egg, Mü2.
perhibetur Wi4 || perhibent Egg, Mü2.
ut pute Hei, Wi4.
expulsa nuper LR1.
diabuli Wol || dyaboli Wi5, Nür, P14, BR2 || demonis Asc.
corr. from tyrannidem Aug || tirannidae Got.
Wür and probably Wol both have caeperat, while the vast majority of MSS read ceperat here || ceperat regnare Sch, Wi2, LR1 || corr. from regna receperat Got.
ex Egg, Mü2.
que P5, P12 (but corrected) || quem Egg, Mü2.
reuerentissimus\textsuperscript{288} antistes Acca\textsuperscript{289} saepius referre et a\textsuperscript{290} fidelissimis eiusdem monasterii fratribus\textsuperscript{291} sibi\textsuperscript{292} relatum\textsuperscript{293} asserere\textsuperscript{294} solebat\textsuperscript{295}, memoriae\textsuperscript{296} mandare\textsuperscript{297} commodum\textsuperscript{298} duximus.

3. Eodem\textsuperscript{299} ferme\textsuperscript{300} tempore, quo ipsa\textsuperscript{301} prouincia\textsuperscript{302} nomen xpi\textsuperscript{303} susceperat,\textsuperscript{304} multas Brittaniae\textsuperscript{305} prouincias\textsuperscript{306} mortalitas\textsuperscript{307} saea corripiebat\textsuperscript{308}. 4. Quae cum praefatum\textsuperscript{309} quoque\textsuperscript{310} monasterium,\textsuperscript{311} cui\textsuperscript{312} tunc\textsuperscript{313} regendo religiosissimus\textsuperscript{314} xpi

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{288} reuerendissimus Egg, Mü2.
\item \textsuperscript{289} acta Egg, Mü2.
\item \textsuperscript{290} om. LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{291} ins. above line Wür.
\item \textsuperscript{292} esse Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zwe.
\item \textsuperscript{293} reseratum LA4.
\item \textsuperscript{294} inserere LA4.
\item \textsuperscript{295} P14, BR2 have asserebat in place of assere solebat.
\item \textsuperscript{296} meorire Wi4.
\item \textsuperscript{297} commendare Mü1 || memoriae digum mandare Wi2 || Asc had inserted the '9'-shaped abbreviation (=com) before mandare, but this has been struck through.
\item \textsuperscript{298} ins. above line SG1 || commudum Mü1.
\item \textsuperscript{299} LR1 seems to begin a new chapter here, marking this word off with a 2-line initial.
\item \textsuperscript{300} fere Got.
\item \textsuperscript{301} iam Nür.
\item \textsuperscript{302} prouincia ipsa LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{303} xpi nomen Ad1.
\item \textsuperscript{304} susciperat Wol.
\item \textsuperscript{305} Wür has Brittan\textbackslash iae, and the vast majority of MSS follow this spelling (with both double 't' and double 'n') || Britanniae LA4, Nür,Asc || Britannie P8 || Britanniae LA1.
\item \textsuperscript{306} prouincias Britanniae P14, BR2.
\item \textsuperscript{307} corr. from mortalitaas Wol.
\item \textsuperscript{308} corripiaebat Wür.
\item \textsuperscript{309} praefatum P4, P8 || praephatum Mü1.
\end{itemize}
sacerdos\textsuperscript{315} uocabulo Eappa\textsuperscript{316} praefuit\textsuperscript{317}, nutu\textsuperscript{318} diuinæ\textsuperscript{319} dispensationis attingeret\textsuperscript{320}, multique siue\textsuperscript{321} de his\textsuperscript{322} qui cum antistite\textsuperscript{323} illo\textsuperscript{324} uenerant\textsuperscript{325}, siue de illis\textsuperscript{326} qui de eadem\textsuperscript{327} prouincia Saxonum nuper ad fidem\textsuperscript{328} fuerant uocati\textsuperscript{329}, passim de hac\textsuperscript{330} uita\textsuperscript{331} raperentur\textsuperscript{332}, uisum est\textsuperscript{333} fratibus\textsuperscript{334} triduanum ieium agere et diuinam suppliciter\textsuperscript{335}

\textsuperscript{310} om. Asc, Egg, Mü2 \| saepe P14, BR2.
\textsuperscript{311} -ius P4, P8 (but rubbed).
\textsuperscript{312} om. Wür.
\textsuperscript{313} tam P5, P12 (but corr. to tum in margin).
\textsuperscript{314} relogiosissimus Wür \| relegi\o/sissimus Wol \| gloriosissimus P12.
\textsuperscript{315} famulus xpi religiosissimus sacerdos Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{316} corr. from Aeppa Got \| Eappa uocabulo Ad2 (but corr. with marks indicating the usual order) \| Eappan Wi1, Zwe \| Eappae Egg, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{317} postfuit LA4.
\textsuperscript{318} nuti Wi4.
\textsuperscript{319} nutu diuinæ] multitudine Egg, Mü2 \| diuinæ] diuino BR2.
\textsuperscript{320} attigeret Wi4.
\textsuperscript{321} sibi Egg, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{322} BR1 has two words erased here, perhaps hiis illis?
\textsuperscript{323} qui cum ant- has been written over erasure in Rei.
\textsuperscript{324} om. Mü1, LR1.
\textsuperscript{325} uenerant Wi4.
\textsuperscript{326} corr. from his Mü1, possibly a result of eye-skip with previous siue de \ldots \| his Ad1, Wi1 \| illi Wi5(?).
\textsuperscript{327} om. Wi1.
\textsuperscript{328} finem LR1.
\textsuperscript{329} fuerant uocati] uocati fuerant Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{330} ac P5.
\textsuperscript{331} ciuitate P4, P8.
\textsuperscript{332} inperentur Ad1 \| reperentur LR1.
\textsuperscript{333} cum Mü1.
obsecrare,\textsuperscript{336} clementiam,\textsuperscript{337} ut misericordiam sibi dignaretur,\textsuperscript{338} inpendere,\textsuperscript{339} et siue,\textsuperscript{340} periclitas\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{341} huc morbo a praesenti\textsuperscript{342} morte liberaret\textsuperscript{343} seu raptos e mundo a\textsuperscript{347} perpetua\textsuperscript{348} animae\textsuperscript{349} damnatione\textsuperscript{350} seruaret.

\textbf{5.} Erat tunc temporis in eodem monasterio puerulus quidam de natione Saxonum, nuper uocatus ad fidem, qui eadem tactus infirmitate non pauco tempore

\textsuperscript{334} om. est fratribus Nür.

\textsuperscript{335} simpliciter P14.

\textsuperscript{336} depreca Mü1 \| subseruare LR1.

\textsuperscript{337} In Got, there is evidence of erasure after obsecrare and clementiam has been inserted above the line.

\textsuperscript{338} dignaretur sibi SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{339} impedere Sch \| impendere LA4.

\textsuperscript{340} sic Ad1, Ad2.

\textsuperscript{341} pereclitas\textsuperscript{t} LR1.

\textsuperscript{342} praesente Wür, SG1 (but corr. above line), P4, P8, P12, Pra.

\textsuperscript{343} morbo SF.

\textsuperscript{344} libera[____] SG1 (letters obscured by an ink blot) \| Wi1 ins. this word in the margin.

\textsuperscript{345} siue LR1.

\textsuperscript{346} a Pra \| de Wi2, LR1.

\textsuperscript{347} om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.

\textsuperscript{348} According to Plummer, both CUL and LCT1 have perpetuo here, as do Wol, Hei, Wi1, Wi4, and Egg \| while Pra and Wi5 read perpetue.

\textsuperscript{349} ab anime Ad1, Ad2 (with ab ins. above line in the latter).

\textsuperscript{350} damnatione is the reading in nearly all the MSS from s. xii onwards.

\textsuperscript{351} om. Mü1 \| P14 reads eod having perhaps omitted a mark of abbreviation.

\textsuperscript{352} do Wol (but corr.).

\textsuperscript{353} naciones P14.

\textsuperscript{354} uocatus ad fidem] ad fidem uocatus Pra, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{355} eodem P8.

\textsuperscript{356} infirmit Nür.
recubans in lectulo iacebat. 6. Cum ergo secunda memorati \[P234\] contiguit \[P234\] fort\[P234\] diei \[P234\] in quo eger iacebat. 7. Erat
enim multum simplicis ac mansueti animi, sinceraque deuotione sacramenta fidei quae susceperat seruans. 8. Salutantes ergo illum uerbis piissimis apostoli dicebant: “Noli timere, fili, mortem, pro qua sollicitus es; nos enim te hodierna die ad caelestia sumus regna perducturi. 9. Sed primum expectare habes, donec missae celebrentur, ac uiatico dominici corporis ac sanguinis accepto, sic infirmitate simul et morte absolutus ad aeterna in caelis
gaudia subleueris. 10. Clama ergo ad te presbyterum Eapan, et dicit illi quia 'Dominus exaudiuit preces uestras, et deuotionem ac ieiunia propitius aspexit; neque aliquis de hoc monasterio siue adiacentibus et possessiunculis hac clade ultra moriturus est, sed omnes qui alicubi de uestris hac egritudine laborant,

403 ins. in margin Wi4.
404 ac LA4, Wi5.
405 subleuaris Wi5.
406 Uoca Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
407 erga Nür.
408 According to Plummer Nam reads Eapan here; LA4 has the same || Eappam Aug, Nür.
409 ei Got.
410 quod Wür, SG1, SG2, Wi2, Rei, Aug, Nür || Asc has quo with a suspension mark [= quoniam?] || qui LR1.
411 exaudiuit dominus Got, Ad1, Wi1, Zwe.
412 et Mü1.
413 om. P4, P8.
414 corr. from aliquid Got.
415 in LA1 || ex Pra, Wi5.
416 According to Mynors, the archetype of the M-type MSS had sibi, but this reading was corrected in many early MSS; Plummer notes that CUL, Nam, LH1 and perhaps also LCT1 all had sibi, though in the last of these it has been corrected to siue. || seu sibi OBo1 (likewise according to Plummer) || seu Sch, Wi2, Aug, Rei, Nür, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe || sibi LA1, P5, P12 (the last of these with uel inserted before sibi by a corrector).
417 om. SG2 || et Wi1, Got (but corrected) || uel LA1 || ei P12 (but canceled).
418 corr. from possessiunculas BR2 || possesiumculis Egg.
419 corr. from ac Wol, SG1 || haec P8.
420 mortuus Nür.
421 ultra moriturus est] moriturus est ultra Pra, Wi5
422 nostris LR1.
423 corr. from ac SG1 || ac Nür || the ‘h’ here may be a later insertion in Wür || om. P4, P8, LA4.
424 hac egritudine] egritudine hac LR1 || egridudine Wi4.
resurrecturī^{226} a languore^{227}, pristina sunt sospitate^{228} recuperandi, praeter te solum, qui hodierna es^{229} die^{230} liberandus^{231} a morte et ad uisionem^{232} dni xpi,, cui fideliter seruisti^{234}, perducendus in câelum. 11. Quod^{236} diuina uobis misericordia^{237} per intercessionem religiosi ac Deo^{238} dilecti regis^{239} Osualdi^{400}, qui quondam^{411} genti Nordanhymbrorum^{444} et regni temporalis^{443} auctoritate^{444} et xpianae^{445} pietatis^{446}, quae ad regnum perenne^{447}

---

Plummer has languore, so also P4, P5 || Mü1 has the labore struck through and followed by languore || languore ac Wi5.

{sospitatem Pra, Wi1, P12 || sospilitate Egg || sospitalitate Mü2 (with soppitate in margin).}

{om. P8, Mü1, Rei, LA4.}

{die es SG1, SG2, Got, Ad1, Aug, Nür, As, P14, BR2 || die hodierna es LR1 || om. die Wi1.}

{liberatus SG2.}

{u\'\'s/\'onem Got || diuisionem Wi2 (with di- struck through), Nür.}

{dni xpi| dni ihu xpi Sch, Aug, Rei, Nür || dni nri ihu xpi Wi2 || dni xpi} xpi dni Pra, Wi5.

{seruisti es P4, P8, LA4 || sed iusti Egg || seruinisti P14 (?)}.  

{ad Mü1.}

{Quia Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, P12 (?).}

{Mynors argues that at this point “a word was missing in the parent MS.; correctors in later copies have suggested misericordia, gratia, clementia, and pietas, any one of which would give a satisfactory sense.” The parent of the German family also seems to have been defective here: misericordia is omitted in Wol (though in this MS the following words might be written over erasure), Got, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, P5, P12 (though this MS may have had clementia ins. in margin), Egg, Mü1, LA1 and Mü2 (though in the last two MSS a corrector has inserted gratia before the preceding uobis) || clementia SG1, SG2, Asc, Aug, Rei, Nür, Pra (with something erased after), Wi5, P14, BR2 || gratia Sch || LR1 has misericordia before diuina uobis.}

{om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe || ac Deo] Deoque P12.}

{om. P14, BR2.}

{The following MSS write this name either Osuualdi or Oswaldii: SG2, Sch, Wi2, Aug, Rei, Nür, LR1, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, Mü2, Pra, Wi5.}

{condam P8 || corr. from quondi Got.}

{Pra and Wi5 ins. Anglorum before Nordanhymbrorum || Nordanhymbrorum Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe | Nordanhimbrorum Wi2, Egg, Mü2 || Nordanimbrorum Pra, Mü1 || Northanymborum Wi5 || Norphanhymbrorum LR1 || Northamhymbrorum Nür.}

{temporalis regni Got.}
ducit
deuotione sublimiter praefuit, conferre dignata est. 

12. Hac etenim die idem rex ab infidelibus in bello corporaliter extinctus, mox ad sempiterna animarum gaudia adsumptus in caelum et electorum est sociatus agminibus. 

13. Quaerant in suis codicibus, in quibus defunctorum est adnotata depositio, et inuenient illum, ut diximus, die raptum esse de saeculo. 

14. Celebrent ergo missas

---

448 auctoritatem Zwe, Egg.
449 xpiana P4.
450 piaetati Wür
451 corr. from perennae SG1 || perhende P8 || peraennae P5 || perhempne P12 || a large number of MSS write this perhene || celeste Pra (with the following word dicit ins. above line), Wi5, LA4.
452 perducit Mü1.
453 deuocionem Egg, Mü2.
454 si sublimiter Rei || in Wi4 sublimiter has been changed to sublimis.
455 dignatus Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, and Mü1.
456 et etenim Aug || enim Pra || autoc Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
457 in\delibus P12.
458 extinctus corporaliter Wi2 || extinctus est Ad1.
459 superna Ad1.
460 assumptus SG1 (by corr.), SG2 || adsumptus P4, P8, Got, LA1, Mü1.
461 om. et Aug || adsumptus in caelum et in celum est assumptus atque Sch, Wi2 (but with assumptus est).
462 agminibus sociatus Sch, Wi2, LA1 || est sociatus est Mü1 (with the second est erased).
463 Plummer notes that CUL has been corrected to Quaerant ergo here || Quaerant ergo Sch, Wi2, Aug, Rei, Nür || Querat Got || Querant Wi1 (but corrected) || Qua erant Egg, Mü2 (but perhaps corrected).
464 est // est Wi5 || est ins. above line BR2.
465 adnotata est Ad1 || ad uocata Mü2 (but corr. in margin).
466 despsicio (sic) LR1.
467 in\ueniet/ Got || inuenit P4, P8.
468 illum illum Got (with the second expuncted).
469 corr. from hanc P5.
470 corr. from dixi P12.
per cuncta\textsuperscript{470} monasterii\textsuperscript{471} oratoria\textsuperscript{472} huius\textsuperscript{473}, siue pro gratiarum actione\textsuperscript{474} exauditae\textsuperscript{475} suae\textsuperscript{476} deprecationis\textsuperscript{477} siue etiam in\textsuperscript{478} memoriam\textsuperscript{479} praeferat\textsuperscript{480} regis Osualdi\textsuperscript{481} qui quondam\textsuperscript{482} ipsorum genti\textsuperscript{483} praeerat\textsuperscript{484}, ideoque pro eis, quasi pro suae gentis aduenis\textsuperscript{485}, supplex orabat\textsuperscript{486} ad dominum; et cunctis conuenientibus\textsuperscript{487} ad ecclesiam fratribus communicent\textsuperscript{488} omnes sacrificii caelestibus, et ita soluto\textsuperscript{489} ieiunio corpus\textsuperscript{490} quoque suis.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{467} \textit{die ut diximus} Ad1.
  \item \textsuperscript{468} a Wi4.
  \item \textsuperscript{469} corr. from \textit{cebrent} Rei.
  \item \textsuperscript{470} \textit{per cuncta loca} Pra, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{471} \textit{monasteria} LA4.
  \item \textsuperscript{472} om. Pra || orataria LR1 || oratarii Wi1, LA4, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{473} \textit{Per cuncta nempe oratoria monasterii huius celebrent missas} Sch, Wi2 (but with \textit{nempe}) || \textit{huius oratoria Aug, Rei, Nür, Asc} || om. \textit{huius} LR1.
  \item \textsuperscript{474} \textit{accione} P8.
  \item \textsuperscript{475} \textit{quia ex} Mü1 || exauditas Egg, Mü2.
  \item \textsuperscript{476} \textit{siue} Ad1 || suas Egg, Mü2.
  \item \textsuperscript{477} \textit{suae deprecationis} sunt \textit{deprecationes eorum} Mü1 || \textit{deprecationes} Mü2 || \textit{predicationis} P4, P8.
  \item \textsuperscript{478} om. Wi1.
  \item \textsuperscript{479} \textit{in memoriam} pro \textit{memoria} Ad1.
  \item \textsuperscript{480} \textit{beati} Pra, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{481} \textit{Osuualdi} is the spelling in most MSS from the 12th c. onwards, with either ‘uu’ or ‘w’.
  \item \textsuperscript{482} \textit{condam} P4, P8, LR1.
  \item \textsuperscript{483} \textit{ipsorum genti} genti eorum Pra, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{484} quondam prae erat genti ipsorum Sch, Wi2 || praeberat P8 || praeferat Pra, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{485} quasi pro suae gentis aduenis] aduenis quasi pro sua gente Pra, Wi5.
  \item \textsuperscript{486} \textit{ora\textbackslash ut}/ Got (with evidence of erasure [possibly -bat?] on the line) || om. BR2.
  \item \textsuperscript{487} corr. from \textit{cum uenientibus} P12.
  \item \textsuperscript{488} \textit{communicet} SG1.
  \item \textsuperscript{489} \textit{solut\textbackslash o}/ Got || \textit{solito} corr. to \textit{soluto} Ad1, Hei.
\end{itemize}
reficiant alimentis.””

15. Quae cum omnia\textsuperscript{490} uocato ad se presbytero puer\textsuperscript{492} uerba narrasset\textsuperscript{493}, interrogavit\textsuperscript{494} eum sollicitus,\textsuperscript{495} quales essent habitu\textsuperscript{496} uel specie uiri, qui sibi apparuissent.\textsuperscript{497}

16. Respondit: “Praeclari\textsuperscript{498} omnino\textsuperscript{499} habitus,\textsuperscript{500} et uultus\textsuperscript{501} erant laetissimi ac\textsuperscript{502} pulcherrimi,\textsuperscript{503} quales numquam\textsuperscript{504} ante\textsuperscript{505} uideram\textsuperscript{506}, neque aliquos hominum\textsuperscript{507} tanti decoris ac uenustatis esse posse credebam\textsuperscript{508}. 17. Unus\textsuperscript{509} quidem\textsuperscript{510} attonsus erat\textsuperscript{511} ut

\textsuperscript{490} corpora Got.

\textsuperscript{491} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{492} omnia puer Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{493} uocato . . . narrasset] puer presbytero narrasset ad se uocato Pra, Wi5 || narraret Ad1.

\textsuperscript{494} interrogabit LA1 || the scribe of P12 first wrote interrogasset, struck it out, and then wrote interrogavit.

\textsuperscript{495} sollicitus LA1, Ad2, Wi1, Zwe, LA4 || sollic\textis{ci/}	extis{cius} Ad1.

\textsuperscript{496} ha- was written by the original scribe and \textis{-bitu} is a marginal addition in a different hand in Wür.

\textsuperscript{497} corr. from praecelare SG1 || praecelar Got, Ad1.

\textsuperscript{498} omni SG2.

\textsuperscript{499} habitu Got (by corrector), Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve, Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{500} uultus Got (by corrector), Ad1, Ad2 || corr. from ultus Rei.

\textsuperscript{501} atque Aug, Rei, Nür || et Pra, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{502} om. ac pulcherrimi P4, P8, LA4.

\textsuperscript{503} numquam LA4, P12.

\textsuperscript{504} numquam ante] ante numquam Ad1, Ad2 || antea P4, P8, Aug, Rei, LA4, Pra, Mü1, Egg, Mü2 || om. ante Wi2.

\textsuperscript{505} ante uideram] uideram ante P12 || uiderat Egg, Mü2 || uiderim P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{506} homines P14.

\textsuperscript{507} esse posse credebam] credebam esse posse BR2 || credebant P5.

\textsuperscript{508} Sed unus Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{509} eorum Sch, Wi2 || quidam Wi4.

\textsuperscript{510} e\textis{r/}at LR1.

