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This dissertation examines the ways in which the Apostle Paul is presented in literature from Anglo-Saxon England, including both Latin and Old English texts. The first part of the study focuses on uses of canonical Pauline sources, while the second concentrates on apocryphal sources.

The introductory chapter summarizes the various forms of commemoration of Paul in Anglo-Saxon religious praxis, including church dedications, hymns, and prayers. The chapter concludes with a brief examination of early Anglo-Latin authors who used Paul’s letters in their writings.

Chapter 2 looks at the Bonifatian Correspondence, which reveals that Boniface viewed himself as a missionary in the Pauline tradition. Like Paul, he and his correspondents found solace by writing letters to one another, often reflecting their affinity for Paul by including quotations from the Pauline epistles.

Chapter 3 examines the Alfredian translation of Augustine’s Soliloquies, providing evidence to support the finding that the hitherto unsourced building metaphor in the preface was inspired by Paul’s comparison of himself to a wise architect in 1 Corinthians 3.9-14.
Chapter 4 looks into the works of Ælfric of Eynsham, discovering that his homilies demonstrate a view of himself as a teacher in the tradition of Paul.

In chapter 5 the study turns to the second part of the dissertation, looking at apocryphal works about Paul, beginning with the Passio Petri et Pauli. Paul’s passio was extant in a variety of texts in Anglo-Saxon England, and the chapter focuses on comparing the different versions and the source relationships amongst them.

Chapter 6 studies the texts of the Visio Sancti Pauli in Anglo-Saxon England, reviewing its wide influence, and examining Blickling Homilies IV and XVI, both of which include passages from the Visio.

Chapter 7 begins by discussing the non-canonical Epistle to the Laodiceans and then turns to the issue of the definition of an apocryphal text in Anglo-Saxon England, and what implications such a label conferred on a text.

The dissertation concludes by observing the many different ways in which the Apostle Paul functioned as a figure to be imitated by Anglo-Saxon writers, and the reasons for his popularity.
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Chapter 1. Introduction: Forms of Veneration of the Apostle Paul

in Anglo-Saxon England

The Apostle Paul has always been an important figure for Christians, seemingly from Christianity’s earliest days in the first century CE. The preservation and imitation of his epistles, as well as their inclusion in the New Testament canon, show that he quickly became a central figure in the movement. Following Paul’s canonical letters, apocryphal writings emerged relating his life and death, which further contributed to the popularity and mystique of the figure of the Apostle Paul in subsequent centuries. In Anglo-Saxon England, as in other medieval cultures, the Apostle Paul and his writings, as well as apocryphal sources about him, formed an important source of Christian doctrine and Paul as a Christian figure functioned as an inspiration in many ways. This study examines some of the various references in Anglo-Saxon literature (both Latin and Old English) to Paul himself, his letters, and apocryphal sources concerning him, seeking to understand in what ways the Apostle Paul figured in the mind and imagination of Anglo-Saxon writers, how he and his works may have influenced Anglo-Saxon writing and thinking, and how Anglo-Saxon writers may in turn have influenced

---

(or intended to influence) the understanding of those reading or hearing their works about Paul.

There is a surprisingly small amount of secondary work available on the figure of Paul and his writings in Anglo-Saxon England, and works of a general nature on the subject are nonexistent. Two volumes address the study of the Bible in the medieval period in a general way, the first by Beryl Smalley, and the second a collection of essays focussing on the Bible in the Carolingian era; however they do not address the study of Pauline works directly. In addition there are two books pertaining more specifically to Anglo-Saxon England and biblical study, the first a general study by Minnie Cate Morrell and the second, enumerating biblical quotations in Old English texts, written by Albert S. Cook. Morrell’s work describes manuscripts, editions and glosses of the Old Testament, the Psalms and the Gospels in some detail but includes nothing on the Pauline letters, since they were not translated into Old English, except incidentally when individual verses or verse fragments were quoted within another text. For these fragmentary translations, Cook’s *Biblical Quotations* is a good resource, for it gathers all of the Old English translations of biblical quotations organized by Old English author. It is, however, quite out of date and cannot therefore be relied on as either definitive or complete. A much more contemporary source for investigating the use of biblical quotations by Old English writers is the on-line database *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici,* which lists the known sources, both biblical and otherwise, for the Old English texts which it

---

3 Celia Chazelle and Burton Van Name Edwards, *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era,* Medieval Church Studies 3 (Turnhout, 2003).
includes. While useful, it is not complete, for all extant Old English works have not yet been sourced and entered in the database. Beyond these sources, a few studies do discuss the use of works by or about Paul in Anglo-Saxon literature but typically deal only with isolated references or topics or examine them only incidentally. As a consequence, this study will consist largely in an examination of the role Paul and his epistles played in the writings of various Anglo-Saxon authors, focusing in particular on Aldhelm (d. 709 or 710), Bede (c. 673–735), Boniface (c. 675–755), King Alfred (ruled 871–899), and Ælfric (c. 950–c. 1010) in Part A, and on the apocryphal texts the Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli and the Visio Sancti Pauli in Part B, addressing secondary sources as they become relevant. Before turning to literary sources, however, in order to have an accurate picture of the Apostle Paul’s role in Anglo-Saxon religious praxis, the project will first turn by way of introduction to textual and architectural evidence of the veneration of Paul in Anglo-Saxon England.

Anglo-Saxon Dedications of Religious Houses, Prayers, and Hymns in Honour of Paul

Although the Apostle Paul did not excite the same kind of popular devotion as the Virgin Mary, who was by far the more beloved subject of veneration and to whom dedications of churches, cathedrals, monasteries and nunneries were common even in the earliest phase of

---

Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England (with dedications to her increasing to 235 monastic churches in England and Wales by the year 1216), Paul played an integral part in the religious life of Anglo-Saxons and, often in conjunction with Peter, was a commonly chosen figure for the patronage of religious houses. The following table, presented by Nicholas Orme, shows the relative popularity of various saints for church dedications between 597 and 800:

**English Church Dedications, 597–800**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saint</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and Paul</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John the Baptist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alban</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuthbert and Oswald</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Four Crowned Martyrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, Peter and Mary were by far the most frequently chosen patrons. Binns attributes Peter’s prominence to the practice of pilgrimages to Rome in the early days of Christianity in England, and it may be further surmised that early Anglo-Saxon Christians wished to demonstrate and cement their connection with Roman Christianity by establishing churches in the names of early Christian figures. The choice of a particular patron saint or saints at times

---

11 Binns, *Dedications of Monastic Houses*, pp. 20–1.
also represented the origin of the institution’s founder, as was the case with the monastery of Peter and Paul at Canterbury, whose founder, Augustine, came from Rome. Paul’s association with Peter, sharing June 29 as the day commemorating their *passio* (since it was widely believed in medieval times that they had been martyred on the same day and year), led to several additional dedications of religious houses in their joint names, for example at Malmesbury, Winchester, Glastonbury, Lindsey, Minster in Thanet, Athelney, Medesramsted, and nunneries at Gloucester and Chester. Paul also received dedications in his name alone, for example at the church and monastery at Jarrow, the Cathedral at London, as well as a portico at Rochester and an altar in the Cathedral of St. Peter in York.

St. Paul’s Cathedral in London was founded in 604, soon after St. Augustine’s mission arrived in England in 597. Bede records in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, “Ubi vero et haec provincia verbum veritatis praedicante Mellito accepit, fecit rex Aedilberct in civitate Lundonia ecclesiam sancti Pauli apostoli, in qua locum sedis episcopalis” (‘When this province [of the East Saxons] had received the word of truth through the preaching of [bishop] Mellitus, King Ethelbert built the church of the holy apostle Paul in the city of London, in which place was the episcopal seat’).

---

12 Orme, *English Church Dedications*, p. 4; André Crépin, Michael Lapidge, Pierre Monat, and Philippe Robin, eds., *Bède le Vénérable: Histoire Eclésiastique du Peuple Anglais*. Tome I, Sources chrétiennes 490 (Paris, 2005), 1.33, p. 260; I have chosen to use this edition of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* as it is the most recent.

13 For further discussion of this point, see chapter 5 on the passion of Peter and Paul, beginning on p. 110.


maintenance of the bishop’s entourage.\textsuperscript{18} Worship at St. Paul’s Cathedral in London did not continue smoothly in the early Anglo-Saxon period, however, for upon the death of Sæberht (king of the East Saxons from 604–616),\textsuperscript{19} his sons did not embrace Christianity, as Bede’s account concerning their encounter with Mellitus in St. Paul’s Cathedral relates:\textsuperscript{20}

(Cumque viderent pontificem, celebratis in ecclesia missarum sollemniis, eucharistiam populo dare, dicebant, ut vulgo furtur, ad eum barbara inflati stultitia: ‘Quare non et nobis porrigis panem nitidum, quem et patri nostro Saba,’ sic namque eum appellare consuerant, “dabas, et populo adhuc dare in ecclesia non desistis?”)

Quibus ille respondebat: “Si vultis ablui fonte illo salutari, quo pater vester ablutos est, potestis etiam panis sancti, cui ille participabat, esse participes; sin autem lavacrum vitae contemnit, nullatenus valetis panem vitae percipere.” At illi: “Nolumus,” inquiunt, “fontem illum intrare, quia nec opus illo nos habere novimus, sed tamen pane illo refici volumus.” Cumque diligenter ac saepe ab illo essent admoniti nequaquam ita fieri posse, ub absque purgatione sacrosanctae quis oblationi sacrosanctae communicares, ad ultimum furore commoti aiebant: “Si non vis adsentire nobis in tam facili causa, quam petimus, non poteris iam in nostra provincia demorari.” Et expulerunt eum, ac de suo regno cum suis abire iussurunt.

(And when they saw the bishop, while mass was being celebrated in the church, give the eucharist to the people, they, inflated with barbarous foolishness, so it is generally reported, said to him, ”Why do you not give us also that bright bread, which you used to give to our father Saba (for so they were accustomed to call him), and which you have not yet stopped giving to the people in the church?” He answered them, ”If you want to be washed in that salvific font, in which your father was washed, you may also share the holy bread which he shared; but if you despise the bath of life, you cannot receive the bread of life.” They replied, ”We do not want to enter that font, because we do not know that we have any need of it, but still we want to eat that bread.” And after they had often and earnestly been admonished by him, that they could not act thus, that no one could take communion in the sacred oblation without the sacred cleansing, at last, moved by anger, they said, ”If you do not want to comply with us in so simple a matter as that which we ask, you cannot now stay in our province.” And they expelled him and ordered him to depart from their kingdom with his followers.)


\textsuperscript{20} Crépin, Bède le Vénérable: Histoire Ecclesiastique, 2.5, pp. 314–6.
Pamela Taylor calls this “our earliest vignette of an actual service,” in St. Paul’s and cites it as evidence of the presence of a font and perhaps a baptistery in the new cathedral.\textsuperscript{21} Despite this setback in worship at St. Paul’s, land disputes, and many other difficulties, including Viking invasions in 842, 851, and 871,\textsuperscript{22} the cathedral survived the Anglo-Saxon period in name at least, and the fourth cathedral to bear Paul’s name now stands on the original site.\textsuperscript{23}

At Jarrow, Benedict Biscop founded St. Paul’s church and monastery in 681, as the second part of a twin monastery, the first part of which, St. Peter’s at Wearmouth, had been founded in 674. Both monasteries were built on land granted to Biscop for the purpose of their establishment by King Ecgfrith of Northumbria.\textsuperscript{24} The Venerable Bede was among the first residents of the monastery, having been placed there under the care of Benedict Biscop and then of Ceolfrid at the age of seven.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[22] Ibid. pp. 7–16.
\end{footnotes}
The church at Jarrow was dedicated to Paul on April 23, 685, as the dedication stone, still in the church, attests:26

DEDICATO BASILICAЕ
S(AN)C(T) PAVLI VIII
K(A)L(ENDIS) MAI
ANNO XV ECFRIDІ REG(IS)

CEOLFRIDI ABB(ATІS)
EIVSDEM Q(UO)
Q(UE) ECCLES(ІAE) D(E)O
AVCTORE
CONDITORIS ANNO ІІІ

(The dedication of the church

of Saint Paul on the ninth day before the kalends of May in the fifteenth year of King Ecgfrith the fourth year of Ceolfrith the abbot and founder by the authority of God of the same church.)

As depicted by the line running through the middle of the dedication, the stone is in two parts, one relating it to King Ecgfrith’s reign and the other concerning Ceolfrith’s abbacy. Bertram Colgrave and T. Romans hypothesize that each part originally stood on either side of a central monument in the original basilica (they were moved to their present place above the archway leading into the tower and chancel in 1782). The chancel, which originally formed an independent chapel, is the only part of the current structure which dates from the seventh century, although concerning it Taylor conjectures, “the church which was consecrated on April 23, 685 was almost certainly the tall aisled nave that was demolished in the eighteenth century. The present surviving chancel represents a separate church of much the same early date, and we believe that the lower part of the tower represents a porch which was built in quite early Anglo-Saxon times.” The church and monastery were sacked by the Vikings in 794, but rebuilt and refounded in 1074.

29 Colgrave and Romans, Guide to St. Paul’s Church, Jarrow, pp. 31–2.
30 Hickmore, St. Paul’s Church Jarrow, pp. 3–4.
As well as having religious houses named in his honour, textual evidence shows the Apostle Paul's name as part of the regular liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon church. The *Natales* of Peter and Paul are included as feasts in all the liturgical calendars, which specify that their masses are to be celebrated for the Vigil and the Octave.\(^1\) The main feast days associated with the Apostle Paul were the *Conversio Pauli* (January 25\(^{th}\); Paul is the only saint to have his conversion celebrated, presumably since he is famed for his dramatic change of faith), the *Passio Petri et Pauli* (June 29), the *Natalis Pauli* (June 30), and the *Octavas Petri et Pauli* (July 6).\(^2\) For the *Natalis Sancti Pauli Apostoli*, the tenth century Durham Collectar first lists several readings from the Pauline Epistles, 1 Cor. 15. 1–2 and 9–10; 2 Tim. 2.4–5, 4.7–8 and


4. 17–18. The readings are followed by collectae beginning with the following prayer seeking Paul’s protection, and recalling his role as a missionary to the Gentiles:\(^{33}\)

Deus qui multitudinem gentium beati Pauli apostoli predicacione docuisti, da nobis quesimus ut cuius natalicia colimus, eius apud te patrocinia sentiamus.

(God, who taught the multitude of the Gentiles by the preaching of the blessed Apostle Paul, grant us, we ask, that we honour his birth, that we may sense his protection in your presence.)

The collects for the Octave of Peter and Paul includes the following prayer, referring to Peter’s walking on water in Matthew 14.28–31 and Paul’s mention of being shipwrecked in 2 Cor. 11.25, and possibly also to the account of his shipwreck in Acts 27.27–28.6:\(^{34}\)

Deus cuius dextera beatum Petrum ambulantem in fluctibus ne mergeretur erexit, et coaepostolum eius Paulum tercio naufragantem de profundo pelagi liberavit, exaudi nos propitius et concede ut amborum meritis aeternitatis gloriam consequamur.

(God whose right hand raised up the blessed Peter when he was walking in the waves so that he would not drown, and who freed his fellow apostle Paul from the depths of the sea when he was shipwrecked three times, let us rejoice and grant that we arrive at the glory of eternity through the merits of them both.)

