

SIR ISRAEL GOLLAN CZ MEMORIAL LECTURE

Authority and Intertextuality in the Works of Ælfric

JOYCE HILL
University of Leeds

IN 811 CLAUDIUS OF TURIN completed an exhaustive commentary on Genesis for Louis the Pious, and wrote in the Preface:

Has autem rerum gestarum sententias de mysticis thesauris sapientium inquirendo et investigando in unum codicem conpiendo brevitatis coartavi, in quibus [lector] non mea legit, sed illorum relegit, quorum ego verba quae illi dixerunt veluti speciosus flores ex diversis pratis in unum collegi et meae litterae ipsorum expositio est.¹

After studying and investigating opinions on historical events taken from mystical treasure troves of learned men, I abridged them in a brief compendium of one codex. The reader does not read my words. Instead, he reads theirs again. I have collected their words like beautiful flowers from many meadows, so my treatise is a work of theirs.

Claudius was not yet Bishop of Turin; his elevation was to take place five years later, in 816, after Louis had succeeded Charlemagne. He was, at this time, still a biblical scholar, studying first with Leidrad (Archbishop of Lyon 798–814), a friend of Alcuin, and then, at Louis's invitation, at Chasseneuil, near Poitiers, where Louis had his court. The comments in his preface, coming from someone at the highest levels of ecclesiastical and political society, sum up for us the essential characteristics of Carolingian

Read at the Academy on 9 September 2004.

¹ *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, ed. E. Dümmler, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Epistolarum Tomus IV* (Berlin, 1895), p. 592. The translation into English is that of M. Gorman, 'The Commentary on Genesis of Claudius of Turin and Biblical Studies under Louis the Pious', *Speculum*, 72 (1997), 279–329 at 287.

exegesis. It was a particular genre of composition,² in which the object was the transmission of consensual authority, achieved in practical terms mostly through the creation of *compilationes* or *catenae*, in which the reader encounters, not the writer's own words, but the words of the authorities who are thus the guarantors of the orthodoxy of the interpretation offered. It is, then, a fundamentally intertextual approach, made all the more so because the authorities on whom the Carolingians drew were themselves profoundly intertextual. The Carolingian *renovatio*, in reasserting patristic orthodoxy, set out to recapture that authority within the texts they wrote and in so doing made even more dense the network of intertextual relations by adding further layers of extraction, selection, compilation and phrasal repetition, giving us, as a result, a textual tradition, a mode of composition, and an intellectual approach characterised by being derivative. The conceptual and practical problems that this presents for modern scholars will be explored below, but it is important to remember that it was not a problem for them. Indeed, they took pride in their dependence, their intertextuality, and often displayed it in manuscripts, as Claudius did in his commentary on Genesis, by providing in the margin abbreviations which indicated the authority from whom a particular sentence or passage had been taken. From a modern perspective, we might hesitate to give close attention to a textual community which, as Rosamond McKitterick once put it, 'bent over backwards in the effort not to be original'.³ But in reality what they created and what we need to come to terms with is something much more challenging than McKitterick's comment would seem to suggest; it is nothing less than a system of discourse, 'a library or larger system of texts within which any text is read or composed'.⁴ My intention here is to examine the way in which this system became available, was understood and was used in the Anglo-Saxon England of the tenth-century Benedictine Reform, and to suggest ways in which we might better equip ourselves to find a way through the system in order to be sensitive to the true nature of the intertextual dialogue that was taking place. My examples will chiefly be drawn from Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*, as edited by Clemons and

² The nature of the *compilatio* method of composition is discussed in detail by M. Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: 'Grammatica' and Literary Theory 350–1100* (Cambridge, 1994). For Irvine, *compilatio* is a macrogenre (p. 428).

³ R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London and New York, 1983), p. 202.

⁴ M. Irvine, 'Medieval Textuality and the Archaeology of Textual Culture', in A. J. Frantzen (ed.), *Speaking Two Languages: Traditional Disciplines and Contemporary Theory in Medieval Studies* (Albany, 1991), p. 184.

Godden,⁵ although reference will be made to other homilies by Ælfric, and quite extensively to the Latin texts on which he drew.

It will be evident, therefore, that I am not here primarily interested in finding new sources, although that will be the incidental outcome of some of the examples cited. Rather, I am interested in exploring the intellectual and textual systems within which Ælfric and his Carolingian models were working: not a matter of identifying the *what*, therefore, but the *how* and the *why*. Within this frame of reference, central though source-identifications are, the focus is on the author, on his cultural context, his compositional process, and his interaction with his textual community, and not on the sources themselves, which are simply forms of evidence to be interpreted. In a number of publications written in the 1980s and 1990s, Allen Frantzen questioned the value of the major source-study projects within the field of Anglo-Saxon studies—the *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* database,⁶ and the *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*⁷—in part on the grounds that they were characterised by a pre-occupation with searching out what he regarded as misleadingly positivist and rigid ‘facts’, and with an investigative paradigm that was obsessed with ‘origins’.⁸ His views were challenged by Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe in the 1993 Toller Lecture,⁹ and there is a further challenge, of a practical kind, in this lecture also. ‘Facts’, in this context the correct identification

⁵ *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The First Series. Text*, ed. P. Clemoes, Early English Text Society, SS 17 (Oxford, 1997); *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: The Second Series. Text*, ed. M. Godden, Early English Text Society, SS 5 (Oxford, 1979). Where numbers are used to identify a homily, following Clemoes and Godden, the number for the homily in Thorpe’s edition will also be given, if this differs, in order to provide a link with earlier scholarship: B. Thorpe (ed.), *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, 2 vols. (London, 1844–6).

⁶ *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: A Register of Written Sources Used by Authors in Anglo-Saxon England*, a project funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Board, now available at <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/> and on CD-ROM.

⁷ F. M. Biggs, T. D. Hill and P. E. Szarmach (eds.), with the assistance of K. Hammond, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version* (Binghamton, 1990); F. M. Biggs, T. D. Hill, P. E. Szarmach and E. G. Whatley (eds.), with the assistance of D. A. Oosterhouse, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture. Volume One: Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum* (Kalamazoo, 2001).

⁸ A. J. Frantzen and C. L. Venegoni, ‘The Desire for Origins: An Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon Studies’, *Style*, 20 (1986), 142–56; A. J. Frantzen, *Desire for Origins: New Language, Old English, and Teaching the Tradition* (New Brunswick and London, 1990); A. Frantzen (ed.), *Speaking two Languages*; A. J. Frantzen, ‘Who Do These Anglo-Saxon(ist)s Think They Are, Anyway?’, *Æstel*, 2 (1994), 1–43; ‘By the Numbers: Anglo-Saxon Scholarship at the Century’s End’, in P. Pulsiano and E. Trehearne (eds.), *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 472–95.

⁹ K. O’Brien O’Keeffe, ‘Source, Method, Theory, Practice: On Reading Two Old English Verse Texts’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 76 (1994), 51–73. Reprinted with an updated bibliography, in D. Scragg (ed.), *Textual and Material Culture in*

of sources, constitute the platform on which the arguments must necessarily be built, but the arguments themselves are directed at understanding the very thing that Frantzen was advocating: namely, a way of looking and understanding that allows us to ‘see documents functioning in culture, and culture functioning through documents’.¹⁰

In discussing authority and intertextuality, I shall be using two main lines of investigation: an analysis of the way in which the early medieval system of intertextual discourse was constructed and perceived; and a critical examination of the efficacy of the models of interpretation that are used in the modern source-study scholarship which engages with this tradition. Examples from Ælfric’s homilies will lie at the heart of the discussion, and from these will be drawn some principles for source-identification which, if systematically adopted, would refine source-analyses and so bring us closer to the reality of what we are trying to understand. Not least among the challenges will be the need to distinguish between ultimate and immediate sources, to be clear about the means of making such distinctions and, above all, to appreciate the benefits that such distinctions can deliver in giving us insights into the how and the why of the authorial mindset and mode of composition.¹¹

In the Latin letter which he wrote to Archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury to accompany the copy of the First Series of *Catholic Homilies* that he was sending to him, Ælfric placed himself in what must have seemed to him to be the seamless intertextual tradition of the patristic and the Carolingian exegetes:

Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 161–81.

¹⁰ Frantzen, *Desire for Origins*, p. 127.