\textsuperscript{511} sicut Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe.
clericus\textsuperscript{512}, alius barbam\textsuperscript{513} habebat\textsuperscript{514} prolixam\textsuperscript{515}, dicebantque\textsuperscript{516} quod\textsuperscript{517} unus\textsuperscript{518} eorum Petrus, alius uocaretur Paulus, et ipsi essent\textsuperscript{519} ministri Domini et\textsuperscript{520} Salvatoris [M380-81] nostr\textsuperscript{521} ihu xpi\textsuperscript{522} ad tuitionem\textsuperscript{523} nostri\textsuperscript{524} monasterii\textsuperscript{525} missi\textsuperscript{526} ab ipso\textsuperscript{527} de\textsuperscript{528} caelis\textsuperscript{529}. 18. Credidit\textsuperscript{530} ergo\textsuperscript{531} uerbis pueri\textsuperscript{532} presbyter, ac\textsuperscript{533} statim egressus requisiuit in annale\textsuperscript{534} suo...
et inuenit eadem\textsuperscript{535} ipsa\textsuperscript{536} die\textsuperscript{537} Osualdum\textsuperscript{538} regem fuisset\textsuperscript{539} peremptum\textsuperscript{540}; uocatisque\textsuperscript{541} fratribus, parari\textsuperscript{542} prandium,\textsuperscript{543} missas\textsuperscript{544} fieri atque omnes communicare\textsuperscript{545} more\textsuperscript{546} solito praecipit\textsuperscript{547}, simul et\textsuperscript{548} infirmanti\textsuperscript{549} puero de eodem sacrificio\textsuperscript{550} dominicae\textsuperscript{551} oblationis\textsuperscript{552} particulam\textsuperscript{553} deferri\textsuperscript{554} mandauit.

19. Quibus ita\textsuperscript{555} gestis, non multo post\textsuperscript{556} eadem\textsuperscript{557} ipsa\textsuperscript{558} die puer defunctus est,

\textsuperscript{535} om. Got \|| in eadem SF, Wi4, Wi5 \|| eadem ipsa\textsuperscript{3} ip\textsuperscript{3} sa in eadem Pra.
\textsuperscript{536} om. Wi2.
\textsuperscript{537} ins. above line P4.
\textsuperscript{538} Osualdum SG2, Sch, Aug, Nür \|| Oswaldum Rei, SF, Ad1, Ad2, Pra, Zwe, Wi1, Wi2, Wi5, LR1 Asc, Wi4, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{539} om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe \|| esse LR1 \|| esse fuisset Wi2.
\textsuperscript{540} Most of the German MSS spell this peremptum.
\textsuperscript{541} Uocatis autem Sch, Wi2.
\textsuperscript{542} iussit parari Asc \|| parare P14, BR2, Egg \|| parati LR1.
\textsuperscript{543} communium (?) Got \|| prandium praecepit LA4.
\textsuperscript{544} missam Mü1 \|| missasque LA4.
\textsuperscript{545} communicare Wol.
\textsuperscript{546} ins. above line P5.
\textsuperscript{547} The entire passage from missas \ldots praecipit has been copied twice in Aug, the second instance having been struck through by a corrector.
\textsuperscript{548} simul et\textsuperscript{3} et simul LR1.
\textsuperscript{549} infirmo Got \|| infirmati Pra \|| infirmante Egg, Mü2.
\textsuperscript{550} sacrificio P4.
\textsuperscript{551} dominice Got.
\textsuperscript{552} corr. from ablationis LA1.
\textsuperscript{553} particulum Wür.
\textsuperscript{554} deferre Pra, BR2.
\textsuperscript{555} itaque Wi5.
\textsuperscript{556} potest LR1.
\textsuperscript{557} eandem (?) Wi2.
suaque morte probuit uera fuisse uerba, quae ab apostolis xpi audierat. 20. Sed et hoc eius uerbis testimonium perhibuit, quod nemo praeter ipsum tempore illo ex eodem est monasterio raptus de mundo. 21. Ex qua nimium uisione multi, qui haec [P236] audire potuerunt, et ad exorandam in adversis diuinam clementiam, et ad salutariaieiuniorum remedia subeunda sunt mirabiliter accensi;

558 om. P4, P8.
559 et sua Sch, Wi2.
560 fuis Wür || esse Sch, Wi2 || om. uera fuisse Wi1.
561 quem P5.
562 apostolo Got || aposulis Wol.
563 hoc P5.
564 uerbi SG1, SG2, LA1, Sch || uerbis eius Aug, Rei, Nür || uerbum P12.
565 eius uerbis testimoniauert testimonium eius uerbis Pra, Wi5.
566 peribuit P8.
567 quia LR1.
568 ins. in margin Wür.
569 ipsum Mü1.
570 monasterii est SG2 || monasterio est Wi2, Mü1.
571 monasterio raptus raptus monasterio Pra.
572 enim Sch, Wi2.
573 om. LA1 || hanc Rei, Nür, LA4, Sch, Wi2, P4, P8 || aec P5.
574 corr. from audiere Hei.
575 om. Got, P8, Rei, LA4, LR1, P14.
576 According to Mynors, the MSS of the M-type omit ad here || this is true of the following MSS: Wol, Wür, SG1, SG2, LA1, F5, Wi5, Mü1, Egg, Mü2 || et ad ins. above line P12.
577 exhortandum Egg, Mü2 || exorandum BR2.
578 in adversis om. Mü1.
579 Mynors notes that the M-type MSS omit et here || this is true of Wol, P8, LA1, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, LA4, BR2, Egg, Mü2.
580 salutaris Wür || salutariam Wol (but perhaps corrected), SF.
et\textsuperscript{583} ex\textsuperscript{584} eo\textsuperscript{585} tempore\textsuperscript{586} non solum in eodem\textsuperscript{587} monasterio sed et\textsuperscript{588} in plerisque\textsuperscript{589} locis\textsuperscript{590} aliis coeptit annuatim\textsuperscript{591} eiusdem regis ac\textsuperscript{592} militis xpi natalicius\textsuperscript{593} dies\textsuperscript{594} missarum celebratione\textsuperscript{595} uenerari\textsuperscript{596}.

**Passage Three: Book IV, Chapter 15**\textsuperscript{597}

1. Interea superueniens cum exercitu Caedualla,\textsuperscript{598} iuuenis strenuissimus\textsuperscript{599} de

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{581} ins. above line Got.
\item\textsuperscript{582} mirabiliter sunt Sch, Wi2, Aug, Rei, Nür.
\item\textsuperscript{583} om. SG1, SG2, Asc || et has been written twice in Wi2, but one has been crossed out.
\item\textsuperscript{584} om. P14.
\item\textsuperscript{585} eodem Pra, Wi5, P14, BR2 || eodem Zwe.
\item\textsuperscript{586} tempore/ Wi1.
\item\textsuperscript{587} non solum in eodem has been ins. in margin in Wi1.
\item\textsuperscript{588} om. Mü1 || \textsuperscript{et}/ P5.
\item\textsuperscript{589} in plerisque] implerisque Nür.
\item\textsuperscript{590} locis has been written twice in P14, but one is struck through.
\item\textsuperscript{591} annua tunc LA1.
\item\textsuperscript{592} et Ad1, Asc.
\item\textsuperscript{593} natal\textsuperscript{ci/us} Got || the scribe of P12 appears to have at first written cath-.
\item\textsuperscript{594} dies natalicius Pra.
\item\textsuperscript{595} celebratione Wol || celebritate missarum Pra, Wi5.
\item\textsuperscript{596} uenerari celebratione Egg, Mü2.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{597} On this chapter Mynors asserts that it is “continuous with XIIII in m, and with XIII in c (which omits XIII). It was separated in German MSS. of the ninth century, and as the resulting numeration of chapters passed thence into the printed editions, we have retained it for the reader’s convenience, although it not Bede’s.” As with the previous passage, there is great variety in how the chapter is treated and numbered in the German MSS: xiii SF, Hei (but with xiii in outer margin) || xiii Ad1, Ad2, Wi4, Zwe, Aug, Rei, Nür || xviiii SG2, LA1, Egg, Mü2 || xviii Sch || the placement of a larger initial suggests it was understood to be a separate chapter, even though not numbered in P4, P8, Pra, Wi5 (here prev. cap. is numbered xiii, and this cap. is continuous with with the next, as Mynors asserts is typical of early M-type MSS), P5, P12 (next cap. xiii), or Wi2 (next cap. xiii), Asc, P14, BR2 || continuous with the previous chapter Got, LR1 (though marked by a much later hand as “Cap. xv”) || “Cap.” but no number in Mü1 || Wi1 LA4 has a 2-line initial, but no legible chapter number in the microfilm.
regio\textsuperscript{600} genere\textsuperscript{601} Geuissorum\textsuperscript{602}, cum exularet a patria sua\textsuperscript{603}, interfecit regem Aedilualch\textsuperscript{604}, ac prouinciam illam saeuæ caede ac\textsuperscript{605} depopulatione\textsuperscript{606} attriuit; sed mox expulsus est a ducibus\textsuperscript{607} regiis,\textsuperscript{608} Berchthuno\textsuperscript{609} et Andhuno\textsuperscript{610}, qui deinceps\textsuperscript{611} regnum\textsuperscript{612} prouinciae tenuerunt. 2. Quorum prior postea ab eodem\textsuperscript{613} Caedualla\textsuperscript{614}, cum esset rex Geuissorum\textsuperscript{615},

\textsuperscript{598} LCT2 reads Ceadualla here (according to Plummer), as do Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1 (-walla), Wi4, Zve (-walla) || Ceaduuala Pra, Wi5 || Cedualla Sch, Wi2, LA4 || Cedualla P4, P8, Got, Aug, Rei, Nür, P12, LR1 (corr. from Cedaulla), Asc, P14, BR2 || Cedualla Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{599} strenuissimus Rei || streuissimus P12.

\textsuperscript{600} \textit{regio} P8 || \textit{regine} Mü1.

\textsuperscript{601} om. CUL (according to Mynors), so also Got || Both Wol and Wür show evidence of a textual problem with the phrase \textit{iuuenis strenuissimus de regio}: in Wür, the phrase was omitted and has been inserted in the upper margin by means of \textit{singes-de-renvoi} || in Wol, in addition to its usual placement, the word \textit{genere} was written before \textit{iuuenis} and later expuncted || the same doubling of \textit{genere} can be seen in P5, P12, Egg, and Mü2.

\textsuperscript{602} Ge\textit{n}uissorum Ad1 || Genissorum BR2.

\textsuperscript{603} om. P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{604} Aedilualch LCT2 (according to Plummer), SG1 || Aedilualch Wür || Aedilualch Wol || Edilualch Nam (according to Plummer), SG2, Aug, Rei, Nür, Wi2, P12, Mü1 || Edilualch LA4 || Edilualch Sch, Pra, Asc (-w-) || Edilualch LR1, Egg, Mü2 || Edilwach W15 || Ediluualchum Ad1 (-uu-), Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve || Ediluwalculum Ad2.

\textsuperscript{605} om. caede ac and insert ac caede after depopulatione Ad1.

\textsuperscript{606} de populatione Nür, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{607} expulsus est a ducibus] a ducibus expulsus est a ducibus Ad1.

\textsuperscript{608} Plummer reads \textit{regis} here, with a note that his MS B has \textit{regiis} \textit{regis} P4, P8, Got, Wi2, Mü1, LA1, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve, Pra, Wi5, P5, P12, Aug, Rei, Nür, LA4, LR1, P14 (corr. from \textit{regib}), BR2, Egg, Mü2, and (possibly) Asc.

\textsuperscript{609} Berechthuno Wür, Wol, P4, P8, Ad2, Hei, SF, Zve, P12 || Bere\textit{c}/ht huno P5 || Berechthuno LA4 || Berechthuno SG1, SG2, Mü1, Ad1, Wi4, LA1 || Berechthuno Sch, Wi2 || Bereathuno Got || Berechthuno Aug, Rei, Wi1 || Bereathuno Nür || Berththuno Pra || Berctuno LR1 || Beruthuno Asc || Beruthymo P14 || Beritchuno BR2 || Berchthuno W15 || Berechuno Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{610} Anthuno SG1, SG2, Wol, P4, P8, Mü1, LA1, LA4, Pra, Wi5, Asc, Egg || Anthinio Mü2 || Anthuno Got || Anduno Ad1, LR1 || Aldhuno P14, BR2 || Hanthuno P12.

\textsuperscript{611} deinceps P8.

\textsuperscript{612} regum Nür.

\textsuperscript{613} eadem Wol, P5, P12 (but corrected), P8.

\textsuperscript{614} Ceadualla LCT2 (according to Plummer), Wol (corr. from Cæ-) || Ceadualla Wür || Cedualla Nam (according to Plummer, corr. from Sedualla), Got, Mü1, Aug, Rei, Nür, Asc, LA4, LR1, BR2 || Cedualla Sch, Wi2 ||
occisus est, et prouincia grauiore seruitio subacta. 3. Sed et Ini, qui post Caeduallan regnauit, simili prouinciam illam adflcione plurimo annorum tempore mancipauit. 4. Quare factum est, ut toto illo tempore episcopum proprium habere nequiret, sed reuocato domum Ulfrido primo suo antistite.

Cedualda SG2 || Caeudualde P4, P8 || Cae eadualla P5 || Ce eadualla P12 (but corr. to Cedualla) || Ceadualla Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Zve || Ceadualllo Wi4 || Ceaduala Pra, Wi5 || Cedalla Egg.

Geuisorum Got || Ge
/uissorum Ad1 || Genissorum BR2.

re expuncted after prouincia in Wür.

grauiori Got, Asc, Wi5 || a grauiore Mü1 || grauiora Egg, Mü2.

subacta est Wi2.

Set LR1.

om. Egg, Mü2.

His P4, P8, Ad1, Wi1 || Hi Mü1 || Is Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve, Pra, LA4, Egg, Mü2 || Nu BR2 || et Ini ille P5, P12 || om. Ini LR1.

Ini qui Inique Wi5, Nür.

Sed et anhunus post berechinum Got (over erasure) || Ceaduallum Wol, P12 || Ceaduallum Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve || Ceaduallium P4, P5 || Ceadualdum P8 || Ceduallam Sch, Wi2 || Ceduallam Aug, Nür, LA4, LR1, Asc || Ceduallum Rei, Mü1 || Ceduallum LA1 || Ceaduualla Pra, Wi5 || Ceduala P14, BR2 || Cedulla Egg, Mü2.

regnabat Nam (according to Plummer), Wol, LA1, Asc, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve (seems to be over erasure), P5, P12, LR1, Pra, Wi5, Egg, Mü2 || regnabant Mü1.

Scribe of Asc has written simili twice || similique Pra, Wi5.

prouintiam P4, Mü1.

ins. above line Zve.

adflcione Wol (with, it seems, the first e expuncted) || affliccione P8, Wi4.

plurimorum LA4, P4, P8, Mü1 || plurima Wi1.

annorum tempore om. Sch, Wi2 (also omits plurimo) || temporae P4, P8.

diueastarunt Mü1 || manciparit Egg, Mü2.

Qua in re LA4 || Qua de re LR1 || some insertion over Quare in P12.

corr. from totu (?) LA1 || some erasure here in Pra.

aepiscopum P8 || corr. from episcorum Got.

episcopum proprium] proprium episcopum Ad1.
ipsi\textsuperscript{642} episcopo\textsuperscript{643} Geuissorum,\textsuperscript{644} id est\textsuperscript{645} Occidentalium Saxonum, qui\textsuperscript{646} essent in Uenta\textsuperscript{647} ciuitate\textsuperscript{648}, subiacerent.\textsuperscript{649}

**Passage Four: Book V, Chapter 24\textsuperscript{650}**

[M566-67; P356] 1. Haec\textsuperscript{651} de\textsuperscript{652} historia\textsuperscript{653} ecclesiastica\textsuperscript{654} Britanniaram\textsuperscript{655}, et\textsuperscript{656}

---

\textsuperscript{636} nequireret (?) Ad1.

\textsuperscript{637} demum LA1, BR2 || domnum LA4.

\textsuperscript{638} Uulfrido (or Wilfrido) SG2, Asc, Aug, Rei, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Zwe, Wi2, Wi5, LR1 || Uulfrido Got, Pra || Ullfridum LA4 || Mulfrido Nür || episcopi Uulfrido Wi4 || P14 has struck out uis before this.

\textsuperscript{639} om. Got || primum LA4.

\textsuperscript{640} om. P4, P8, LA4, Wi5, P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{641} episcopo Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{642} sibi P4, P8, LA4 || corr. from ipso P5 || ipsi ins. in margin Wi4 || ipso Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{643} antistiti Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{644} Geuisorum Got || Genuissorum Ad1 || Genissorum BR2.

\textsuperscript{645} LA4 omits episcopo Guissorum and has idem in place of id est.

\textsuperscript{646} qu\textdown{\textsubscript{1}/ Wür.}

\textsuperscript{647} inuenti in Mü1, Wi2 || inuenta in Sch, Egg, Mü2 || qui in uenta Wi4 || uecta Got (over erasure).

\textsuperscript{648} in Uenta ciuitate] in ciuitate in Uenta Ad1.

\textsuperscript{649} subiaceret Mü1, Pra, Wi5 || subiacerunt LR1 || subiacerre Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe || subiecere LA4 || this chapter is joined to the next in P4, P8, Got, Rei, LR1, SF, Pra, Wi5, Nür || the next chapter seems to be set off, but is unnumbered in Mü1, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, Wi1, Wi4, Zwe, Aug, P14, BR2, LA4 (or at least not visible in the microfilm) || in certain MSS, the next chapter is numbered as follows: \textnumero{XIII} P5, P12 || \textnumero{XIII} Wi2, Asc || \textnumero{XVIII} LA1 || \textnumero{XIX} Egg, Mü2.

\textsuperscript{650} The following autobiographical section is preceded by a set of annals recapitulating much of the history, but also adding some new information. In most German manuscripts the chronological summary ends with the year 731, the death of Archbishop Berctwald. P14 and BR2, however, contain additional annals for the years 732-735 (the so-called Moore continuations, so named because they are found after the end of the HE in CUL, as though a later addition). Furthermore, Pra and Wi5 contain a set of annals continuing Bede’s recapitulation for the years 732-766; this so-called Continuatio Bedae is known to exist in eight other manuscripts, all of Continental origin. Wi2 makes the autobiographical sketch a new chapter (numbered “\textnumero{XXVIII}” [sic]), as do the MSS of Plummer’s Durham group, which number it “\textnumero{XXV}”; LA1 is defective up to “Historiam abbatum” (sent. 27 below); both Egg and Mü2 break off with the words “in dedicionem accepit” early in the chronological summary (s.a. 46).
maxime\textsuperscript{657} [P357] gentis Anglorum\textsuperscript{658}, prout uel\textsuperscript{659} ex\textsuperscript{660} litteris antiquorum\textsuperscript{661} uel ex\textsuperscript{662} traditione\textsuperscript{663} maiorum uel ex mea ipse cognitione\textsuperscript{664} scire potui, Domino\textsuperscript{665} adiuuante\textsuperscript{666} digessi\textsuperscript{667} Baeda\textsuperscript{668} famulus xpi et\textsuperscript{669} presbyter\textsuperscript{670} monasterii\textsuperscript{671} beatorum apostolorum\textsuperscript{672} Petri et Pauli\textsuperscript{673}, quod est ad\textsuperscript{674} Uiuraemuda\textsuperscript{675} et Ingyrum.\textsuperscript{676}

2. Qui natus in territorio eiusdem

\textsuperscript{651} Set LR1 || many MSS make the ‘H’ in Haec a 2- or 3-line initial || Hei and SF both insert Uerba Bedae presbiteri at the head of this section.

\textsuperscript{652} ins. above line Ad2, Aug.

\textsuperscript{653} istoria Wür, P5, P8 || ystory Hei.

\textsuperscript{654} historia ecclesiastica] ecclesiastica historia Ad1.

\textsuperscript{655} Britanniorn Wür, SG1, SG2, P4, P8 || Britanniorn Ad1, SF, Rei, P12, Asc || Britanniorn Ad2, Aug || Britannororn Zwe, Wi1 || Britannororn Hei, Pra, Wi2, LA4, Wi5 || Britannororn Nür || Britanniarorn Got || Britanniarorn P14, BR2 || Bitarianorn P5.

\textsuperscript{656} uel Wi1.

\textsuperscript{657} maximae SG1, maxima LR1.

\textsuperscript{658} gentis Anglorum] Anglorum gentis Asc.

\textsuperscript{659} om. Ad1, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{660} om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi1, Wi4, Zve.

\textsuperscript{661} anquorum Hei.

\textsuperscript{662} om. LR1.

\textsuperscript{663} Corr. from traditio SG1 || traditione SF.

\textsuperscript{664} ipse cognitione] cognitione ipse Got, Pra || traditione Rei.

\textsuperscript{665} deo P4, P8, LR1.

\textsuperscript{666} iuuante P12, BR2.

\textsuperscript{667} degessi Wür, P5, P12 (but corrected to di-) || dogessi SG1 (but corrected) || digressi SF.

\textsuperscript{668} Most German MSS read Beda here.

\textsuperscript{669} om. famulus xpi et Hei, SF, Wi4 || famulus xpi et] dei famulus et Wi5.

\textsuperscript{670} prespyter Wür.

\textsuperscript{671} P12 repeats et presbyteri after monasterii (but struck through).

\textsuperscript{672} om. Aug, Nür, Pra.