Other Anglo-Saxon texts also show that Paul, often along with Peter and the other apostles, played an important role in Anglo-Saxon prayers. His name appears without fail immediately following Peter’s at the head of the list of apostles in each of the manuscripts of the litanies of the saints catalogued by Lapidge.\(^{35}\) The ninth-century Book of Cerne (Cambridge, University Library, MS Ll. I. 10) includes several prayers which involve Paul, where he is again usually appealed to just after Peter. One prayer which is copied twice in the book requests, “per merita beati pauli apostoli tui da mihi fidei speique et caritatis augmentum” (‘through the merits of your blessed apostle Paul, give me an increase in faith, hope and love’), recalling

---


\(^{34}\) Corrêa, *Durham Collectar*, p. 184.

Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians. 36 In another example of a prayer addressed to Paul in the Book of Cerne, the worshipper asks, “intercede pro me peccatore sce paule apostole xpi vas electionis” (‘intercede for me, a sinner, holy apostle of Christ Paul, the chosen vessel’), 37 a title given to Paul after his conversion in Acts 9. 15–16.

As well as having prayers offered in his name, Old English hymn books attest that Paul was the subject of hymns regularly sung in his honour. The following hymn was sung at Vespers on the feast day of Peter and Paul, June 29th: 38

**Ymnus in Passione Apostolorum Petri et Pauli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mid ænlicum leohete</th>
<th>and wite rosenum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Aurea luce</td>
<td>et decore roseo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leoth leohes ealle</td>
<td>þu geondgute werulde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lux lucis, omne</td>
<td>perfudisti seculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gewlitisende heofonan</td>
<td>mid æþelum martrydome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decorans caelos</td>
<td>inclyto martyrio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On þisum halgan dege</td>
<td>scyldigum forgifenesse þe he selð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hac sacra die,</td>
<td>quae dat reis veniam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. With golden light and rosy beauty

II. Light of light, you have bathed the whole world

On this sacred day, which gives forgiveness for deeds.

The gatekeeper of heaven together with the teacher of the world,

Judges of the world,

(Saint Peter, Saint Paul)

One triumphs by the cross, the other by the sword.

---


37 Ibid. p. 218.

Lifes rædgyft gewuldorbeagode hi ahniþ
Vitae senatum laureati possident.

Wreathed in laurel, they have attained the senate of life.

Nu eala þu gode heorde mildherot underfoh
III iam, bone pastor Petre, clemens accipe
Behát biddendra and senne bendas
vota precantum et peccati vincula
tolys þe anwealde betahtum
resolve tibi potestate tradita,
mid þam eallum heofonan mid worde þu beclyst þu geopenast
qua cunctis caelum verbo claudis, aperis.

Now good shepherd Peter, receive with mercy
the wishes of those praying and the bonds of sin
loosen, by the power given to you,
by which you close or open heaven with a word.

O
Lareow eala þu æþele þeawas ty
IV Doctor egregie, Paule, mores instrue
and mode heofonan us gebringan hoga
et mente polum nos transferre satage,
opfæt fullfremed sy forgyfen fullicor
donec perfectus largiatur plenius
aidlod þæt we be dæle dop
evacuata, quod ex parte gerimus.

Excellent teacher, Paul, teach us virtues and strive to bear us to heaven in mind
until the perfected one bestow more fully
the things emptied out, because we succeed only in part.

Eala ge arfæstnysse ancænndre elebeames getwinne
V Olive bine pietatis unice,
On geleafan estfulle on hihte strange swiþost
Fide devotos spe robustos, maxime
Mid welle gefellede sopre lufe twifealdre
Fonte repletos caritatis gemine
Æfter deaþe lichoman biddaþ libban
Post mortem carnis impetrate vivere.
Sy þrynysse ece wuldor

Two olive trees of a single piety,
Devoted in faith, robust in hope, most of all
filled with the fountain of twinned love
Procure life after the death of the flesh.
VI. Sit trinitati sempiterna gloria, May there be eternal glory for the trinity,
Wyrðment miht and fægnung
Honor, potestas atque iubilatio, Honour, power and jubilation,
on annysse þam wunaþ cynedom
in unitate cui manet imperium For which power remains in unity
heanon forð and nu geond ece sorulda
extunc et modo per aeterna secula. then and now for eternity.

The hymn, which is included in five extant hymnals from the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, is written in rhythmical iambic trimeter, with a caesura after the fifth syllable, as has been indicated in the Latin text. In addition to being sung in its complete form, stanza four was at times extracted from the hymn and used on its own for the feasts of the Apostle Paul, under the heading, “Hymnus de Sancto Paulo apostolo”. The Leofric Collectar (London, BL, Harley 2961; Exeter, s. ximed) lists its use for the Conversio Pauli (January 25) and for Vespers and Nocturn for the Natalis Pauli (June 30). The Old English glosses are the “Durham Hymnal Gloss”, found in the eleventh–century manuscript Canterbury, Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32. The addition of the Old English gloss was common in hymn books and functioned to assist oblates and novices (who were expected to participate in the Divine Office from their entrance into the monastery at the age of seven and would not have known Latin or understood the words of the liturgy) to understand the oftentimes difficult syntax of the hymns. The address to Paul as the doctor egregie/lareow æþele (excellent/noble teacher) is one which, as we will come to see here and in subsequent chapters, was a common

39 Ibid. pp. 9, 334. The manuscripts which include it are: London, BL, Add. 37517 (Canterbury, s. X\textsuperscript{cs}); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 391 (Worcester, c. 1065); Durham, Cathedral Library, B. III. 32 (Canterbury, s. xi\textsuperscript{i}); London, BL, Cotton Vespasian D. Xii (?Canterbury, s. xi\textsuperscript{med}); and London, BL, Cotton Julius A. vi (?Canterbury, s. xi\textsuperscript{med}).
40 Ibid. pp. 9, and 377.
41 Ibid. p. vii.
title for Paul, and one emphasized by Æfric in his own role as a teacher (see chapter 4) and by the compiler of Blickling Homily IV when incorporating passages from the *Visio Sancti Pauli* in his text (see chapter 6, pp. 153-7). The hymn also mentions the simultaneous martyrdom of Peter on the cross and Paul by the sword, “per crucem alter, alter ense triumphat” (‘one triumphs by the cross, the other by the sword’), another theme which will be picked up in chapter 5 (beginning at p. 110). The content of the hymn is thus representative of various themes pertaining to Paul in Anglo-Saxon England which we will discover throughout this study.

In addition to being petitioned through prayer and honoured by hymns on his feast days, Paul’s relics were venerated, according to evidence from Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*:


(However, we have caused to be given to the bearers of these our letters sent to you, the blessed gifts of the saints, that is, the relics of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, and of the holy martyrs, Laurentius, John, and Paul, and Gregory, and Pancratius, all to be delivered back to your excellence. And also to your consort, our spiritual daughter, we have sent by the aforesaid bearers a cross, with a gold key made out of the most sacred chains of the apostles, Peter and Paul.)

Finally, veneration of Paul is shown in Anglo-Saxon illuminations, for example in the Benedictional of Æthelwold, which includes a “decorative composition” depicting Peter tied

to the cross and Paul with a sword-wielding executioner. The illumination demonstrates the pervasiveness of the opinion in Anglo-Saxon England of the belief that Peter and Paul were martyred together on the same day, a theme which the current study will show to have been one of most popular elements of the veneration of Paul in the Anglo-Saxon period. As Biggs convincingly argues, CCCC 198 also includes an illustration of Paul, depicting their role in the transmission of the gospel, Peter to the evangelist Mark, and Paul to the evangelist Luke. This illustration, included in a manuscript which also preserves Ælfric’s homily on Mark (stressing Peter’s role in the transmission of the gospel to Mark), underlines that for Ælfric Peter and Paul played a critical role in the perpetuation of Jesus’ message as found in the gospels.

While reverence for the Apostle Paul in Anglo-Saxon England is amply demonstrated through religious praxis, including church dedications, hymns, feasts, illuminations, and prayers in his honour, evidence found in the literary works of Anglo-Saxon authors is even more abundant, and discussion of these literary sources will form the basis for the study henceforth. References to the Apostle Paul or his letters appear in all varieties of Anglo-Saxon writing, including saints’ lives, homilies, commentaries, poetry, philosophical works, letters, laws, charters and charms. Paul and his teachings were especially attractive subject matter for homilies, with apocryphal stories involving him becoming increasingly popular as homiletic fodder. Several of these homilies will be discussed in detail in later chapters. Fontes Anglo-Saxonici catalogues the uses of all the Pauline letters, and they are found in the works of

46 Ibid., p. 177.
47 For example, ÆCHom I, 26 and 27, pp. 388–409; and ÆCHom II, 19, pp. 180–9.
numerous Anglo-Saxon authors. The sheer number and diversity of these references, however, make a cohesive discussion of individual quotations from Paul’s letters unwieldy to say the least, and so I have decided to focus on a number of themes which have emerged in my examination of references to Paul himself in the works of Anglo-Saxon writers, that is, cases in which the authors’ writing refers to Paul by name, and the way in which these texts make use of Paul as a figure for discussion or imitation. Boniface, for example, identified with Paul in his role as a missionary; Alfred with Paul as and wise architect; and Ælfric as a teacher. Because of the wide range of the sources as well as their volume, the study will focus on certain authors and texts which, based on my reading and interests, I believe to be the most fruitful and intriguing.

Of course it is difficult to avoid dealing with quotations from Paul’s letters entirely, and I will turn to a brief, general discussion of Pauline citations in Anglo-Saxon works to finish off this chapter, before turning to more thematic topics beginning in the second chapter. Anglo-Saxon authors, as virtually all medieval authors, both wrote commentaries on the Pauline letters and relied on them as a source to quote from in support of Christian dogma and theological arguments. While medieval biblical commentary was largely allegorical in nature, the Pauline epistles, practical, situational and exhortational in their original intent, lent themselves, as Smalley notes, more to straightforward theological teaching than did most other books of the Bible. Thus homiletic works in particular frequently utilize a Pauline quotation to buttress their points, often quoting Paul by name. The author seldom cites the exact location of the source for his quotation, though, and it is frequently unclear whether he is quoting it from memory or has the work in front of him. It is often very difficult to tell whether a text

contains a direct biblical quotation, a biblical allusion or merely biblically-flavoured language. Frequently, the Anglo-Saxon author was working not directly from the Bible itself, but from a different Latin source, another commentator or homilist, in whose work the quotation was embedded. Instances in which the Anglo-Saxon author likely adapted his source or added a new reference to Paul are particularly useful in understanding how Paul and his works were viewed and are especially helpful for understanding the various ways in which the Apostle Paul appeared in Anglo-Saxon literature.

The Apostle Paul in the Writings of Bede

The voluminous works of Bede, the seventh- to eighth-century monk and renowned writer, include several elements which reflect the honour he accorded to Paul. First, Bede compiled a commentary on Paul’s letters, drawn from the sixth-century abbot Eugippius’s extracts of Augustine’s writings on Paul with additions of his own (bringing the number of extracts from 348 to 457) and ordering the extracts into the current arrangement of Paul’s letters in today’s bible, entitled Collectio ex opusculis S. Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli.50 The collection may be taken as an indication of Bede’s high opinion of both Paul and Augustine. It may have been well-known and used by subsequent medieval writers such

as Rabanus Maurus, and Florus of Lyons,\textsuperscript{51} and may even have been the book referred to as *aliqua de opusculis* requested by Boniface in his letter 76, as discussed in chapter 2 (pp. 43-4).\textsuperscript{52} The collection will not be examined in detail here because it does not include Bede’s own thoughts on Paul so much as Augustine’s; however, little work has been done on this text, and it is deserving of further examination in a separate study. Bede’s *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* and his *Homilies on the Gospels* refer to Paul and his letters numerous times, and may serve as examples of an author using individual verses from the Pauline epistles as biblical support for his arguments. Bede, in his *Opera Homiletica*, uses 229 references to Paul’s letters, with each letter represented at least once, and 1 Corinthians as many as 49 times.\textsuperscript{53} Bede’s *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* lists 61 references to Paul’s letters.\textsuperscript{54}

In Bede’s homily 1.15, for example, Bede writes, quoting Rom. 5:5: 55

\begin{quote}
Baptizat quoque dominus in spiritu sancto cum per adflationem eiusdem spiritus corda fidelium suorum fervore suae siue fraternae caritatis accendit; caritas enim, inquit, Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per spiritum sanctum qui datus est nobi.
\end{quote}

(The Lord baptizes in the Holy Spirit when, through the inspiration of the same Spirit, he enkindles the hearts of his faithful ones with the fervour of his charity or of fraternal charity. For, it says, the charity of God is poured out in your hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us.)

As well as utilizing Paul’s letters for proof texts so extensively, Bede devotes one of his homilies, 2.22, to Peter and Paul; however the majority of the homily is about Peter, until the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{52} I am indebted to Frederick Biggs for the suggestion that this may be the book Boniface is requesting in letter 76.
\textsuperscript{55} Bede, *Opera Homiletica*, p. 108.
\end{flushright}
very end, when Bede suddenly seems to remember that the day is for Paul, too, and adds a paragraph about Paul, focussing largely on Paul’s tribulations for Christ, and mentions that Paul wrote fourteen letters.56

Although these sorts of quotations are not necessarily very illuminating in themselves about how Anglo-Saxons viewed the Apostle Paul, other than showing how important his letters were for backing up their arguments and instruction, one of the more interesting aspects of these quotations is the epithets and images they use to cite Paul as their source. These labels often indicate something about the way the author viewed Paul. Bede generally refers to Paul as the apostolus, and on one occasion, in homily 2.15, he speaks of him as the egregius praedicator (‘excellent preacher’).57 A hymn dedicated to Peter and Paul in Bede’s Liber Hymnorum refers to Paul as the doctor almus gentium (‘nurturing teacher of the nations’) and the magister altus gentium (‘high teacher of the nations’).58 While the titles doctor gentium and magister gentium were common ones for Paul, as will be discussed in chapter 4 on Ælfric and Paul, and in chapter 6 on the Visio Pauli, the addition of almus and altus appear to be unique to this hymn, and demonstrate the degree to which Bede venerated the Apostle Paul.59 Bede again demonstrates his approval for veneration of Paul when, in his Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, he quotes a letter sent to England from the pope in 665 A. D., calling Peter and Paul, “sancti apostoli ... qui ut duo luminaria caeli inluminant mundum,” (‘the holy apostles who illuminate the world like the two lights in the sky’).60

57 Bede, Opera Homiletica, p. 289.
58 Hymn 9, Bede, Opera Homiletica, Part 4, ed. J. Fraipont, pp. 428–9. Michael Lapidge notes, however, that this, along with several other hymns in the collection may not be by Bede. See Michael Lapidge, Bede the Poet, Jarrov Lecture, 1993, (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1993), p. 21 n. 34 and pp. 25–6, n. 64.
Paul in Aldhelm’s Writings