¹¹ The *Fontes* database (see above, n. 6) distinguishes between ‘immediate’ and ‘antecedent’ sources, and makes no use of the term ‘ultimate’. However, ‘antecedent’ (i.e. antecedent to the identifiable immediate source) is not a helpful contrast to ‘immediate’ in the context of this lecture, since there are often shown to be several ‘antecedent’ sources standing in temporal and textual relationship, with the patristic text being the primary authority in such a sequence. For the sake of clarity in this paper, I therefore use the term ‘ultimate’ for the patristic authority, ‘immediate’ for the source directly used by Ælfric (where this can be determined), and ‘intermediate’ for a transmitter standing between the identifiable ‘immediate’ and ‘ultimate’ authority. In using the term ‘ultimate’, I do not mean to imply that the words used by authors such as Gregory, for example, were original in the modern sense that no one else had used them before in a similar exegetical context, since the patristic writers exploited by the early middle ages were themselves working within an intertextual tradition; the term is simply a means of indicating that these authorities were the ‘ultimate’ for the Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon authors, in the sense that they were as far back in the orthodox exegetical tradition as these medieval writers went, and that they were regarded by them as the ‘ultimate’ authority in having the highest status within that tradition.

Hos namque auctores in hac explanatione sumus secuti. uidelicet Augustinum. ypponiensem. Hieronimum. Bedam. Gregorium. Smaragdum, et aliquando Hægmonem; Horum denique auctoritas ab omnibus catholicis. libentissime suscipitur;¹²

For, indeed, we have followed these authors in this exposition: namely, Augustine of Hippo, Jerome, Bede, Gregory, Smaragdus, and sometimes Haymo, for the authority of these is most willingly acknowledged by all the orthodox.

His homilies, he explains, are to be seen as ‘translations’, by which he means, as I demonstrated in the 1996 Toller lecture,¹³ not ‘translation’ in the narrow sense in which we commonly use the word today, but ‘translatio’ in the more literal sense of the Latin word: a ‘carrying over’ of the textual material and its tradition of interpretation from Latin into the vernacular. Two authors of homiliaries are named: Smaragdus,¹⁴ a friend of one of the leading Carolingian reformers, Benedict of Aniane, who appears in records as the Abbot of Saint Mihiel from 816 onwards; and Haymo, now known to be Haymo of Auxerre (died 865 or 866), rather than Haymo of Halberstadt (778–853), who was earlier considered to be the author of this popular homiliary.¹⁵ The other homiliary which was important for Ælfric was that of Paul the Deacon, as Smetana demonstrated in 1959.¹⁶ Paul made his anthology of patristic items in the late 790s, at the direction of Charlemagne. It quickly achieved a wide circulation and rapidly began to acquire augmentations, some of which were probably present in the copy that Ælfric used.¹⁷

¹² *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: First Series*, ed. Clemons, p. 173. The following English translation is that of J. Wilcox, *Ælfric's Prefaces* (Durham, 1994), p. 127.

¹³ J. Hill, ‘Translating the Tradition: Manuscripts, Models and Methodologies in the Composition of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 79 (1997), 43–65. Reprinted with corrections in Scragg (ed.), *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, pp. 241–59.

¹⁴ The only edition of Smaragdus's homiliary is *Collectiones in epistolas et evangelia*, ed. J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 102 (Paris, 1865), cols. 13–552. The work is more usually referred to as *Expositio libri comitis*.

¹⁵ The only edition of Haymo's *Homiliae de Tempore* is that by J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 118 (Paris, 1880), cols. 11–746. Migne attributed the homiliary to Haymo of Halberstadt, as also did Smetana, following Migne: C. L. Smetana, ‘Ælfric and the Homiliary of Haymo of Halberstadt’, *Traditio*, 17 (1961), 457–69. For a summary of the scholarship by which these two Haymos may be distinguished, and the correct authorial attributions thus to be arrived at, see R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), pp. 172–4.

¹⁶ C. L. Smetana, ‘Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary’, *Traditio*, 15 (1959), 163–204.

¹⁷ J. Hill, ‘Translating the Tradition’, pp. 52–9, for discussion of the form of Ælfric's copy of Paul the Deacon's homiliary. As explained on p. 55 and in note 32, material in this homiliary for the period after Pentecost was originally rubricated by an old system which divided the long run

Between them, these three homiliaries illustrate three of the chief ways in which the Carolingians perpetuated and indeed complicated the intertextual traditions of the Church Fathers. Paul's homiliary is a *compilatio*, an anthology of whole items from various authorities, organised in liturgical order in two books, one for the winter period (Advent to Holy Saturday) and one for the summer (beginning with Easter). The homilies were on the gospel lections, with certain major saints' days also being commemorated and some provision at the end for the Common of the Saints. A few days had only one item, but there was a choice of items for most days, even in the original homiliary. In the present context, the key factor to bear in mind about this homiliary is that each item was attributed to its reputed author and could thus be referred to in this way: for instance, Gregory's homily for Epiphany, Bede's homily for the Second Sunday in Lent, Augustine's homily for the Vigil of the Ascension. There was no practical need for anyone to refer to Paul the Deacon himself when citing material from this collection, which in any case—perhaps understandably given that it was an expanding anthology of discrete items—was soon circulating without the originally extensive prefatory matter in which Paul's name could be found.¹⁸

of Sundays into groups keyed to particular saints' days. Ælfric, however, in common with Smaragdus and Haymo, used the simpler and more modern method of counting all the Sundays in sequence from Pentecost. Cross-reference to the homiliary of Paul the Deacon would therefore have been difficult, were it not for the fact that the rubrications in the homiliary were almost immediately updated so that its system of designating the Sundays after Pentecost conformed to the more modern norm. We can safely assume that Ælfric's copy of Paul the Deacon used the modern system, thus facilitating cross-referencing in the composition of the *Catholic Homilies*.

¹⁸ The argument for Ælfric not having the homiliary with the elaborate prefatory material and thus lacking the identification of Paul the Deacon as the compiler is presented in J. Hill, 'Translating the Tradition', pp. 52–4. The listing of Augustine, Jerome, Bede and Gregory in the letter to Sigeric, preceding the names of Smaragdus and Haymo, may even be Ælfric's way of referring to this particular homiliary. This contrasts with Godden's assumption that he did have access to the preface and indeed modelled the *Catholic Homilies* on what it said: M. Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, Early English Text Society, SS 18 (Oxford, 2000), p. 3. However, survival of the preface is not well supported by the manuscript tradition, or by observable practice with regard to prefatory material generally (including Ælfric's own) when collections are successively copied and modified. Ælfric's models could well have been what his available texts, not confined to Paul the Deacon, actually presented him with. Further, Godden's argument that Ælfric modelled his two books of *Catholic Homilies* on the two books of Paul the Deacon is based on a false analogy: Paul's is arranged in liturgical order for two halves of the year, whereas each of Ælfric's two collections ranged across the full year and they were produced in sequence to provide variety, with the possibility of either combining them as a more comprehensive composite for the whole year, or leaving them as two series that could be alternated.