\textsuperscript{673} beatorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli] Petri et Pauli beatorum apostolorum P12 (with marks indicating the usual order).
monasterii, cum esset annorum VII, cura propinquorum datus sum educandus reuerentissimo abbati Benedicto, ac deinde Ceolfrido, cunctumque ex eo tempus uitaie in eiusdem monasterii habitacione peragens, omnem meditandis scripturis operam dedi, atque inter obseruantiam discipline regularis, et cotidianam cantandi in ecclesia curam, semper aut discere aut docere aut scribere dulce habui. 3.
Nono decimo autem anno diaconatum, tricesimo gradum presbyteratus, utrumque per ministerium reuerentissimi episcopi Iohannis, iubente Ceolfrido abbate, suscepi. Ex quo tempore accepti presbyteratus usque ad annum aetatis meae haec in Scripturam sanctam meae meorumque.
necessitate\textsuperscript{717} ex opusculis\textsuperscript{718} uenerabilium\textsuperscript{719} patrum\textsuperscript{720} breuiter adnotare, siue\textsuperscript{721} etiam ad formam sensus et interpretationis\textsuperscript{722} eorum superadicere\textsuperscript{723} curaui\textsuperscript{724}:

5. In\textsuperscript{725} principium\textsuperscript{726} Genesis,\textsuperscript{727} usque ad\textsuperscript{728} natiuitatem Isaac,\textsuperscript{729} et\textsuperscript{730} eiectionem\textsuperscript{731} Ismahelis,\textsuperscript{732} libros\textsuperscript{733}.

6. De\textsuperscript{734} tabernaculo\textsuperscript{735} et uasis\textsuperscript{736} eius ac\textsuperscript{737} uestibus\textsuperscript{738} sacerdotum,\textsuperscript{739} libros\textsuperscript{740}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{717} necessitate Wür, Wi2, Wi5 \| om. meae meorumque necessitati Aug, Nür.
\item \textsuperscript{718} opululis SG2.
\item \textsuperscript{719} uerabilium Rei.
\item \textsuperscript{720} om. Rei.
\item \textsuperscript{721} seu LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{722} interpretationes Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Zwe, LA4.
\item \textsuperscript{723} Some erasure in this word in Wür \| semper adicere Got, Pra, Wi5.
\item \textsuperscript{724} Wi1 breaks off here at the end of a page; a leaf has probably been lost. Plummer notes that Bu1 breaks off at exactly this point as well, though obviously there is no connection between the two MSS.
\item \textsuperscript{725} Some MSS place a multi-line (ranging from 2- to 4-line) initial 'I' here.
\item \textsuperscript{726} principio Aug, Rei, Nür.
\item \textsuperscript{727} genesi P4, P8 \| mox genesis Pra, Wi5 \| genisis Wi4.
\item \textsuperscript{728} om. Sch, Wi2.
\item \textsuperscript{729} Many German MSS read ysaac here.
\item \textsuperscript{730} et eiectionem Ismahelis\textsuperscript{730} et in alio libro et electionem Israelis et Ismahelis Wi5.
\item \textsuperscript{731} According to Plummer, CUL has \textit{eiectionem} here. This is true of Wol, Wür, and SG1 \| \textit{eiectionem} Wi2.
\item \textsuperscript{732} Hismahelis Wol, Wür, SG1, Asc, P4, P8, Got \| Hysmahelis Ad2, Zwe, Wi4 \| Ysmahelis Rei, Nür \| Hismahilis Hei, SF \| Hismaelis P5 \| Ysmaelis P12, P14 \| Ismaelis LA4.
\item \textsuperscript{733} Mynors notes here that the archetype of the C-type MSS had \textit{III} here \| tres SG1, SG2, Asc, LR1 \| libros \textit{III} \| libros Zwe, LA4.
\item \textsuperscript{734} The 'D' appears not to have been filled in in P8.
\item \textsuperscript{735} tabernaculos Got (corr. from tabernaculis).
\item \textsuperscript{736} uassis Wol.
\item \textsuperscript{737} eius ac] a LR1.
\item \textsuperscript{738} uestibus eius Wi4.
\end{itemize}
7. In \textsuperscript{741} primam partem \textsuperscript{242} Samuēlis, \textsuperscript{743} idest \textsuperscript{744} usque ad mortem Saulis \textsuperscript{745}, libros \textsuperscript{246} III. [P\textsuperscript{358}] 8. De \textsuperscript{247} aedificatione \textsuperscript{748} templi allegoricae \textsuperscript{749} expositionis \textsuperscript{750}, sicut et cetera \textsuperscript{751}, libros \textsuperscript{752} II. \textsuperscript{753}.

9. Item \textsuperscript{754} in \textsuperscript{755} Regum librum \textsuperscript{756} XXX\textsuperscript{757} quaestionum \textsuperscript{758}.

10. In Proverbia Salomonis \textsuperscript{759} libros III\textsuperscript{760}.

\textsuperscript{739} sacerdotis Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{740} Sch has this item inserted in the margin, but omits libros III || Wi2 also omits libros III || III SG1, SG2, Asc, Got, Aug, Rei, Nür, Hei, SF, Wi4, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{741} This entire item (On the First Part of Samuel) is omitted in SG1, SG2, Asc and (according to Plummer) Nam || Item in . . . Pra, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{742} primam partem] prima parte Aug, Rei, Nür || In primam partem] Ultimam partem LR1.

\textsuperscript{743} Samuelis Ad1, Hei, Wi4, Zwe, Aug, Rei, Nür, Wi2, LA4, P5, P12, LR1, Wi5, P14, BR2 || according to Plummer, CUL has Samu\h/ēlis.

\textsuperscript{744} ins. above line LA4.

\textsuperscript{745} Samuelis LR1 || Sa\h/ēlis P12.

\textsuperscript{746} Plummer reads III here, but notes that C-type MSS have III || om. im primam . . . III Nam || III Got, LR1 || libros III] libri III Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{747} The 'D' has not been added in P8, as happenned for most of the initials that were planned to set off the items in this list || De] In Rei || De] I (?) Wi4.

\textsuperscript{748} aedificatione Wür || aedificatione Got.

\textsuperscript{749} allegoricae Wür, Wol, SG1 || alle\go/rice Pra.

\textsuperscript{750} ex populo sit Got || expositum Ad1 || .

\textsuperscript{751} om. Rei.

\textsuperscript{752} libri Wi4.

\textsuperscript{753} om. cetera libri II Hei, SF (with this item therefore connected to next: sicut et item in Regum).

\textsuperscript{754} 'I' in Item has not been filled in Hei, Ad1.

\textsuperscript{755} ins. in margin Wi4.

\textsuperscript{756} libris LR1 || librum cetera librum II Hei, SF (runover from the previous line in a parent MS has been incorporated into the text), cf. also n. 745 || Regum librum] librum Regum Ad1, Ad2, Zwe || Regum librum XXX] libros Regum libros XXX Aug, Rei, Nür.

\textsuperscript{757} triginta Sch, Got.

\textsuperscript{758} quaestiones SG1, SG2 || quaestiones Sch, Wi2, LR1.

12. In Isaiah, Danihelem, xii prophetas et partem Hieremiae distinctiones capitulorum ex tractatu beati Hieronymi excerptas.

13. In Ezram et Neemiam libros iii.

759 Salesonis Ad2, Hei, SF, Zwe, Pra || Salamonis LR1.

760 I P5.

761 This entire item (In Cantica . . . vii) ins. in margin in Sch.

762 According to Plummer and Mynors, C-type MSS read vi here || septem SG2 || vi SF, P14 || sex BR2 || octo Got.

763 According to Mynors, this entire item (In Isaiah . . . excerptas) is omitted in MSS of the C-type || isahyam P4 || isahiam P8 || 'I' in "In" was not filled in in Ad1.

764 Esaia SG1 || Esaia SG2, Aug, Nür || Ysaiai Sch, Wi2, Rei, LA4, LR1, Asc, BR2 || Esayam Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Zwe, Pra || Ysayam P12, P14, Wi4, Wi5.

765 Danielem Sch, Wi2, Rei, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, LA4, LR1, Pra, Wi5, Nür, Asc || Danielem P14, BR2.

766 et duodecim BR2.

767 profetas Wür, Wol || prophaetas Got.

768 parte Pra, Nür.

769 Hieremae P8 || Hieremiae Sch, Ad2 || Hieremie LA4, P12, Wi5, Asc, BR2 || Jeremiae Rei, Wi2 || Jeremie Pra, LR1, Wi4, Nür, P14 || Heremie SF, Hei (but changed to Ger) || Hieremie P5 || Iereme Ad1.

770 distinctionis P5 || distinctiones Aug || Distinctionesque Pra (perhaps understood as a separate item).

771 capitularum Ad2, Zwe || capitullorum Wi5.

772 om. LR1, P14, BR2.

773 Hieronimi Sch, P4 (though only poorly legible), P8, Asc, P12, LA4, Ad2, BR2 || Ieronimi Rei, Nür, Ad1, Wi4, Wi2, Pra, P14 || Jeronimi LR1 || Hieronimi Hei || Hieronimi SF || ins. above line P5.

774 exceptas Got, LA4 || exceptas SF || excerptos Pra || excerptas P5.

775 In LR1, the entry beginning In librum . . . Tobiae is placed before this item (In Ezram . . .) and the next one (In Canticum . . .).

776 Esdram Got, LA4 || Esdram Aug, Rei, Nür, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zwe, Pra, LR1, P14, BR2, Asc || Esdram Wi5 || Ezra with Esdram written above the line P12.

777 quique et Pra.

778 III LA4.
14. In Canticum\textsuperscript{779} Habacum\textsuperscript{780} librum\textsuperscript{781} I\textsuperscript{782}.

15. In librum\textsuperscript{783} beati patris\textsuperscript{784} Tobiae\textsuperscript{785} explanationis\textsuperscript{786} allegoricae\textsuperscript{787} xpo et ecclesia,\textsuperscript{788} librum\textsuperscript{789} I\textsuperscript{790}.

16. Item\textsuperscript{791}, capitula lectionum\textsuperscript{792} in Pentateucum\textsuperscript{793} Mosi\textsuperscript{794}, Iosue\textsuperscript{795}, Iudicum\textsuperscript{796}; in\textsuperscript{797} libros\textsuperscript{798} Regum et Uerba Dierum\textsuperscript{799}; in librum\textsuperscript{800} beati patris\textsuperscript{801} Iob; in Parabolas\textsuperscript{802}.

\textsuperscript{779} Cantico Aug, Rei, Nür.

\textsuperscript{780} Abacuc SG2, Asc, Got, Ad1, Ad2, SF, Nür, Wi2, P12, LA4, P14, BR2, Pra || Abba\ba/cuc Sch || Abbacuc SG1 (with first ‘b’ over erasure) P4, P8, Aug, Rei || Abuch Hei || Abacuch P5 || Abachuc LR1 || Abbacut Wi5 || Abacum (?) Wi4.

\textsuperscript{781} librum || liber unus Rei || lib[er] primus SF.

\textsuperscript{782} libro Aug, Rei, LA4.

\textsuperscript{783} beati patris] patris nostri beati SF (but with marks indicating beati should be placed first) || beati nostri patris Hei, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{784} Thobie P12, Asc, Wi4, Wi5, P14, BR2 || Tobye Nür.

\textsuperscript{785} explanationes SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{786} allegoricae Wol, Wür, SG1 || allegorice Nür || allegorice Rei, Ad1, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zwe, LA4, LR1, P5, P12, Pra, Wi5, P14, BR2, Asc.

\textsuperscript{787} It seems that the scribe of Pra may have understood this as a new item.

\textsuperscript{788} eclesiae Wür.

\textsuperscript{789} liber Rei, P12, Nür.

\textsuperscript{790} According to Plummer, Nam reads libros \textit{here}, and so also LR1, Pra, Wi5 || unus Rei || primus SF.

\textsuperscript{791} iam SG1, Asc || Nam P4 || am P8 (an intended ‘I’ probably not filled in).

\textsuperscript{792} capitula lectionum] lectionum capitula Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{793} Pentateucum Wür, SG1, SG2 || Pentatheucum Sch, P4, P8, Hei, SF || Pentateucum Wi4, Wi5, Asc, BR2 || Pentateuchum Aug, Nür, Pra || Pentathoecum LR1.

\textsuperscript{794} All but the earliest MSS read Moysi or Moisi.

\textsuperscript{795} Got seems to have originally had nun before Iosue || om. Iosue Aug, Nür || Yosue Wi4.

\textsuperscript{796} om. Aug, Rei, Nür.

\textsuperscript{797} Got marks each of Bede’s sets of capitula as a separate item in the list of works using litterae notabiles; so also, with relative consistency: Aug, Rei, Nür, Pra, Wi5 || LA4 begins a new item here.

\textsuperscript{798} libro LA4, Aug, Nür || librum Rei, BR2.

\textsuperscript{799} Derum Pra.
Ecclesiasten\textsuperscript{803} et\textsuperscript{804} Cantica\textsuperscript{805} Canticorum\textsuperscript{806}, in Isaiam\textsuperscript{807} prophetam\textsuperscript{808}, Ezram\textsuperscript{809} quoque\textsuperscript{810} et Neemiam\textsuperscript{811}.

17. In\textsuperscript{812} euangelium\textsuperscript{813} Marci\textsuperscript{814} libros \textsuperscript{815}.
18. In\textsuperscript{816} euangelium\textsuperscript{817} Lucae libros\textsuperscript{818} \textsuperscript{819}.

\textsuperscript{803} libro Got, Aug, Rei, Nür || librī LA4 || librium LR1.

\textsuperscript{804} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{805} parabulas Wür, Wol || corr. from parabolis Sch || perabolas SF, LR1, Wi5, Nür || perabolis Pra.

\textsuperscript{806} Ecclesiastem Pra || in Ecclesiasten LA4 || et in Ecclesiasten P14 || et Ecclesiasten P5, P12, BR2 || Ecclesiastes LR1.

\textsuperscript{807} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{808} Cantiaca Wür || Canticum Aug, Rei, Nür || in Cantica Ad1 (with in ins. above line), LR1.

\textsuperscript{809} Canticorum Iudicum Aug (with a correction mark above?), Rei, Nür. It seems probable that, in a common ancestor of these three MSS, the word \textit{ludicum} from the entry for Bede’s \textit{capitula} on the Pentateuch, was probably written as runover (cf. n. 788 above).

\textsuperscript{810} Esaiā SG1, SG2, Aug, Nür || Ysaiam Sch, Wi2, Rei, P8, LR1, LA4, BR2, Asc || Isayam P4 || Ysayam Hei, SF, Wi4, P12, P14, W15 || Esayam Ad1, Ad2, Zve, Pra.

\textsuperscript{811} propheta Got || propheta Aug.

\textsuperscript{812} Ezdram Got, LA4 || Esdram Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Aug, Nür, BR2, Asc, LR1 || In Esdram Pra, W15 || Esram P14 || et Ezram P5, P12 (Ez\textbackslash d\textbackslash ram) || Hezram P4, P8 || Hesdram Zwe.

\textsuperscript{813} om. Sch, Wi2.

\textsuperscript{814} According to Mynors SP adds \textit{item in libro Tobiae Judith et Aester} here || Neemia Wür || Nemeiam Ad1.

\textsuperscript{815} Not set off from the previous item in Got, Ad1, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve, LR1.

\textsuperscript{816} euuglium P4, P8 || euangelio Rei || euangelii Hei, SF || librum euangelii Zwe || euangelium Ad2.

\textsuperscript{817} om. SF, WI4 || Marchi P5, P12 || M\textbackslash a\textbackslash rci LR1.

\textsuperscript{818} iii Aug, Rei, Nür.

\textsuperscript{819} This item and the next are omitted in Ad1, Ad2, Hei (with “hic deessunt” in margin), SF, Wi4 || Zve has them both, but does not mark them off from the other items as strongly, nor does it number them, as it does the other items in the list of Bede’s works || the entire item is inserted in the margin in Sch || In \textit{Item in} Wi5.

\textsuperscript{819} euuglium P4, P8.

\textsuperscript{819} libri Zwe.

\textsuperscript{820} Neum Nür || iii P14 (with \textit{Marci libros quattuor} crossed out after this, suggesting it may have been runover in the parent MS) || tres BR2.
19. Omeliarum\textsuperscript{820} euangelior\textsuperscript{821} libros \textsuperscript{822}.
20. In\textsuperscript{823} Apostolum\textsuperscript{824} quaecumque in\textsuperscript{825} opusculis\textsuperscript{826} sancti Augustini exposita
    inueni\textsuperscript{827}, cuncta per ordinem\textsuperscript{828} transcribere\textsuperscript{829} curau\textsuperscript{830}.
21. In Actus Apostolorum\textsuperscript{831} libros \textsuperscript{832}.
22. In epistulas\textsuperscript{833} VII catholicas\textsuperscript{834} libros singulos.
23. In Apocalypsin\textsuperscript{835} sancti Iohannis\textsuperscript{836} libros\textsuperscript{837} III\textsuperscript{838}.
24. Item, Capitula\textsuperscript{839} lectionum in totum\textsuperscript{840} Nouum Testamentum, excepto euangelio.

\textsuperscript{820} In omeliaire Wi5.
\textsuperscript{821} euangeliorum Zwe.
\textsuperscript{822} libros duo Got || libri II Zwe.
\textsuperscript{823} ‘I’ never filled in, SG2.
\textsuperscript{824} apostulum Wür, Wol, Wi4 || apostolicum Got.
\textsuperscript{825} ins. above line Wür.
\textsuperscript{826} opusculum P4, P8 || ocusculis P14.
\textsuperscript{827} repperi Rei.
\textsuperscript{828} per ordinem om. Hei, SF, Wi4.
\textsuperscript{829} scribere P14, BR2.
\textsuperscript{830} curam LR1.
\textsuperscript{831} apostulorum Wol, Wür || apostorum SG1.
\textsuperscript{832} duo Got || duus Sch || ww LA4..
\textsuperscript{833} aepistulas Wol || epystolas Wi4..
\textsuperscript{834} canonicis Got (over erasure) || canonicas Aug, Rei, Nür, Wi5, LA4, P14, BR2 || canolicas Pra || catholicos Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve || ins. et canonicas above line || catholicas has been crossed out and canonicas ins. above line Asc || cat\h|/olicas P5.
\textsuperscript{835} Apocalipsin Wür, SG2, Got, Asc, P5, Wi2, Pra || Apolipsin SG1 || Apocalipsin P4, P8 || Apocalipsyn Rei || Apakalipsin Ad2 || Apokalypsin Zve || Apocaphapisim LA4 || Apokalipsim Hei, SF, Wi4 || Apocalipsisim P12, Wi5, LR1, P14, BR2 || Apokalipsim Nür.
\textsuperscript{836} om. sancti Iohannis Hei (corrected in margin), SF, Wi4 || ihoannis P5, P12.
\textsuperscript{837} libri Got || libro Wi4.
\textsuperscript{838} tres Sch, Got.
\textsuperscript{839} in Capitula Hei, SF, P5, P12, Wi4.
25. Item librum epistularum\textsuperscript{841} ad diuersos\textsuperscript{842}: quarum\textsuperscript{843} de sex\textsuperscript{844} aetabibus\textsuperscript{845} saeculi una est\textsuperscript{846}, de\textsuperscript{847} mansionibus filiorum Israel\textsuperscript{848} una\textsuperscript{849}, una\textsuperscript{850} de eo\textsuperscript{851} quod ait Isaias\textsuperscript{852} “Et claudentur [P359] ibi\textsuperscript{853} in carcerem\textsuperscript{854}, et\textsuperscript{855} post dies multos\textsuperscript{856} uisitabuntur”\textsuperscript{857}, de\textsuperscript{858} ratione bisexti\textsuperscript{859} una\textsuperscript{860}, de\textsuperscript{861} aequinoctio\textsuperscript{862} iuxta Anatolium\textsuperscript{863} una.

\textsuperscript{840} in totum] totum in Pra.

\textsuperscript{841} epistolarum SG1, SG2, Got || aepistolarum Wol.

\textsuperscript{842} ad |di|uersos Wür || ad diuersus Wol, Hei, SF || om. ad diuersus Aug, Rei, Nür || d\i|uersos Wi4.

\textsuperscript{843} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{844} de sex] sex de LA4 || VII Ad1.

\textsuperscript{845} etates P4, P8.

\textsuperscript{846} om. Nür.

\textsuperscript{847} Set off as a new item Wol, SG1, SG2, Asc, P4, P8, Got, Rei, Nür, P5, P12, Pra, P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{848} Israhel Wür || [Israel una] Israhel // Israhel una est Nür.

\textsuperscript{849} om. LA4, P14, LR1, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{850} Set off as a new item, SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Wi2, P4, P8, Got, Rei, Nür, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Zwe, P5, P12, LA4, BR2, Pra || Wi4 shows eye-skip from this una to una de equinoctio below (l. 200), but the omitted text has been inserted before the item de historiis sanctorum (cf. n. 857 below).

\textsuperscript{851} corr. from ea Got || de eo] deo Wi4.

\textsuperscript{852} Esaias Wür, Wol, SG1, SG2, Aug, P5, Nür || Ysaias P4, P8, LA4, Zwe, Wi2, LR1, Asc, BR2 || Esayas Hei, SF, Ad1, Ad2 || Ysayas Pra, Wi5, Wi4 || ait Isaias] Ysayas ait P14 || É|ysayas P12.

\textsuperscript{853} om. LR1.

\textsuperscript{854} carcer Pra, Wi5, LA4 || a carcerem P14.

\textsuperscript{855} Pra breaks off imperfectly at et.

\textsuperscript{856} ins. above line Got || dies multos] multos dies P12, LR1, P14, BR2.

\textsuperscript{857} -bunter is runover in P8 || uisitabuntur una LR1, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{858} Set off as a new item Wol, SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Wi2, Got, P5, P12, LA4, Aug, Rei, Nür, BR2 || both P4 and P8 omit this entire item.

\textsuperscript{859} bis(r)exti Wür || byssexti SG2 || bisextiti Got, LR 1, Wi5, P12 (with bisextus struck through before) || bis sex Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{860} om. Wi5 (cf. n. 850 above).