As one might expect, Bede’s older contemporary Aldhelm (d. 709 or 710), abbot of Malmesbury, bishop of Sherborne, and famed for his very learned and ornate style of Latin writing, also has several imaginative epithets for Paul. He, too, calls Paul the *egregius doctor* (‘excellent teacher’) and adds *mundique magister* (‘and teacher of the world’), as well as the *vas electionis* (‘vessel of choice’), the title seen above in one of the prayers addressed to Paul in the Book of Cerne. Aldhelm also calls him the “*egregius agonista et divini sermonis dogmatista*” (‘excellent competitor and teacher of the holy word’) when he quotes 1 Cor. 9:24, “*Omnes currunt, unus tamen accipit bravium,*” (‘all run but only one receives the prize’); “*famosus spiritalis palestrae agonitheta*” (‘the famous competitor in the spiritual arena’); “*celeberrimus ille nominis Christi gerulus*” (‘the most celebrated proponent of the name of Christ’); and the *apostolica buccina* (‘apostolic trumpet’). Paul and his letters actually play an important role in Aldhelm’s prose *De virginitate*, for the orthodox teaching on virginity came from 1 Cor. 7 and this text formed the basis for Adhelm’s doctrine on the subject. Aldhelm develops Paul’s image of the champion of Christ to apply to the nuns at Barking, whom he likens to talented athletes. Paul is also cited amongst Aldhelm’s model virgins. In the citation, Aldhelm refers to Paul’s twenty-four hours at the bottom of the sea, his forty stripes save one (both mentioned by Paul in 2 Cor. 11.24–5) and his traversing of the third heaven (2 Cor. 12. 2–4). Here he places his famous condemnation of the *Visio Pauli*,

---

64 Ibid. p. 75.
65 Ibid. p. 231.
66 Ibid. p. 482.
saying that it is forbidden because it is outside of the canon, which will be discussed in detail in chapter 6 on this controversial yet popular Pauline apocryphal text.\textsuperscript{69} The \textit{Carmen de virginitate}, too, cites Paul as an exemplary virgin, this time focussing on his former life as a persecutor of Christians, his conversion, his blindness and illumination, and his transformation to become “egregius doctor mundique magister barbarar convertens doctrinis agmina sacris” (‘the famous instructor and teacher of the world converting the barbarian masses to the sacred doctrines’).\textsuperscript{70}

From the earliest days of Christianity in England, then, the Apostle Paul played an important role: he was a patron for newly built churches; a figure to honour in song and to turn to in prayer; a “noble teacher”, “exemplary virgin” and “famous instructor”, whose letters provided the support the early Anglo-Saxon writers Bede and Aldhelm turned to for authority in their theological arguments. The following chapters will continue to look at Paul’s place in Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the various roles which he played in the minds of its writers, some who wrote in Latin and others who used Old English, some who relied mostly on canonical Pauline sources, and others who turned to certain apocryphal texts as well.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid. p. 256. \\
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid. p. 374.
Part A: Anglo-Saxon Writers and the Pauline Epistles

Chapter 2. Boniface and Paul: *Virtus in infirmitate*

While for Aldhelm Paul was an exemplary virgin and spiritual athlete, the Boniface Correspondence shows that the seventh– to eighth–century Anglo-Saxon missionary to Germany Boniface identified his own role as a missionary with that of the Apostle Paul. Boniface, born in Wessex near Exeter about the year 675 and given the name Wynfrith at birth, entered the monastery at Exeter, likely at the age of seven, then the abbey of Nursling at Winchester where he studied the classics, the Bible and the Church Fathers. He was ordained as a priest c. 705. On a trip to Rome in 718–19 he was given both the name Boniface and a commission to preach in Germany by Pope Gregory II. He became a bishop in 722 and archbishop of Mainz in 732. His mission ended abruptly in 755, however, when he and his company were murdered at Dokkum in the Netherlands. His prose and verse writings, among which are works on grammar and metre, dozens of letters and a collection of twenty riddles, show that he was highly educated, particularly in the works of Aldhelm.¹ His letters, in particular, demonstrate his literary background, and of specific interest for this chapter, his propensity to include biblical references, especially from the Pauline letters. The manner in which Paul’s epistles are used in the Boniface Correspondence shows that Boniface viewed

himself as a missionary in the Pauline tradition. He was, like Paul, a missionary to the *gentes* who had to undergo tribulation and suffering to further the spread of the gospel.

The collection of over 150 letters which comprise the Bonifatian Correspondence have been preserved primarily in the ninth-century manuscript Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, lat. 751 (Mainz, s. ix\textsuperscript{med}),\(^2\) henceforth in this chapter Vienna 751, which includes letters to and from Boniface and several people linked with his mission, including Lull (c. 710–86), his successor as the Archbishop of Mainz from 754 to 786. The letters were written over a period spanning perhaps 100 years, from the late seventh century to the late eighth century. Lull may in fact have been instrumental in the collection and preservation of the letters in Vienna 751.\(^3\) The collection is remarkable in a number of ways: for the sheer number of letters preserved, for the historical details they afford, for the unusual opportunity they allow us to study a group of medieval writers closely and for the depth of emotion and intimacy they reveal. The standard edition of the Boniface Correspondence by M. Tangl utilizes Vienna 751 as well as two other manuscripts, Munich, Staatsbibliothek, lat. 8112 (Mainz, s. viii/iix) and Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Rastatt 22 (Mainz, s. ix\textsuperscript{med}).\(^4\)

As several recent writers on the Bonifatian Correspondence have pointed out,\(^5\) the letters collected in Vienna 751, which also preserves several letters of Aldhelm,\(^6\) were probably preserved and gathered together to serve as a “pattern–book” in the composition of

\(^{2}\) For a facsimilie of the manuscript see F. Unterkircher, *Sancti Bonifacii Epistolae. Codex Vindobonensis 751 der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, codices Selecti Phototypice Impressi* 24 (Graz, 1971).
\(^{4}\) Ibid. pp. 16–17.
letters for different occasions. In sixteen letters the recipient is either unnamed or the letter ‘N.’ has been substituted for his or her name.\(^7\) Even as the writer composed them, while clearly addressing actual issues, he or she may have been conscious of composing a letter which was not private, would probably be read aloud to many people, and perhaps be preserved as literature or as a model for future letter-writers. The fact that the letters survived suggests that the writer may have made an extra copy before the letter was sent, planning for its preservation.\(^8\) Fell even suggests that the apparently personal emotional detail in many of the letters may be “neither more nor less personal than the laments of the shadowy personae of *The Seafarer* or *The Wanderer*.”\(^9\) Patricia Wallace concurs, observing that the conventionality of Ecgburg’s letter, for example, “seems to demonstrate the mere formality of her friendship with Boniface.”\(^10\) A similar situation of collection and preservation pertains in the collection of the letters of Alcuin of York (c. 735–804). Donald Bullough believes that a scribe or amanuensis began to keep copies of Alcuin’s letters in 790 and evidence suggests “an attempt, not long after Alcuin’s arrival at St. Martin’s to create a ‘formula letter book’ perhaps intended for his pupils.”\(^11\) Alcuin provides proof of this letter-copying practice himself, when in a letter to his friend Arn (c. 740–821), the archbishop of Salzburg, he writes, “misi tibi epistolam, quam ante paucos dies domno regi de hac eadem re direxi,” (‘I have sent to you the letter which I directed to the lord king a few days ago about the same matter’).\(^12\) Students at York with whom Alcuin corresponded also assembled the letters they received from him into a

---


\(^8\) Fell, “Some Implications,” p. 41.


collection, now preserved in London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. xv. Nonetheless, although Alcuin wrote his letters knowing that they were being copied as models and school texts, they are often highly emotional expressions of his feelings. Orchard comments about Alcuin’s poetry, “in Alcuin’s rarefied thought-world, poems and songs come to symbolise the elements of love, friendship and affection which shine through his work,” and this observation seems equally true of many of his letters, for example this expression directed to a “dulcissimae dilectionis fratri et amico” (‘brother and friend of the sweetest love’):

Sicut flamma potest videri, tangi autem non potest, ita caritas in litteris cerni potest, sed vix in animo scribentis sentiri valet. Quasi scintillae de igne sparguntur, ita dilectio litterarum officio volat.

(Just as a flame is able to be seen but is not able to be touched, so love is able to be discerned in letters, but scarcely able to be felt in the soul of the one writing. Just as sparks are scattered from fire, so love flies by the service of letters.)

As we shall see in this chapter, this same kind of poetic and yet heartfelt emotional content is found in many of the Boniface letters, where the missive is infused with the sender’s deepest feelings, suggesting that even though these letters were perhaps intended for public reading and preservation, they remain highly individual expressions of the author to the recipient.

Medieval letters were inherently formulaic in nature, as the collection and use of pattern-books suggests. Constable, in his study of medieval letters, outlines five sections of the later medieval letter, as specified by the *ars dictaminis*: 1) the salutation; 2) the exordium, a commonplace generality or scripture quotation to put the reader in the right frame of mind to

---


15 Dümmler, *MGH Epistolae*, letter 39, p. 82.
grant the coming request, possibly including a modesty topos; 3) the narration or statement of the purpose of the letter; 4) the petition; and 5) the conclusion. The *ars dictaminis* was not written until several centuries after the Boniface Correspondence but many of the elements it specifies are evident in the letters of Vienna 751. The letters generally open with a lengthy, often formulaic and self-deprecatory salutation, continue with thanks for gifts sent, outline the purpose of the letter, and make petitions, most often for prayers, but frequently also for books or other items. Most of the letters contain a ‘gift section’ immediately preceding the conclusion, in which the writer specifies the gifts he or she is sending to the recipient. Interestingly, the gift section in the Boniface correspondence, while frequently mentioning a piece of clothing or a book, just as often mentions a gift of poetry in the form of a verse appended at the end of the letter. Leobgyth, for example, in Tangl 29, sends Boniface a *parvum munusculum* (‘little gift’) “ut memoriam parvitatis meae retines” (‘so that you keep a memory of my insignificance’), which consists of the following verse, introduced by an Aldhelmian quotation:

\[
\text{Arbiter omnipotens, solus qui cuncta creavit,}
\text{In regno patris semper qui lumine fulget,}
\text{Qua iugiter flagrans sic regnet gloria Christi,}
\text{Inlesum servet semper te iure perenni.}
\]

(Omnipotent judge, who alone created all things,
Who shines with light always in the kingdom of the father,
Where glowing perpetually thus the glory of Christ rules,
May he preserve you always unharmed by the eternal law.)

Following a mention of gifts, the letters end with a conclusion, often a farewell benediction. Leobgyth in letter 29, for example, concludes her letter, “Vale, vivens aevo longiore, vita

---

17 See Orchard, “Old sources,” pp. 23–9, for a detailed discussion of the *clementiam* and *exiguus* formulae in the salutations.
18 Tangl, *Die Briefe*, p. 53. See note 8 on p. 53 for the identification of the Aldhelmian quotation, which is in F. Vollmer, ed., *Carmina* IV.i.36, MGH AA15, 1905, pp. 231–70.
feliciore, interpellans pro me” (‘Farewell, may you live a longer life, a happier life, and pray for me’). In considering the content of each letter one must remember these constraints and how they may have influenced the writer. One may not necessarily attribute specific content to the invention of the writer if he or she is following a model or formula.

Further, when using a letter to make inferences about the education of its writer, it is important to note that the sender usually had a scribe do the actual writing of the letter, as the process of composing a letter was thought incompatible with the hard work of writing. The sender may have dictated an outline only, leaving the scribe to fill in the details. As a result, one must be cautious in attributing authorship. Moreover, it may have been unusual for the recipient to read his or her own letter, as most letters were read aloud, often to a group of people and frequently by the messenger who delivered the letter. The sender and recipient of a letter may not in fact have been able to read or write at all. Thus, judgments regarding the education of letter-writers and recipients should reflect the nature of the letters as exemplars, their formal requirements, their joint production by sender and scribe and the public delivery to the recipient. With this in mind let us now turn to a discussion of the Apostle Paul in the letters of the Boniface Collection.

Paul is referred to at least 22 times in the Boniface collection and 96 separate verses of his epistles are quoted, some several times, bringing the total to at least 125 citations, roughly equal to the 132 quotations from the four gospels together, and vastly outnumbering the 53 references to the Psalms. Each of Paul’s letters with the exception of Philemon is represented, Romans with 19 separate citations, 1 Corinthians with 20. The figure of Paul and

---

19 Tangl, *Die Briefe*, p. 53.
21 Ibid. p. 54.
22 Tangl, *Die Briefe*, Namenregister, p. 207.
quotations from his epistles are employed, in addition to their common use as sources for
teaching and exhortation, in several different ways in the letters: first, to undergird Boniface’s
authority as a missionary and apostolic figure; second, as a figure for the Boniface
correspondents to identify with in their tribulations; and third, as a source of comfort, often
seen in the formulation of prayer requests.

First, the apostle Paul was a figure the imitation of whom lent authority to Boniface’s
position in Germany. Martin Irvine points out, "Boniface was keenly aware of the need for
auctoritas, referring to himself in the preface as ‘born from ignoble stock in the extreme
regions of the German people.’" As Irvine shows, Boniface used the authority of classical
sources to establish his latinitas, and hence his own position as a Latin author and his own
right to authority. His latinity is admirably demonstrated in many of his letters, letters which
Claudia Di Sciacca characterizes as “derivative and echoic” because they often combine
citations from such authoritative sources as Virgil, the Bible, Jerome, Gregory, and Aldhelm,
thus establishing Boniface’s own place in the catena of Latin authors. Letter number 10 in
Tangl’s edition is typical of Boniface’s method of letter composition. The letter is addressed to
Eadburg, who was once identified with Eadburg, Abbess of Thanet, but who, Sims-Williams
argues, was a nun and possibly later, abbess, of Wimborne. In any case, we know from
another letter (Tangl 29) that she was a teacher and was one of Boniface’s correspondents who
had remained in England. She was apparently an important and trusted friend of Boniface and

background reads, “de extremis Germaniae gentibus ignobili stirpe procreatum,” and is found in the Preface to
Boniface’s *Ars Grammatica*, George John Gebouer and Bengt Lofstedt, *Bonifatii Ars Grammatica*, CCSL 133B
26 P. Sims-Williams, “An Unpublished Seventh or Eighth Century Anglo-Latin Letter in Boulogne-sur-mer MS
74,” *Mevium Ævum* 48 (1979), 1–22 at pp. 15 and 22, n. 119; also P. Sims-Williams, “A Recension of
Boniface’s Letter to Eadburg about the Monk of Wenlock’s Vision,” *Latin Learning and English Lore*, 1, eds.
his mission; Vienna 751 preserves four letters from Boniface to Eadburg and one from Lull to Eadburg. In Tangl’s edition, letter number 10 is addressed from Winfred (Boniface) to “Beatissimae virgini, imo dilectissimae dominae Eadburae” (‘to the most blessed virgin, nay rather the most beloved lady Eadburg’). It has been dated as an early letter (perhaps 716) because Boniface was evidently still using the name Winfred. The letter details the vision of a monk at Wenlock, who reportedly had died and come to life again, about which Eadburg had apparently requested Boniface tell her. During his sojourn the monk reportedly experienced a vision of heaven and hell, which was related to Boniface by “veneranda abbatissa Hildelida” (‘the venerable Abbess Hildelith’). We seem to be indebted to Boniface for the preservation of this particular vision, which falls into the genre of visions of heaven and hell, a genre becoming increasingly popular in the time when the letter was written. The vision as described in Boniface’s letter demonstrates striking similarities to at least three other visions, namely the long version of the Visio Sancti Pauli, the Vita S. Fursei and Bede’s vision of Drythelm (which latter two were themselves influenced by the Visio Sancti Pauli), as well as verbal echoes of Gregory’s Dialogi. Sims-Williams explains these similarities by postulating that these sources were all (including the account of Drythelm, even though it was not recorded by Bede until after 730) circulating prior to the account of the monk at Wenlock’s vision, and were used in the interpretation of his vision.