Smaragdus provides a model of a different though related kind. His homiliary is likewise for the whole year, but with only two homilies for each of the days covered: one on the epistle, and one on the gospel. Where Smaragdus's homiliary differs from Paul's is that each homily was put together by Smaragdus. However, each homily is a *catena* of passages—sometimes quite substantial ones—taken from the patristic authorities, directly or via an intermediary, such as Alcuin, and attributed to the authority in question by marginal letter-abbreviations (G for Gregory, B for Bede, and so on).¹⁹ Thus, a user of Smaragdus could have exactly the same degree of confidence in the authority of this homiliary as he could in Paul the Deacon's because, although presented in a different form, the patristic attributions were just as easy to see, and could be used as a validating name when part or all of a particular passage was taken into a new *catena*, such as one of Ælfric's homilies. As with Paul the Deacon, then, manuscripts of Smaragdus's homiliary presented an inscribed material intertextuality. Ælfric's version of this, in a vernacular collection designed for oral delivery to the laity, rather than for reference or use within a monastic and thus Latinate and literate context, was not inscription of intertextuality in the visually prominent locations of rubrics or margins, such as would be useful for readers of manuscripts, but validation embedded in the words of the homilies themselves—simplified for his audience in reflecting the main patristic authority (where one is acknowledged) rather than tracing the complexity of movement between authorities, which was often the truth of the matter. There was no need at any time to refer to Smaragdus by name when drawing upon his text, although for the homiliary as a whole one would be obliged to

¹⁹ F. Rädle, *Studien zu Smaragd von Saint-Mihiel* (Munich, 1974), pp. 137–42. Rädle comments on Smaragdus's failure to distinguish between ultimate and immediate sources but, as will be clear from this lecture, early medieval perceptions differed from those that apply within the framework of modern scholarship. For comment on some of the Smaragdus manuscripts, see J. Hill, 'Ælfric and Smaragdus', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 21 (1992), 203–37, at pp. 234–7. The author attributions are poorly represented in the *Patrologia Latina* edition of Smaragdus's homiliary. For corrections see A. Souter, 'Contributions to the Criticism of Zmaragdus's *Expositio Libri Comitis*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 9 (1908), 584–97; 'Further Contributions to the Criticism of Zmaragdus's *Expositio Libri Comitis*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 23 (1922), 73–6; 'A Further Contribution to the Criticism of Zmaragdus's *Expositio Libri Comitis*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 34 (1933), 46–7. In 'Contributions', p. 584, Souter suggests that Smaragdus borrowed the system of marginal attribution from Bede. For Bede's practice, see M. L. W. Laistner, 'Source-marks in Bede Manuscripts', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 34 (1933), 350–4. It is striking that Laistner's examples are from manuscripts of Bede's commentaries on Mark and Luke, which Smaragdus used extensively.

use his name as an identifier, since each *catena* making up the homiliary was unique to him, even though demonstrably highly derivative.²⁰

A third approach is illustrated by the homiliary of Haymo, who likewise provides one homily for the epistle and one for the gospel for the whole of the liturgical year. Anyone familiar with patristic interpretations of gospel and epistle can quickly recognise that Haymo is steeped in this tradition; there are many passages that occur elsewhere, and there are many that are almost the same. But, derivative though Haymo is in modern terms, each homily is indubitably Haymo's own and, because the compositional dependence on patristic authorities is more internalised, the result is neither *compilatio* (on the model of Paul the Deacon), nor a series of *catenae* (on the model of Smaragdus). Furthermore, Haymo differs from Paul and Smaragdus in providing no visual signals, in rubrics or margins, of his dependence on patristic authorities. Here, then, is the reason why Ælfric is twice obliged to cite Haymo by name in the homilies themselves.²¹ Most commonly, Haymo is used for additional detail, often historical or cultural, or for supplementary biblical quotations or allusions—which accounts for the 'aliquando', 'sometimes', that describes, in the Letter to Sigeric, the distinctive use made of Haymo. But when there is exegetical interpretation that needs validation (as the supplementary details generally do not), Ælfric has to fall back on Haymo's own name, since the manuscript of this homiliary provides no access to anyone else's.

However, if we recognise in these homiliaries that there is a patristic tradition on which the Carolingian exegetes overlaid a yet more derivative intertextuality, through which the patristic tradition could be more conveniently and more widely disseminated, it is worth pausing to reflect on the position of Bede, who is something of an anomaly. On the one hand he is unambiguously in the patristic camp. We see this, for example, in Ælfric's Letter to Sigeric, where he is within the patristic list, between Jerome and Gregory, and by the way in which he is repeatedly cited as an interpretative authority in the homilies themselves. Yet, on the other hand, he is aligned with the Carolingians in using the same kind of com-

²⁰ Ælfric's only reference to Smaragdus by name is in the Letter to Sigeric, which indicates that his copy of the homiliary must have had this identifying detail, as is common in extant manuscript copies. Within the body of the homilies, by contrast, the marginal attributions provided him with what he needed.

²¹ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: First Series*, ed. Clemoes, p. 241 (hom. VIII, *Dominica III post Epiphania Domini*) and p. 470 (hom. XXXIV, *III Kalendas Octobris: Dedicatio Ecclesie Sancti Michahelis Archangeli*). On Ælfric and Haymo, see Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Homiliary of Haymo of Halberstadt'.

positional methods as they do, even to the extent of providing, in his Commentaries on Mark and Luke, marginal letter abbreviations to indicate the patristic authority whose words he was employing at any given point.²² Claudius of Turin, who used the same technique, acknowledged that Bede was his model,²³ and Bede himself characterised his dependent relationship on patristic authorities in ways very similar to those of the Carolingians. He was a *compilator*, a creator of *catenae* no less than they were—and no less overtly.²⁴ Yet it was they who placed him among the Fathers of the Church, citing him as an authority equal to the likes of Augustine and Jerome in the reforming Councils, according him the title of ‘doctor’ and ‘magister’, and even describing him as ‘nostri didascalus aevi’, ‘the teacher of our age’.²⁵ In Paul the Deacon’s homiliary, Bede accounts for fifty-six of the 244 items originally assembled, a larger contribution than that from any other authority, including the historical Fathers,²⁶ and in the homiliary of Smaragdus he accounts for about ten

²² Laistner, ‘Source-marks in Bede Manuscripts’.

²³ *Epistolae Karolini Aevi*, II, ed. Dümmler, p. 592, with translation by Gorman, ‘The Commentary on Genesis’, p. 287: ‘Et ne ab aliquibus praesumptor et temerarius diiudicaret, quod [ab] alieno armario sumpserim tela, uniuscuiusque doctoris nomen cum suis characteribus, sicut et beatus fecit presbiter Beda, subter in paginis adnotavi’; ‘And so no one will think me presumptuous and rash because I took arms from the cabinet of another, I have indicated the name of each learned authority by placing letters in the margin, just as the blessed priest Bede did’.

²⁴ J. Hill, *Bede and the Benedictine Reform*, The Jarrow Lecture, 1998 (Jarrow, 1998). For a list of the instances in which Bede refers to himself as walking in the footsteps of the Fathers, see P. Meyvaert, ‘Bede the Scholar’, in G. Bonner (ed.), *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Century of the Birth of the Venerable Bede* (London, 1976), pp. 40–69, at n. 7, pp. 62–3.

²⁵ *Concilia Aevi Karolini I*, ed. A. Werminghoff, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Legum Sectio III, Concilia II, I (Hannover and Leipzig, 1906), p. 266 (Council of Mainz, 813), p. 409 (Council of Aachen, 816), p. 517 (Council of Paris, 825), pp. 620, 644, 653, 662, 664, 666 (Council of Paris, 829), pp. 759, 762 (Council of Aachen, 836). He is referred to as ‘nostri didascalus aevi’ in an anonymous poem, *Poetae Latini Medii Aevi Carolini*, II, ed. E. Dümmler, Monumenta Germaniae Historica (Berlin, 1884), p. 665 (Poem XIX, anonymous). Reference can also be made to Alcuin’s poem on York, where he is called ‘magister’ at lines 744, 1207, and 1305, and ‘doctor’ at line 1306: *Versus de patribus regibus et sanctis Euboricensis ecclesiae*, ed. P. Godman, *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York* (Oxford, 1982). The poem eulogises Bede, describes him as a priest of outstanding merits (line 1289), recognises his position in the library alongside the historical Fathers and classical writers, and celebrates him as someone who followed in the footsteps of the Fathers, the phrase ‘vestigia patrum’ (line 1313) being Bede’s own favoured metaphor.

²⁶ The contents of Paul the Deacon’s homiliary are discussed by C. L. Smetana, ‘Paul the Deacon’s Patristic Anthology’, in P. E. Szarmach and B. F. Huppé (eds.), *The Old English Homily and its Backgrounds* (Albany, 1978), pp. 75–97. Scholars differ slightly in their count of Bede items, variously giving 53, 56 and 57. This is because one Bedan item occurs twice, and there are variations in the form of identification used in the manuscripts and thus in the modern schedules of content.

per cent of the more than five hundred marginal citations, far more than Gregory, more than Ambrose, and more than Augustine.²⁷ We accede to the authority ascribed to Bede by the scholars of the early middle ages, and in the context of Ælfrician studies we follow them in accepting him, as Ælfric did, as an ultimate authority, grouped with the Fathers themselves. Yet there is no logical reason why, on the basis of modern perceptions of the derivative text, he should not be grouped with the Carolingian *compilatores*. Bede thus confronts us with one of the central problems of this area of source-study: what is an ultimate, and what an immediate source? And from that flows a further question of equal importance: on what grounds do we give priority to one text or one author over another, when intertextual relationships are so very close, and dependence rather than independence characterises the tradition? Bede is a salutary reminder that we look at evidence within terms of reference that may be artificially constructed: in his case the early medieval construction of him as member of the patristic textual community when, objectively, his intellectual and compositional approaches in the area of discourse that we are concerned with here are closer to those of the Carolingian *compilatores* than to the Fathers with whom he is bracketed.