\textsuperscript{861} Set off as a separate item in Wol, Sch, P4, P8 (with the 'D' never added), Got, Aug, Rei, Ad1, Hei, SF, Wi2, LA4, P5, P12, BR2, Asc.
26. Item de historiis sanctorum: librum uitae et passionis sancti Felicis confessoris de metrico Paulini opere in prosam transtuli; librum uitae et passionis sancti Anastasi male de Greco translatum et peius a quodam inperito emendatum, prout potui, ad [M570-71] sensum corregi; uitam sancti patris, prout potui, ad sensum correxi; utiam sancti patris.

---

862 equinoctio Hei || equinoxio Wi5.
863 Anatholium SG1, SG2, Got, Sch, Wi2, P4, P8, Aug, Nür, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zwe, P5, P12, LA4, LR1, Wi5 || Anotalium Wol, Wür (but corr. by later hand).
864 Initial 'I' never filled in SG2, P4, Wi4 || Wi4 inserts an omitted item from above (see n. 843), reading here Item una de eo . . . bis sex una and then continues with Item de hystoris sanctorum . . .
865 hystoriis SG2, Got || historis Wol || ystoris P5 || hystoris Wi4.
866 liber Got, Nür.
867 passiones Sch, Wi2 || passio Got || passionem Aug, Rei, Nür, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zwe (?).
868 ins. in margin in SG2.
869 confessoris xpi Sch, Wi2 || et confessoris Asc.
870 Set off as new item in SG1, SG2, Got.
871 metrito (?) LR1.
872 prosa LA4.
873 translili (?) Hei || P5 breaks off here imperfectly.
874 Set off as new item in SG1, SG2, Sch, Asc, P4, P8, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve, Aug, LA4, P5 (judging by the blank space at the end of the previous line, though the MS is defective here), P12, BR2, Wi5.
875 uitae Anastasii LA4 (with Anastasii expuncted)
876 passiones Hei, SF, Wi4.
877 An\a/stasii Asc.
878 Plummer has Graeco here || Greco SG1, SG2 || ins. in latinum after Greco Zwe.
879 et peius ins. above line SG1 || corr. from potius Got.
880 quondam Nür.
881 corr. from emendatam SG1 || emenda\tum/ P8 || emedatum LR1.
882 prout potui om. here and ins. after correxii in Asc.
883 ad sensum] assensum Aug, Nür.
884 Set off as new item in Wol, SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Wi2, P8 (om. the initial ‘u’), P12, Got, Aug, Rei, Nür, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4 (with item uitam), Zwe, Wi5, BR2, LA4.
monachi\textsuperscript{886} simul\textsuperscript{887} et\textsuperscript{888} antistitis\textsuperscript{889} Cudbercti\textsuperscript{890} et prius\textsuperscript{891} heroico\textsuperscript{892} metro et postmodum\textsuperscript{893} plano\textsuperscript{894} sermone descripsi.

27. Historiam\textsuperscript{895} abbatum\textsuperscript{896} monasterii huius, in quo\textsuperscript{897} supernae\textsuperscript{898} pietati deseruire gaudeo\textsuperscript{899}, Benedicti\textsuperscript{900}, Ceolfridi et Huaetbercti\textsuperscript{901} in libellis duobus\textsuperscript{902}.

28. Historiam\textsuperscript{903} ecclesiasticam\textsuperscript{904} nostrae insulae ac\textsuperscript{905} gentis\textsuperscript{906} in libris\textsuperscript{907} v.\textsuperscript{908}.

\textsuperscript{885} patris nostri Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{886} monachi Wi2 \| modo corr. to monachi in margin P12.

\textsuperscript{887} ins. above line Sch.

\textsuperscript{888} simul et atque Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{889} antistis SG2, P12 (but corr. above line).

\textsuperscript{890} Cudberecti Wür \| Cudberecti SG1 (?), Wol, SG2, P8 \| Cutberti Rei, Nür \| Cudberti Wi5, Asc \| Cudberecti Sch, Wi2, P12 \| Codberecti corr. to Cud- Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve \| Cudberecti LA4.

\textsuperscript{891} et prius primum Wi5.

\textsuperscript{892} heroico Sch, Wi2 \| eroico P8 \| heroyico P12.

\textsuperscript{893} et prius heroico metro et postmodum} om. Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve (but the missing text has been supplied in the margin in this last MSS).

\textsuperscript{894} om. Asc \| plane P8 \| corr. from paulo (?) P14.

\textsuperscript{895} LA1 resumes with this word, the previous leaf having been removed \| the initial ‘H’ was never added in P8, Wi4 \| ystoriam SG2 \| hystoria Got, Hei, SF.

\textsuperscript{896} abb\textsuperscript{194}/atum P12.

\textsuperscript{897} ins. above line Wol.

\textsuperscript{898} superna Wür, Wol, SG1, P8, SG2 \| supernae Hei, SF, Wi4, Rei, Nür, LA4, P12, P14, BR2, Asc.

\textsuperscript{899} ga\textsuperscript{194}/deo Wür \| gaudio LR1.

\textsuperscript{900} Benidicti Wol.

\textsuperscript{901} Hu\&berecti Wür \| Heu\&berecti Wol, SG1 \| Hucberechtii (?) Sch \| Hucberehti Wi2 \| Hucberehtii Ad1 \| Haetbercti Hei \| Haetberctei SF \| Haetberctei Ad2, Zve \| Heberctei P8 \| Heu et berctei SG2 \| Hei et berctei LA1 \| Hua et bercti Got \| Hieu et berctei Aug, Rei, Nür \| Heu et benti (?) LA4 \| Eueberctei P12 \| Wicberti W15 \| Hugbercti LR1 \| Hubrechtii Asc \| Huaetberci P14, BR2 \| Huecherecti (?) Wi4.

\textsuperscript{902} doubus scripsi LA4 (perhaps a result of eye-skip to the previous item \ldots sermone descrips).

\textsuperscript{903} ystoriam SG2.

\textsuperscript{904} ecclesiasticam Wür, Wol.

\textsuperscript{905} et LA4, LR1.
29. Martyrologium909 de nataliciis910 sanctorum martyrum diebus; in quo omnes, quos inuenire potui911, non solum qua die, uerum etiam912 quo genere certaminis913, uel914 sub quo915 iudice mundum uicerint916, diligenter adnotare917 studui918.

30. Librum hymnorum919 diuerso metro siue rythmo920.

31. Librum921 epigrammatum922 heroico923 siue elegiaco925.

32. De natura rerum, et926 de temporibus libros singulos927; item928 de temporibus929

909 om. ac gentis Asc.
907 liber SF.
908 In Wi5, this item reads Historiam quoque ecclesiasticam gentis nostrae in quinque libris || libros quinque

909 Item Martirologium Wi4 || Martyrologium Got || Martirilogium BR2 || Martilogium P12.
910 natalicis Wür, Wol || natalibus LA4 || nathaliciis P12.
911 om. Sch, Wi2.
912 uerum etiam ins. above line SG1 || et Ad1.
913 certamis Wi4 || certami Hei.
914 uel quo Nür (but with quo expuncted).
915 As noted by Plummer, LCT2 ends here imperfectly || que (?) LA1.
916 uicerunt P14, BR2.
917 notare Aug, Rei, Nür || adnotaui Hei, SF, Wi4 || beginning with this word, about half of each of the remaining lines is missing in LR1.
918 Wür has been corrected here, but from what is unclear || studiu Wol, SG1 || perhaps studiu in SG2 || illeg. in P8 || om. Hei, SF, WI4 || curau P14, BR2.
919 ymnorum Sch, Wi2, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Zwe, Aug, Wi5, Asc || ymnpnorum Nür, BR2, Wi4.
920 ritmo Wol, SG1, SG2 (?), Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4 || rithmo Sch, Wi2, Aug, Rei, Nür, Zwe, P8, Got, P12 (corr. from ridmo), LA4, Wi5, P14, Asc || ritemap LA1 || rithmo BR2 || rithmo Ad1.
921 Item librum Wi4.
922 epigrammatum Wür, Wol, P8, Wi4, P12, LA4, Wi2, SF, Hei, Ad2 || epygrammatum Sch, Got, Nür || epygrammatum Ad1, Zwe, P14, BR2.
923 eroico Got || heroico P8, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, SF, Wi4, Zve, P12.
924 metrico Hei, SF, Wi4.
925 elegiaco SG1 || elegiaco Sch, Ad1, Ad2 (corr. from ela-), Zve || alayaco SF || elayaco Hei || elayaco Wi4 || elegiato Nür.
librum\textsuperscript{930} unum maiorem\textsuperscript{931}.

33. Librum\textsuperscript{932} de\textsuperscript{933} orthographia\textsuperscript{934} alphabeti\textsuperscript{935} ordine distinctum\textsuperscript{936}.

34. Item librum de metrica arte\textsuperscript{937}; et\textsuperscript{938} huic adiectum alium\textsuperscript{939} de schematibus\textsuperscript{940} siue\textsuperscript{941} tropis libellum, hoc est de figuris\textsuperscript{942} [P360] modisque\textsuperscript{943} locutionum\textsuperscript{944}, quibus scriptura\textsuperscript{945} sancta contexta\textsuperscript{946} est\textsuperscript{947}.

\textsuperscript{926} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{927} libr\textit{um} Sch \textbar\textbar singulos libros Asc.

\textsuperscript{928} Set off as a new item in Wol, SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Wi2, P8, Got, LA1, LA4, LR1, Aug, Rei, Nür, Ad2, Hei, Wi4, Zwe, P12, P14 (?), BR2, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{929} d\&e\textit{mporibus} Wür \textbar\textbar libros singulos . . . unum maiorum was omitted in SF (eye-skip on temporibus), but has been supplied in the lower margin.

\textsuperscript{930} liber SF.

\textsuperscript{931} In Got, the word maiorem is attached to the next item (= Maiorem librum. . .) \textbar\textbar libr\textit{um} unum maiorum has been struck through in SF, and added with the marginal insertion noted above in n. 922.

\textsuperscript{932} Item libr\textit{um} Asc \textbar\textbar Librum etiam Wi5.

\textsuperscript{933} Doubled (de de) in Got.

\textsuperscript{934} ortographia Wol \textbar\textbar ortographia SG1, LA1, Got, Sch, Wi2, P8, P12, BR2, Hei, SF, Nür \textbar\textbar ortographia Aug, Rei, Ad2 \textbar\textbar ortografia Ad1 \textbar\textbar orthografia Zwe \textbar\textbar orthograuia Wi4.

\textsuperscript{935} According to Plummer CUL reads alphabeti here \textbar\textbar alphabeto P8 \textbar\textbar alfabeti Aug, Got, Zve, LA4, Asc.

\textsuperscript{936} distinctum Wol.

\textsuperscript{937} artae Got.

\textsuperscript{938} om. Hei, SF, Wi4.

\textsuperscript{939} P12 sets alium off as beginning a new item \textbar\textbar Item alium Wi4.

\textsuperscript{940} schematibus SG1, SG2, Asc, Sch, Wi2, Got, Aug, Rei, Ad1, Ad2, Hei, Wi4, Zve, P14, BR2, LA4, Wi5 \textbar\textbar chematibus P8.

\textsuperscript{941} et Wi5 \textbar\textbar siue de LA4.

\textsuperscript{942} figura Aug, Nür.

\textsuperscript{943} motisque Wol (but corrected).

\textsuperscript{944} locutionum P12.

\textsuperscript{945} scripturas P12 (with the final 's' expuncted).

\textsuperscript{946} contexta Wol.
35. Teque\textsuperscript{948} deprecor\textsuperscript{949}, bone\textsuperscript{950} ihu, ut cui\textsuperscript{951} propitius donasti uerba tuae\textsuperscript{952} scientiae
dulciter haurire\textsuperscript{953}, dones etiam benignus aliquando\textsuperscript{954} ad te\textsuperscript{955}, fontem omnis sapientiae\textsuperscript{956},
peruenire\textsuperscript{957}, et parere\textsuperscript{958} semper\textsuperscript{959} ante faciem tuam\textsuperscript{960}.

\textsuperscript{947} Sch, Wi2, and Asc insert Oratio. after est || Sch has or in the margin || SF breaks off here || LR1
likewise omits the prayer (which is clear despite the defects of the manuscript) || est is not visible in LA4,
though it may simply be in the gutter.

\textsuperscript{948} om. -que SG1, SG2, Asc, P8, LA1, LA4, Wi5.

\textsuperscript{949} depraecor Wol.

\textsuperscript{950} bonae Wür, Wol.

\textsuperscript{951} corr. from cuius Asc.

\textsuperscript{952} om. SG2 || doubled in Sch (but corr).

\textsuperscript{953} \textit{h}aurire P12.

\textsuperscript{954} om. Hei, Wi4 || aliquii (?) Asc.

\textsuperscript{955} \textit{ad te} ins. above line SG1.

\textsuperscript{956} According to Mynors, the C-type MSS read scientiae here || Wi5 reads sapiantie uel scientie || fontem
omnis sapientiae] omnis sapientiae fontem Wi5.

\textsuperscript{957} uenire Aug, Rei, Nür.

\textsuperscript{958} apparere Wi5.

\textsuperscript{959} om. Asc.

\textsuperscript{960} As noted by Plummer, C-type MSS here insert the prayer found at the end of the preface in M-type
MSS || Got, LA1, and Asc add Amen here || expliciunt libri quin[t]ique historiae ecclesiasticae . Gentis anglorum. deo
gratias ago tibi semper et ubique amen. MAP OAR. Wol || deut gratias tibi ago semper et et (?) // Explicit libri quinque
Historiae ecclesiasticae?] lege feliciter et memento mi || Legerit hos libros obseuro ut t/ re . . (illeg.) Wür || Qui uiuis et
regnas cum deo patre in unitate spiritus sancti per omnia saecula saeculorum . amen; and in the left margin expliciunt
libri .v. hystoriae ecclesiasticae gentis anglorum. Sch, WI2 || Amen followed by Explicit liber quintus historiae
ecclesiasticae gentis Anglorum quam scriptit uenerabilis Beda P14 || Amen. Deus gratias tibi ago semper et ubique.
Explicitur libri v hystoriam ecclesiasticam gentis Anglorum. Lege feliciter et memento mi. Ad2, Hei, Zve || Explicit liber
historiarum gentis Anglorum Bede presbiteri ad Ceouulfum regem LA4 || Qui uiuis et regnas deus per omnia saecula
saeculorum // Amen // Deo gracias W15 || Explicit hystoria Bed[ . . . ] de gestis Anglorum LR1 (lacuna of approx. 12-14
chars.) || Explicit historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum Aug, Rei, Nür (with “1.4.lxxii*” [i.e., 1462] written after) ||
Qui legis rogo te ut ores pro me. P8 || Explicit Liber quintus hystoriae gentis anglorum Bedae Presbiteri. Deo gratias.
\textit{Amen. Got} || [no explicit] LA1.
CHAPTER 4
MANUSCRIPT CONTEXT

Having examined the transmission of the HE in the manuscripts of Mynors’ German textual province, we can now—in the following two chapters—turn to the question of its reception in the German-speaking world. The text’s migration to the Continent in the eighth century, and its continued copying right up to the advent of printing (and beyond, for that matter), clearly indicate that there was a genuine interest in the text outside of England. The reasons behind that interest, on the other hand, are not immediately apparent. As noted above, Bede took Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* as his main model. In contrast to the former work, however, his own ecclesiastical history has a notable “national” focus; that is, it is concerned almost exclusively with the church in England (and is in some respects even more narrowly focused, on Northumbrian matters). Just why a Continental audience would take a significant interest in what is fundamentally a work of English history remains to be explained, though there are a few obvious connections between England and the Continent in the early period that immediately present themselves as possible reasons for its early migration.¹

The earliest documented Continental readers of Bede’s works were the Anglo-Saxon missionaries, and the potential resonances of the HE for such an audience are not difficult to locate. As will be clear to any reader of the HE, one of Bede’s main themes is conversion, which is something that missionaries willing to risk life and limb in a foreign land are likely to have found compelling, to say the least. Boniface and his associates might very well have seen themselves as the natural continuators of a conversion process begun in England by the two apostles of the English, Gregory the Great and Augustine of Canterbury, with

the ultimate goal of spreading the faith to the ends of the earth.\(^2\) It is therefore not all that difficult to see how the *HE* gained its first audience, but why did the text go on to be so popular outside of this initial circle of readers? The surviving manuscripts may be of some help in revealing answers to this question.

The manuscripts of the *HE* are physical evidence of its dissemination and reception, but as such they are far from being straightforward or easily quantifiable.\(^3\) They are, first of all, only a partial record of the manuscripts that once existed. For every copy that survives today, there may have been many more that do not. Just how many is impossible to say.\(^4\) In addition, the manuscripts that do survive are complex, multi-layered pieces of evidence, and to interpret the significance of what they may seem to suggest about the ways the *HE* was understood in the Middle Ages can, to say the least, be difficult. For example, a given set of marginalia can be said to represent at least one reader’s response to the text, but how representative of the general readership are such notes? There were almost certainly many other readers who did not record their interest in what they were reading by marking the manuscript, and it would be wrong to assume that they necessarily shared the proclivities of those of their contemporaries who more readily took up the pen.

Furthermore, though the manuscript record offers some indication of the extent of the text’s dissemination, it is not, in the final analysis, a perfect indicator of the size of the text’s audience over the centuries. It does, however, seem safe to assume that the time and expense involved in copying a manuscript of a text as long as the *HE* would have been enough to deter all but the most motivated of scribes, and so we can proceed on the assumption that copying activity is indicative of real interest in the text.\(^5\) But what can we

---

\(^2\) David Rollason, “Bede and Germany,” *passim.*

\(^3\) But this is not to say that to enumerate them is not interesting or even illuminating. For a list of the manuscripts that make up the surviving record, see Appendix A below; for a summary of their distribution, by region and over time, see Chapter Five.

\(^4\) In addition to the manuscripts themselves, there is a second body of evidence for the dissemination of the text: namely, medieval library catalogues. For the German-speaking world, these catalogues are available in two major series, *MBKÖ* and the ongoing *MBKDS*. For full details, see below, p. 118, n. 9. These two series and the evidence they provide for the dissemination of the *HE* will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five below.

\(^5\) By which I do not mean to suggest that a monastic scribe would have decided for himself which texts to copy, but rather that to copy the whole text would require a substantial commitment.
say about the subsequent generations of monks and nuns—and that the audience was largely monastic will become clear in Chapter Five below—who may have had access to a given manuscript in subsequent times? Did they read it? In seeking to answer this question, even the seemingly straightforward evidence of a given manuscript’s survival is ambiguous. The most heavily used manuscripts are likely to have suffered the most wear, and as a result are probably less likely to have survived than manuscripts that were rarely read.6 On the other hand, a manuscript that was neglected and forgotten might easily have been lost or otherwise destroyed, and a text that was considered of no further use might well have been erased to make room for a new text, or had its pages cut up for use in binding of other manuscripts, as so often happened.7 Thus, the preservation of a given copy of the text would seem to suggest that it was valued by its owners, and yet it tells us little about the text’s real readership. For that we must instead rely on marginalia and the other traces that subsequent users of these books have left behind, which themselves only partially and imperfectly bear witness to reader interest, as already noted.

Despite all these problems and ambiguities, the manuscripts remain our best body of evidence for readership and reception of the text, and they will therefore be the main sources for the following survey of the text’s readership and reception in medieval Germany. This survey will be divided into two parts, corresponding to two contextual layers discussed above in Chapter One: that is, manuscript context, which will be treated in the present chapter, and library context, which will be surveyed in Chapter Five. Under “manuscript context” I will consider the physical characteristics of the text’s presentation (that is, format, layout, script, and decoration), as well as the other texts that circulated alongside it in those manuscripts, which includes not only texts that comment upon it directly, such as marginalia and glosses, but also those that are simply found alongside it in

---

6 Examining an almost pristine copy such as Admont, Stiftsbibliothek 552 (=Ad2), for example, one cannot help but wonder just how many, or perhaps how few, of the Admonter monks and nuns who had access to it over the years actually took an interest in it.

7 An example of the latter is Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 5257a, a thirteenth-century fragment of HE III.11 from the monastery at Chiemsee that was used in the binding of another manuscript. It probably is the remains of a copy of the complete text, but given that the chapter it contains recounts a miracle of St. Oswald, about whom there was significant interest in the German-speaking world, as will be seen below, we cannot discount the possibility that the lost MS contained only excerpts from the HE.
a manuscript. As evidence of reception, such juxtaposed texts are fraught with difficulties, for even though one could make the case that juxtaposition is, in itself, a form of comment on the text, anyone who has spent time perusing medieval manuscripts will recognize that such juxtapositions are, in many cases, wholly fortuitous and seemingly with neither rhyme nor reason. To make a judgment about which pairings are random and which reflect an intentional choice by a scribe or a later binder depends very much on our ability to recognize connections between the texts that are being juxtaposed, which may be different from the connections recognized by a medieval reader. Despite these potential pitfalls, it is my hope that by examining the entire corpus of surviving manuscripts from this region, patterns will emerge that will allow more confidence in our assertions about what the manuscripts reveal about the text’s readership and reception.

The Earliest Manuscripts

As has been noted above, the first wave of interest in Bede’s works can be traced back to the Anglo-Saxon missionaries active in Germany in Bede’s own day and for a number of years thereafter. Four manuscripts survive from German-speaking regions in this early period (the eighth and ninth centuries), and these offer us a sense of how the HE’s earliest audiences may have read and understood the text. In order of age, these are the well-known manuscripts now found in the libraries at Kassel, Wolfenbüttel, Würzburg, and St. Gall (which are my Ka1, Wol, Wür, and SG1). Their respective medieval homes were at Fulda, somewhere in Lotharingia (later at Weissenburg), at Würzburg, and at St. Gall.