In addition to these influences on the composition of his letter, the construction of Boniface’s letter to Eadburg (Tangl 10) is typical of many of the letters in the collection,

---

27 Tangl, Die Briefe, p. 8.
28 Sims-Williams, Religion and Literature, pp. 247–50.
weaving together material from both biblical and nonbiblical sources, all of which serve to demonstrate Boniface’s excellent latinity. In epistle 10, Boniface quotes 1 Cor. 15.52, “in momento et quasi in ictu oculi” (‘in a moment and in the twinkling of an eye’), along with material from Psalms, Virgil, and Aldhelm, and closes the letter with a brief and highly alliterative octosyllabic verse of his own, yet clearly dependent on Aldhelm:30

\[
\begin{align*}
Vale, & \text{ verae virgo vitae} \\
& \text{ut et vivas angelicae,} \\
& \text{Recto rite et rumore} \\
& \text{regnes semper in aethere} \\
& \text{Christum.}
\end{align*}
\]

(Farewell, maiden of true life,  
may you live angelically,  
In correct manner and reputation,  
and reign always ethereally  
in Christ.)

Although Orchard comments that Boniface’s composition for Eadburg is evidence that he lacked Aldhelm’s poetic gifts,31 nonetheless elements such as these, using allusions to authors such as Aldhelm and Virgil, along with Bonface’s obvious command of the Bible, especially Paul’s epistles, provided ample evidence to demonstrate Boniface’s credentials as doctus, and establish his position as a Latin litteratus.

Yet, Boniface’s literary background and capabilities were only one way in which he gained the auctoritas he so needed to lend weight to his role as missionary to the pagans and as leader of the church in Germany. He was also granted authority by taking up his position in the apostolic tradition of Peter and Paul. An early letter in the collection, Tangl 12, dated 719,

30 Andy Orchard, The Poetic Art of Aldhelm, CSASE 8 (Cambridge, 1994), p. 63, where the verse is quoted; the verse is also found in Tangl, Die Briefe, p. 15.
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Exigit manifestata nobis relegiosi propositi tui piae in Christo flagrantis intentio adprobata sincerissima fidei tuae perlata relatio, ut ad dispensationem verbi divini, cuius per gratiam Dei curam gerimus, te conministro utamur. Experientes proinde te ab infantia sacras litteras didicisse profectusque indolem ad augmentum crediti caelitus talenti prospectu divini amoris extendere, videlicet gratiam cognitionis caelestis oraculi in laborem salutiferae praedicationis ad innotescendum gentibus incredulis mysterium fidei instanti conatu expendere; conlaetamur fidei tuae et adiutores effici cupimus gratiae praerogatae. Idcirco praemissi conatus pium affectum usque ad apostolicae sedis modesta praevisione perduxisti consultum ut membrum ex membro proprii corporis caput requirens motum mentis probares capitisque arbitrio humiliter te submittens eius directioni iusto tramite properans solidati conpaginis plenitudo existas; ideo in nomine indivisibilis trinitatis per inconcussam auctoritatem beati Petri apostolorum principis, cuius doctrinae magisteriis divina dispensatione fungimur et locum sacrae sedis amministramus, modestiam tuae relegionis instituimus atque praecipimus, ut in verbo gratia Dei, quo igne salutiferio, quem mittere Dominus venit in terram, enitere videris, ad gentes quascumque infidelitatis errore detentas properare Deo comitante potueris, ministerium regni Dei.

(The intention of your pious, ardent, religious purpose in Christ and the relation of your faith, proven most sincere, demand that for the dispensation of the divine word, the care of which we bear through the grace of God, we make use of you as our co-worker. Knowing, therefore, that you have learned sacred literature from infancy and that you have set out for the love of God to extend for increase the natural ability divinely entrusted to you, that is to weigh out the grace of the knowledge of the heavenly prophecy in the work of salvific preaching in order to make known to the ignorant gentiles the mystery of the faith by an urgent effort. We rejoice in your faith and desire to be made helpers of the previously proposed grace. Therefore, because you have set the pious feeling of your proposed effort before the apostolic see with modest foresight, just as the head requires that each member of the body is moved by the mind and submitting yourself humbly to the judgment of the head and hurrying on the path by his just direction, you are part of the completeness of a solid structure. Therefore, in the name of the indivisible trinity, through the unshaken authority of Peter, the blessed prince of the apostles, whose teaching we pass on to teachers by divine dispensation and the place of whose sacred seat we administer, we establish the modesty of your religion and
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order that by the word of the **grace of God**, that salvific flame which the Lord came to earth to send, you appear to shine forth, so that you are able, with God’s help, to rush the message of the kingdom of God to those who are imprisoned by the error of infidelity.

This initial letter granting Boniface permission and authority to begin a mission to those yet held in the error of infidelity is couched in Pauline language and allusions throughout. While Boniface is given his commission in the name of Peter, the prince of the apostles, there are several references to Paul’s letters in the passage, suggesting that Gregory was establishing Boniface as a successor of Paul and his mission to the *gentibus* (nations, or gentiles). The letter contains two direct quotations from Paul’s epistles. The first is a reference to 2 Tim 3.15, “ab infantia sacras litteras,” a nod to Boniface’s prodigious literary knowledge and capabilities and hence his suitability and worthiness for his new position. The second is an application to Boniface of Paul’s well-known head and body metaphor, “membrum ex membro proprii corposis caput,” here likely taken from 1 Cor. 12.12–27 (but also found in Rom. 12.4, Eph. 1.23, 4.16, and 5.30, and Col 1.18, and 2.19). There are some other suggestions of Pauline language, for example Gregory’s reference to the *mysterium fidei* (1 Tim 3.9) which Boniface’s missionary work will teach to the *gentibus*, reminiscent of Paul’s moniker as teacher of the *gentibus*. *Gratia dei*, grace of God, while a common Christian word, of course, was a phrase largely coined in its Christian use in Paul’s epistles, for example in Romans 5.15, where we find a similar reference to the *gratia dei*, and the term here may here have been intended as another connection to Paul and his mission. Finally, the terms *adıutores* (co-workers) and *conministro* (co-servant) could both be allusions to 1 Cor 3.9 in which Paul refers to Christians as God’s *adıutores*, co-workers.

---
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Letter 24 is another of Pope Gregory’s missives to Boniface which situates Boniface in the line of the apostles. Gregory II encourages Boniface to continue to preach in “imitationem apostolorum” (‘imitation of the apostles’) so that, “possis cum apostolo dicere, ‘certavi, currsum consummavi, fidel servavi.’” (‘you may be able to say with the apostle [Paul], “I have struggled, I have run the course, I have preserved the faith’”), quoting 2 Tim. 4.7. He goes on to refer to the crown the righteous will receive, mentioned in 2. Tim. 4.8. The letter finishes with a Pauline quotation from 2 Tim. 4.2 for Boniface “oportune inportune praedicare” (to preach when it is convenient and when it is inconvenient, or as it is commonly translated in modern English, in season and out of season). According to Gregory, Boniface’s authority comes to him via the authority of the Apostolic see, from Peter and Paul themselves, and in his work he is to imitate Paul and preach as he did. As J. M. Wallace-Hadrill observes, Boniface’s idea of himself may well “be derived from St. Paul, whose apostleship was equally set in a world of pagans, ignorami and falsi fratres. Boniface’s authority was derived from Rome; his interpretation of it came from St. Paul.”

Pope Zacharias followed Pope Gregory’s lead in giving Boniface the authority of Peter and Paul, as is demonstrated in letter 57, addressed from Zacharias to Boniface and dated to 744: 36

Legimus in libro actuum apostolorum sanctum spiritum apostolis precepisse: ‘Separate mihi Barnaban et Paulum in opus, quod adsumpserim eos,’ id est, ut per predicationem christianae religionis et eiusdem spiritus sancti gratiam mundum inluminarent universum. Quorum inluminatio predicationis atque doctrinae Christi presidio mansit et manet catholica Deo ecclesia praefulgens horum et beati apostolorum principis Petri inluminata doctrinis. Et eorum sequi pedem ex inspcriatione divina tuam sanctissimam fraternitatem in partibus illis esse credimus.

---
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destinatam, ut etiam instar eorum idem spiritus sanctus in eodem te adsumpsit opere ad inluminationem gentium illarum.

(We read in the book of the Acts of the Apostles that the Holy Spirit commanded the apostles saying, ‘Separate for me Barnabas and Saul for the work for which I have called them,’ that is, so that they may illumine the whole world through the preaching of the Christian religion and the grace of that same spirit. By the illumination of their preaching and the protection of the Christian doctrine, the universal church of God remains and will remain shining forth in the splendour of their doctrine and that of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles. We believe that your most holy brotherhood has been destined by divine inspiration to follow in their footsteps in those lands so that like them, the same Holy Spirit will take you up for the same work in order to illuminate those peoples.)

Here, once again, it appears that Boniface’s authority is given in the name of Peter and his apostolic succession but his example for imitation is Paul because of his role as a preacher who travelled to foreign lands and preached to the gentibus, the ‘heathens’ of different nations, just as Boniface did.

The letters written by Boniface himself show that he did indeed take to heart Pope Gregory’s gift of the authority of Peter and Paul and used it, and the model of Paul as a missionary, as a source of authority, encouragement, and comfort in his work. In Targl 35, a brief, practical letter written by Boniface to Eadburg, his colleague in England, mentioned above, Boniface requests a copy of the epistles of Peter. Boniface asks for Epistles of “domini mei sancti Petri apostoli” (‘my master, St. Peter the apostle’), who “me in hoc iter direxit” (‘directed me on this road’). Peter is his master and guide on the road of his mission. Yet although Peter was the ultimate source of apostolic authority, other letters show that Paul was the one Boniface identified with, since both Paul and Boniface were missionaries who had left their homeland to convert “pagans”. Paul’s image became additionally appealing to Boniface because Paul’s letters are filled with references to his own struggles and hardships, both
physical difficulties and those related to preaching, favourite themes of Boniface’s. Although Boniface does not specifically mention Paul’s trials at sea, he seems to have compared his own trials to tempests at sea, and to have sought comfort from them in the words and image of Paul. Boniface himself does not refer directly to the dangers Paul faced at sea, which are mentioned, for example, in 2 Cor. 11.25–6, “Thrice was I beaten with rods, once I was stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I was in the depth of the sea. In journeying often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren.”

This verse is alluded to, however, in a letter from Bishop Daniel of Winchester to Boniface (Tangl, 64) written to comfort Boniface in his difficulties with false brethren, with the knowledge that Boniface is facing the same trials “a quibus se periculis implicatum Paulus apostolus adserebat” (in which dangers Paul the apostle asserted that he was involved).

In letter number 34 in Tangl’s edition, for example, Boniface writes to Abbot Duddo, a friend and former student, presumably still in England, requesting that he be mindful of “senis Germanici maris tempestatibus undique quassantibus fatigati” (‘of an old man worn out by the German sea’s battering tempests all around’). The particular support he requests is another book on the Apostle Paul, to supplement the one he already has on 1 Corinthians and Romans:

Rogo, ut mihi in adiutorium divinae scientiae partem tractatus super apostolum Paulum, quae mihi deest, mittere digneris. Habeo enim super duas epistolas tractatus, id est ad Romanos et ad Corintheos primam.

I ask that you deign to send to me part of a tract on the apostle Paul which I lack, as a helper in divine knowledge. For I have tracts on two epistles, that is Romans and 1 Corinthians).

---
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J. M. Wallace-Hadrill reminds us that Boniface “was a man of books; and if we are to get anywhere near his mind we must take his books into account.” On the basis of quotations and verbal reminiscences in Boniface’s letters, Michael Lapidge reconstructs the list of books (excluding the liturgical books) in the “small, portable working library” which Boniface seems to have had with him in Germany as follows:

Julianus Pomerius, *De vita contemplativa*; Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*; Isidore, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*; Gregory, *Regula pastoralis*; Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas*; the Cassiodoran *Historia tripertita*; and various collections of conciliar canons and decretals.

In addition, there are three famous books in the Landesbibliothek at Fulda considered to have belonged to Boniface: the *Codices Bonifatiani*; a sixth-century gospel harmony; an early eighth-century collection of patristic texts; and an early eighth-century gospel book, the Cadmug Gospels. Although, unfortunately, none of these would seem to be the books Boniface had in his possession or to be the book about the Apostle Paul which he requested from Abbot Duddo, commentaries on the letters of Paul would certainly have complemented the collection and were likely the type of material he had on hand, judging by the numerous Pauline quotations in Boniface’s correspondence. Boniface knew Paul’s letters well and seems often to have reflected on their relevance for his own situation, as we shall see shortly.

Boniface’s appeal for a book from Abbott Duddo is only one of many letters in which Boniface requests books, or gives thanks for books received, from his friends and colleagues whom he left behind in England. In fact, as both Wallace-Hadrill and Lapidge remark, the

---
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letters suggest that many, perhaps most, of the books in Boniface’s library were produced in English monasteries and scriptoria and sent to Boniface on the continent. Boniface’s mission was short of the books necessary for teaching the “Germanic peoples” and his correspondents often provided them. As Lapidge points out, in determining the holdings of Anglo-Saxon libraries, the migration of books across the sea from England to the continent is an important consideration. At Boniface’s and Lull’s request, many books were sent to ecclesiastical foundations at places such as Fulda, Würzburg, and Mainz and eighth-century books found in the area of the Anglo-Saxon mission in Germany may well have been produced in England.

Tangl 30 (dated 735–6), written by Boniface to Eadburg, is another letter referring to books sent to Boniface, and also makes full use of the letter-writing techniques discussed above, making reference to three Psalms, Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians; patristic sources, possibly Gregory the Great; and to Virgil and Aldhelm in the storm imagery introduced in line eight, “quia peccatis meis exigentibus periculosi maris tempestatibus quatior” (‘because I am shaken by the driving tempests of a dangerous sea on account of my sins’). Boniface essentially writes to thank Eadburg “quae sanctorum librorum munera transmittendo exulem Germanicum spiritali lumine consolata est” (‘who has consoled a German exile with spiritual light by sending the gifts of holy books’). The combination of the terms munera with librorum and consolata est is one example of a common theme in the Boniface Correspondence: books, verses and letters are seen as gifts which bring consolation. This theme appears several times, for example again in Tangl 35, mentioned above, also sent from Boniface to Eadburg, where before asking Eadburg to send him a copy of the epistles of Peter, Boniface prays that God may reward Eadburg for her kindnesses, for “sive solamine librorum sive vestimentorum
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adiuvamine pietas tua tristitiam meam consolata est” (‘whether by the gift of books or by the help of clothing, your piety has consoled my sadness’). As in Tangl 30, Boniface shows that in the sufferings of his exile, books are a solace and consolation and these letters demonstrate the attitude of Anglo-Latin writers to learning and scholarly endeavour: books and writing provided a source of comfort, employment and enjoyment for both writers and recipients.