Other pre-disposing constructions may lie in the terms of reference that are found—conscious or unconscious, declared or undeclared—in current scholarship. It is to this that I now want to turn.

In 1894, when Förster published his study of the sources of the *Catholic Homilies*, he surmised that Ælfric may have accessed at least some of his wide range of sources through collected works, such as homiliaries, rather than having an extensive library of discrete items, as the source-study superficially implied.²⁸ The breakthrough came in 1959, with Smetana's demonstration that much of the patristic material on which Ælfric drew was available to him in the homiliary of Paul the Deacon.²⁹ Two years later, in 1961, he published a further study, this time of Ælfric's use of the homiliary of Haymo;³⁰ and subsequently, in a series of articles

²⁷ This count is based on the marginal attributions in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Barlow 4 which, in the opinion of Bernhard Bischoff, is from the third quarter of the ninth century, written in northern France. It was most probably imported in the Benedictine Reform. I am grateful to Bodley's Librarian for permission to consult this manuscript, on which see further J. Hill, 'Ælfric and Smaragdus', pp. 234–5.

²⁸ M. Förster, 'Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae', *Anglia*, 16 (1894), 1–61, at 58–9, in agreement with a suggestion made ten years before by John Earle on p. 215 of *The Dawn of European Literature: Anglo-Saxon Literature* (London, 1884).

²⁹ Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary'.

³⁰ Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Homiliary of Haymo of Halberstadt'.

beginning in 1992, and in the Toller and Jarrow lectures, I have examined the ways in which Ælfric made use of the homiliary of Smaragdus.³¹ Förster found no evidence for Ælfric's use of Haymo, except for the two homilies where he is mentioned by name.³² The situation for Smaragdus was slightly different, but equally revealing. In some cases, when a patristic source was identified, Förster noted in passing that the material was also available in Smaragdus, but he did not probe further. As a result, priority was given to the patristic text (which might therefore have been the ultimate rather than the immediate source), and Smaragdus was admitted as a source for Ælfric only when his text yielded a detail that could not be found elsewhere.³³ This is the position taken also by Pope,³⁴ Cross³⁵ and Godden,³⁶ with the added complication that, if an apparently positive

³¹ Hill, 'Ælfric and Smaragdus'; 'Ælfric's sources reconsidered: some case studies from the *Catholic Homilies*', in M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler (eds.) *Studies in English Language and Literature. 'Doubt wisely': Papers in honour of E. G. Stanley* (London, 1996), pp. 362–86; 'Ælfric's Homily on the Holy Innocents: the Sources Reviewed', in J. Roberts and J. L. Nelson (eds.), with M. Godden *Alfred the Wise: Studies in honour of Janet Bately on the occasion of her sixty-fifth birthday* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 89–98; 'Ælfric's Authorities', in E. Treharne and S. Rosser (eds.), *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg* (Tempe, 2002), pp. 51–65. Further examples of Ælfric creating new *catenae* by exploiting the convenience of material collected in his liturgically indexed source-homiliaries (in this case Paul the Deacon's) are given in J. Hill, 'Ælfric, Gregory and the Carolingians', in J. Hamesse (ed.), *Roma, Magistra Mundi: Itineraria Culturae Medievalis. Mélanges offerts au Père L. E. Boyle à l'occasion de son 75e anniversaire* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1998), pp. 409–23. For the Toller and Jarrow lectures, see above, nn. 13 and 24 respectively.

³² Förster, 'Über die Quellen', 45–6.

³³ *Ibid.*, 39–43.

³⁴ *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. J. C. Pope, 2 vols., Early English Text Society OS 259, 260 (London, 1967–8), especially the discussion of sources at pp. 150–77 and the comments on Smaragdus at p. 171.

³⁵ J. E. Cross, 'Ælfric—Mainly on Memory and Creative Method in Two *Catholic Homilies*', *Studia Neophilologica*, 41 (1969), 135–55, particularly at 139–40, where he argues for Ælfric's dependence on Bede for part of the First Series homily on the Holy Innocents (hom. V), while noting that the same material is also in Smaragdus; 'More Sources for Two of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*', *Anglia*, 86 (1968), 59–78, in relation to the Second Series homily on St Peter, *Item de Sancto Petro* (hom. XXIV; Thorpe XXVIII), particularly at pp. 64–5 on Ælfric's 'digression' on John III. 13; and in the same article, at pp. 67–77, on Ælfric's Ascension Day homily from the First Series (hom. XXI). Cross's rejection of possible immediate sources simply because they are copies, and his consequent automatic prioritisation of ultimate (i.e. patristic) sources whenever possible in his analyses of the Holy Innocents and Ascension Day homilies are discussed by me in 'Ælfric's Homily on the Holy Innocents', and on pp. 370–2 of 'Ælfric's sources reconsidered'. On the John III. 13 'digression' in the homily for the Feast of St Peter, see below, pp. 175–7.

³⁶ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, in various examples that will be discussed below. But see especially, p. lx, where Godden reveals a disposition to count Smaragdus only when he provides something different, and goes so far as to suppose that Ælfric did not really mean what he said in giving Smaragdus such prominence in the preface to the *Catholic Homilies*. In response to this, see my discussion in 'Ælfric's Authorities', especially pp. 56–9 and 64–5.

source-identification is in Paul the Deacon's homiliary, in its original or augmented form, there is no need to investigate further. There is clearly here a predisposition to give priority to the patristic text ('patristic' including Bede in this context); and there is a failure of historical imagination in not coming to terms with how the range of intermediate texts available to Ælfric might have given him access to this material in more than one form, and how, in practical terms, he might have drawn upon that range of options in creating his own *catenae*. Since 1959 there has, of course, been a recurrent acknowledgement of access through Paul the Deacon, but since this is an anthology of discrete items, that still leaves us in the modern comfort-zone of discussing what we are prepared to treat as authorial compositions in a relatively modern sense—in effect the ultimate authorities come to the fore. But since we are dealing with a complex intertextual tradition, this may not be adequate to identify what was actually happening. It is important to remember that, within this tradition, a writer such as Smaragdus—or even Bede—was not highly regarded for the elements of difference that he offered, however useful they might be, but for the extent to which he offered a version, a derivative version, of the tradition. Thus, in order to assess the nature of Ælfric's textual dialogue, we have to recognise that the derivative matters; the close similarity of textual material, and even the fact that texts may be identical at given points, have to become visible in our frame of reference and be carefully considered, if we are to uncover the full range of evidence for Ælfric's mode of composition and textual interactions.

There are, however, inherent invisibilities within the textual system, to which we need to be alert. For example, in his homily on Sexagesima Sunday, Smaragdus at one point gives a marginal attribution to Gregory, for a passage which is indeed from Gregory but in a form modified in precisely the way found in Bede's Commentary on Luke.³⁷ This cannot be coincidence, and we know, in any case, that Smaragdus, throughout his homiliary, made extensive use of Bede's Commentary. The only rational conclusion, therefore, is that Smaragdus took over from Bede the Gregorian attribution, along with the modified text.³⁸ Ælfric, in turn, in his Second Series homily for Sexagesima (hom. VI) can be shown to have used Smaragdus,³⁹ yet it is the ultimate source that remains visible in each

³⁷ Smaragdus's homily is at PL 102, cols. 109–12.

³⁸ Rädle, *Studien zu Smaragd*, p. 214, identifies Bede's Commentary as Smaragdus's immediate source.