All four of these manuscripts transmit the HE alone, as seems to have been its normal mode of circulation in the early days. Among all the earliest manuscripts, including those from other regions, one of the few exceptions to this is the Namur manuscript of the early ninth century, in which the HE has been bound up with Gregory of

---

8 Because Ka1 is of the C-type recension, and therefore was not part of Mynors’ German textual province, it has been excluded from consideration in the study of textual transmission above. Because it is known to have been present at the monastery of Fulda by at least the ninth century (due to its pigskin binding, which is typical of Fulda in that period), however, it has been brought into consideration here. On the MS, see the work by Van Els cited below, n. 9.
Tours’ History of the Franks. This manuscript is not directly relevant to the question of the German reception of the text, because its medieval home was further to the west (at the monastery of St. Hubert in the Ardennes), outside of the region under consideration here. It is also worth noting that Nam is a composite manuscript, and so exactly when the Gregory text first came to be paired up with the HE is unclear. The only other early examples of the HE circulating in a manuscript alongside another text are CUL and its six complete ninth-century descendants. In these manuscripts, a Liber de consanguinitate was copied into the back of the manuscript, probably at Charlemagne’s court sometime around A.D. 800. In this case the pairing is unlikely to have been fortuitous, as the text made its way into all seven of this manuscript’s descendants, which seems to suggest it was understood to be a sort of complement to the HE. Since these manuscripts likewise circulated further to the west (though one of them [=BS1] did find its way as far east as Trier), they are not directly relevant to our survey of the text in Germany. I have thought it useful to mention them here in order to illustrate the fact that even when not necessarily part of the original scribal program of the manuscript, such later juxtapositions can still reflect, at least in some sense, the way the text was understood or used by its medieval audiences. Additional examples where this seems to be the case will be discussed below. For the moment, however, it is sufficient to note that the normal mode of circulation for the HE in the earliest days was to circulate alone, as was the case in all four of the early manuscripts that comprise our evidence for its circulation in Germany in the early period.

---

9 In his notes, Bernhard Bischoff dated the text of Bede in this manuscript to the early ninth century, and the Gregory to the first or second quarter of the same. See Handschriftenarchiv Bernhard Bischoffs, 2 (4.1).

10 This so-called Liber de consanguinitate is collection of excerpts from Isidore that deals with the lawful degrees of consanguinity in marriage. This point has been demonstrated by Bischoff, “The Court Library of Charlemagne,” pp. 67-68.

11 David Rollason has suggested that this text would have been of interest to missionaries concerned with introducing Christian marriage practices, in much the same way the so-called Libellus responsionum (HE I.27)—that is, Gregory the Greats answers to Augustine of Canterbury’s questions regarding matters of practical concern in the conversion of a pagan peoples—would have been useful to them. See “Bede and Germany,” p. 20.

12 Or even to circulate in two volumes, one containing the first three books, and a second containing books four and five. Ka1, which contains the latter two books, was already detached from the rest of the text when it was bound at Fulda in the ninth century. Also in the ninth century, the library at Reichenau, it
In terms of their script and format, three of the four manuscripts (Ka1, Wol, and Wür) clearly reflect early connections to Northumbria. Ka1 dates from the late eighth century. Though it is of Northumbrian origin, it definitely resided in the library of the monastery at Fulda in the later Middle Ages, and its pigskin binding would seem to be typical of a ninth-century Fulda binding. These links to Fulda make it tempting to connect the manuscript’s migration to the Continent to Boniface’s mission, though definitive proof of such a connection has remained elusive. There are, in fact, a number of other routes by which the monastery may have come into possession of the manuscript.

Wol and Wür, by contrast, were copied on the Continent, but they nonetheless reflect the insular origins of their archetype or archetypes. Both are written in Caroline script, and yet they use insular abbreviations, which have at times been expanded by later hands. Wol, moreover, has initials decorated in what Mynors described as “the insular taste,” and the similarity of these initials to the corresponding initials in the earliest surviving copy of the text, the Moore manuscript (CUL), are quite striking, though the initials in the latter manuscript are admittedly more modest. Another feature that links Wol, and in this case also Wür, to the Moore manuscript is the use of marks in the margins to set off materials that are being quoted verbatim, in much the same way that we use quotation marks today. Such marks are visible in the margins of all three manuscripts seems, contained what might have been the companion volume with the first three books (see MBKDS I, 249.30-31).


14 These were recently discussed by Rollason, “Bede and Germany,” 12-13.

15 As I have indicated, Mynors believed these two to be closely related, and perhaps copied from the same insular migrant to the Continent (“Textual Intro.,” p. xlv-lxv).

16 See Hans Butzmann, Die Weissenburger Handschriften, Katalog der Herzog-August-Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, neue Reihe, 10 (Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 1964), 144-45, who asserts that these have been “aufgelöst und verständlich gemacht” by a later hand, perhaps a ninth-century Weissenburg hand. For an example of the same phenomenon in the Würzburg manuscript, see the insular autem on fol. 14v.

17 Compare, for example, the a-initial that opens book three in both manuscripts. Though the initial in Wol is more elaborately decorated, the shape of the two initials (which is calligraphic and by no means a standard letter form) are exactly the same.
across from, for example, Gregory’s the Great’s letter of encouragement to his missionaries, which was quoted verbatim by Bede in HE 1.23. We know that Bede had devised a system of source marks for use in his Biblical commentaries, in order to indicate which passages were borrowed from the fathers.\(^{18}\) Mynors has, furthermore, suggested that Bede was so meticulous in reproducing quoted material exactly that he sometimes reproduced the errors of his sources or failed to make grammatically necessary changes to adapt the quotations to his own text.\(^{19}\) Given these facts, and the presence of these ‘quotation marks’ in the margins of three of the earliest copies of the text, the conclusion that these marks go back to Bede himself is not far off. Certainly further investigation and a systematic comparison of the marks in these three manuscripts seems warranted.

The Wolfenbüttel manuscript is interesting for yet another reason. On a blank leaf (fol. 99v) between the third and fourth books, two later scribes have drawn a sort of diagram juxtaposing what one might describe as four modes of monastic living with the four cardinal virtues and the biblical Beatitudes. The earlier of the two hands, dated by Bernhard Bischoff to the ninth or tenth century, has written part of Acts 4:32 running in a square shape in the center of the page: “Multitudinis credentium erat cor unum et anima una.”\(^{20}\) Surrounding this in a circular shape running clockwise, he has written “HEREMITAE CANONICI CENOBITAE SANCTI MONIALES.” In the four corners outside of this circle, he has written four virtues: “IUSTICIA FORTITUDO TEMPERANTIA PRUDENTIA.” A later scribe, according to Bischoff of the eleventh century, has expanded on this by writing in the eight beatitudes, one on either side of each of the virtues and next to either end of each of the four monastic ways of life.\(^{21}\) One possible interpretation of the diagram is that two of the four virtues were meant to correspond to each of these monastic ways of life, and thus the cenobites were characterized by fortitude and temperance, while nuns were characterized by temperance and prudence, hermits by prudence and justice, and (regular) canons by justice and

---

\(^{18}\) On this system see J. E. Cross, “Bede’s Influence at Home and Abroad,” in Houwen, Beda, 17-29, at 26-27.

\(^{19}\) “Textual Intro.,” xxxix-xl.

\(^{20}\) Handschriftenarchiv, 28 (3.110).

\(^{21}\) Ibid.
fortitude. The context of the quotation from Acts is a description of the apostolic church and of how the early believers shared their belongings according to their respective needs, which sentiment would have an obvious resonance in a monastic context. While this diagram is interesting to contemplate, however, it is difficult to see any specific connection to the HE, and it seems likely that this is one case where the insertion of the diagram was determined by the availability of a blank leaf of parchment.

The St. Gall manuscript (SG1) stands somewhat apart from the other three early German copies. Mynors believed that it might be a direct copy of Wol, and if that is in fact the case then one could say that the fact that this manuscript is one generation further removed from its insular ancestors has blurred its pedigree, as insular features are far less apparent here than in the other three manuscripts. The manuscript is nonetheless interesting, but for different reasons than the others. Unlike them, SG1 bears some indication of later reader-interest in the form of marginal notations. While most of the marginalia seem to be simple corrections of the text, there is a large nota-mark visible in the margin across from iii.19 (the story of the visionary Irish monk Fursey [†650]). That there was interest in Fursey’s life in ninth-century Allemania is further evidenced by the book-list of Reginbert of Reichenau, where he lists the books that he himself had copied between 835 and 842. The fifth of these contained, among other visionary texts, a “liber Fursei de uisione eius et nonnullae uisiones excerptae de libris gestorum Anglorum Bedae. . .” The other visions Reginbert here refers to are likely to be those of Dryhthelm and the others recorded in v.12-14, which were some of the most often excerpted parts of the HE, to judge by Laistner’s and King’s listing in their Hand-list. It is tempting to speculate about whether or not Reginbert’s manuscript is the ancestor of any of these surviving collections of visions.

In addition to this interest in St. Fursey, it seems as though one reader of SG1 was interested in Bede’s description of the migration of Germanic peoples to the island of Britain. In two places in HE i.15 in this manuscript, a relatively inconspicuous “N” has been

---

22 “Textual Intro.,” lxv.
23 MBKDS, I, p. 259, lines 6-10.
written in the margin, next to the passages beginning “De Iutarum origine sunt . . .” and “Erant autem filii Uictgisi. . .” This sort of “ethnographic” interest—if we can call it that on such an admittedly slim basis—is possibly also reflected in the note appended to the end of book five, after the explicit: “Rutubi portus a gente anglorum nunc reptacestir vocatur. Angli ciuitatem cestir, urbem burg dicunt.” The linguistic kinship of the English and the Germans was probably not lost on this glossator, but it is also important to note that this sort of interest in “things Germanic” is not reflected in any of the other manuscripts I have examined.

THE ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURIES

Judging by the record of surviving manuscripts, copying of the HE in the German-speaking regions came to a halt sometime in the ninth century, as it seems to have done throughout most of Europe. It resumed again some time in the eleventh, and the manuscripts of Mynors’ German textual province include six manuscripts that can be dated to that period. Interestingly, only one of these six actually comes from the German-speaking regions (LA1, from St. Georgenberg in Tyrol). The others are of Italian (Bam, MC1) or southern French origin (P4, P5, P8), though they all contain the text type that Mynors referred to as German. P4 contains a scribal colophon that dates its writing to the year 1093, and the other manuscripts may also be of the latter part of the century. It seems, in fact, that these eleventh-century manuscripts mark the beginning of a single wave of heavy copying activity that would continue through the twelfth century. Within the German-speaking regions, this activity seems to have been located primarily in the South (today’s Switzerland, Austria, and Bavaria). Altogether there are eighteen

---

25 Only a handful of MSS of the text (among them BS1 of ca. 900 and BS3 of s. x/xi) from any part of Europe have been dated to the tenth century, though in England its Old English translation continued to be copied during that period. See Dorothy Whitelock, “The Old English Bede,” Proceedings of the British Academy 1962, vol. 48 (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1963), 57-90, at 81, n. 22.

26 In the low countries and Northern Germany, another text type (the so-called Continuatio family) was in circulation, and manuscripts of this type were being copied during this period, though not as frequently as manuscripts of the so-called “German” type were further South (or at least not as many copies have survived). Those manuscripts cannot be treated fully at this time, though it is my intention to include them in a later, expanded version of this study.
manuscripts that can be dated to the twelfth century from this region, and these, together with the five eleventh-century copies already mentioned, are the evidence for the following discussion.

**Physical Appearance**

Like their early predecessors, the manuscripts of the *HE* copied during this period have a utilitarian appearance. The twelfth-century Austrian, Swiss, and Bavarian copies (with the exception of the large historical compilation manuscript of ca. A.D. 1200, SG2) are all copied in a single column, whereas the French copies and the Bamberg manuscript (which, as noted, is likely from Italy) are in two columns. They are generally of modest size, and written in library hands, clear and not highly calligraphic. There are certain other aspects of the layout of the text that had been set down in the earliest manuscripts and are continued in these. For example, the *capitula* are placed at the beginning of each book in order to serve as a sort of table of contents for that book (as in Colgrave-Mynors, but not in Plummer). To facilitate their use in finding specific chapters, they are frequently marked by numbers that correspond (or at least which should correspond) to numbers marking the beginning of chapters. There is, however, a certain amount of fluidity in the way the chapters are numbered, and often changes in the way the chapters have been divided are not reflected in the *capitula*. The beginning of individual books are frequently marked with a multi-line initial that is sometimes decorated, though rarely elaborately. With the exception of an author-portrait found in the Schaffhausen manuscript to be discussed presently, these initials are the only decoration in any of these manuscripts. Individual chapters are likewise often marked off by multi-line initials, though these are always modest (usually no more than two-line).

**The Schaffhausen Author-Portrait**

Manuscript number 66 in the collection of the Ministerialbibliothek in Schaffhausen (which collection is now housed in the Stadtbibliothek) is unique among manuscripts of the *HE*, in that it is the only surviving copy that has been illustrated. This is not to say elaborately so, for the illustration is limited to a single full-page portrait of a scribe at the front of the codex. That the portrait depicts Bede is clear from the image’s placement at
the beginning of the text of the HE, and by the fact that the text visible on the scroll that the figure is writing are the opening lines of book one of the HE. The manuscript is dated to the twelfth century and probably was in the collection of the reformed Benedictine monastery of Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen in the Middle Ages.\(^{27}\) The community is known to have acquired manuscripts from nearby centers of book production such as Reichenau.

The portrait depicts Bede in a full-size, three-quarters view, seated and facing right. He is bearded and tonsured, wears naturalistic looking robes, and appears to have a nimbus around his head.\(^{28}\) He sits under an archway supported by two columns with decorated capitals, and topped by three towers. The image is framed on three sides by a decorative pattern of spiral leafy motifs. The figure is seated on a bench covered with a carpet that is decorated with a pattern of diamond shapes. He is sitting at a flat desk, holding a pen-knife in his left hand and a pen in his right, writing on a long piece of what appears to be scroll parchment, on which the first words of book one of the HE are clearly visible. Two ink horns are on the table. Bede looks down at what he is writing, and his arms appear long and his hands relatively large, all of which serves to draw the viewer's attention to the page he is writing. The words flow from left to right for the viewer, and not as it would logically flow for the writer in a more naturalistic depiction.

Perhaps the most obvious association of this image would be with Carolingian evangelist portraits, which were in turn based upon the late-antique Mediterranean tradition of author portraits.\(^{29}\) Especially in the period after 1100, to depict a historian in this manner is also not unprecedented.\(^{30}\) Zürich, Staatsarchiv, AG 19 xxxv is a single-leaf

---

\(^{27}\) This community and the evidence for its ownership of the manuscript will be treated more fully in the discussion of library context in Chapter Five.

\(^{28}\) It was not until 1899, however, that Bede was made an official doctor of the church.

\(^{29}\) On traditions of portraiture in general in medieval Germany, see Joachim Prochno, Das Schreiber- und Dedikationsbild in der deutschen Buchmalerei, I: Bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts (800-1100), Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsinstitute an der Universität Leipzig (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1929). For a contemporary, but very different, depiction of Bede, see the image from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, MS theol. lat. fol. 337, fol. 124v, a plate of which is in Tilo Brandis and Peter Jorg Becker, Glanz alter Buchkunst: Mittelalterliche Handschriften der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz Berlin (Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1988), 82-83; the manuscript is a copy of Augustine's City of God, but the illustration may have come from a copy of Bede's DTR, as it depicts the finger-counting method described therein.

\(^{30}\) Prior to 1100, there are few portraits of writers alone, and instead one finds dedicatory, devotional, and donation-portraits that depict the author with others. The writers who are depicted alone are generally
fragment detached from St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 376. The leaf bears a full-page portrait depicting Notker the Stammerer (as is clear from the letters “NOTKERUS” that have been written in the surrounding frame). This image, which is dated ca. 1070, bears some resemblance to our Bede portrait. Notker is likewise depicted in full-size, three-quarters view facing right, and is seated at a (in this case slanted) writing desk or lectern. Like the Schaffhausen Bede, he is bearded and wears naturalistic robes, but unlike Bede he wears a hood, and therefore his tonsure is not visible. The architectural background is also similar to the setting of Bede’s portrait, with three towers and some sort of canopy or archway, though in the case of Notker he does not appear to be seated directly under the archway; instead, the arch forms part of the background directly behind the figure, and serves to frame and accentuate his head and upper body, but does not to enclose him. It is also notable that Notker is depicted not writing, but rather in contemplation, with a book in one hand resting on his lap and his head in his other hand. Perhaps the most notable difference between the two depictions, however, is that in the depiction of Notker there is no sign of a nimbus. The presence of the nimbus would seem to separate the portrait of Bede from other simple author-portraits and to connect it to the depictions of evangelists and church fathers common in early medieval manuscripts. While we should be careful not to attach too much significance to a single depiction, it is certainly reasonable to say that the image in the Schaffhausen manuscript suggests that Bede was afforded a high degree of authority and status by the artist who created this frontispiece.

MARGINALIA

It is not possible to discuss each and every instance where marginal notations are visible in the many copies of the text from these two centuries, nor would it likely add much to our knowledge of the reception of the text. But some general observations are important to make. First of all, it should be noted that the marginalia in these manuscripts are generally not extensive, and for the most part they are limited to supplying text that


31 See the plate, ibid., Abb. 41.
was inadvertently omitted by the main scribe. When marginalia do seem to reflect reader interest in the text, it is almost always limited to a simple *nota*-mark indicating that special attention should be paid to that passage by the reader. In the twelfth century in general, these *nota*-marks and other indications of reader interest tend to be found in the margins of the pages that contain the *Libellus responsionum* (I.27); materials relating to saints, especially Saint Oswald (III.1-2 and IV.14); and as was apparent in SG1, otherworldly visions (III.19 and v.12-14).

The two Admont manuscripts are a case in point. Neither Ad1 nor Ad2 has significant marginalia beyond corrections and insertions of missing text, but they do both have several *nota*-marks in the margins of I.27, most notably next to passages relating to personal purity (responses 8-9). Ad2, furthermore, reflects an interest in the additional letters of Gregory the Great included by Bede in I.29-30. In addition, there is indication in Ad2, in the form of the numerals one to three written in the margins, that Oswald’s life in III.1 has been broken into three lections. Interest in Oswald (though not division of the text into lections), can also be observed in the Augsburg manuscript (Aug), the manuscript from Frankenthal now in Vienna (Wi2), and the manuscript from Rein (Rei). Given that we know St. Oswald had a significant cult in medieval Germany, especially in the South, as has been demonstrated by Peter Clemoes in his Jarrow Lecture on the subject, this interest in Bede’s Oswald material should not be that surprising.32 Indeed, Bede would have been their main historical source for information about the saint, though many later legends and traditions came to be associated with him.33 That the *HE* was considered significant during this period precisely for its information on Oswald is further underscored by the notice in the twelfth-century book-list of St. Maximin’s, Trier, where what appears to be a copy of the *HE* is listed as “Beda de gestis Anglorum et Oswaldi regis.”34 Still further indication of the same

---

32 Clemoes, “The Cult of St. Oswald on the Continent.”

33 For a survey of some of vernacular legends connected to the Saint, see A. M. Jansen, “Bede and the Legends of St. Oswald,” in Houwen, Beda, 167-78.

sort of interest is clear from the list of manuscripts containing chapters excerpted from the HE given by Laistner and King.\(^3^5\)

**ASSOCIATED TEXTS**

As has been noted, not every text that appears alongside the HE in a manuscript is necessarily a reflection of the medieval reception of the text, but nonetheless there are patterns of juxtaposition that can be instructive in evaluating the ways the text was used and understood. In the manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries we can identify at least three types of text that were commonly associated with the HE. The first group consists of what I have called supplementary texts, or texts that seem to continue or otherwise fill out the information in the HE itself. Their connection to the HE is based on shared subject matter. The other texts that are found alongside the HE in the manuscripts most often fall into one of two types: hagiographical texts or other histories.

One example of a supplementary text that is attached to the HE in manuscripts of this period is the *Continuatio Bedae*, which is found in the Prague manuscript of ca. 1200 (Pra). This text circulated as a fully integrated part of the HE, and it was probably not apparent to subsequent readers that it was an addition to the text, and hence it tells us little about the reception of the HE. Furthermore, since this continuation is not an original product of twelfth-century Germany, but rather originated in Northumbria in the eighth or ninth centuries, it is not of direct relevance in this study. There is another example that is more instructive. This is the set of canons purporting to be from Pope Boniface IV (r. 608-615) that are found immediately following the HE in the Gotha manuscript (Got). In HE II.4, Bede tells of a synod held by Boniface in Rome in A.D. 610, which Bishop Mellitus is said to have attended. Bede further reports that Mellitus brought back the decrees of the synod in order that they might be implemented in England, but he does not specify exactly what the canons prescribed. The set of canons preserved in Got follows a text printed by Migne in the *Patrologia Latina*, but whether we are dealing with authentic canons or not is unclear.\(^3^6\) The fact that the canons make direct reference to Augustine of Canterbury makes it seem

\(^{3^5}\) *Hand-list*, p. 105.

\(^{3^6}\) *PL* 80, cols. 105B–106D.
probable that their placement in this manuscript immediately following the HE reflects the deliberate juxtaposition of what was perceived to be a related text.

The other texts that are found alongside the HE in manuscripts of this period are most often hagiographical in content. At times they seem to be connected to the content of the HE in some way, for example the thirteenth-century copy of the life of Thomas Becket that was appended to Ad2, or the copy of Hincmar of Rheims’ life of Remigius attached to the HE in Hei, which would seem to relate to the HE in its general subject matter (both texts being concerned with apostolic saints and dealing with the history of the conversion of peoples). At other times, there are hagiographical materials that bear no obvious connection to the HE, such as the legendary containing lives and passions of 31 Roman martyrs and Germanic saints found in Ad1, the copy of Possidius’ life of Augustine in SF, or the life of Catherine of Alexandria that was attached (after the life of Thomas Becket already mentioned) to Ad2. Given what has already been said about the interest of readers of the HE in its hagiographical content, these juxtapositions would seem to suggest that the HE may often have been read as a collection of saints lives rather than as a history in the traditional sense.