In letter 30, Boniface follows his thanks for the consolation of the gift of books with a request that Eadburg pray for him, an exulem, being tossed by the storms of a dangerous sea. The root word exul appears only twice in the Boniface Correspondence, here in letter 30 where Boniface calls himself an exul and in its verb form in Tangl 14, a letter sent to Boniface by the abbess Eangyth and her daughter, Bugga, in which the two women, friends of Boniface’s left behind in England, lament their situation, express regret that they have not been able to join Boniface in his mission and ask his advice about, perhaps even permission to embark on, a desired pilgrimage to Rome. They ask Boniface to pray that God may direct them “sive in patrio solo vivere vel in peregrinatione exulare” (‘whether to live alone in the fatherland or to be exiles on a pilgrimage’). For these women the idea of a pilgrimage is an exciting one, almost as though they ought to have written in peregrinatione exultare (to exult in a pilgrimage) rather than using the verb exulare; it would be a way for them to escape the troubles at home which they describe with rather excessive poignancy in their lengthy letter. When Boniface uses the word exul in letter 30, however, he is painting a picture of himself as an exile in the sense of a bereft outcast who requires consolation.

Although the word exul and its derivatives are used infrequently in the Boniface Correspondence, the root word peregrin- is found much more often, appearing 24 times in the
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Boniface Correspondence, including 16 uses of the noun *peregrinatio*, five uses of the noun *peregrinus* and three occurrences of the verb *peregrino*. Eangyth and Bugga, in letter 14, express regret that they are unable to join Boniface in *illam peregrinationem* (‘on that pilgrimage’) in which he is engaged, that is his missionary journey and work in Germany. They view Boniface’s situation as something to be desired, but Boniface’s own references to his *peregrinatio* reveal his journey in a different light. In his travels and mission to Germany, Boniface considers himself a *peregrinus* or a voluntary exile, who leaves his loved ones and homeland and undergoes loneliness, suffering and trials far from home.\(^{50}\) Eleven of the instances of the root *peregrin-* are found in letters written by Boniface, and letter 65, in which he is writing to Eadburg, is a typical example:\(^{51}\)

\[
\text{Nostris peccatis exigentibus conversatio peregrinationis nostrae variis tempestatibus inliditur. Undique labor, undique meror. ‘Foris pugnae, intus timores’ (2. Cor. 7.5).}
\]

(For our pressing sins the way of our pilgrimage is crushed by various storms. Everywhere labour, everywhere misery. ‘Fighting without, fears within.’)

True to human nature, *peregrinatio* is viewed as a positive by Eangyth and Bugga, still at home in England, in that it will extract them from their troubles at home, but for Boniface, already suffering loneliness and trials in a foreign land, pilgrimage has resulted in hard work and misery. He identifies with the Apostle Paul as a missionary experiencing opposition from outsiders and fears from his own people. Just as life on earth was often viewed by medievals as a pilgrimage in which the individual was separated from God, caught between the two worlds of heaven and hell,\(^{52}\) so Boniface was caught between his colleagues and his

---
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opponents, between England and Germany, his homeland and his place of exile. As Orchard observes, “the elegiac instinct is extensively apparent in Anglo-Saxon literature, as befits a culture torn between worlds,” and as one might expect from Boniface, a man caught between the two worlds of his home and his mission field, “several of [his] letters have strong elegiac overtones.” These elegiac passages also evoke the theme of exile, and we see the results of Boniface’s view of himself as an exile, adrift and belonging in neither his homeland nor his mission field, in the many references in his letters to being tossed by tempests.

Boniface was, however, able to turn to his friends in England for comfort, in particular by means of the exchange of books and letters. As we saw in letter 35 to Eadburg above, for Boniface, the suffering *perigrinus*, spiritual books as well as prayers were a source of consolation. Writing to Bishop Daniel of Winchester (Tangl 63), Boniface requests:

Preterea paternitatis vestrae clementiam de uno solacio peregrinationis meae intimis precibus diligenter rogare velim, si presumam, id est, ut librum prophetarum, quem venerandae memoriae Uuinbertus abbas et magister quondam meus de hac vita ad Dominum migrans dereliquit, ubi sex prophetae in uno corpore claris et absolutis litteris scripti repperientur, mihi transmittatis. Et si hoc Deus cordi vestro facere inspiraverit, maius solacium vitae meae senectuti et maius vobis premium mercedis transmittere non potestis, quia librum prophetarum talem in hac terra, qualem desidero, adquirere non possum et caligantibus oculis minutas litteras ac connexas clare discere non possum.

(Meanwhile, I would like to ask diligently with my innermost prayers the mercy of your fatherliness about one comfort for my pilgrimage, if I may presume, that is, that you send me a book of the prophets, which Winbert, once my abbot and teacher, left behind when he migrated from this life to God, in which the six prophets are found in one book, written in clear and separate letters. And if God inspires your heart to do this, you will not be able to send a greater comfort for my old age and a greater promise of reward for you, because such a book of the prophets as I so desire, I am not able to acquire in this land and I am not able to read clearly with my darkening eyes tiny and connected letters.)

---
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A biblical volume is the earnest desire of Boniface for his solace, both to provide a tool for his missionary work, as well as to connect him to his fatherland and those he misses from his former life at home. The letter addresses directly the paucity of books in Germany, the relative abundance of books in England and the practice of sending them across the sea to Boniface and his mission. It also demonstrates the intimate and lasting connection Boniface felt for his homeland. Boniface’s detailed description of the book in question suggests that Boniface spent much time in his youth with Abbot Winbert, perhaps studying the very book he requests, for he seems to know it intimately, able after many years to picture the clearly formed characters on its pages, which he can still distinguish, as opposed, perhaps, to cursive script which he finds difficult to read clearly. Now that Abbot Winbert’s exile on earth is over and he is once more at home with God, Boniface wishes the book to be used as a connection between himself and his homeland as well as himself and God, both of which he is exiled from. The letter paints a picture of a lonely and troubled, aging man who was comforted by the gift of books from his friends.

Several other letters also mention the exchange of books. In Tangl 15, sent to Boniface from Bugga, who is presumed to be the same Bugga writing with Eangyth in letter 14 and who was a close friend of Boniface judging by the frequency and content of the letters they sent back and forth to one another, Bugga expresses her regret that she has failed to send the book he requested:

Simulque sciat caritas tua, quod passiones martyrum, quas petisti tibi transmitti, adhuc minime potui impetrare. Sed, dum valeam, faciam. Et, mi carissimus, dirige meae parvitati ad consolationem, quod per dulcissimas tuas litteras promisisti, id est congregationes aliquas sanctarum scripturarum.
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(At the same time your dearness knows that the passions of the saints, which you asked to be sent to you, I have not yet been able to procure. But when I am able, I will do it. And you, my most dear one, direct for the consolation of my insignificance, what you promised in your most sweet letters, that is a collection of the sacred writings.)

This excerpt is revealing in several respects, first, again, in demonstrating the need for Boniface to receive books from England; second, in showing by the particular request for a collection of passions of the saints that Boniface knew such a collection existed and was available in England, a point which will be discussed further in chapter five; and third in referring again to the written word, in this case letters, as a source of consolation. Bugga is comforted by Boniface’s letters, both in the receiving of them and by the content, consisting, as they often do, of a collection of scriptural references. Another letter dealing with the exchange of books also involves Bugga, letter 48 addressed by Boniface to Bugga, nearly 20 years later, in which this time it is Boniface who apologizes de conscriptione sententiarum (‘about the copying of writings’) promised to Bugga but which he has been unable to complete. The particular writing in question is unspecified; it may have been a collection of scripture references of the sort Bugga referred to in letter 15 rather than a book.

Another of his English compatriots to whom Boniface turned for books was Abbot Hwætberht, abbot of Monkwearmouth-Jarrow, the successor of Ceolfrith. Hwætberht was renowned for his scholarship, having studied in Rome and gained skill in writing, reading and teaching, and Bede had dedicated a work to him. Boniface wrote to him (Tangl 76, dated 746–7) requesting:

\[
\text{ut aliqua de opusculis sagacissimi investigatoris scripturarum Bedan monachi, quem nuper in domo Dei apud vos vice can} \text{dellae ecclesiasticae scientia scripturarum fulsisse audivimus, conscripta nobis transmittere dignemini.}
\]
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(that you deign to send to us some writings from the excerpts of the most wise investigator of the scriptures, the monk Bede, whom we have heard recently shone in knowledge of the scriptures in the house of God among you like a candle of the church).

Interestingly, the aliqua de opusculis Boniface requests in this passage may refer to the Collectio ex opusculis S. Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli, since, as mentioned in chapter one (p. 18) this collection is thought to have been familiar to later writers such as Rabanus Maurus and Florus of Lyons, and otherwise it would seem odd for Boniface to label a work of such a shining light as Bede with a diminutive title. Boniface also requested works of Bede from Archbishop Ecgbert of York (Tangl 91, dated 747 to 754) in similar words, this time seeking commentaries on the proverbs of Solomon, “quod nobis predicantibus habile et manuale et utilissimum esse videtur” (‘which would seem to be most suitable, handy and useful for us when preaching’).

Even after Boniface’s time, Lull, his successor as archbishop of Mainz, was requesting books from England, as Tangl 71 demonstrates. In this letter Lull writes to Dealwine of Malmesbury seeking “ut mihi Aldhelmi episcopi aliqua opuscula sue prosarum seu metrorum aut rithmicorum dirigere digneris” (‘that you deign to direct to me some small works of Bishop Aldhelm, either prose or metrical or rhythmical verse’). Like Boniface, Lull also wanted works of Bede to be sent from England and wrote to Archbishop Coena of York asking for them in letter 125, dated 767–778. He had specific commentaries in mind, “id est in primam partem Samuelis usque ad mortem Saulis libros quattuor, sive in Esdram et Nehemiam libros tres, vel in evangelium Marci libros quattuor” (‘that is from the first part of Samuel up to the death of Saul, four books,
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or three books on Esdra and Nehemia, or four books on the gospel of Mark’). Unlike Boniface, who sought commentaries of Bede for efficacy in preaching from Archbishop Ecgbert of York in letter 91, Lull couches his request in more personal terms, “ad consolationem peregrinationis nostrae” (‘for the consolation of our wandering’). One is reminded of Boniface’s heartfelt request for a book of the prophets from Bishop Daniel in letter 63, for the solace of peregrinationis meae.

The theme of spiritual books as a source of comfort and the motif of Boniface and his colleagues as peregrini on a sea voyage come together in Tangl 9, where Boniface writes to admonish and encourage a “carissimo sodali et amico dilectissimo” (‘most dear companion and most beloved friend’) Nithard, who seems to have been slipping in his studies.

Quid enim, frater karissime, a iuvenibus decentius queritur aut a senibus demum sobrius possidetur quam scientia sanctorum scripturarum? Que sine ullo naufragio periculose tempestatis navem anime nostrae gubernans deducet ad amoenissimi litus paradisi et ad perpetua supernorum gaudia angelorum.

(For what, dearest brother, is sought more properly by young men or finally, what is more sensibly possessed by elderly men than knowledge of the holy scriptures? Without any shipwreck in a dangerous storm, guiding the ship of our soul, it leads it away to the shores of the most pleasant paradise and to the perpetual joys of the supernal angels.)

This comparison of the soul to a vessel led by scripture, brings to mind the classical theme of a composition as a nautical voyage. Ernst Robert Curtius points out that this theme was used by Virgil and Horace and was widely taken up by medieval authors like Fortunatus and
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Aldhelm.70 Miranda Wilcox also refers to the nautical theme in patristic theology, pointing out that Ambrose, for example, compared the soul of the Christian to a ship voyaging toward spiritual illumination.71 Boniface may have had this metaphor in mind when composing the letter to Nithard, for he viewed himself as a sailor, being shaken *periculosi maris tempestatibus* (‘by the storms of a dangerous sea’), and at the same time he is in fact engaged in the act of composition. Knowledge of the Scriptures, compositions in themselves, functions for Boniface as a guide for the vessel of his soul.

Among scriptural sources, the Apostle Paul’s letters seem to have been a particular source of comfort and encouragement for Boniface. Both men were missionaries having set out on journeys far from their homeland, separated from those they knew and suffering various hardships associated with attempting to convert the *gentes*. Boniface’s letters demonstrate that his identification with Paul as a missionary and his knowledge of Paul’s letters in particular seemed to help him navigate what he viewed as the perilous sea of his mission. This is once again evident, for example, in a letter of which we have already examined a section, Boniface’s moving letter to his fellow Englishman, Daniel, Bishop of Winchester (c. 705–745),72 a letter which makes use of several Pauline references:73

> Consuetudo apud homines esse dinoscitur, cum aliis tristae et honerosum quid acciderit, anxiatae mentis socalium vel consilium ab illis querere, de quorum maxime amicitia vel sapientia et foedere confidunt. Eodem modo et ego de paternitatis vestrae probabili sapientia et amicitia confidens vobis fessae mentis angustias expono et vestrae pietatis consilium et solacium quero. Sunt enim nobis iuxta dictum apostoli non solum ‘foris pugnae et intus timores’ (2 Cor. 7.5) sed
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73 Tangl, *Die Briefe*, letter 63, p. 129.
etiam intus pugnae simul cum timore maxime semper per falsos sacerdotes et hypochritas.
Et quod plantamus non irrigant ut crescat (alluding to 1 Cor. 3.7).
‘Quidam abstinentes a cibis quos Deus ad percipiendum creavit’ (1 Tim. 4.3).
Populi autem iuxta dictum apostoli, ‘sanam doctrinam non sustinebunt sed coacervabunt sibi magistros secundum sua desideria’ (2 Tim. 4.3).

(It is a well known custom among men when anything sad or burdensome happens to them to seek comfort and advice from those in whose friendship and wisdom they have the greatest confidence. In the same manner, I also, trusting to your well-proven fatherly wisdom and friendship, reveal to you the troubles of my weary mind and ask for the counsel and comfort of your piety. We have, according to the saying of the Apostle, not only ‘fighting without and fears within’ (2 Cor. 7.5), but even fighting within at the same time as fears, caused especially by false priests and hypocrites.
What we plant they do not water so that it may grow (1. Cor. 3.7).
Some abstain from foods which God made for our use (1 Tim. 4.3).
But the people, as the Apostle says, ‘will not keep to sound doctrine but gather for themselves teachers according to their own desires’ (2 Tim. 4.3).)

Boniface uses the words of Paul to express his own conflicts with others in his mission, the obstacles he is facing in converting people, and the stumbling blocks he sees as holding back his success. Even in this mournful, personal lament to a friend, Paul’s words serve as powerful expressions of Boniface’s feelings and circumstances.