³⁹ Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies: Second Series*, ed. Godden, pp. 52–9, analysed in relation to its immediate sources by Hill, 'Ælfric and Smaragdus', pp. 225–8.

successive transmission: Bede is invisible in Smaragdus's text, and Smaragdus and Bede are both invisible in Ælfric's, where the reference is again to Gregory. Ælfric's Second Series homily for the Third Sunday after Pentecost (hom. XXIII, Thorpe XXVI) provides a similar example.⁴⁰ Gregory is named as the source, and the homily in question, identified by Förster,⁴¹ was shown by Smetana to be available in Paul the Deacon's homiliary.⁴² However, Gregory's homily is also used for the same day by Smaragdus, who modifies it, mainly by abbreviation and omission, in ways that are also evident in Ælfric's text.⁴³ It would therefore seem likely that Ælfric's immediate source was Smaragdus, who retained the Gregorian attribution, which Ælfric naturally adopted. But even this does not take us to the heart of the case, because close textual analysis shows that Smaragdus did not work directly from Gregory but from Bede's Commentary on Luke, from where he took both the modifications and the patristic attribution.⁴⁴ To say, then, as Smetana does in both cases, that Ælfric's source is Gregory's homily in Paul the Deacon, or to quote Gregory throughout, with only an occasional passing reference to verbatim parallels in Smaragdus, as Godden does for the Sexagesima Sunday homily,⁴⁵ or to ignore Smaragdus altogether in the citations, as he does for the Third Sunday after Pentecost,⁴⁶ arbitrarily gives priority to one part of the intertextual network over another and effectively discounts evidence from which something might be learnt. The examples are a vivid demonstration of the range of options that might be in play and the complexity that needs to be unravelled, but it is only if we probe these options

⁴⁰ My comments relate only to the main body of the homily in Godden's edition, lines 1–125 (pp. 213–17), and not to the Stilling of the Storm and the Gadarene Swine, which form a confirmatory appendix in Godden's edition (lines, 126–98, pp. 217–20) and a separately numbered homily (hom. XXVII) in Thorpe's edition.

⁴¹ 'Über die Quellen', p. 5, § 49.

⁴² 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary', p. 198.

⁴³ Smaragdus, PL 102, cols. 355–8. On the relationship between Smaragdus's text and that of Ælfric, see Hill, 'Ælfric's sources reconsidered', pp. 372–7.

⁴⁴ Rädle, *Studien zu Smaragd*, p. 214.

⁴⁵ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 388–94. It is revealing that Godden accounts for his citations being from Bede because he is 'the prior text' and because 'Smaragdus has nothing of his own to add in this case' (p. 389). Godden ignores the evidence of textual modifications, pays no attention to the nature of the textual material with which Ælfric was working, the form in which it was presented and the prevailing cultural attitudes to authorised derivation, and does not consider the practicalities of how a *catena* might be created from a group of homiliaries containing similar material for any given day.

⁴⁶ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 549–55. For further discussion of this homily and Godden's prioritisation of the patristic source, see below, pp. 173–5.

and penetrate the complexity that we can see how Ælfric, as a creator of *catenae*, worked within an extended and multi-layered textual chain. A culture of *compilatio* is about bringing textual material together, and the instruments are previous intermediaries through whom the chains of authority are gradually assembled. Source-study, with its modern tendency to focus on ultimate sources (because they are the ‘real authors’) tends to pull the elements apart, so that we cannot grasp the cultural and practical conditions from which a text emerged. Of course, the ultimate source is the patristic writer, however transmitted, but source-study of this kind, that stops when a respectable ultimate source is identified, is the sort that Frantzen objected to: the collection of ‘facts’, which usefully increases the number of identifications, but which, in cultural terms, becomes repetitive in simply demonstrating, over and over again, which intellectual tradition, in a broad sense, the author in question was indebted to. By contrast, it is a searching engagement with immediate sources, however derivative they might be from a modern perspective and however much we might therefore be culturally conditioned to discount them, that takes us away from the *what* to the more interesting questions of the *how* and *why*.

However, in order to steer a way through the range of options that we need to confront, we require some guiding principles, the first and most fundamental being the principle of practical accessibility. A particularly neat example of the applicability of this principle is Ælfric’s homily on the healing of the king’s son (John IV. 46–53), which occurs in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Bodley 343. Susan Irvine, the homily’s editor,⁴⁷ notes that published source-study points to the use of Gregory for the first part of Ælfric’s text, but she draws attention also to relevant material in several expositions that might have been known to Ælfric: works by Hericus, Haymo, Pseudo-Bede, Alcuin and Smaragdus. They testify to the complexity of the intertextual tradition in standing in varying relationships one with the other, with Gregory being drawn on by Alcuin, and Alcuin then being copied by Pseudo-Bede, rewritten by Haymo and Hericus, and excerpted by Smaragdus. Paul the Deacon’s homiliary should also not be overlooked as a possible channel of transmission for Gregory or Hericus. However, as Irvine remarks:

⁴⁷ *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, ed. S. Irvine, Early English Text Society, OS 302 (Oxford, 1993), pp. 5–7. The homily (homily I. in Irvine’s edition) is on pp. 19–25.

all the Alcuin material used by Ælfric is also in Smaragdus, and since we know that Ælfric drew on Smaragdus elsewhere, he seems altogether the most likely source.⁴⁸

And she continues:

This solution, however, still leaves questions unanswered. Did Ælfric use Gregory for the first part of the commentary, then move to Smaragdus when Gregory abandoned a verse-by-verse treatment? Or did he use Smaragdus's exposition throughout as his main source? The simpler answer, that Ælfric drew on Smaragdus throughout, is preferred here, since Ælfric has nowhere used material from Gregory which is not included in that excerpted by Smaragdus.⁴⁹

Thus, the *words* that Ælfric worked from are those of Gregory and Alcuin (drawing in part on Gregory), but arguments based on accessibility—and also selectivity and juxtaposition—point to an intermediate transmitter, who would otherwise be invisible.⁵⁰

There are similar examples in Pope's edition of Ælfric's *Supplementary Homilies*, although here, instead of an active engagement with intermediate transmitters such as Irvine displays, the question of accessibility is set on one side in favour, for example, of an underlying supposition that Ælfric consulted Alcuin's *Commentaria in S. Ioannis Evangelium* directly when writing *Supplementary Homily VII* for the Fourth Sunday after Easter.⁵¹ Yet the whole of the relevant passage from Alcuin is also in Smaragdus, beginning and ending at the right point and conveniently associated with the correct day—as of course it is not in Alcuin's commentary.⁵² Thus, given that the other sources for this piece are homilies by Haymo and Bede, with Bede's being available through Paul the Deacon, and that all three Latin homilies are for the Fourth Sunday after Easter, we can see here that, whatever source-study might seem to indicate, the practical reality was that Ælfric was creating a *catena* from the three homiliaries he is known to have used, and that the material from which he made his selection was already identified for him in being for the same day in each of them. Other equally telling instances occur in *Supplementary*

⁴⁸ *Old English Homilies*, ed. Irvine, p. 7.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ The Smaragdus homily to which Irvine refers is PL 102, cols. 495–6. Smaragdus himself attributed this homily to Gregory.

⁵¹ *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. Pope, I, 337–9, for a discussion of the full range of sources for this homily.

⁵² Smaragdus's homily, rubricated for the Third Sunday after the Octave of Easter (the common alternative way of referring to the Fourth Sunday after Easter), is at PL 102, cols. 296–9. The argument for bringing Smaragdus into play, rather than Alcuin's *Commentaria* directly, is set out more fully in my article 'Ælfric's Authorities', pp. 59–60.

*Homilies X and XVII.*⁵³ In all of these, if we step back from analysing what Ælfric used as his source, and consider instead how Ælfric had access to the material, and thus how he was placed, from a practical point of view, in creating new *catenae*, we see that he was able to work with the homiliaries of Paul the Deacon, Haymo and Smaragdus, despite the seemingly diverse range of sources given by Pope.

The principle of accessibility is, of course, always a valid criterion and, as in the examples just cited, it can produce clear and convincing answers in favour of particular immediate sources, although it is instructive to note that we do not arrive at these answers by paying attention to what are, in effect, the ultimate sources. We need, rather, to focus on the points within the intertextual tradition where sources begin to come together, where the *compilatores* are already mapping the ground.