And yet there clearly was a sense among its later readers that the HE was a work of national, or, to borrow a phrase from Walter Goffart, “barbarian history.”37 Beginning with the Bamberg manuscript of the eleventh century (Bam), which, though probably written in Italy, was present in eleventh-century Bamberg after having been given to the Cathedral Library by Emperor Heinrich II (†1024), we see the HE increasingly paired up with historical and national-historical texts. In this particular manuscript the HE resides with historical works of Aurelius Victor, Orosius, Gregory of Tours, Jordanes, and Paul the Deacon, but these other historical works are freely abridged and adapted, and they are presented as though they are a single text, namely the Historia Romana of Paul the Deacon.38 A more


38 This curious collection has been treated in detail by Georg Waitz, “Über eine Bamberger Handschrift des Jordanis, Paulus u. s. w.” Archiv 9 (1847; repr. 1979): pp. 673–703. The manuscript is also important, and much studied, for its Alexander material (Historia de Preliis); see, for example, George Cary, The Medieval Alexander, ed. D. J. A. Ross (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), esp. pp. 38–43.
traditional historical collection (and one more faithful to the texts it contains) is the compilation manuscript St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 547 (SG2), which pairs the HE with both sacred and secular histories: Orosius’ Historia contra paganos, Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History, Paul the Deacon’s Historia Langobardorum, and Einhard’s Vita Karoli Magni. A similar national-historical pairing can be observed in the Prague manuscript (Pra) of ca. 1200, which contains the HE together with Vincent of Prague’s Chronicon Boemorum, with the latter’s continuation by Gerlach of Mylewsk. The pairing of the HE with other historical works is not at all surprising. Nonetheless, its frequent juxtaposition with “national” histories would seem to suggest that there was an understanding of the HE more as a Historia Anglorum (a title that was in fact frequently applied to the work, as will be seen in Chapter Five below) than as (what Bede perhaps intended when he wrote it) something more universal.

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

The thirteenth century was not, as far as the manuscript record shows, a successful period for the HE. Aside from Pra, which was probably put together sometime around A.D. 1200 or a little after, no “German” copies have survived that can be dated to that century. It would seem that the text aroused little interest in a university context.39 It also seems likely that historiographical interest in this period may have focused on newer works, such as those of Jacques de Vitry or Vincent of Beauvais, and that scribes directed their energies toward copying those rather than the HE, which was by this time fairly common, having been so frequently copied in the twelfth century. In the fourteenth century, the HE seems to have been no more popular in Germany than it had been in the thirteenth, even though it was being copied rather frequently in England during this period, as will be discussed in Chapter Five.40 Renewed copying of the text in the German-speaking regions can first be observed in the fifteenth century, from which period we have eight surviving manuscripts from the German-speaking regions (Asc, BR2, Mü1-2, Nür, P14, and Wi4-5).
PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

Many of the same tendencies can be observed in the copying of the text in this period as have been apparent from the earliest days. It continued to be copied plainly, usually in library hands, and rarely with much decoration beyond the modest initials that begin the five books. Occasionally an additional aid to the reader was added, for example, the page headers in Mü2 (A.D. 1477, from Tegernsee) that serve to indicate the current book number.

MARGINALIA

Interest in many of the same sections of the text can be observed in the marginalia of these manuscripts. In Mü2, for example, marginal notations indicate the location of Bede’s discussion of the following topics: the Pelagian controversy, St. Germanus, Gregory the Great, the Libellus responsionum, St. Oswald, St. Fursey, and the other visions found in book five. Similar interests can be observed in Mü1, where “ab hinc de Osualdo” can be seen in the margin of fol. 333r, “de miraculis Aidan episcopi” on 350v, and “De Sci Furseo” on 354r. But one fifteenth-century manuscript occasionally also gives more specific detail on how these materials may have been of practical use to its audience. In Asc (A.D. 1472, from Speyer, perhaps later at Freiburg im Breisgau), one reader of the manuscript has marked two passages as being exempla useful for preaching. On fol. 169r (HE v.12, Dryrthelm’s vision), can be observed in the margin the words, “notabile miraculum de quodam mortuo reviviscente,” and on 174v (v.14, the unnamed brother’s vision of Hell), “aliud exemplum terribile contra differentes penitenciam et uitam emendare, de quodam converso tempore Bede presbyteri, qui uidit eum.” Finally, written at the end of the manuscript, on the flyleaf, “1495 predicatum in cartusia Fryburgensi.”

ASSOCIATED TEXTS

The practice of pairing the HE with other historical works is perhaps even more apparent in this period than it had been in the twelfth century. Examples include the manuscript BR2, where the HE is paired up with Leonard of Florence’s Historia Ostrogothorum, Paul the Deacon’s Historia Langobardorum, Jacques de Vitry’s Historia occidentalis et orientalis, among a few other miscellaneous historical and hagiographical
texts. In Mü1 it is likewise paired with Jacques de Vitry, while in Mü2 it can be found alongside Otto of Freising’s *Chronicon de duabus civitatibus*. In P14 it is bound with a Chronicle of the Counts of Flanders as well as some materials relating to the Council of Constance. In Nür it is found with various collections of “biographical” texts, including Jerome’s *De illustribus uiris*, Gennadius’ *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, Isidore’s *De uiris illustribus*, Boccaccio’s *De casibus uirorum illustrorum*, and Boccaccio’s *De mulieribus claris*, as well as a set of Easter sermons and Walter Map’s tract against marriage, the *Dissuasio Valerii ad Rufinum*.41

CHAPTER 5
THE HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA IN ITS LIBRARY CONTEXT

There are two ways in which the evidence that I have grouped under the heading “library context” can be illuminating for the history of our text. The first and more straightforward of these is simply by virtue of what the known medieval locations of the text (as evidenced by both the surviving manuscripts and the medieval library catalogues that list it) can teach us about its circulation. Simply put, if we are to fairly assess the HE’s influence and reception, a full accounting of the evidence for its dissemination is necessary. This is the evidence that will be considered first in the chapter that follows. There is also a second, more subtle way of using the evidence of the library catalogues: namely, by focusing on the way the catalogues classify and describe texts. “Classification” is most evident in the headings that were used in those catalogues to group books by purpose, content, or author, but there is also an element of assessment or classification inherent in the title that was given to an individual work. Furthermore, even when no obvious classification system is present in a booklist, the other texts that are found in the same list, and perhaps even more specifically, the texts that are listed alongside the HE, can be understood as a sort of commentary on the text—unless of course the list is determined to be purely random, which is a possibility that must be acknowledged. Much like the evidence of associated texts, the evidence of library context is often difficult to interpret, but nevertheless I believe it can be instructive in the aggregate. In short, understanding the place (both literally and figuratively) of the HE in medieval book collections can help us to explain the reasons behind its popularity, and can show us how it was being used by the communities that valued it.

1 For a insightful reassessment of the importance of the titles given to medieval works, see Richard Sharpe, Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts, An Evidence-Based Approach (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003). Sharpe is concerned with titles as evidence of authorship and for the identification of texts rather than as indicators of a text’s reception, but his basic point that title found in manuscripts ought to be taken more seriously than they often are is equally valid in the context of examining reception.
SURVEY OF COLLECTIONS

Before turning to the more elusive questions of reception, it is necessary to begin with a survey of the evidence for the circulation of the text within the German-speaking regions, and a consideration of the libraries that held copies of it. Likewise, in order to place the German transmission in context, it is necessary to first consider the geographical and temporal extent of copying activity throughout Europe over the course of the Middle Ages, for which I have created the following summary table.

FIGURE 4
SURVIVING MANUSCRIPTS BY REGION AND CENTURY OF ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saec.</th>
<th>Britain</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Low Countries</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables similar to this one have been published previously by both Bernard Guenée and R. H. C. Davis, though the tabulation here is my own. The almost complete lack of

---

2 These figures have been tabulated largely on the basis of the indications of date and place of origin given by Mynors; supplementary information has been gleaned, where available, from recent catalogues and other recent publications on individual manuscripts. The purpose here is to trace copying activity, not necessarily known locations of the text, so Ka1, for example, is included among the six eighth-century copies from Britain, and not among the German MSS, though we know it was in Germany by the ninth century. Similarly, there is no eighth-century copy listed for France, even though CUL was probably there by ca. 800. The numbers given here do not correspond precisely to Mynors’ groupings according to textual province, since his primary criterion was textual, not geographic, as noted above. For the boundaries of regions I have used the modern political boundaries of the countries; “Germany” here includes Germany, Switzerland, and Austria (and the Prague manuscript as well); the Low Countries includes manuscripts from Belgium and the Netherlands. It corresponds in part to Mynors’ “Continuatio” group, though the manuscript from München-Gladbach and the other copies of the Continuation from what is now Germany have been included in the German totals.

tenth-century copies is indeed striking (the one manuscript I have listed in that century is BS3, which has been dated by Paul Lehmann to s. x/xi and which therefore could equally have been included with the eleventh-century copies). The relatively meagre evidence of thirteenth-century copying activity is also notable. The latter hiatus may not necessarily indicate a lack of interest in the text, but instead could be due, at least in part, to the fact that all of the twelfth-century copies listed here (and probably many more) would have still been available in libraries of the thirteenth century. In most centuries, Continental copying (especially in France and Germany) kept pace with English copying activity, and in fact it often surpassed it (for example, in the ninth century). The one period for which notably more British copies than Continental copies have survived is the fourteenth century. Could the Hundred Years War have played a role in the text’s “re-nationalization” in that century? We can only speculate, but perhaps a closer examination of the evidence for the French transmission could shed light on this question.

The fifteenth century saw a reinvigorated copying activity, especially in Germany and the Low Countries, where a number of copies containing the Continuatio were made, many of which are connected to communities of the Brethren of the Common Life. The fifteenth century also saw the first printed edition of the text in

---

4 To group the manuscripts by century is, of course, to create completely artificial groupings. In England, it would be equally important to know, for example, which of the eleventh-century manuscripts were copied before 1066 and which after. Dating by centuries is, however, practical given that palaeographers tend to use centuries to date scripts when the historical evidence does not allow for a more precise dating.

5 “Mitteilungen aus Handschriften, IV” Sitzungsberichte der Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Abteilung (Munich, 1933), Heft 9, p. 3.

6 In addition to the two copies cited by Mynors in his discussion of the Continuatio tradition (Ldn and Gla), the Deventer copy (Dev) also belonged to the Brethren; Dev was not known to Mynors, and it seems likely that it is related to the other copies made by the Brethren, and therefore there is a good chance that Dev represents an eleventh copy containing the Continuatio, though I have not yet had opportunity examine the manuscript in order to verify this. Wi5 belonged to the Carthusians of Roermond, and therefore is not properly to be included in the German family, where Mynors had placed it, on either textual or geographical grounds. The lost copy formerly in the collection of the humanist Thomas Rehdiger (1540-1576), which is my Wro†, also originated in the Netherlands (to judge by the scribal signature), and was probably acquired by Rehdiger when he visited there in the 1560s, fleeing Paris after the outbreak of religious warfare in France. Rehdiger’s copy was signed by its scribe, a certain “Albert Pau de Tiela,” who dated the manuscript A.D. 1449. According to Albrecht Wachler, who saw it in the early nineteenth century, it was “schön geschrieben.” See Albrecht W. J. Wachler, Thomas Rehdiger und seine Büchersammlung in Breslau: Ein biographisch-literarischer Versuch (Breslau: J. D. Grüson, 1828), p. 30. It seems probable that it was at some time in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century that the manuscript disappeared from its home in the public library “zu St.
Strasbourg, so interest in it on the Continent during that time may have been even greater than it would appear from these figures. Considerable as they may be, however, both the fourteenth-century interest in the text in Britain and fifteenth-century interest on the Continent pale in comparison with the considerable Europe-wide interest in the text during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It is quite clear that, for the HE at least, the twelfth century was the heyday.

The Evidence of Medieval Library Catalogues

The main evidence for the place of the text in the medieval intellectual context in which it was being read is the surviving corpus of medieval library catalogues from the German-speaking regions. The following is a complete list of the references to the text in those catalogues, at least as far as they have been published to date. The individual

Elizabeth” that Rehdiger’s executors had founded (cf., however, H&R, who list it as having been lost in the Second World War). Had the MS still been in the collection in 1915, it almost certainly would have been described by Konrat Ziegler in his Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Classicorum qui in Bibliotheca Urbica Wratislaviensi Adservantur (Wrocław: M. & H. Marcus, 1915); despite the title, Ziegler’s catalogue includes manuscripts containing medieval texts as well. In the current system of shelfmarks at the University Library in Wrocław, the missing manuscript would be R[ehdigeranus] 185, not no. 43, which is the number given by Laistner-King and Mynors, and which originated as a serial number assigned when it was listed in Archiv 6 (1838): 95-99. Its old shelfmark was S[crium] IV. [Series] 1. [Numerus] 24. I owe thanks to Joanna Madej of the Department of Manuscripts at the University Library in Wrocław for the clarifying the current status of this manuscript.

Eggestein was also, incidentally, an early printer of the German vernacular Bible.

This was not the case with others of his works; for example, the DTR enjoyed its greatest success in the Carolingian period. See Contreni, “Bede’s Scientific Works in the Carolingian Age,” (cited above in Chapter One, n. 6).

For the present study, two major projects are essential: Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs, ed. Theodor Gottlieb et al., 5 vols. (Vienna and Graz, 1915-71); and its ongoing companion series, Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, ed. Paul Lehmann et al., (Munich: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagshandlung/Oskar Beck, 1918-77); also essential is the supplement to the latter series by Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard, Handschriftenerbe des deutschen Mittelalters, 3 vols. (Munich: C. H. Beck’sche Verlagshandlung, 1989-1990) [cited below as “Krämer”]. In addition, several studies of individual medieval libraries have been valuable. These are: Angelike Häse, Mittelalterliche Bücherverzeichnisse aus Kloster Lorsch: Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar, Beiträge zum Buch- und Bibliothekswesen, 42 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002) [cited below as “Häse”]; Wolfgang Milde, Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert: Ausgabe und Untersuchung von Beziehungen zu Cassiodors Institutiones,” Beihefte zum Euphorion, 4 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1968) [cited below as “Milde”]; and Gangolf Schrimpf et al., Mittelalterliche Bücherverzeichnisse des Klosters Fulda und andere Beiträge zur Geschichte der Bibliothek des Klosters Fulda im Mittelalter, Fuldaer Studien, 4 (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1992) [cited below as “Schrumpf”].
catalogues are presented chronologically in order of date of the catalogues, which may often be significantly later than the dates of the manuscripts themselves.

**Figure 5**
The *Historia Ecclesiastica* in German Medieval Library Catalogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</th>
<th>Date of Attestation</th>
<th>Title or Volume Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reichenau (OSB, Constance, 724)</td>
<td>A.D. 821-22</td>
<td><em>De historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum libri III in codice I.</em> [under “De libris Bedae presbyteri.”]</td>
<td><em>MBKDS I, 249.30-31</em> [= the missing portion of Ka1?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg Cathedral Library (742)</td>
<td>ca. 830-40</td>
<td><em>Historia Anglorum.</em></td>
<td><em>MBKDS IV, p. 979, l. 55</em> [=archetype of Wür?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murbach</td>
<td>s. ix&lt;sup&gt;med&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>Historiam gentis anglorum</em> (followed by a list of Bedan works not held by the library, based on HE v.24)</td>
<td>Milde, no. 193 (p. 43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall (OSB, dioc. Constance, 614)</td>
<td>s. IX&lt;sup&gt;med&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>Gesta Anglorum, volumen I.</em> [under the heading, “De libris Bedae presbiteri.”]</td>
<td><em>MBKDS I, 75.17</em> [=SG1?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reichenau (OSB, dioc. Constance, 724)&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>s. IX&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>Gesta Anglorum, volumen I.</em></td>
<td><em>MBKDS I, 265.29</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 References to the medieval catalogues follow the conventions of the editions in which they are found. In the two major collections this is by volume, page, and line number. All appearances of the HE in these catalogues are given here. Cross-references to what is presumably the same book in a single catalogue are given alongside the references quoted here, and are marked with a superscript ‘x’. Finally, it should be noted that from volume four of the *MBKDS*, the line numbering of individual catalogues is continuous, where in the earlier volumes and in the *MBKÖ* numbering begins anew on each page.

11 A list of books copied by the scribe Reginbert of Reichenau in the period 835-42 has also come down to us, and lists the following volume: “In V. libro continentur libri prognosticorum, ii. et iv. liber dialogorum et liber Fursei de uisione eius et nonnullae uisiones excerptae de libris gestorum Anglorum Bedae et de visione Barontii monachi et liber uisionis Wettini, fratris nostri, quam Heito episcopus descripsit et Walfrid, frater noster, metricis uersibus subsequens illam decoravit” (*MBKDS I, 259.7-8*).
## Twelfth-Thirteenth Centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</th>
<th>Date of Attestation</th>
<th>Title or Volume Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelsberg, Bamberg (OSB, dioc. Bamberg, 1015)</td>
<td>s. XII&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Beda de gestis Anglorum</td>
<td>MBKDS III, 359.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelsberg, Bamberg (OSB, dioc. Bamberg, 1015)</td>
<td>A.D. 1172-1201</td>
<td>Ecclesiastica historia gentis Anglorum</td>
<td>MBKDS III, 368.12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwettl (OCist., dioc. Passau, 1138)</td>
<td>s. xiii&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Anglicana historia</td>
<td>MBKÖ I, 514.21 (=Zwe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fourteenth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</th>
<th>Date of Attestation</th>
<th>Title or Volume Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klosterneuburg (OSA, dioc. Passau [later Vienna], 1106)</td>
<td>A.D. 1330</td>
<td>Item Beda de gestis Anglorum. Ibidem vita sanctissimi Augustini, in uno volumine. (among works of Bede)</td>
<td>MBKÖ I, 112.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiligenkreuz (OCist, dioc. Passau [later Vienna], 1134-35)</td>
<td>A.D. 1363-74</td>
<td>Idem [i.e. Beda] de gestis Anglorum. (on a shelf with 10 other works of Bede)</td>
<td>MBKÖ I, 29.39 (=Hei?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-1381</td>
<td>Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum li. V. Vita sancti Remigii episcopi Sermo unus ad plures partes divisus.</td>
<td>MBKÖ I, 49.18-11; 69.22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Item eadem historia in alio volumine et in eodem passio sanctorum Lamberti, Anastasie et aliorum triginta trium.</td>
<td>MBKÖ III, 22.19-20 (= Ad1); 44.26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</td>
<td>Date of Attestation</td>
<td>Title or Volume Reference</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt, Collegium Amplonianum (dioc. Erfurt, 1412)</td>
<td>A.D. 1410-12</td>
<td>211. <em>Item hystoria ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum</em> conscripta a venerabili Beda in quinque libris, et est bona et rara; passio sanctorum Sixti, Felicissimi et Agapiti, Laurencii et I驿站i cum aliis xix et aliorum clxii et aliorum seruorum xxi, conscripta per Bedam; omelie decem Cesarii episcopi ad monachos, et continet plura bona; sermo b. Augustini de pace; sermo b. Augustini de obediencia; passio Edmundi regis martiris, descripta per Abbonem Floriacensem; dicta b. Bernhardi de duabus piscinis superiori et inferiori, que in Ysaia describuntur; dicta Bernhardi de vii donis spiritus sancti; passis Naboris et Feliciis; liber b. Augustini de opere monachorum; sermo Basilii ad penitentes; sermo Basilii ad monachos; de vita solitaria. Et est volumen bonum.</td>
<td>MBKDS II, 95.20-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg, Cathedral Chapter (OSA [from s. xii], dioc. Salzburg, s. viii)</td>
<td>A.D. 1433</td>
<td><em>Cronica Bede de gente Anglorum</em>(^\text{12})</td>
<td>MBKÖ IV.37.18 (=Wi1?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) This same Salzburg catalogue also lists a volume containing an anonymous ecclesiastical history: “Ecclesiastica hystoria et Hugo de archa Noe. Item quidam tractatus, quomodo ex rebus intelligenda est sacra scriptura, qui ut putatur est Hugonis” (IV, 44.25 [in the index, s.v. “Beda,” erroneously referenced as line 5]). Given the very different title used for the *HE* in the above-referenced place (*Cronica Bede de gente Anglorum*), it seems unlikely that this is a reference to a second copy of Bede’s *HE*. Of course “Chronica Bede” could be interpreted as one of Bede’s chronicles (originally attached to *DT* and *DTR*, but which sometimes circulated separately), but the words “de gente Anglorum” would seem to rule this out. There are certain other entries in Salzburg catalogues, however, that may well refer to excerpts from the *HE*. The first comes from the same catalogue, and reads in part, “. . . Item hystoria de Forseo et de quibusdam aliis sanctis hystorie” (IV, 45.26). This could quite possibly be *HE* III.19. It could be related to the text found in a manuscript listed in the twelfth-century catalogue of St. Peter’s, Salzburg: “Visio cuiusdam monachi in extremis iacentis. Vita sancti Fursionis confessoris in [uno] volume.” (I, 70.9-10; bracketed portion is the editor’s insertion). Another reference to what is likely an excerpt from the *HE* is found in the former catalogue (Salzburg Cathedral, A.D. 1433): “Item actus sancti Oswaldi regis Anglorum” (IV, 45.33), which refers, according to n. 215 on the same page, to the surviving MS Vienna, ÖNB, lat. 448.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Manuscript Details</th>
<th>Relevant Text</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waldhausen</td>
<td>s. xv²</td>
<td>Item ecclesiastica hystoria gentis Anglorum, vita sancti Augustini episcopi, vita regis Oswaldi in pergamo, inicium, ’Gloriosissimo regi’</td>
<td>MBKÖ V.129.12-14 (= SF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall</td>
<td>A.D. 1461</td>
<td>X 20 Libri Orosii presbiteri VII; ecclesiastica hystoriam, libri XII; scolastica hystoria; summa magistri Johannis Beleth; hystoria Rothperti de expedizione Jherosolimitana; hystoria Langobardorum; gesta Anglorum Bede; gesta Francorum; gesta Karoli Magni. [=SG2]</td>
<td>MBKDS I, 116.25-26 and 117.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaubeuren</td>
<td>s. xv³</td>
<td>Bedae historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum</td>
<td>MBKDS I,12.29-30 (=Wi3? before truncation?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Erfurt, Carthusians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</th>
<th>Date of Attestation</th>
<th>Title or Volume Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt, Carthusians s. XV ex</td>
<td>Ecclesiastice historie de gestis Anglorum lib. V (In the context of a larger entry on Bede’s life &amp; works.)</td>
<td>MBKDS II, 568.19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt, Carthusians s. XV ex</td>
<td>31. . . . Quedam visio ex historia Anglorum. . .</td>
<td>MBKDS II, 255.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melk (Can. [later OSB], dioc. Passau [later St. Pölten], 985/1089) A.D. 1483</td>
<td>E51. Historia ecclesiastica Eusebii Cesariensis. Item historia ecclesiastica Bede de gestis Anglorum, in pergamento.</td>
<td>MBKÖ I, 227.10 (=Egg?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegernsee (OSB, dioc. Freising, pre-770) A.D. 1483</td>
<td>Gesta Anglorum, O 38 [Under the heading, “Bede Venerabilis presbiteri et monachi sancti Petri Girnensis in Anglia.”]</td>
<td>MBKDS IV, 768.537-38 (=Mü2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sixteenth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, dioc., found. date)</th>
<th>Date of Attestation</th>
<th>Title or Volume Reference</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt, Collegium Universitatis</td>
<td>A.D. 1510</td>
<td><em>Ecclesiastica historia Eusebii et historia de gestis Anglorum</em></td>
<td>MBKDS II, 188.3 (=Egg or one of its reprints?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall (OSB, dioc. Constance, 614)</td>
<td>A.D. 1518</td>
<td><em>Hystoria Anglici Baedae</em></td>
<td>MBKDS I, 144.26 (=SG1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Medieval Locations of Surviving Copies**