In a rare example in which it appears that the letter collection includes Daniel’s response to Boniface’s lament, Daniel responds to Boniface’s complaints with some Pauline quotations of his own in the next letter in the collection, Tangl 64.74

Unde vos operam dare primitus oportet, ut incoepito gloriosa, quae est, ut arbitror, apostolicis coequanda certaminibus, nullatenus propter illorum deseratur insidias, qui dolis instructi salutiferæae solent resistere doctrinae. Sed tanto libentius inlatae difficultates ferendae sunt, quanto certius conperimus sanctorum esse ac martyrrum in mundo pressuras, in caelo autem copiosissimam Domino promittente mercedem.
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A communione autem falsorum fratrum sive sacerdotum (1 Cor. 5.10), quale consilium est tam idoneum, ut te in rebus corporalibus separatim disiungat, nisi forte de hoc mundo exire incipias, quando isti ubique et semper subintroire nituntur? A quibus se periculis implicatum Paulus apostolus adserebat (2 Cor. 11.26).

(You ought therefore first of all to make every effort that the glorious beginning which, as I judge, ought to be equated with the struggles of the apostles, on no account be abandoned on account of the plots of those men who, instructed in tricks, are accustomed to resist the doctrine of salvation. Difficulties should be borne that much more willingly, the more certainly we discover that there are pressures for saints and martyrs in the world, but a most abundant reward in heaven, according to God’s promise.

As for communion with false brothers or priests, what counsel is able to separate you in worldly matters, unless by chance you begin to depart from this world, when those people struggle to force themselves in everywhere and always? Paul the Apostle asserted that he was entwined in these dangers.)

Without mincing words, Daniel comes out and says what Boniface will not say outright in his own letters: he is doing work in the tradition of, and in fact worthy of, the Apostle Paul, and so should expect to face the same trials and challenges, but also to receive the same rewards as Paul. Boniface and his correspondents seem to have found comfort by bringing to mind their identification with Paul in his role as a missionary and letter-writer (albeit in a way that oftentimes sounds presumptuous and histrionically exaggerated to the modern ear), encouraging and supporting one another through books, letters and, as we shall see, prayer requests in the words of the Apostle Paul.

Further support for the idea that Boniface identified himself with Paul and his various tribulations, represented as tempests at sea, comes from a series of prayer requests in the letters which demonstrate a formulaic pattern. Orchard notes that the Pauline epistles were Boniface’s favourite mine for composing prayer requests in his evangelizing mission.75 Two of his favourite quotations were Ephesians 6:19, “Pray for me that utterance may be given me
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in opening my mouth,” (Tangl 30, 31 and 76) and 1 Tim. 2:4, “God desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth,” (Tangl 38, 46, and 65). In several of his letters, especially the more personal ones, Boniface uses a formula in his prayer requests which consists of the request for prayer followed by a description of his trials, often using sea imagery, and then specifies the content of the requested prayer (usually to pray for the success of his mission), often using a Pauline quotation. In a letter from Boniface to Eadburg (Tangl 30) for example, he requests that she pray for him in the following words (in this and the next several quotations elements which the prayer requests have in common are in bold and Pauline quotations in italics):76

Praterea de caritate tua diligenter confidens **obsecro**, ut pro me **orare digneris**, quia peccatis meis exigentibus **periculosi maris tempestatibus quiator**; rogans, ut ille, qui in altis habitat et humilia respicit, indulgens flagitia **praestet mihi verbum in aerture oris mei**, [Eph. 6:19] ut **currat et clarificetur inter gentes evangelium gloriae Christi** [2 Thess 3:1].

(Meanwhile trusting diligently in your affection I **beg** that you **deign to pray** for me, because for my sins I **am shaken by the driving storms of a dangerous sea**; asking that he who lives on high and looks down on the humble, indulging my shameful deeds, **will show for me his word in the opening of my mouth so that the gospel of the glory of Christ may run and be made famous among the nations.**)

Boniface wrote another letter to Eadburg (Tangl 65) which also includes a prayer request with similar elements to those in the request in letter 30, lamenting his situation in the language of an exile struggling through tempests at sea and using Paul’s words to express his trials:77

Dilectionis vestrae clementiam intimis **imploramus precibus** ut pro nobis **intercedere** apud auctorem omnium **dignemini**. Ut non ignores causam huius precis sciatis, **quia nostris peccatis exigentibus conversatio peregrinationis nostrae variis tempestatibus inidituir**. Undique labor, undique meror. *Foris
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pugnae, intus timores’ (2 Cor. 7.5). Super omnia gravissimum; quod vincunt insidia falsorum fratrum malitiam infidelium paganorum (perhaps alluding to 2 Cor. 11.26).

Precor ut intercedere pietas vestra pro istis paganis, qui nobis ab apostolica sede commissi sunt, dignetur, ut eos salvator mundi ab idolorum cultura eripere dignetur et adgregare unicae matris catholicae filiiis ecclesiae ad laudem et gloriam nominis sui, ‘qui vult omnes homines salvos fieri et ad agnitionem veritatis venire.’ (1 Tim. 2.4)

(We beseech the mercy of your loving-kindness that you deign to intercede with your most profound prayers for us with the Creator of all things. That you may not be ignorant and know the reason for these prayers, it is because for our sins the progress of our travels is hindered by various tempests. Everywhere there is struggle and grief, fighting without and fears within. Worse than all else, the plots of false brethren overcome the malice of unbelieving pagans.

I pray that your kindness deign to intercede on behalf of those pagans who have been entrusted to us by the apostolic see, that the saviour of the world deigns to seize them out of the culture of idols and add them to the brothers of the one mother, the catholic church, for the praise and glory of the name of him ‘who wants all people to be saved and come to the knowledge of truth’.)

Boniface’s entreaties to Eadburg for support in the form of prayer strike a particularly personal note, consistent with several of his letters to women whom he left behind in England.

He turned to them for help in the form of prayer, as well as for books, as we have seen earlier.

Two other letters in the collection addressed from Boniface to women also include a prayer request which refers to his troubles and includes a Pauline quotation. Letter 66 is addressed to “reverentissimae et dilectissimae ancillae Christi N.” (the most reverent and beloved servant of Christ N.) Presumably Boniface was not in the practice of referring to his addressees by initial only, nor had he forgotten her name; the initial ‘N.’ signals that the manuscript has left out the name and the letter is intended to be used as a ‘pattern’ for future letter-writers to use: 78

Obsecramus precibus ut pro nobis peccatoribus apud Deum intercedere curetis, quia multis et variis tempestatum turbinibus concussi et quassati sumus sive a paganis sive a falsis christianis seu a fornicariis clericis sive a pseudosacerdotibus (2. Cor. 11.26?).

‘Stabiles estote et immobiles habundantes in opere Domini semper’ (1 Cor. 15.58).
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‘Vigilate et state in fide, viriliter agite et confortamini’ (1 Cor. 16.13–14).
‘Quando infirmor, tuc potens sum’ et ‘Virtus in infirmitate perficitur’ (2 Cor. 12.10–9).

(We beseech) that you take care to intercede with prayers to God for us, sinners, because we are struck and shaken by many and various whirlwinds of storms whether from pagans or from false Christians or from fornicating clerics or from pseudopriests.
‘Be stable and immobile holding always to the work of the Lord.’
‘Be vigilant and stand firm in the faith, act bravely and be comforted.’
‘When I am infirm then I am strong’ and ‘virtue is perfected in infirmity.’

Three others women from whom Boniface also sought support in the form of prayer, Leobgytha, Tecla and Cynehild, were women who had joined Boniface in his mission, according to the Vita Bonifatii, whom Boniface addresses in letter 67 as “et amandis carissimis sororibus” (‘most dear, venerable and beloved sisters’).

Obsecro ut vestris orationibus crebris Dominum deprecemini, ‘ut liberemur ab importunis et malis hominibus non enim est omnium fides’ (2 Thess. 3.2) et scitote quia Deum laudamus ut tribulationes cordis nostri dilatate sunt.
‘Ut sermo Domini currat et clarificetur’ (2 Thess. 3.1) ... ut ‘gratia Domini in me vacua non sit’ (1 Cor. 15.10).

(I beg) that you pray to the Lord with your frequent prayers, that ‘we may be freed from troublesome and evil men, for not all have faith’ and know that we praise God that the tribulations of our heart are extended.
‘So that the word of the Lord may run on and be glorified’ ... so that ‘the grace of the Lord is not worthless in me.’

Boniface uses a similar prayer formula ending with a Pauline quotation in Tangl 31, 32, 38 and 46. Letter 31 is addressed from Boniface to a reverentissimo fratri. The letter is almost identical to letter 30 (addressed to Eadburg), but without the thanks for books and is written in first person plural rather than singular; in essence it has no content other than the prayer request and may have been included as a pattern for those wishing to write a prayer.
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request to a man, rather than a woman as in letter 30. Also using the first person plural instead of singular, suggests the writer is assuming a more formal, institutional tone, so perhaps the letter was included as a model for a letter less familiar in tone than letter 30, which is more personal.

In Letter 32, written from Boniface to Bishop Pehthelm, a pupil of Aldhelm, a monk at Malmesbury and the first bishop of Candida Casa at Whithorn from 730/1–735/6, Boniface writes seeking counsel on marriage regulations, and once again combines a request for prayer with the comparison of himself and his missionaries to sailors at danger on the sea as well as an athletic metaphor Paul used of his own mission:

flagitamus precibus, quia nobis opus est periclitantibus, ut vestris Deo dignis orationibus adiuvemur et quia Germanicum mare periculosum est navigantibus vestris precibus et Deo gubernante ad aeternae tranquillitatis litus sine macula vel damno animae perveniamus.

Non in vacuum curramus aut cucurrissemus. (Gal. 2.2)

(we seek your prayers for we are in need because of those testing us, and we ask that we be aided by your prayers worthy to God also because the German ocean is dangerous for sailors and we ask for your prayers that with God guiding, we may reach the shore of eternal tranquillity without stain or injury to our soul. Let us neither ‘run in vain nor have run in vain’.)

Epistle 38 is addressed from Boniface to Abbot Aldherius, an individual apparently unknown to modern scholars outside of the Boniface Correspondence. The letter is a general letter of greeting to the abbot and his monks, asking him to “salutate omnes frateres sanctae congregationis vestrae nostros in Deo carissimos in osculo dilectionis ac devotionis nostrae” (‘greet all the brothers of your holy congregation, our most dear brothers in Christ, with a kiss
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of love and of our devotion’). Boniface seems to be assuming a Pauline epistolary tone here, and is perhaps deliberately imitating the greeting in the conclusion to Paul’s letter to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. 5.26), “salutate fratres omnes in osculo sancto” (‘greet all the brothers with a holy kiss’). He continues with a prayer request which develops the theme of sea imagery even further and includes a Pauline quotation:85

Obsecramus ut in vestris sacrosanctis orationibus intercedendo nostri memores esse dignemini et almitatis vestrae precibus imploretis, ut pius Dominus, qui causa est peregrinationis nostrae, navem fragilitatis nostrae, ne fluctibus Germanicarum tempestatum submergatur, dextera sua protegente et gubernante inlesam custodiendo ad caelestis Hierusalem litus tranquillum perducat.

Petimus quoque, ut pro Germanicis gentis idolorum culturae deditis intercedere curetis rogantes Dominum, qui pro totius mundi salute proprium sanguinem fudit et ‘vult omnes homines salvos fieri et ad agnitionem veritatis venire’ (1 Tim. 2.4).

(We beseech that by interceding in your holy prayers you deign to be mindful of us and implore our kind God with your prayers, that the pious God, who is the cause of our wandering, will lead the ship of our fragility in his protecting hand, while he governs and guides it, unharmed to the tranquil shore of the heavenly Jerusalem so that it is not submerged under the waves of German storms.

We also beg that you take care to intercede for the German people who are given over to the worship of idols, asking the Lord, who poured out his own blood for the salvation of the whole world and who ‘desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of truth’.)

Imitation of Pauline epistolography is found once again in letter 46, addressed from Boniface “generaliter omnibus catholicis Deum timentibus de stirpe et prosapia Anglorum” (in general to all the catholics fearing God from the stock and race of the Anglo-Saxons) and listing the various ecclesiastical positions, e.g. deacons, canons, clerics, abbots etc. Boniface writes to urge them to pray for him and his mission. The address is echoic of the typical Pauline salutation, for example, “omnia sanctis in Christo Jesu qui sunt Philippis cum
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episcopis et diaconis” (‘to all the saints in Jesus Christ who are in Philippi, with the bishops and deacons’ [Phil. 1.1]). The prayer request is as follows:86

Obsecramus precibus ut nostrae parvitatis in orationibus vestris memores esse dignemini, ut liberemur a laqueo venantis satanae et ab inportunis et malis hominibus, et ‘sermo Domini currat et clarificetur’ (2 Thess. 3.1) et ut praecibus pietatis vestrae impetrare studeatis, ut deus et dominus noster Jesus Christus, ‘qui vult omnes homines salvos fieri et ad agnitionem Dei venire’ (1 Tim. 2.4) convertat ad catholicam fidem corda paganorum Saxonum.

(We beseech that you deign to be mindful of us who are so small in your prayers, so that we may be delivered from the snare of Satan the huntsman and from troublesome and evil men, and that the word of God may make its way and be glorified and we beseech you to be eager to procure through the prayers of your piety that our God and Lord Jesus Christ ‘who wants all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of God’ convert to the catholic faith the hearts of the pagan Saxons.)

The repetitive, formulaic nature of the prayer requests in the collection becomes readily apparent to the reader of the letters, and with the help of Tangl’s marginal glossing of Pauline citations, it then becomes clear that prayer requests are often associated with quotations from Paul’s epistles. The prayer requests share three common elements: 1. a request word or words; 2. a complaint about trials; and 3. a Pauline quotation of encouragement. Frequently, the vocabulary for each of the three elements is identical or similar. The prayer request is introduced by a beseeching word, usually a form of obseco (Tangl 30, 38, 46, 66, 67 and 76), but sometimes also flagito (Tangl 32) or imploro (Tangl 65). It generally includes a form of the modesty topos words digno and a reference to Boniface’s peccata (sins) and the word precibus or orationibus. Recurring words for Boniface’s troubles are forms of quatior, tempestas, Germania/germanicus, periculosus, navis or navigo. The same Pauline quotations are also repeated in several of the letters, as mentioned above, the favourites being Eph. 6.19 and 1 Tim. 2.4, both of which relate to proclamation of the Christian message to nonbelievers.
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Another favourite, again with a missionary theme, is 2 Thess. 3.1. The formula for these prayer requests can in fact be compared to the observation of Leonard Frey, that “the speech of the exile usually follows [a] conventional pattern, beginning in personal lamentation and moving on to more general moral reflections.” Boniface begins by bewailing his trials and difficulties as a peregrinus, and then moves on to general reflection in the form of a Pauline quotation, designed to provide the rationale behind his trials, referring to the overarching reason for the suffering, namely to follow in Paul’s footsteps and bring unbelievers to God. As Frey comments about Andreas, so for Boniface, the setting of the rigors of seafaring in the stormy northern sea, “throw[s] into relief the nature of the man who can rise above it, spiritually.” The Pauline reference shows how Boniface can, and why he is willing to try to, rise above his exilic sufferings.