Another useful principle in negotiating a way through the density of the textual system is that of contiguity, which I illustrate through the First Series Homily for Midlent Sunday (hom. XII), the Feeding of the Five Thousand (John VI. 1–14).⁵⁴ Förster thought that Bede's homily on this lection was the sole source.⁵⁵ Smetana, however, while pointing out that the Bedan homily was readily accessible in Paul the Deacon, rubricated for the third Sunday in Lent, argued that Ælfric also made use of a homily by Augustine, which was likewise in Paul the Deacon, though occurring in a different place, for the Fifth Sunday before Christmas.⁵⁶ Godden accepts these identifications, though he points out that the Augustinian homily was in fact Augustine's Tractatus XXIV from his *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*.⁵⁷ This, Godden believes, was Ælfric's main source, used in conjunction with Bede's homily, which expands on Augustine, and Haymo's homily for the same day, which expands on Bede. In addition, Godden puts forward a case for Ælfric's use of Alcuin's *Commentaria in S. Ioannis Evangelium*, 'or perhaps the extract from it by Smaragdus'.⁵⁸ However, at the level of detailed verbal parallels, the situation is far less definite than Godden's citations imply. The Alcuinian detail (at ll. 102–6 of Ælfric's homily), which is not in Augustine, Bede or Haymo, could, as Godden notes, actually have been taken from Smaragdus

⁵³ Discussed in 'Ælfric's Authorities' pp. 61–2 and 62–4.

⁵⁴ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, ed. Clemoes, pp. 275–80.

⁵⁵ Förster, 'Über die Quellen', p. 19, § 72 (the modern numeration for Bede's homily is II, 2, but it is referred to by Förster as I, 21).

⁵⁶ Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary', p. 188.

⁵⁷ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 94–101, for a discussion of all the sources. The identification of Augustine's 24th Tractate is on p. 94.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 94–5.

as the immediate source⁵⁹— all the more readily, one might observe, since it is conveniently there in a homily for the day in question, whereas it is not liturgically ‘indexed’ in Alcuin’s *Commentaria*, which would have had to be consulted as a discrete item. For lines before and after this, however, Godden identifies Bede as the source, at Ælfric lines 84–91, and 106–11. The only other places where Bede is confidently identified and quoted as the source are for Ælfric lines 39–44 and 117–20. But all four of these so-called ‘Bedan’ passages, are also in Smaragdus, although Godden makes no reference to this.⁶⁰ Since the words are identical, Ælfric could have used either, but if that is so, it needs to be recognised as a range of possibly unresolvable options within the intertextual tradition. However, if the principle of contiguity is invoked, we might be inclined actually to give priority to Smaragdus rather than Bede, since Smaragdus is the most likely immediate source for the Alcuinian detail (following the principle of accessibility), and could perfectly well have been Ælfric’s source for material just before and just after (i.e. the so-called ‘Bedan’ passages at lines 84–91, and 106–11). The principle of contiguity is appropriate here because, if we think Ælfric looked at Smaragdus for one detail, why not for three almost consecutive details? Why should we imagine that he switches between two sources (in the order Bede/Paul the Deacon, Smaragdus, Bede/Paul the Deacon) when he had no need to, when the sequence of details was in one of these sources already, though not in the other? And if that is the case here, it is possible that the other so-called Bedan details were taken from Smaragdus likewise (i.e. lines 39–44 and 117–20).⁶¹ Bede is thus not a *necessary* source for this homily, but in modern scholarship he is given priority over a Carolingian intermediary who actually offers more than Bede. Why should this be so? We come closer to seeing how Ælfric might well have been working by paying attention to the principles of accessibility and contiguity together. Since all of this part of Smaragdus’s homily is in any case attributed to Bede by a marginal letter, there would have been no compelling reason to fall back on Bede in Paul the Deacon, since this offered nothing with a higher authority than was already signalled in Smaragdus.

In commenting earlier on the complexity of intertextual relations between Latin texts, I drew attention to a body of potential source-material

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 98–9, 99–100, 97 and 100 respectively. The Smaragdus homily is at PL 102 cols. 151–5.

⁶¹ All other references to Bede in Godden’s commentary are given as possible alternates to other sources, to whose wording, at the points cited, Ælfric seems to be closer.

for the Third Sunday after Pentecost, in which the dominant patristic authority was Gregory, available in Paul the Deacon, but also in Smaragdus (via Bede) in a somewhat abbreviated form, and I indicated that Ælfric (Second Series, hom. XXIII, lines 1–125; Thorpe XXVI) shows the same abbreviations as in Smaragdus, suggesting that this was therefore his immediate source.⁶² Within the Latin tradition, sequences of matching abbreviations or other modifications are taken as strong evidence for direct textual relationships in determining a Carolingian *compilator*'s immediate source, as opposed to the ultimate source that might be acknowledged in some way in the manuscript. This is how Rädle, in the network of texts for this Sunday, is able to determine that Smaragdus's immediate source was Bede, rather than Gregory directly, despite Gregory's initial being in the margin of the Smaragdus homily, where, in modern terms, it thus has to be interpreted as signalling the ultimate source. I see no reason why Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* should not be probed in the same way, and in commenting on the homily for the Third Sunday after Pentecost, I was anticipating another of the principles that might usefully be applied to the assessment of the evidence: the principle of abridgement. Since I have already published an analysis of how the abridgements match throughout Ælfric's homily, in comparison with Smaragdus's shortened version of Gregory's homily on the one hand, and the full version in Paul the Deacon's homiliary on the other, there is no need to repeat the evidence here. It is worth noting, however, that Ælfric made a particular point about treating this exposition in an abbreviated form,⁶³ and that, even if he had also had an eye on the much longer version in Paul the Deacon, with its identification of Gregory, the naming of Gregory as the authority in the Old English version could have been taken directly from Smaragdus, where the manuscript tradition has this attribution correctly, in contrast with the misleading detail in *Patrologia Latina*, where Migne prints an attribution to Jerome.⁶⁴ Yet Godden, recognising the primacy of the Gregorian source, comments that 'The homily by Smaragdus (*Collectiones*, PL 102, 355–8) is primarily a condensation of Gregory's, however, and seems to have contributed nothing'.⁶⁵ This is a classic exam-

⁶² See above, p. 169, where the references are given to Rädle's analysis of Smaragdus's sources, and my study of this homily in 'Ælfric's sources reconsidered'.

⁶³ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Godden, p. 217, line 123, on which I comment in 'Ælfric's sources reconsidered' p. 377.

⁶⁴ Compare the attribution in PL 102, col. 355, with Souter, 'Contributions to the Criticism of Smaragdus's *Expositio*', p. 593.

⁶⁵ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 549.

ple of how the dominant models of interpretation limit our assessment of the evidence, and hold us back from engaging with Ælfric's actual process of creating new *catenae*. The principle of accessibility indicates that there is always the possibility that Ælfric made use of any or all of his three major homiliaries, and in this case they all had something potentially to offer. Haymo provides some details, in a characteristic way, and we have no difficulty in accepting that because we can proceed as if Haymo's material is his own.⁶⁶ Similarly, if we turn to Paul the Deacon, having acknowledged this homiliary's role as the medium of transmission, we can proceed to deal directly with a whole homily by Gregory. With Smaragdus, however, even within this recognisably derivative tradition, we reject him because he copies Gregory and so 'contributes nothing'. One has to ask whether that would have mattered to Ælfric. Did it matter to Louis the Pious that his commissioned commentary on Genesis by Claudius of Turin paraded its textual dependencies by marginal abbreviations? Did it matter to the Carolingians, or to Ælfric, that Bede did likewise in some of his works, and never made a secret of walking in the footsteps of the Fathers? Or were they, as my earlier discussion suggests, impressed by the demonstrable intertextuality, the avowedly derivative nature of the texts?⁶⁷ At the very least, if we are concerned with the processes of composition, we cannot ignore, on the basis of somewhat arbitrarily applied modern standards of originality, one of Ælfric's demonstrably available sources, nor should we ignore the evidence available from the textual abridgements that Ælfric's homily stands in closer relationship to Smaragdus's version than to Gregory's original, however much our predispositions might lead us to give priority to the ultimate source made available through Paul the Deacon. The outcome, in source-study terms, might be less clear-cut than it is within the traditional scholarly construct, but in order to understand how Ælfric interacts with an intertextual tradition which was made all the more dense by the Carolingians, we have to engage with the coming together of textual material within that tradition—the selections, modifications and juxtapositions—and that in turn means engaging with the full range of options he had before him.