In addition to the medieval catalogues, the surviving manuscripts must be taken into account when assessing the evidence for the text’s dissemination. In certain cases a surviving manuscript can be connected directly to a mention of the text in a medieval catalogue, and therefore the two bodies of evidence can both complement and supplement one another. The surviving manuscripts are presented in chronological order in the following table. It is important to note that although there is significant overlap between the manuscripts presented here and the group of manuscripts analyzed in Chapters Two and Three, the two groups are not exactly the same. In the earlier chapters, the goal was both to verify the reliability of Mynors’ survey, and to expand upon it by identifying additional textual groups within the German textual province. As a result, the manuscripts examined were those identified by Mynors as either clearly belonging to that textual group, or that he indicated seemed to be likely members of that family, whether or not
there was evidence indicating their presence in German-speaking regions in the Middle Ages. In the present discussion, on the other hand, the purpose is to trace the cultural influence of the text in Germany, and therefore all manuscripts of the text that are known to have been written or owned in Germany are relevant, and these are the manuscripts that have been included here.

Figure 6
**Medieval Locations of Surviving Copies Written or Owned in Germany\(^\text{13}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, Dioc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northumbria; later (by s. ix) at Fulda (OSB, dioc. Mainz)</td>
<td>s. vii(^\text{est})</td>
<td>(Ka1) Kassel, Landesbibliothek, Theol. 4° 2</td>
<td>Krämer 1.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorsch, later Weissenburg (OSB, dioc. Speyer)</td>
<td>s. vii-ix</td>
<td>(Wol) Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 34</td>
<td>Krämer 2.822; Bischoff, <em>Lorsch</em>, 120(^\text{14})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werden?</td>
<td>s. ix(^1)</td>
<td>(Blo1) Bloomington, Lilly Library, Ricketts 177 + (Düs) Düsseldorf, Universitätsbibliothek, Fragm. K 1: B216 (frag. HE v.13)</td>
<td>Bischoff, <em>Kat.</em>, no. 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainz, Michelsberg (OCarth, dioc. Mainz)</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
<td>(Ma1) Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 181, fols. 290-342</td>
<td>Krämer 2.538; Bischoff, <em>Kat.</em>, no. 2669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval location unknown.</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
<td>(Ma2) Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. frag. 1 a palimpsest of s. ix under a copy of Conrad of Soltau, <em>Super firmiter credimus</em>, etc., written a.d. 1450-51</td>
<td>Bischoff, <em>Kat.</em>, no. 2674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall (OSB, dioc. Constance)</td>
<td>s. ix</td>
<td>(SG1) St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Several of Mynors’ “German” manuscripts have been excluded from this list as not written or owned in a German-speaking region in the Middle Ages, even though textually they may be connected to other manuscripts of the German province: LR1, Nam, P4, P5, P8, P12, and Wro\(^1\). Others have been excluded from this list because their origins or medieval home are unknown, though they were possibly written or owned in a German-speaking region: Lpz and Pri (both are either German or possibly Dutch).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, Dioc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg Cathedral, later Ebrach (OCist)</td>
<td>s. ix [probably 832-42]</td>
<td>(Wür) Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M. p. th. f. 118</td>
<td>Krämer 1.186 and 2.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| “Maingegend oder Hessen?” | s. ix
tmed | (Blo2) Bloomington, Lilly Library, 47 | Bischoff, Kat., no. 644. |
| St. Gall? By s. xiv at Strasbourg Cathedral | s. ix2 | (Bn2) Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363 parts of book I only | Krämer 1.743; Bischoff, Kat., no. 585 |
| “Deutsch-insulaires Gebiet” | s. ix1 | (Ka2) Kassel, Landesbibliothek, Theol. 4° 162 a single-leaf fragment of HE v.19 | Bischoff, Kat., no. 1827 |
| Trier, St. Maximin’s (OSB, dioc. Trier) | s. ix/xi | (BS1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Phillippps 1873 | Krämer 2.774 |

**Eleventh Century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, Dioc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław, St. Vincent’s (OPrem) by s. xiii</td>
<td>s. x/</td>
<td>(BS3) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, lat. 2° 378</td>
<td>Krämer 1.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy; given to Bamberg Cathedral Library by Emperor Heinrich II (dioc. Bamberg)</td>
<td>s. xi</td>
<td>(Bam) Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Hist. 3</td>
<td>Krämer 1.60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaubeuren (OSB, dioc. Constance)</td>
<td>s. xiex</td>
<td>(Wi3) Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 532</td>
<td>Tischler, <em>Einhart</em>, no. 127 (p. 43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Twelfth Century**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, Dioc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gladbach?</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Man) Manchester, John Rylands University Library, 182</td>
<td>Krämer 1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admont (OSB, dioc. Salzburg)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Ad1) Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 326</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admont (OSB, dioc. Salzburg)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Ad2) Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echternach St. Peter’s and Paul’s/St. Willibrord’s (OSB, dioc. Trier)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(P15) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 10184</td>
<td>Krämer 1.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenthal, St. Maria Magdalena (OSA, dioc. Worms)</td>
<td>s. xii (with texts of s. x)</td>
<td>(Wi2) Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 443</td>
<td>Krämer 1.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (Order, Dioc.)</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Modern Shelfmark</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiligenkreuz (OCist, dioc. Passau)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Hei) Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek, 145</td>
<td>Krämer 2.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neunkirchen am Brand (OSA), later Augsburg, St. Ulrich und Afra (OSB, dioc. Augsburg)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Aug) Augsburg, Bischöfliche Ordinariatsbibliothek/Bistumsarchiv?, K 43</td>
<td>Krämer 2.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegau (OSB, dioc. Merseburg)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Dr2) Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, J. 45</td>
<td>Krämer 2.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rein (OCist, dioc. Salzburg)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Rei) Rein, Stiftsbibliothek, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg Cathedral Library</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Wi1) Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaffhausen, Allerheiligen (OSB, dioc. Constance)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Sch) Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek, min. 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopheim, St. Martin’s (OSB, dioc. Mainz)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(NH) New Haven, Yale University Library, 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Georgenberg</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(LA1) London, British Library, Add. 18150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trier, St. Eucharius-Matthias (OSB)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Tr1) Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1195/61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldhausen (OSA, dioc. Passau); later St. Florian (OSA, dioc. Passau)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(SF) St. Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, xi. 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwettl (OCist, dioc. Passau)</td>
<td>s. xii</td>
<td>(Zwe) Zwettl, Stiftsbibliothek, 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gall (OSB, dioc. Constance)</td>
<td>s. xii/xiii</td>
<td>(SG2) St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Altzelle, St. Mary (OSB, OCist from 1175, dioc. Meißen) | s. xiii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(†Dr1) Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, J 44 (destroyed 1945)</td>
<td>Krämer 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pra) Prague, Strahovský Klášter, DF III 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fifteenth-Sixteenth Centuries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location (Order, Dioc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Modern Shelfmark</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>s. xv</td>
<td>(Wi5) Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 13707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eberhardsklausen (OSA)</td>
<td>s. xv</td>
<td>(Tr2) Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1993/647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne, St. Pantaleon (OSB)</td>
<td>c. 1430</td>
<td>(P14) Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 5237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg, St. Veit (OESA, dioc. Bamberg)</td>
<td>A.D. 1462</td>
<td>(Nür) Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. III. 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speyer; later at Freiburg, Johannisberg? (OCarth)</td>
<td>A.D. 1472</td>
<td>(Asc) Aschaffenburg, Hofbibliothek, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s. xv&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegernsee (OSB, dioc. Freising)</td>
<td>A.D. 1477/79</td>
<td>(Mü2) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1207 (olim 18198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence; made on commission for Johann Jakob Fugger of Augsburg</td>
<td>A.D. 1549</td>
<td>(Mü1) Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Place of the HE in Medieval Libraries**

**Early Circulation**

Together these two bodies of evidence give the impression that the HE was, relatively speaking, widely available in important libraries of the ninth century. We know there were copies of it at Fulda, Lorsch (and later Weissenburg), Reichenau, St. Gall, Würzburg, Murbach, and St. Maximin’s, Trier. Several of these copies survive today, and still other copies that exist in fragmentary form (such as Düs, Ka2, Ma1, and Ma2) may be the remains of some of the other copies attested in the early catalogues, or they may represent still other copies otherwise undocumented. That these early copies were largely found in monastic (Benedictine) and cathedral libraries is all we could expect in this period, but it is important to note that the evidence for the early presence of the Historia is by no means limited to the so-called Anglo-Saxon centers. There were other lines of transmission by which the text came to this region, for example via the court library of Charlemagne (one clear example is the manuscript BS1 from Trier, which is a copy of the manuscript CUL, which was at court by around A.D. 800, as has been indicated above). We should also not discount the possibility that Irish peregrini may have taken an interest in the text and helped circulate it.<sup>15</sup> There is in fact physical evidence of such interest in

---

<sup>15</sup> That the Irish took an interest in Bede’s historical works has been shown by Steven Killion, “Beden Historiography in the Irish Annals,” *Medieval Perspectives* 6 (1991): 20-36.
manuscript Bn2 (s. ix, from Strasbourg Cathedral), which seems to have been the personal manuscript of such a peregrinus and contains parts of book I.16

That Bede’s reputation in this early period rested on much more than the HE can be seen clearly in the context in which it appears in the ninth-century catalogues. It is always listed with other works of his (which are often quite numerous). In fact, the ninth-century St. Gall catalogue lists the HE once, but has another dozen works of Bede, including his DAM in no less than seven copies.17 Bede’s works usually appear under an author-heading, such as “De libris Bedae presbyteri.”18 To be listed under a separate heading is normally how the fathers appear in these catalogues, though it is not only the fathers who are listed that way. For example, the same St. Gall catalogue already mentioned lists the four Latin fathers first, followed by Prosper, Bede, Isidore, Cassiodorus, and Eusebius. But even though it was not only the fathers who received their own author-heading in these book-lists, to be listed that way was a reflection of a certain status, and the fathers are the ones who are most frequently so listed with their own heading.19 It is, after all, logical that the works of authors who are highly respected authorities will form a large part of such a collection, and therefore are the ones whom it makes sense to list in that way. It seems that Bede was both prolific and well respected enough to be so listed most of the time.

The Twelfth Century

As was the case with the surviving manuscripts, the library catalogues do not indicate that there was a particularly great interest in the HE in the tenth century, nor in the eleventh, but this may just be an accident of survival. In contrast, the foundation of many new monastic communities in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries seems to

---


17 This is MBKDS I, cat. no. 16.

18 This is the heading from the Reichenau catalogue of A.D. 821-22 listed above (MBKDS I, 249.30-31).

19 Practically speaking, an author had to be prolific to warrant listing in this way. A single book of Orosius, for example, is accommodated between the headings for Isidore and Cassiodorus in the St. Gall list already mentioned. Orosius gets no separate heading of his own in the list. On Bede’s inclusion among the fathers of the Church, see Pfaff, “Bede Among the Fathers? The Evidence from Liturgical Commemoration,” (cited above in Chapter One, n. 6).
have created a great demand for copies of the HE, as evidenced by the many surviving copies from this period. Much of the interest seems to have been located in Benedictine communities, though there is also evidence of copies in Cistercian and Augustinian communities. Interestingly, the evidence for a version of the text with an abbreviated prologue in circulation in Austria in the twelfth century (discussed above in Chapter Three) also shows us that the Benedictine, Cistercian, and Augustinian communities in that region were sharing manuscripts amongst themselves regardless of order, though there is also evidence that there were particular connections between communities following the same rule. The copy of the text now at St. Florian (SF) was originally at Waldhausen, and another copy which, like SF, also had the HE bound together with Possidius’ Life of Augustine was once at Klosterneuberg. These are all Augustinian houses. Several other houses that had copies of the text were reform centers (Admont, Allerheiligen in Schaffhausen), and it is possible that the text was particularly appealing in a reform context. It is also important to note that many of these houses were recent foundations and were just developing their libraries when they seem to have acquired their copies of the HE. This may reflect an idea that the HE was considered a basic part of a collection, one which needed to be acquired for any library.

The Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries

The thirteenth century saw what seems to be a declining need for new copies of the HE. Though we have a few library catalogues that can be dated to this period, they largely record copies that we know to have been copied in the twelfth century. Beginning in the fifteenth century, however, there seems to be renewed interest in the HE. Admittedly, several of the library listings from the fifteenth century refer to earlier copies (for example the catalogues of St. Gall, Salzburg, and Waldhausen), but others do not, as far as we can tell. There are also a number of new copies of the text made during this period, and we furthermore know that the printed edition was beginning to circulate and becoming quite common by the end of the century (e.g. copies attested at Salvatorberg, Melk, the Collegium Universitatis in Erfurt, the Dominican convent in Vienna may all have been
copies of the *editio princeps* or one of its reprints). As one might expect, there is more evidence of individuals owning the text in this period, including a number of humanist scholars: Hartmann Schedel, Johann Jakob Fugger, and Thomas Rehdiger. There is also some evidence of the text’s at last making its way into a university setting. Copies are attested in Benedictine, Augustinian (Canons and Hermits), Carthusian, Premonstratensian, Dominican, and lay collections in this century. The reference in the catalogue of the Carthusians of Erfurt notes that Bede “multa scripta et historiam famosam reliquit.” The fact that this work is singled out in this way in the catalogue is perhaps indicative of the growing importance of that work in particular for Bede’s reputation.

**Classification in Medieval Catalogues**

It remains to discuss briefly the ways the work is classified in the catalogues that have come down to us. As noted above the work very often is listed among numerous other works of Bede, much as the Church Fathers are often listed. Occasionally, the *HE* is listed instead with other works of history (for example, in the mid-ninth-century list from Reichenau); and sometimes it is listed with historical works and cross-referenced in the list of Bede’s works (this is the case in the late fifteenth-/early sixteenth-century catalogue from Rebdorf).

Finally, the title under which the work circulated in the Middle Ages is important to note. Bede gave it the title *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* for a reason, but this was not the title it was most often known by in the medieval period. On the contrary, it very often circulated with a title that reflects its “national” focus, such as “Historia Anglorum” or “De

---

20 As noted above in the discussion of the Tegernsee copy (Chapter Two), the volume combining Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* with Bede’s *HE* that is attested in the late fifteenth century is likely to have been a printed book; we cannot discount, however, the possibility that a volume containing those two works attested in the fifteenth century could be either a manuscript copy of the printed edition, or a manuscript unconnected to any printed copy. The pairing of two ecclesiastical histories is obviously a logical one that could have been arrived at independently by more than one scribe or printer.

21 The Vienna Dominicans had a copy, as did Amplonius Ratinck, founder of the Collegium Amplonianum in Erfurt. Ratinck’s copy later passed to the University Library in Erfurt.

22 MBKDS II, 549.5; cf. 576.25-34.

23 MBKDS III, 270.36-37 and 274.24.
gestis Anglorum.” The latter title is attested already in the ninth century, and continued to be used right up until the end of the sixteenth century.²⁴

²⁴See MBKDS I, 75.17, 265.29; IV, 37.18.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

The evidence assembled here for the transmission and reception of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* leaves no doubt about its wide dissemination and popularity in medieval Germany. Along with so many of Bede’s works, the *HE* passed to the Continent and became widely available there within a few generations of the author’s death. It continued to be copied there over the entire medieval period, reaching its greatest popularity, to judge by the surviving manuscripts, in the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. It was first and foremost a monastic text, and found its home most often in the libraries of Benedictine, Augustinian, Cistercian, Premonstratensian, and later Carthusian communities. In the fifteenth century, it also found a place in Humanist book collections, and perhaps had by that time grown in popularity relative to Bede’s other works.

It is also clear from the information presented so far that the medieval readers of the *HE* were reading it for rather different reasons than might sometimes be assumed. Continental readers of the text were not particularly interested in the aspects of the history of the Anglo-Saxons or in Bede’s historiographical techniques, but instead focussed on his Saints’ lives, miracles and visions, and the regulatory elements such as the *Libellus responsionum*. Of particular interest, especially in more southerly parts, were Bede’s materials on Saint Oswald, who was widely venerated in that region. Bede’s medieval readers had no difficulty with his recounting of miracle stories. They did not (apparently) find them at all incongruous with his apparent reliability and good historical judgement, as a few modern critics have done.\(^1\) To judge by the title under which the work so often circulated (*Historia Anglorum, Gesta Anglorum*), the *HE* was understood to be a “national” history, and yet this did not seem to make it unappealing to medieval readers. Instead, the text was successful at transcending its national focus.

---

\(^1\) See the authors mentioned by Joel T. Rosenthal, “Bede’s Use of Miracles in *The Ecclesiastical History,*” *Traditio* 31 (1975): 328-35.
With respect to the transmission of the text, clearly much work remains to be done. While the test collations carried out here have been successful in identifying groups of related manuscripts within the German textual province, and also in revealing that certain other manuscripts belong to other branches of the tradition, they have only given a foretaste of what might ultimately be learned from a closer examination of the surviving manuscripts. In particular, Mynors’ French and Italian families need to be analyzed more closely. As I believe I have demonstrated clearly, Mynors’ textual categories are only provisional; and further study is needed to clarify what he has outlined, and to provide a textual basis for what he asserts. The origin of the so-called Continuatio Bedae has never been adequately explained, and for that reason the Continuatio MSS also deserve closer attention. A new edition of that text that takes all the surviving manuscripts could shed light on this text’s origins, which might well lie in the circle of Willibrord. Studies such as these would also be a useful first step toward a full critical edition of the HE that will eventually be needed. Michael Gorman has recently proposed that “The New Bede” be undertaken; if that goal is to be achieved, it will have to be done on the basis of a full and accurate account of the transmission of his works.²

INTRODUCTION

In order to undertake a detailed study of any part of the corpus of surviving *HE* manuscripts, it is necessary first to make sense of the diverse and widely dispersed body of scholarship that has been published on them to date. The advances that have been made since Laistner compiled his handlist in 1943, and even since Mynors’ treatment in 1969 are substantial, and I have endeavored to take them fully into account here. Included in this list are all manuscripts that contain the complete text or significant portions thereof, and fragments that may once have been part of a complete copy (that is to say, extracts are excluded). Detached fragments from surviving manuscripts are listed under the shelfmark of their parent.