Boniface’s identification with the Apostle Paul and his use of Pauline quotations to console and encourage his recipients frequently appears in prayer requests but it also appears in other contexts, where he may be expressing laments, or exhorting his colleagues. In letter 94 to Abbess Bugga, he encourages her by quoting 2 Cor. 12.10, “quando infirmor, tunc potens sum” (‘when I am weak, then I am strong’) and Rom. 8.35, “Quis nos separabit a caritate Christi? Tribulatio?” (‘Who will separate us from the love of Christ? Tribulation?’). His use of Pauline quotations was adopted by his recipients as well. In letter 37, for example, when an unknown writer, whom Tangl suggests is Boniface’s successor, Lull, writes to Sigebald, who is ill, he exhorts, “dicas cum Paulo apostolo: ‘Quando infirmor tunc potens sum’ et ‘Virtus in infirmitate perficitur’” (‘you may say with the Apostle Paul, “when I am weak then I am strong” and “Strength is made perfect in weakness”’ [2 Cor. 12. 10,9]).
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Boniface used one or both of these same verses in three of his own letters, Tangl 94, as mentioned above, and letters 63 and 66, to encourage his recipients. By and large, though, the quotations of Paul are in letters written by either a pope or Boniface himself. Perhaps they were the ones seen to have been granted the apostolic auctoritas of Paul himself and so the ones who had earned the right to speak in his words.

The figure of the Apostle Paul, then, as well as his epistles, played a critical role in Boniface’s mission to Germany, both externally for the papal see in granting him the authority to assume his position, and additionally in his own mind, providing him with an example of a suffering missionary, giving him a voice with which to express his personal feelings as an exile, separated from loved ones, often rejected or deceived by those around him, yet able to persevere by focussing on Paul’s own determination and success in ensuring that, “sermo Domini currat et clarificetur” (‘the word of God may make its way and be glorified,’ 2. Thess. 3.1). Boniface viewed himself as a new Paul, taking on the Pauline role of spreading the word of Christ beyond previously set confines, of writing epistles to encourage and instruct his followers in the teaching of scripture, and of suffering mental and physical tribulations for the sake of the gospel. Like Paul’s epistles, Boniface’s letters, whether or not it was Boniface’s intention when he wrote them, were preserved, imitated by his correspondents and successors and preserved for posterity. Fortunately for the study of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, the preservation of the Boniface Correspondence affords a first-hand glimpse into the lives of Boniface and his colleagues, just as Paul’s epistles allow us a view into the lives of the first Christians. In the next chapter we will examine another well-known Anglo-Saxon figure, King Alfred, and the way in which he, too, identified with the Apostle Paul, but focussed on a different aspect of Paul’s character.
Chapter 3. God’s Co-workers and Powerful Tools: Pauline Sources for Alfred’s Building Metaphor in the Old English Translation of Augustine’s Soliloquies

The Old English translation of Augustine’s Soliloquies has traditionally been included in King Alfred’s undisputed works, along with his translations of the first fifty Psalms, Boethius’ De consolatio philosophiae, and Gregory’s Cura pastoralis. The attribution of the translation of these works to Alfred has now been put into question by Malcolm Godden, who posits that Alfred in fact had little or nothing to do with their translation. In fact the translations of the Soliloquies and Boethius’ Consolation of Philosophy, he suggests, may be the product of neither Alfred nor his circle, but may have been written at a later date. The Old English translation of the Soliloquies survives complete only in a twelfth-century manuscript, BL, Cotton Vitellius A. xv, Part I. The Soliloquies occupies folios 4a through 59b of the portion of the manuscript called the Southwick Codex, a collection which also includes the Old English Gospel of Nicodemus, the debate of Solomon and Saturn and a sermon on Saint Quentin, and is dated to the second quarter of the twelfth century. An extract of the Old
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English *Soliloquies*, consisting of a transcript of two sections of the prayer in Book I, is also extant in Cotton MS Tiberius A. iii, ff. 50v–51v, important in spite of its fragmentary nature because of its mid-eleventh century date, perhaps a century earlier than the complete version, and useful in determining the accuracy of readings of this section of the Vitellius manuscript.⁶ Due to the late date of the only two manuscripts of the Old English *Soliloquies*, there is no need to place the production of the text as early as (or even close to) Alfred’s time, yet the work has been considered authentically Alfredian in large part due to the content of the Preface and to the last few lines of the work, in which it is claimed to be the work of King Alfred: ⁷

(H)er endiað þa cwidas þe ælfred kining alices of þære bec þe we hatað on (Ledene *de uidendo deo* and on Enlisc *be godes ansyne*).

(Here end the sayings which King Alfred selected from the book which we call in Latin ‘*de uidendo deo*’ and in English ‘*be godes ansyne*’).

Janet Bately also cites in favour of Alfredian involvement in Old English translations the first person prefatory letter claiming to be by King Alfred at the beginning of the *Pastoral Care*, and she remains unpersuaded by Godden’s arguments, seeing no reason to change her opinion that, “‘behind the translation, or rather renderings, of *Pastoral Care*, *Consolatione*, *Soliloquies* and *Psalms* there was one mind at work (though probably never entirely on its own ... and it is reasonable to conclude that that mind was King Alfred’s.’”⁸
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Whether or not Alfred actually had a hand in the translation of the *Soliloquies*, it has several features which have lent credence to its association with Alfred and his circle, some of which this chapter will examine. The *Soliloquies* is perhaps the least thoroughly examined of the four traditionally Alfredian works, despite the fact that the translator makes substantial alterations to Augustine’s text. Among these changes are several intriguing additions of a metaphorical nature, including the addition of the Preface which develops a building metaphor which is at once detailed and memorable. This chapter will discuss a potential Pauline source for the imagery in the Preface.

The Preface of the Old English *Soliloquies* is particularly intriguing because of the curious wood-gathering and building imagery which forms its content. The text of the Preface is as follows: 9

Nis it nan wundor þeah man swilc ontimber gewirce, and eac on þa(re) lade and eac on þære bytlinge; ac ælcene man lyst, sidonan he ænig cotlyf on his hlafordes læne myd his fullume getimbred hæfð, þæt he hine mote hwilum þar-on gerestan, and huntigan, and fuglian, and fiscian, and his on gehwilce wisan to þere lænan tilian, ægðær ge on se ge on lande, oð þone fyrst þe he bocland and æce yrfe þurh his hlafordes miltse geearnige. Swa gedo se weliga gifola, se ðe egðer wilt ge þissa lænena stoclife ge þara ecena hama. Se ðe ægðer gescop and ægðeres wilt, forgife me þæt me to ægðrum onhagige: ge her nytwyrde to beonne, ge huru þider to cumane.

Agustinus, Cartaina bisceop, worhte twa bec be his agnum ingeþance; þa bec sint gehatene Soliloquiorum, þat is, be hys modis smeange and tweounga, hu hys gesceadwisnes answarode hys mode þonne þæt mod ymbe hwæt tweonode, oðþe hit hwæs wilnode to witanne þæs þe hit ær for sweotole ongytan ne meahte.

(Then I gathered for myself wall-posts and corner-posts and tie-beams and handles for each of the tools which I knew how to work with, the timber of bough and bole, 10 for each of the structures which I knew how to make, the fairest wood to the extent that I could carry it. Nor did I come home with one burden, but that it would have pleased me to bring home the whole forest, if I could have carried it; in each tree I saw something of which I had need at home. Therefore I would instruct each of those who is able and has many wagons, that he go to the same wood where I cut these posts, and fetch more there for himself, and load his wagons with fair lengths, so that he can weave many a fair wall, and set up many a splendid house, and build many a fair enclosure, and dwell therein pleasantly and quietly both in winter and summer, just as I now have not yet done. But he who taught me, to whom the wood is pleasing, he may cause that I may dwell there more pleasantly both in this borrowed dwelling place along the way while I am in this world, and also in the eternal home which he has promised us through Saint Augustine and Saint Gregory and Saint Jerome, and through many other holy fathers. Just as I also believe that he will for the merits of all of them, both make this way better than it was before and also illuminate the eyes of my mind so that I can find the right way to the eternal home, and to the eternal glory, and to the eternal rest which is promised to us through the holy fathers. Amen.

Nevertheless it is no wonder that a man should work with such material both in the carrying and also in the building; and it is pleasing to each man, after he has built

10 The translations of the terms “kigclas and stuþansceafas, and lohsceafas”, as well as “bohtimbru and bolttimbru”, are taken from the suggested renderings of these terms by William Sayers, “King Alfred’s Timbers,” Selim 15 (2008), 117-24, which includes a discussion of the Anglo-Saxon terminology for construction in timber. The suggested translation of this sentence is at p. 123, discussion of the terms at pp. 121-2. For an older discussion and translation of these terms see Herbert D. Meritt’s review of Carnicelli’s edition in “King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies,” Speculum 45 (1970), 661–3, at p. 662.
a dwelling on the land leased from his master, with his help, that he might rest
himself there at times, and hunt and fowl and fish, and provide for himself in every
manner on the leased land, both on the sea and on the land, until the time when he
should earn bookland and an eternal bequest through the mercy of his lord. So the
wealthy giver does, he who rules both this leased dwelling-place and the eternal
home. May he who created both and rules both, grant me that both of these may be
possible: that I may be useful here and especially arrive there.

Augustine, the bishop of Carthage, made two books about his own
contemplations. The books are called the Soliloquies, that is, about the meditations
and doubts of his mind, how his reason answered his mind when that mind doubted
about something, or what it wanted to know about which it could not understand
clearly before.)

This Preface has no counterpart in the Augustinian text. Due to its abrupt beginning, E. G.
Stanley questions whether it might not have been a second preface, following a more factual
first preface, now lost, akin to the Preface for the Old English Cura pastoralis. The absence
of a subject pronoun and the presence of the adverb ¿onne in the first line, have prompted
some to argue that the text begins acephalusly. The sense of ¿onne suggests a preceding
idea or sentence so it is possible that the first part of the Preface has been lost. If this is so, it
was likely already lost at the time of the manuscript’s copying, for the first word of the text,
Gaderode, begins with an ornamental capital suggesting that it was the first word of a chapter
or book, even though there is no title or incipit for the work. If, however, the Soliloquies is a
more personal, contemplative text, it may not have needed a preface like that for the Old
English Cura pastoralis which was seemingly intended as an instruction manual for leaders of
the kingdom. The nature of the Soliloquies may have inspired this metaphorical, less practical,
preface. In addition, the last paragraph of the Preface to the Sololoquies is of a more practical,

---

11E.G. Stanley, “King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies. Edited by Thomas A. Carnicelli,’’ book
357.
13Ibid.
explanatory nature and perhaps fulfilled the role of the traditional preface. If so, another preface before this one would have been redundant.

The Preface to the Old English *Soliloquies* begins by describing the intriguing metaphor of a builder going to the woods and carefully gathering the best materials with which to make tools and the best timbers to build a dwelling-place. The builder advises all who have the means, to do the same. He wishes that they, as he has not yet been able to do, may live peacefully in this dwelling, which he nonetheless designates a temporary home. It will be replaced with an eternal home, which has been promised through the works of St. Augustine, St. Gregory and St. Jerome as well as other unnamed holy Fathers. The writer compares this temporary home to land leased from a lord, *lænland*, and the eternal home to *bocland* (‘bookland’), land owned legally and permanently, a perpetual inheritance. He concludes by wishing that he may be both fit for the temporary dwelling, by being useful in this life, and fit to arrive in the eternal home. In pre-Conquest England, *lænland* was owned by the *hlaford* (lord) who bestowed it upon someone in return for service. If the service requirement was not fulfilled the land reverted to the lord.14 Bookland, however, was a permanent and stable land grant. Abels explains, “by the eighth century, royal followers who served the king especially well could hope for a royal charter that would transform their precarious holdings into the hereditary property known as ‘bookland’.”15 Just as a man who serves an earthly king well exchanges the uncertainties and servitude of loaned land for a stable home, so the author of the Preface hopes to serve God well by being useful and thus merit the eternal home of heaven. Ann Williams points out that bookland was originally introduced by the Church in the seventh century to provide religious houses with stable

---

endowments, and also to free them from worldly dues, so that the inhabitants could focus on their spiritual duties.\textsuperscript{16} Similarly, the preface expresses the writer’s goal to exchange worldly duties for a spiritual existence after death.

It seems that in this building metaphor, the woods are the writings of the Church Fathers, especially Augustine, Gregory and Jerome, and the material carefully gathered from the woods by the builder corresponds to the writings of these Fathers which the writer has chosen to study and translate. He advises others who have the ability, to gather (study and perhaps translate) such materials also. The writings of the Fathers are pleasing to God and will both make the present life more pleasant and instruct the individual in the way to attain eternal life; to move from this transitory world (leased land) to the permanent, everlasting kingdom (bookland).\textsuperscript{17}

Scholars have made various attempts to understand the source of this striking, and rather unexpected imagery. Most of these attempts assume that Alfred was the translator and find the source for the imagery in the sorts of interests and skills he seems to have had and activities in which he is thought to have been involved. Thomas Carnicelli suggests that the content of the Preface reflects Alfred’s knowledge of woodcraft and construction.\textsuperscript{18} William Sayers, although not specifically addressing the issue of Alfred’s personal familiarity with carpentry, relates the terms used in the metaphor to the current archaeological understanding of Anglo-Saxon timber-cutting and wood-working practices, concluding that the description in the preface is consistent with the construction of “a simple house resembling the farm

\textsuperscript{16} Williams, “Land Tenure,” p. 277.  
\textsuperscript{17} For a more detailed interpretation of the significance of Alfred’s comparisons here, see Abels, Alfred the Great, pp. 235–6; Gatch, “King Alfred’s Version,” pp. 22–5.  
\textsuperscript{18} Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies, pp. 38 and 99.
buildings at Bede’s World in Jarrow.”¹⁹ Asser relates that Alfred instructed his goldsmiths and craftsmen and himself designed wonderful and precious *aedificia nova* (‘new structures’)²⁰ and also details Alfred’s invention of a lantern constructed out of wood and ox-horn, designed to burn for exactly twenty-four hours.²¹ In addition, Asser stresses the many cities and towns which Alfred caused to be rebuilt or built where none were before.²² Although this last detail is taken from Einhard’s *Life of Charlemagne*, and perhaps even modelled on the biblical King Solomon,²³ Abels notes that in the area of construction projects Alfred’s accomplishments exceed this description, for “under his direction some thirty fortified centres of varying sizes were either built or refurnished.”²⁴ Alfred, then, seems to have been personally involved in design and construction on a small scale, as well as being responsible for the direction of major building projects in his kingdom. It is clear that Alfred took an interest in construction of various sorts, and sensible therefore that the building metaphor seems particularly apt.

Whether or not Alfred is the translator of the *Soliloquies* as a whole, it seems as though, if the answer to Godden’s question, “Did Alfred write anything?” could be “possibly” or even “yes”, the Preface to the *Soliloquies* would be one of the most likely passages to attribute to him, given that Alfred’s own interests and responsibilities as an Anglo-Saxon lord and king do seem consistent with some of the specific details of the metaphor. Moreover, several elements of the imagery in the Preface clearly come from an Anglo-Saxon context, for example the comparison of the transitory world to loaned land and eternal life to *bocland*. As mentioned

¹⁹ Sayers, “King Alfred’s Timbers,” p. 119-21, quotation at p. 121.
²⁰ William Henry Stevenson, ed., *Asser’s Life of King Alfred* (Oxford, 1904), §76. 6–8, p. 59; see also Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 249 n. 114 and p. 257 n. 153. Although Asser uses the word *aedificia* to describe what Alfred made, Keynes and Lapidge argue that, given its use here and in other passages, this word should likely be understood to signify finely made objects of value, rather than buildings, so may not be as well-connected to the building metaphor as it at first appears.
²² Ibid. §91, pp. 76–9.
²⁴ Ibid. p. 201.
above, *lænland* was land belonging to the royal demesne, to be granted out to people as the king saw fit.²⁵ Their hold on this land was tenuous, however, and nobles hoped instead for a royal charter to transform their land into hereditary property, or *bocland*. The term *bocland* seems especially appropriate in the context of Alfred’s metaphor, for like the written charter granting *bocland*, Alfred’s metaphor is referring to the written material (books) of the Fathers and its power to transform the temporary hold on life in this world to permanent existence in the eternal sphere. The references to hunting, fishing and fowling are also taken from everyday Anglo-Saxon life, as is the discussion of the relationship between a lord and his subjects. Thus it seems likely that the Preface was composed by an Anglo-Saxon writer, either Alfred, a member of his circle, or someone else with interests similar to and in line with his.