The Second Series Homily for the Feast of St Peter (hom. XXIV; Thorpe XXVIII) provides a further example.⁶⁸ The sources for this homily are complex, but among them Godden proposes Bede's Homily

⁶⁶ For these, see *ibid.*, pp. 549–54.

⁶⁷ See above, pp. 157–66.

⁶⁸ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series*, ed. Godden, pp. 223–9, lines 53–253; Thorpe pp. 384–94: *Item de Sancto Petro* only.

II. 18.⁶⁹ However, it was written, not for this day (29 June), but for the Sunday after Pentecost. When included in Paul the Deacon's homiliary, it was assigned to a different day altogether: *In pascha annotina*, falling in this case between the Octave of Easter and the Major Litany (25 April), and was only reassigned to the Sunday after Pentecost in later recensions.⁷⁰ Godden observes in a footnote that 'All that Ælfric used from Bede is in fact excerpted by Smaragdus in his sermon (*Collectiones*, PL 102, 341–2), but there is nothing specific to point to Smaragdus rather than Bede'.⁷¹ Smaragdus is thereafter ignored. It is, of course, not necessary for there to be anything specific to make Smaragdus a source to stand alongside Bede on equal terms, if the material in both is the same. In this case, however, there are distinguishing features which help us find a way through the apparent similarity. In the first place, as a reminder of the complex intertextual relationships that are in play, it is worth noting that Bede's homily is largely drawn from Augustine's *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*,⁷² and that Smaragdus does not in fact draw from Bede directly, but from Alcuin's *Commentaria in S. Ioannis Evangelium*.⁷³ This alerts us to the possibility that Smaragdus's text might show some modifications that appear to be direct modifications to Bede, if it is Smaragdus and Bede that are compared, but which in fact derive from Alcuin. If, then, we apply the principle of abridgement, we see that the points at which Ælfric's text skips lines in Bede (if that is the reference

⁶⁹ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 555–64, for the full discussion, with Bede being identified as the source for Ælfric's discussion of John III. 13 in lines 98–130 (Godden, pp. 556–7, and p. 561).

⁷⁰ It is for the Sunday after Pentecost (*Octava Pentecostes*) in *Beda's Venerabilis Opera: Pars III Opera Homiletica*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 122 (Turnhout, 1955), pp. 311–17, and both Godden in his *Commentary*, p. 557, and J. E. Cross, 'More Sources for Two of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*', p. 65, seem to assume that it could have been found in that liturgical position in Paul the Deacon's homiliary. However, they are both referring to a later recension as represented in *Patrologia Latina* 95. Cross notes that it might not have been in the original version of Paul the Deacon, although this is belied by Smetana, 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary' who, in summarising Wiegand's study of Paul the Deacon's original, lists it for *In pascha annotina* on p. 173 (item 16 in the *Pars Aestiva*). Smetana's representation of the contents of the original Paul the Deacon homiliary is borne out in this case by R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: analyse des manuscrits* (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 450, 456 (item 16, as in Smetana's list).

⁷¹ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 557, note 4. The full reference for Smaragdus's homily is PL 102, cols. 339–43.

⁷² *Beda's Venerabilis Opera: Pars III Opera Homiletica*, ed. Hurst, pp. 311–17, source-notes from line 25.

⁷³ Radle, *Studien zu Smaragd*, p. 217. Alcuin's work is, of course, heavily dependent on Augustine's *Tractatus*, which further complicates the picture.

text one uses) are lines that are skipped in *Smaragdus* also. For example, for a piece of continuous Ælfrician text, at lines 100–6, Godden quotes a discontinuous piece of Bede, lines 119–21 and 125–8, followed by use of Bede lines 128–31 for Ælfric lines 109–13, with a subsequent skip to Bede line 139, at which point selective use only is made of Bede lines 139–53, corresponding to Ælfric lines 116–25. Yet all of these apparently Ælfrician abridgements are also in *Smaragdus*, which—unless one has a penchant for coincidence—seems to indicate that Ælfric actually had his eye on his copy of *Smaragdus*.⁷⁴ The principle of accessibility might also be worth considering here, because the Ælfrician passage under discussion (lines 98–130) is a kind of side-issue, though an important one, which takes him away from the exposition of the specified lection into a discussion of John III. 13, ‘Nan man ne astihð to heofonum. buton se ðe of heofenum astah. Mannes bearn se ðe is on heofenum,’ ‘And no man ascendeth up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.’ Godden assumes that Ælfric would have been able to access Bede’s homily readily enough because John III. 13 forms part of the pericope for the Sunday after Pentecost; the implication is that, knowing the text was used on that particular day, it would not have taken much for Ælfric to find the homily in Paul the Deacon by turning to the homiliary’s material for that Sunday. However, as noted above, although Bede’s homily was originally written for the Sunday after Pentecost, this was not where it first occurred in Paul the Deacon, so finding it in that collection would have been a problem, unless Ælfric’s copy was one in which it was already reassigned. By contrast, there would have been no problem in finding the relevant homily in his *Smaragdus* manuscript, where it was always in its correct liturgical position as defined by the lection: the Sunday after Pentecost. Thus the principle of accessibility, which may be applicable here, together with the principle of abridgement, tip the scales in favour of supposing that Ælfric actually consulted *Smaragdus* as the immediate source, notwithstanding the priority given to Bede on the grounds that there is ‘nothing specific to point to *Smaragdus* rather than Bede’. Even if one put the evidence of abridgement and accessibility on one side, and considered only the evidence of the identical words, it would be just as accurate to reverse the statement and say that ‘there is nothing specific to point to Bede rather than *Smaragdus*’. But this formulation is never found in the modern analytical construct.

⁷⁴ *Smaragdus*’s homily is at PL 102, cols. 341–2.

The final principle that I propose as a criterion for judging between similar options is that of the indicative detail. There are examples in homilies that I have already discussed in print, some of these being etymologies which are often interpreted as additions from another source, supplementing the supposedly main source identified, when in fact they are clues to the use of an intermediate source where the juxtaposition already occurs.⁷⁵ I will not review these examples here, but will illustrate the principle by examining another instance: homily XXXVIII from the First Series, the homily for the Feast of St Andrew.⁷⁶ For this occasion, Ælfric offers material on the gospel (Matthew IV. 18–22, the calling of Simon Peter, Andrew, James and John), followed by the passion of the saint. My concern here is with detail in the first part, the exposition of the calling of the disciples. Smetana reported Davis's identification of the source as a homily by Gregory, which he noted was in Paul the Deacon's homiliary for the Feast of St Andrew, where it is the only item

⁷⁵ The inclusion of the etymology of Nain (Vulgate: Naim) in the First Series Homily on the Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost (hom. XXXIII), 'Ælfric and Smaragdus', pp. 211–14; the etymology of Decapolis in *Supplementary Homily XVII*, for the Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost (rubricated as the Twelfth Sunday after the Octave), 'Ælfric's Authorities', pp. 62–4; and detail of a different kind, the inclusion of a biblical reference and comment, not in the main source, in the First Series homily for the Second Sunday in Advent (hom. XL), 'Ælfric and Smaragdus', pp. 215–16. On etymologies, see Joyce Hill, 'Ælfric's use of etymologies', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17 (1988), 35–44. In relation to Nain, an indicative detail pointing to Smaragdus and ultimately to Bede, who is the authority acknowledged by Ælfric, Godden notes (as I do also) that the etymology is in Hericus, which he prefers, though without considering other evidence, including that of the manuscript traditions; and he further rejects Smaragdus on the grounds that his text has nothing further to offer that is distinctive, an argument which, as we see throughout this paper, is a false one in the context of an intertextual tradition. He also discounts my rejection of Hericus on the grounds that I am incorrect in claiming that the etymology in Hericus is attributed to Jerome and that I therefore cannot use this as a reason for rejecting him. This is simply perverse. In discussing Nain, I noted Rädle's observation that the etymological detail originates with Jerome and that the etymology occurred in Hericus, but I did not state that there was this attribution (or indeed any attribution) in Hericus, so that it was clearly not part of my argument for deciding against him as a source at this point. See Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 276, note 3, where there is also a misrepresentation of my argument in respect of the later part of Ælfric's homily which, despite the inference that might be drawn from Godden's note, does not have a bearing on source-analysis for the earlier part. In relation to the biblical reference and comment in First Series hom. XL, Godden quotes what is in modern terms the ultimate source, from Gregory's *Moralia*, though he notes that the material also occurs in Bede's Commentary on Luke and Smaragdus without discussing what might be most readily accessible as an immediate source, or what we might learn from considering how material is juxtaposed in the sources on which we know Ælfric drew: see Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 343.