COMPLETE OR ONCE-COMPLETE\(^1\) COPIES OF THE *HISTORIA ECCLESIASTICA GENTIS ANGLORUM*

1. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, 21245
2. Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, Peniarth 381
3. Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 326 (Admont, s. xii)
4. Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, 552 (Admont, s. xii)
5. Aschaffenburg, Hofbibliothek, 39 (Speyer, later Freiburg?, s. xv)
6. Augsburg, Bischöfliche Ordinariatsbibliothek, 43 (Neunkirchen am Brand, s. xii)
7. Bamberg Landesbibliothek, E. iii. 14 (Hist. 3)
8. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Hamilton 70
9. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, lat. 2° 378
10. Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phill. 1873
11. Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 49
12. Bloomington, Lilly Library, 47
14. Boulogne-sur-mer, Bibliothèque publique, 103
15. Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, (VDG 1353)

---

\(^1\) By “complete or once-complete” is meant manuscripts that are or may have been complete copies of the text (including fragments that are not known to have been detached from another copy listed here; detached fragments are listed here with their parent manuscripts).
16. Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, 8245-57 (VDG 3116)
17. Cambridge University Library, Kk. 5. 16
18. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 264
19. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 270 (flyleaf)
20. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 359
21. Cambridge, Emmanuel College, I. 1. 3 (3)
22. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Bradfer-Lawrence MS
23. Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 109 (Phillipps 15601)
24. Cambridge, Pembroke College, 82
25. Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Δ. 2. 8 (James 30)
26. Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College, Δ. 5. 17 (James 102)
27. Cambridge, St. John’s College, B. 5 (James 27)
28. Cambridge, St. John’s College, S. 6 (James 254)
29. Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22 (James 722)
30. Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 27 (James 717)
31. Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 3 (James 741)
32. Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 7. 5 (James 743)
33. Deventer, Athenaeumbibiotheek, I. 94
34. Dijon, Bibliothèque publique, 574
35. Douai, Bibliothèque publique, 335
36. Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek, J 45
37. Dublin, Trinity College, E. 2. 23 (492)
38. Durham Cathedral Library, B. ii. 35
39. Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, Advocates 18. 5. 1
40. Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ashburnham 991
41. Florence, Biblioteca nazionale centrale, 2671 C 7
42. Florence, Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Conv. Soppr. A. 1. 450
43. Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian T. 4. 3
44. Gotha, Öffentliche Bibliothek, memb. I 63 (19)
45. Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibliothek, 145
46. Hereford Cathedral Library, P. v. 1
47. Kassel, Landesbibliothek, 4º MS theol. 2
48. Kassel, Landesbibliothek, MS. theol. 162
49. Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus lat. Q. 57
50. Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek, I 58a (CLXV?)
51. London, British Library, Add. 10949
52. London, British Library, Add. 14250
53. London, British Library, Add. 18150
54. London, British Library, Add. 25014
55. London, British Library, Add. 33371
56. London, British Library, Add. 38130 (Phillipps 16250)
57. London, British Library, Add. 38817 (Phillipps 25402)
58. London, British Library, Arundel 74
59. London, British Library, Burney 297
60. London, British Library, Burney 310
61. London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. xiv
63. London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E. i
64. London, British Library, Egerton 3278
65. London, British Library, Harley 3680
66. London, British Library, Harley 4124
67. London, British Library, Harley 4978
68. London, British Library, Royal 13 B. xviii
69. London, British Library, Royal 13 C. v
70. London, British Library, Royal 13 C. vii
71. London, British Library, Stowe 104
72. London, College of Arms, M 6
73. London, College of Arms, Arundel 16
74. Madrid, Real Biblioteca, 2 C 2?
75. Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. I 181
76. Mainz, Stadtbibliothek, Hs. frag. 1
77. Manchester, John Rylands Library, lat. 182 (Phillipps 1089)
78. Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, C. 72 inf.
79. Monte Cassino, Archivio della badia, 177
80. Monte Cassino, Archivio della badia, 181
81. Montpellier, École de Médecine, 92
82. Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 118
83. Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 1207 (olim 18198)
84. Namur, Musée des arts anciens du Namurois, Fonds de la Ville 11
85. Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale (no. 49?; or VIII C 10?)
86. New Haven, Yale University Library, MS 330
87. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library M 826 (Phillipps 36275)
88. Oxford, All Souls College, 31
89. Oxford, Balliol College, 176
90. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow 39 (SC 6462)
92. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 302 (SC 2086)
93. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 712 (SC 2619)
94. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 101 (SC 1702)
95. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 211 (SC 1812)
96. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Douce 368 (SC 21943)
98. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Fairfax 12 (SC 3892)
100. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Holkham misc. 7
102. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson B 189 (SC 11550)
103. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C 162 (SC 12026)
104. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 348 (SC 10175)
105. Oxford, Christ Church, 99
106. Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279
107. Oxford, Lincoln College, lat. 31
108. Oxford, Magdalen College, lat. 105
109. Oxford, Merton College, 95 (K. 3. 6)
110. Oxford, New College, 308
111. Oxford, Pembroke College, 3
112. Oxford, St. John’s College, 99
113. Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 1154
114. Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 982
115. Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 989
116. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5226
117. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5227
118. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5227A
119. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5228
120. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5229
121. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5230
122. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5230A
123. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5231
124. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5232
125. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5233
126. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5234
127. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5235
128. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5236
129. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 5237
130. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 10184
131. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 12942
132. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 12943
133. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, latin 16078
134. Prague, Strahovské Klafter, DF III 1
135. Princeton University Library, Kane collection (olim Phillipps 256)
136. Reims, Bibliothèque publique, 1429 (formerly 873)
137. Rein, Stiftsbibliothek, 59
138. Rome, Biblioteca nazionale, Vittorio Emmanuele II 1452
139. Rouen, Bibliothèque publique, 1177
140. Rouen, Bibliothèque publique, 1343
141. San Marino, Huntingdon Library, HM 27486
142. San Marino, Huntingdon Library, HM 35300
143. Schaffhausen, Stadtbibliothek, min. 66
144. St. Florian, Stiftsbibliothek, xi. 247
145. St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 247
146. St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 547
147. St. Petersbourg, Public Library, Lat. Q. v. I. 18
148. Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1195/61
149. Trier, Stadtbibliothek, 1993/647
150. Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 735 [245] (4. F. 12)
151. Valencia Cathedral, 59
152. Vatican Library, Ottoboni lat. 877
153. Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 122
INDEX OF CROSS-REFERENCES AND EXCLUSIONS

Ashburnham Place, Ashburnham S 863: Laistner 103; now London, BL, Stowe 104
Cheltenham, Phillipps 163 (Hardy 81):
" " " 256: A reference to Phillipps 256?
" " " 1089: Now Princeton UL
" " " 1873: Now Manchester, Rylands
" " " 2701: See Rome, Bibl. Naz. Cent., V.E. 1452
" " " 9428: now Huntington 27486
" " " 13153: now Bloomington, IN, Lilly Lib. MS 47
" " " 15601: now Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus., McClean MS
" " " 16250: now BL, Add. 38130
" " " 25402: now BL, Add. 38817
" " “ 36275: now NYC Morgan Lib. M 826
Dusseldorf, Universitätsbibl., Fragm. K 1: B 216 with Bloomington, IN, Lilly Lib. Ricketts MS
Bern, Burgerbibliothek 363, fols. 188v-194 Part of I only (Mynors xlvi)
Bologna, Biblioteca comunale MS 131 Excluded by Mynors, lxx, n.3: Laistner (p. 95) took ghost ref. from Archiv 12 (1874): 576; but MS not to be found in published catalogue.) see †Wroclaw, now lost
Breslau, Rehdigeranus 43 excerpt only
Brussels, Bibliothèque royale 8059, fols. 56-57 now San Marino, Hunt 35300
Bury St. Edmunds, Cathedral Lib., Syon K. 59 now San Marino, Hunt 27486
Cheltenham, Phillipps 9428 now Rome, BNC VE II 1452
Cologny, Bodmer (Phillipps 2701) now San Marino, Hunt 27486
Dunn, George with Rome, BNC VE II 1452
Durham, NC, Duke UL, lat. 140 not the HE (cf. H&R, Mynors lxvii)
Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek 685 now NYC, Morgan Lib. M 826
London, Chester Beatty MS (Phillipps 36275)
London, BL, Cotton Vitellius E. vii
with London, BL, Cotton Vit. E. i
now New Haven, CT, Yale UL 330
London, Messrs. Quaritch (Mynors lxvii)
now Aberystwyth, NLW 21245
Mostyn Hall, Lord Mostyn
Middle Irish translation
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale latin 7418
not the HE (Laistner 101, H&R)
Parish, Hengwrt 102
now Aberystwyth, NLW Peniarth 381
Prague, Domkap. G. xxvii (1020)
see Prague, Strahovský Kla_ter
Quaritch
see New Haven, CT, Yale UL 330
Quaritch
see Rein
Ripley Castle, Library of Sir W. Ingilby, Bt.
now Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Mus.
RL(101, Mynors liv, H&R)
Ripon, H. L. Bradfer-Lawrence collection
now Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum,
Bradfer MS
Rome, Biblioteca Naz., Cod. Sessorianus:
see Rome, Bibl. Naz. Cent., V.E. 1452
Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 1116
duplicated in Laistner-King (p. 102,
same as Vat. Reg. 122; cf. H&R)
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek Rh. 95
Libellus responsionum only

LOST OR DESTROYED

Lost copy from among books of Poggio Bracciolini. (Mynors lxx)
Cambridge, Pembroke College (copy bequeathed by Hugh Damlett, 1476) (Mynors lvii)
†Chartres, Bibliothèque publique 21, fols. 1-6v, 109-111 (H&R)
†Chartres, Bibliothèque publique 80, fols. 51-52v (H&R)
†Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek J44, fols. 1-109v (Laistner 96; Mynors lxvii)
Melk, Stiftsbibliothek E 51 23 (cf. 1483 catalogue in Gottlieb, MBÖ 227, l. 10) (Mynors lxvii)
Oxford, Merton College (lost #258 from Powicke’s list?) (Mynors lix)
Papal copy removed to Peñiscola in 1409, no. 244 in list of MSS removed (this is different
from the copy now Paris 5235, which is no. 454 in Peñiscola list) (Mynors lxx)
Strasbourg MSS (two copies, Mynors lxvii)
Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville 134 (Ker, no. 38; destroyed in WWII) (Laistner 101,
Mynors lxi)
†Wrocław (Breslau), Rehdigeranus 43 (recte R185; Mynors lxvii)

MENTIONED BY LAISTNER, BUT NOT BY MYNORS (INCLUDED IN THE FINDING LIST)

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek lat. 2º 378 (Laistner 94)
Florence, Bibliotheca Laurenziana 2671 C 7 (L96)
Madrid, Biblioteca del Rey 2 C 2 (L98)
Munich, Staatsbibliothek, Clm 118 (Laistner 98)
Vatican Library, Reginensis lat. 692 (L102)

FRAGMENTS, EPITOMES, TRANSLATIONS

Bloomington, Ind., Lilley Library MS Ricketts 177 (Laistner 96, Mynors xliv n. 5)
Bourges, Bibl. pub. 97, fols. 186-88v (Laistner 95)
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 270 (Laistner 103; Mynors lviii; Gneuss 75), s. xi<sup>x</sup> or xi/xii; Canterbury, St. Augustine’s.
Cheltenham, Phillipps 9428 (purchased by George Dunn, untraced according to Mynors, lv) now Huntington 27486
Durham, Duke University, lat. 140
Florence, Bibliotheca Laurenziana, Ashburnham 991 (abbreviation; Mynors lxx)
Kassel, Landesbibliothek MS. Anhang 19. 5, fol. 1 (Mynors lxv, see also Bischoff’s cat.
London, British Library, Egerton 3278 (Mynors xlvii)
London, Sir A. Chester Beatty collection (Laistner 98); now New York, Pierpont Morgan
Library M 826 (formerly Phillipps 36275; fragment contains part of HE III.29-30; Mynors xlv)
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud misc. 610 (books I and II in Old Irish; Mynors xlvii)
Zürich, Zentralbibliothek Rh. 95 (Lib. resp. only, Mynors xliii)
APPENDIX B
A TRANSCRIPTION OF THE CONTINUATIO BDEAE FROM PRAGUE, STRAHOV LIBRARY, DF III 1, AND VIENNA, ÖSTERREICHISCHE NATIONALBIBLIOTHEK, LAT. 13707

PREFACE

The purpose of the following transcription is to make available the variant readings in the two “newly discovered” manuscripts of the text (Pra and Wi5) discussed above in Chapter Two. To ease the comparison of these two copies with the edition printed by Colgave and Mynors (pp. 572-76), I have taken their text as the base text here, placing the variants from Pra and Wi5 in the notes. I have recorded all instances where these manuscripts differ from their text, including minor spelling differences, but I have not recorded manuscript punctuation or capitalization. The use of the Colgrave-Mynors text as the base text here is not to be construed as an attribution of special authority to it; since the text is transmitted exclusively in manuscripts of the twelfth century and later, either of these copies could conceivably have an equally strong claim to authority as any of the others. Only by a full collation of all ten witnesses will we be able to determine their relative values.

TEXT

Anno ab incarnatione Domini¹ DCCXXXII² Ecgberct³ pro Uilfrido⁴ Eboraci episcopus factus⁵; Cyniberth⁶ episcopus⁷ Lindisfarorum obiit.

¹ Pra does not have the formula “ab incarnatione Domini” here or in any of the following annals, with the exception of the annal for 735, where it reads “ab incarnatione Christi”.

² septingentesimo XXXII⁶ Wi5.

³ Ecgberth Pra, Wi5.

⁴ Wilfrido Pra, Wi5.

⁵ factus est Wi5.

⁶ Ciniberth Pra; Cyniberth Wi5.

⁷ Wi5 has what appears to be a letter ‘d’ with a trailing stroke after “episcopus” (perhaps “de”?).
Anno ab incarnatione Domini DCCXXXIII\textsuperscript{8} Tatuini archiepiscopus\textsuperscript{9}, accepto ab apostolica auctoritate\textsuperscript{10} pallio, ordinuit Aluuchi\textsuperscript{11} et Sigfridum episcopos\textsuperscript{12}.

Anno ab incarnatione Christi DCCXXXIII\textsuperscript{13} Tatuini\textsuperscript{14} episcopus obiit.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini\textsuperscript{15} DCXXXV\textsuperscript{16} Nothelm archiepiscopus ordinatur, et Ecgberth episcopus\textsuperscript{17}, accepto ab apostolica sede pallio, primus post Paulinum in archiepiscopatum confirmatus est ordinuitque Fruidubertum\textsuperscript{18} et Fruiduualdum\textsuperscript{19} episcopos; et Baeda\textsuperscript{20} presbyter obiit.

Anno DCCXXXVII\textsuperscript{21} nimia siccitas terram fecit infecundam; et Ceoluulfus\textsuperscript{22} sua uoluntate attonsus regnum Eadberto reliquit.

Anno ab incarnatione Christi DCCXXIX\textsuperscript{23} Edilhard\textsuperscript{24} Occidentalium Saxonum rex\textsuperscript{25}

---

\textsuperscript{8} septingentesimo xxxiiio Wi5.
\textsuperscript{9} om. archi- Pra.
\textsuperscript{10} auctoritate Wi5.
\textsuperscript{11} Alwich Wi5.
\textsuperscript{12} episcopus Wi5.
\textsuperscript{13} septingentesimo xxxiiio Wi5.
\textsuperscript{14} Tatwini Wi5.
\textsuperscript{15} Christi Pra.
\textsuperscript{16} septingentesimo tricesimo quinto Wi5.
\textsuperscript{17} ins. above line Pra.
\textsuperscript{18} Freudibertum Pra.
\textsuperscript{19} Freudwaldum Pra || Fruiwaldum Wi5.
\textsuperscript{20} Beda Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{21} septingentesimo tricesimo septimo Wi5.
\textsuperscript{22} Ceolwlf Pra || Ceoluulf Wi5.
\textsuperscript{23} XIi Pra || septingentesimo tricesimo nono Wi5.
\textsuperscript{24} Edilhart Wi5.
\textsuperscript{25} om. Pra.
obiit, et Nothelm archiepiscopus\footnote{om. archi- Pra.}.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini \textit{DCCXL}\footnote{XLII Pra || septingentesimo quadragesimo Wi5.} Cudberth\footnote{Cudbert Pra.} pro Nothelmo consecratus est. Aedilbaldus\footnote{Edilbaldus Pra, Wi5.} rex Merciorum\footnote{Mertiorum Pra.} per impiam fraudem uastabat\footnote{rastabat (?)Wi5.} partem Northanymbrorum, eratque rex eorum Eadberth occupatus cum suo exercitu\footnote{exercitu Wi5.} contra Pictos. Aediluuald\footnote{Edilwald Pra, Wi5.} quoque episcopus obiit et pro eo Cy\textit{n}iuulf\footnote{Cyniwlf Pra || Conuulf Wi5.} ordinatur antistes. Arnuuini\footnote{This is the reading of Plummer’s A, but he also notes that MS ‘b’ has “arnwyn” || Arnuwi Pra || Aruwim Wi5.} et Eadbertus interempti.

Anno \textit{DCCXLI}\footnote{XLIII Pra || septingentesimo quadragesimo primo Wi5.} siccitas\footnote{primo sic\textit{c}itas Pra, with primo inserted (it seems) over correction.}\footnote{et Ceol Pra.} magna terram occupauit. Karolus\footnote{Plummer prints “Conuulfus” here, and notes that ‘a’ has “Erniulfus” || Cy\textit{niwlf} Pra || Conuulf Wi5.} rex Francorum obiit et pro eo filii eius Karloman\footnote{Karoloman Wi5.} et Pippin\footnote{Puppin Wi5.} regnum acceperunt\footnote{susceperunt Pra.}.

Anno \textit{DCCXLV}\footnote{septingentesimo quinto Wi5.} Ulfridus\footnote{Ulfridus Pra, Wi5.} episcopus et Ingualdus\footnote{septingentesimo quadragesimo \textit{quinto} Wi5.} Lundoniae\footnote{Wilfridus Pra, Wi5.} episcopus
migrauerunt ad dominum.

Anno DCCXLVII Herefrid uir Dei obiit.


Anno DCCCLIII, anno regis Eadberti quinto [decimo, quinto] idus Ianuarias eclipsis solis facta est, et nec mora, postea eodem anno et mense, hoc est nona kalendarum Februariarum, luna eclipsim pertulit, horrendo et nigerrimo scuto, ita ut sol paulo ante, cooperta.

---

45 -e Pra, Wi5.
46 septingentesimo quadragesimo septimo Wi5.
47 septingentesimo quinquagesimo Wi5.
48 Cunred Pra|| Cudreth Wi5.
49 Edilbaldum Pra; Wi5.
50 Oengusum regem Pra.
51 Plummer prints “Theudor” from MS A, and notes that “edd.” has “theneorus,” while “b” has “thendor” || Theudor Pra || Wi5 might have Theudor or Thendor.
52 Eadbert Pra.
53 Cil Pra.
54 Plummer: “DCCLI edd. DCLXVI altered from DCLXXI A,” (p. 362, n. 5) || Mynors notes that “The MSS., which are very late, vary between 756 and 766, and omit something, probably decimo quinto (though the regnal year ought, according to Plummer, to be sexto decimo)” (p. 574, note a) || Dcclii Pra || septingentesimo quinquagesimo sexto Wi5.
55 x anno Pra.
56 y Pra.
57 ydus Wi5.
58 nono Wi5.
59 februarum Pra.
60 om. Pra.
61 ecipsin Pra.
62 cooperiretur Pra.
Anno DCCLIII, Bonifacius, qui et VVinfridus, Francorum episcopus cum quinquaginta tribus, martyrio coronatur; et pro eo Rehdgerus consecratur archiepiscopus a Stephano papa.

Anno DCCLVII Aedilbald rex Merciorum a suis tutoribus nocte morte fraudulenta miserabiliter peremptus occubuit; Beonred regnare coepit. Cyniuulfus rex Occidentalium Saxonum obiit. Eodem etiam anno Ofta, fugato Beornredo, Merciorum regnum sanguinolento quesuit gladio.

Anno DCCLVIII Eadbertus rex Nordanhymbrorum Dei amoris causa et caelestis patria uiolentia, accepta sancti Petri tonsura, filio suo Osuulfo regnum reliquit.
Anno DCCLnono\textsuperscript{82} Osuulf\textsuperscript{83} a suis ministris facinore\textsuperscript{84} occisus est, et Ediluuald\textsuperscript{85} anno eodem a sua plebe electus intruuit in regnum; cuius secundo anno magna tribulatio mortalitatis uenit et\textsuperscript{86} duobus ferme annis permansit, populantibus duris ac diuersis\textsuperscript{87} egritudinibus maxime tamen dysenteriae\textsuperscript{88} languore.

Anno DCCLXI\textsuperscript{89} Oengus Pictorum rex obiit, qui regni sui principium usque ad finem facinore cruentum tyrannus\textsuperscript{90} carnisfex perduxit\textsuperscript{91}; et Osuuiini\textsuperscript{92} occisus est.

Anno DCCLXV\textsuperscript{93} Aluchred rex susceptus est\textsuperscript{94} in regnum.

Anno DCCLXVI\textsuperscript{95} Ecgbertus archiepiscopus, prosapia regali\textsuperscript{96} ditatus ac diuina scientia inbutus\textsuperscript{97}, et Frithubertus\textsuperscript{98}, uere fideles episcopi, ad Dominum migrauerunt.

\textsuperscript{82} LIX Pra || septingentesimo quinquagesimo nono Wi5.
\textsuperscript{83} Oswulf Pra.
\textsuperscript{84} Plummer: “facinorose edd” || facinorose Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{85} Edilwald Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{86} om. Pra.
\textsuperscript{87} Plummer: “aduersis b.”
\textsuperscript{88} dissinterie Pra || discinterie Wi5.
\textsuperscript{89} DCCLX primo Pra; septingntesimo sexagesimo primo Wi5.
\textsuperscript{90} tirannus Wi5.
\textsuperscript{91} perduxit carnisfex Wi5.
\textsuperscript{92} Oswini Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{93} septingentesimo sexagesimo quinto Wi5.
\textsuperscript{94} om. Pra.
\textsuperscript{95} septingntesimo sexagesimo sexto Wi5.
\textsuperscript{96} corr. from regalia Pra.
\textsuperscript{97} inbutus Pra, Wi5.
\textsuperscript{98} Frithuberth Pra || erithuberth Wi5.
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