⁷⁶ *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The First Series*, ed. Clemoes, pp. 507–19, with the gospel exegesis being lines 1–168, and the *passio* being lines 169–351.

provided.⁷⁷ Godden accepts this identification and demonstrates Ælfric's high level of dependence,⁷⁸ but he notes that Ælfric's exegesis of the gospel concludes with a discussion of the names of the four disciples. For this one has to look beyond Gregory, and Godden turns to Hericus and Haymo.⁷⁹ Yet we see from his discussion that both are problematic as direct sources: Hericus takes 'agnoscens' as the meaning for Peter, but interprets it as signifying 'acknowledging sins', whereas Ælfric interprets it to mean 'acknowledging Christ'. In this interpretative detail, Ælfric agrees with Haymo. On the other hand, Haymo does not discuss all of the names, since he omits Simon. Ælfric's interpretations are: Simon 'gehyrsum', 'obedient'; Peter 'oncnawende', 'acknowledging', which is carefully explained in the next sentence as meaning acknowledging Christ with true belief, because he said 'þu eart crist þæs lyfigendan godes sunu', 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God' (Matthew XVI: 16); Andrew 'ðegenlic', 'bold'; James 'forscrencend', which Thorpe translates as 'withered',⁸⁰ but which is correctly 'supplanter'; and John as 'Godes gifu', 'God's grace'. Ælfric could have acquired this range of meanings by combining various sources, although if he had drawn upon Haymo, he would have had to turn not to Haymo's collection of *temporale* homilies (which is the Haymo material he generally uses, and to which he was liturgically keyed in his homily XXXVIII), but to Haymo's collection of homilies on the saints,⁸¹ for which there is little convincing evidence of use. However, since there is a deficiency of detail in both Haymo and Hericus (not to mention the shift of source-text required in the case of Haymo), a simpler solution might seem more compelling, and that is to be found in Smaragdus's homily for St Andrew, which is not only liturgically aligned with Ælfric's own, in being within the *temporale* sequence, but also provides the meaning of all the names, including Simon, and in all cases with the significance that Ælfric gives them.⁸² When Susan Irvine analysed the apparent

⁷⁷ 'Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary', p. 195, and see also C. R. Davis, 'Two New Sources for Ælfric's Catholic Homilies', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 41 (1942), 510–13.

⁷⁸ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 318–24, the part dealing with the Gospel exposition; discussion of the remainder of the homily, which is the *passio*, continues to p. 329.

⁷⁹ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 323–4, with reference to Ælfric lines 153–68.

⁸⁰ *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Thorpe, p. 587.

⁸¹ Haymo's St Andrew Homily is the first homily in his *Homiliae de Sanctis*, PL 118, cols. 747–55.

⁸² PL 102, cols. 510–12, with the names being discussed at the end.

range of discrete sources for one of Ælfric's homilies in Bodley 343, she finally decided on Smaragdus as the immediate source because this was the simpler solution: it was the one place where the particular selection of material came together.⁸³ On the level of the indicative detail, this example from the homily on St Andrew is a parallel case. Indicative details also suggest that Smaragdus may be the immediate source for Ælfric's opening remarks, which are likewise not drawn from Gregory. Godden points to possible inspiration from Haymo, again from the Andrew homily in his *sanctorale* collection.⁸⁴ But the opening of Smaragdus's *temporale* homily for St Andrew is another possibility for this and has the added advantage that it draws attention to the choice of fishermen before men of greater social standing and education. Godden notes that the sentiment is found in Jerome's Commentary on Matthew, and in Bede's Commentary on Mark, as well as being reflected also in Hericus and Haymo. But we do not have to imagine that Ælfric consulted Jerome or Bede directly, when there was already enough in the homilies; and if we accept that Smaragdus is the simple solution to the revealing detail at the end of the gospel part of the homily, we might also accept that he is a possible source for the opening part. At least, Smaragdus should be admitted to the range of options, since he has as much claim as the others.

From the beginning of his career, when he produced the *Catholic Homilies*, Ælfric saw himself as standing within a chain of authority reaching back through the Carolingians to the Church Fathers, and although he was never again to articulate it in quite the way that he did in the Letter to Sigeric, he worked consistently within an intertextual tradition in transmitting authoritative and orthodox material both in Latin and Old English. The *Lives of Saints* draw on a Frankish legendary, itself a *compilatio*;⁸⁵ the Grammar uses the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, another *compilatio*, classical in its roots but probably Carolingian;⁸⁶ the *Pastoral*

⁸³ See above pp. 170–1.

⁸⁴ Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, pp. 320–1.

⁸⁵ P. H. Zettel, 'Ælfric's Hagiographic Sources and the Latin Legendary preserved in BL MS Cotton Nero E.i. + CCC MS 9 and other Manuscripts', D.Phil. thesis (Oxford, 1979); and 'Saints' Lives in Old English: Latin Manuscripts and Vernacular Accounts: Ælfric', *Peritia*, 1 (1982), 17–37; P. Jackson and M. Lapidge, 'The Contents of the Cotton-Corpus Legendary', in P. E. Szarmach (ed.), *Holy Men and Holy Women: Old English Prose Saints' Lives and their Contexts* (Albany, 1996), pp. 131–46.

⁸⁶ Vivien Law, 'Anglo-Saxon England: Ælfric's *Excerptiones de arte grammatica anglice*', *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 9 (1987), 47–71, reprinted in Vivien Law, *Grammar and Grammarians in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1997), pp. 200–23; *Excerptiones de Prisciano: The Source for Ælfric's Latin-Old English Grammar*, ed. D. W. Porter (Cambridge, 2002).

Letters draw upon a range of Carolingian regulatory material;⁸⁷ the *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham* is heavily dependent on Amalarius of Metz, as well as upon the *Regularis Concordia*, itself heavily indebted to Continental reform models;⁸⁸ the *Interrogationes Sigewulfi in Genesin* draw on Alcuin,⁸⁹ and so on. In some of these, though by no means all, Ælfric's relationship to his source-text is more straightforward than in the *Catholic Homilies*, where the *catena* is internal to individual homilies, and where the potential sources formed a particularly dense tradition, which requires vigilance to unravel. It requires of us also the imagination to understand what the tradition meant for them: in our terms, a commitment to derivation rather than originality, which we find difficult to deal with; but in their terms, a commitment to a chain of authority to which they were proud to belong. Martin Irvine has reminded us that a central presupposition of medieval textual culture was that no book was ever understood as a discrete instance of discourse, because it belonged to an intertextual system.⁹⁰ In inviting a more engaged appreciation of what that meant for Ælfric, I have needed both to look more closely at how he was working and to challenge some of the assumptions and conclusions found in modern scholarship. It is a form of deconstruction, but I hope that it will be seen—to use Frank Lentricchia's words—as 'a dismantling that enables a more intimate kind of knowing'.⁹¹

⁸⁷ Some indication of sources is given in *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, ed. B. Fehr, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa IX (Hamburg, 1914), reissued with a supplementary introduction by P. Clemoes (Darmstadt, 1966), but there are further references in the editions of the Letter for WulfSIGe, the private letter from Ælfric to Wulfstan, and the First Old English Letter to Wulfstan in D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke (eds.), *Councils and Synods with other documents relating to the English Church, I: A.D. 871–1204* (Oxford, 1981), *Part I: 871–1066*, pp. 191–226, 242–55 and 255–302 respectively.

⁸⁸ *Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, ed. C. A. Jones, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 24 (Cambridge, 1998).

⁸⁹ Apart from MacLean's edition of this text, there is practically nothing else in print: G. MacLean, 'Ælfric's Version of Alcuini Interrogationes Sigewulfi in Genesin', *Anglia*, 6 (1883), 425–73 (discussion); *Anglia*, 7 (1884), 1–59 (text).

⁹⁰ Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture*, p. 338.

⁹¹ F. Lentricchia, *After the New Criticism* (Chicago, 1980), p. 209.