For ease and felicity of expression, the author of the Preface will be referred to as Alfred or the Alfredian translator in this chapter, acknowledging, however, that the author’s identity is in question. Whether or not the features outlined above point to Alfred or another Anglo-Saxon writer as the author of the Preface, there still remains a need to seek a clear source for the metaphor it presents and to entertain the possibility of a particular antecedent which may have influenced the author of the Preface to use the building metaphor.

Prodosh Bhattacharya²⁶ has suggested as a possible source for the building metaphor a passage from the *Cura pastoralis* involving tree-cutting:²⁷

```
Swa sint toweorpanne ðærest ða ðære nan god [ær] ne dydon ðurh ðreaunge of ðære
heardnesse hiora yfelnesse, to ðæm ðæt hi sien eft on firste arærde & gestonden on
ryhtum weorce; forðæm we ceorfað heah treowu on holte ðæt we hi eft uparæren on
```

ðæm botle, ðær ðær we timbran willen, ðeah we hi for hrædlícæ to ðæm weorcæ don ne mægen for gremesse, ærðæmæde hi aðrugien.

(So those who have done no good are first to be cast down by reproof from the hardness of their wickedness, that they may after a time be raised, and stand firm with righteous works; for we cut down tall trees in the wood to erect them afterwards in the building, where we intend to build, although we cannot use them for the work too soon, because of their greenness, before they are dry.)

Bhattacharya suggests that this metaphor of woodcutting, which was not original to the Old English translation but is in Gregory’s Latin text, may have stayed in Alfred’s mind (again assuming that Alfred was the translator of both texts) and presumably inspired the imagery in the Preface to the Soliloquies. The article does not elaborate on the mechanics of the transformation or the parallels, likely because beyond the parallel in the vocabulary of tree-cutting, there is no other commonality of vocabulary or content between the two images. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine that this passage could have been behind the metaphor in the Preface, because the ideas in these two passages are quite different. The trees being cut down in Gregory’s metaphor are not precious, carefully selected building materials, but sinners who must be reproved and redeemed to be of use. These sinners are, initially at least, quite the opposite of the building materials in the Preface, where they represent divine wisdom from the writings of the Fathers. The materials being gathered in the Preface do not need to be redeemed for building but are already precious guides on the path to the eternal home. This image should be viewed, perhaps, not as a source of the Soliloquies’ building metaphor, but as one more piece of evidence of a penchant for practical imagery in the translator’s writings, like the concern in the epilogue to the Cura pastoralis with fixing the leaky pitcher lest the drink of life be spilled:

29 Sweet, Pastoral Care, p. 469.
Ac hladað iow nu drincan, nu iow Dryhten geaf ðæt iow Gregorius gegiered hafað to durum iworm Drhytan welle. Fylle nu his fatels, se ðe fæstne hider kylle brohte. Cume eft hrafe, gif her ðegna hwelc ðyrene kylle brohte to ðyys burnan, bete hine georne, ðylæs he forsceade scirost wætra, oððe him lifes dryne forloren weorde.

(But now draw water to drink, now that the Lord has granted to you that Gregory has directed the spring of the Lord to your doors. Let him who has brought a watertight container fill his vessel now. Let him who has brought a leaky container to this stream, fix it quickly, lest he spill this brightest of waters and lose the drink of life, and come back quickly.)

Where in the Preface to the *Soliloquies* the writings of the Fathers are compared to wood gathered for building, here their writings are compared to water drawn from the kingdom of heaven. Alfred, through his translations, has directed the stream to *durum iowrum* (‘your doors’), making it available for gathering in pitchers. Another practical metaphor appears in the comparison of the various societal groups to tools necessary for running the kingdom, in the Old English translation of Boethius’ *Consolation of Philosophy*:31

Hwæt, þu wast þæt nan mon me mæg nænne cræft cyðan ne nænne anweald reccan ne stioran butan tolum and andweorce. Þæt bið ælces cræftes andweorc þæt mon þone cræft buton wyrcað ne mæg. Þæt bið þonne cyninges andweorc and his tol mid to ricsianne, þæt he hæbbe his lond fullmannod. He sceal habban gebedmen and fyrdmen and weorcmen. Hwæt, þu wast þætte butan þissan tolum nan cyning his cræft ne mæg cyðan.

(So, you know that no man can make known any skill, nor direct and guide any authority, without tools and materials; a man cannot work on any craft without the materials for that craft. The materials and tools with which a king rules are that he should have his land fully manned. He must have praying men, fighting men and working men. As you know, without these tools no king may make his craft known.)

Thomas D. Hill discusses the Anglo-Saxon concept of the kingdom being supported by three segments of society, *oratores* (praying men), *laboratores* (working men) and *bellatores* (fighting men), and posits this tripartite structure as the answer to a riddle in the *Collectanea*

---

Pseudo-Bedae. These three groups correspond to the *gebedmen, fyrdmen* and *wyrcmen* who function as the *tol* necessary for the king to run the kingdom in the Boethius passage cited above. Hill comments:

Alfred (or whoever was responsible for this portion of the translation) does speak of the three estates, but does not elaborate the figure of the throne resting on three supports. Instead he elaborates a metaphor that is as far as I know unique in the extensive literature dealing with the three estates: He speaks of the three estates as tools (Old English *tol*) which the king needs to perform his craft.

These are the supports of the *cynestole*, the royal throne (*stol*). Perhaps there is more than mere coincidence in the orthographic similarity between the words *tol* and *stol* which may have prompted the use of the word “tool” to describe the supports of the royal throne in the Old English Boethius. In any case, in this image, the “tools” are more like instruments than building tools, so aside from the lexical parallel, the metaphor does not exhibit a close affinity with the building imagery in the Preface.

An addition to the Old English translation of the *Soliloquies* farther on in Book One, does, however, suggest a source for Alfred’s building metaphor. Following another intriguing metaphorical addition to Augustine’s text, in which the Alfredian translator discusses the anchors, “geleafa, tohopa and lufu” (‘faith, hope and charity’) which sustain the ship of the mind, he writes that God “(wyrcð) myd us swa swa myd sumum gewealdnum tolum” (‘works with us just as with powerful tools’) and then quotes part of 1 Corinthians 3.9, “swa swa hyt awritten ys þæt ælcum welwyrcendum god myd beo mydwyrhta” (‘just as it is written

---

that God is a fellow-worker with each well-working person’). The remainder of 1 Cor. 3:9 refers to Christians not only as co-workers with God, but also as God’s field and his building. 1 Cor. 3:9 in the Vulgate reads:  

Dei enim sumus adiutores  
Dei agricultura estis  
Dei aedificatio estis.

(We are the helpers of God.  
You are the field of God.  
You are the building of God.)

The passage in 1 Corinthians 3.9–14 proceeds to develop a building metaphor, in which Paul is a wise architect (sapiens architectus) who has laid a foundation which others must build upon. Here we begin to see a number of parallels between 1 Cor. 3 and the building metaphor in the Preface. The translator starts the Preface by describing himself as a builder who is capable of working with many different tools, reminiscent of the gewealdnum tolum which God works with in Alfred’s reference to 1 Cor. 3.9. He is gathering the finest building materials in order to construct each of the structures he knows how to make. The translator is clearly describing a skilled builder, who not only gathers the materials and the tools for the building, but knows how to design the building and construct it, much like Paul’s description of himself as a wise architect (1. Cor. 3.10). Paul follows his description of himself as a wise architect by saying that others will build upon his foundation, and warns, “unasquisque autem

---

35 Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version, pp. 68.15–69.2.  
36 Weber, Robert, ed., Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem (Stuttgart, 1969), p. 1772. It is interesting and possibly useful to note that in Greek (Aland, Kurt, et al., eds. The Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1983, p. 584) the verse uses the term συνεργοί (fellow-workers) which is much closer to the Old English mydwyrhta, than the Latin adiutores (helpers). In the Greek and the Vulgate ‘we’ is the subject and God is in the genitive, but in Old English God is the subject, resulting in differences of emphasis in the three versions. In the Greek, more of a partnership is implied, whereas in Latin ‘we’ are active and God receives our help. In the Old English, God is active, helping the Christian. Again, these differences make the Old English version closer in meaning to the Greek, than to the Vulgate. It is possible that Alfred was not reading or recalling the Vulgate, but a form of the Vetus Latina for his quotation. There is evidence that Asser used the Vetus Latina rather than the Vulgate, for he quotes from it in his Life of Alfred (see Keynes and Lapidge, p. 53.) and its use was still common in Wales and Ireland at this time, where adoption of the Vulgate occurred gradually (see Stevenson, xciv–xcv).  
37 Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version, p. 47.3.
videat quomodo superaedificet” (‘but let each person take care how he builds upon [the foundation]’). Similarly, the Alfredian translator advises each person who has many wagons (in other words each person who is capable of doing so) to follow his example by gathering the best building materials and “windan manigne smicerne wah, and manig ænlic hus settan and fegerne tun timbrian” (‘to weave many an elegant wall, and to set up many a splendid house and to build a fair town’). Paul proceeds in 1 Cor. 3.12–13 to advise each builder that his work will be dependent on the type of building material he has chosen. The work of those who choose the best materials (gold, silver and precious stones) will survive a test of fire, representing the test of fire at Judgement Day. Likewise, the Old English writer describes the care with which he chose the wlietgostan treowo (‘the finest wood’) and advises others to collect fegrum gerdum (‘fair lengths’) for building. Paul says that those who have built with the best materials and whose structures therefore survive at Judgement Day, will receive a reward (mercedem, 1 Cor. 3.14). The Preface writer, too, proceeds to describe how, having gathered the best wood (the teachings of the Fathers) he will be able to use the “buildings” constructed from these writings to illuminate his eyes so that he can see the road to the eternal home, the eternal glory and the eternal rest, in other words, so that he can receive the promised reward. Both 1 Cor. 3.9–14 and the Preface to the Old English Soliloquies describe a master builder who gathers the best materials and builds carefully, advising others to do the same, so that their work will last and earn for them an eternal reward. These parallels, along with the evidence that the Alfredian translator consciously quoted Paul’s words from 1 Cor. 3.9, suggest that 1 Cor. 3.9–14 was a source for the building metaphor in the Preface to the Old English Soliloquies.

38 1 Cor. 3.10, Weber, Biblia Sacra, p. 1772.
39 Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version, p. 47.9–10.
40 Ibid. pp. 47.12–48.3
Other parallels between the Old English *Soliloquies* and 1 Corinthians 3 support the hypothesis that the translator was aware of the passage and used it when writing his translation. 1 Cor. 3.1 contrasts the spiritual to the fleshly nature. The Alfredian translator makes a point of bringing out this distinction in his *Soliloquies*, in several instances adding some form of the pair of terms *lichamlice* and *gastlice* to Augustine’s text. To Augustine’s point that God helps Christians overcome their enemies, for example, the Old English adds that he helps them “ægþer ge gastlice ge lichamlice” (‘both spiritually and physically’).41 When translating Augustine’s quotation from Cornelius Celsus that humans are composed of two parts, the soul and body, the Old English text strives to clarify the division between the soul and body by adding, “seo sawel is gastlic and se lichaman, eordlic” (‘the soul is spiritual and the body earthly’).42 Likewise, in attempting to define the nature of wisdom, the Alfredian translator questions whether it is *lichamlice* or *gastlice*.43

A second parallel comes from the passage immediately preceding Paul’s building metaphor, 1 Cor. 3.5–9, in which Paul uses an agricultural metaphor to explain that God is really responsible for the growth of the Church:44

```
eg plantavi Apollo rigavit
sed Deus incrementum dedit
itaque neque qui plantat est aliquid
neque qui rigat
sed qui incrementum dat Deus
qui plantat autem et qui rigat unum sunt
unusquisque autem propriam mercedem
accipiet secundum suum laborem.
```

(I planted, Apollo watered
but God gave the growth.
And so neither he who plants

---

41 Carnicelli, *King Alfred’s Version*, p. 51.22.
42 Ibid. p. 75.13–4.
43 Ibid p., 81.29.
44 1 Cor. 3.6–8, Weber, *Biblia Sacra*, pp. 1771–2.

nor he who waters is anything,
but God who gives the growth.
The one who plants and the one who waters are one
and each will receive his own reward
according to his own labour.)

This passage brings to mind another significant and beautiful addition to Augustine’s text involving the cyclical variations in nature:45

On ða ylcan wisan hweorfiað ealle gescæafta. Wrixliað sume þeah on oððer wyssan,
swa þat þa ylcan eft ne cumað þær ðær hy er weron, eallunga swa swa hy er weron.
Ac cumað oðre for hy, swa swa leaf on treowum; and æpla, (and) gears, and wyrtan,
and treowu foraldiað and forseriað; and cumað oððer, grenu wexað, and gearwað,
and ripað, for þat hy eft onginnað searian; and swa eall nytenu and fugelas, swelces
ðe nu ys lang æall to arimanne. Ge furþum manna lichaman forealdiað, swa swa oðre
gescæaftas ealdiat. Ac swa swa hy ær wurðlicor lybbað þonne treowu oððe oðre
nytenu, swa hy eac weordfulicor arisað on domes dæge, swa þæt nefre syððam þa
lichaman ne geendiað ne ne forealdiað.

(In the same manner, all creatures change. But some change in another way, so that
the same ones do not come again where they were before, entirely just as they were
before. But others come in their place, just as leaves on trees; and apples, and grass
and plants and trees grow old and dry; and others come, grow green, and bloom, and
ripen, before they again begin to become dry; and so all animals and birds, so many
that it would take too long to enumerate them all. And also the bodies of men grow
old, just as other creatures grow old. But just as they before lived more worthily than
trees or other animals, so they will also arise more worthily on Judgment Day, so that
never again the body will end nor grow old.)

Just as Paul’s growing and watering metaphor leads to a statement about the eternal reward
due to the labourers, so this metaphor about the cyclical variations in nature builds to a
declaration of eternal reward and an end to decay. Gatch noted another parallel with 1
Corinthians, suggesting that this nature passage likely descends from a tradition found in 1

45 Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies, p. 53.16–26.
Cor. 15.38–49, of developing natural parallels to and proofs of the resurrection, in this case dealing with the perishability of seeds, plants, animals, birds and humans.\textsuperscript{46}

A third similarity is the emphasis in both 1 Cor. 3 and the Old English \textit{Soliloquies} on the folly of worldly wisdom. Paul admonishes, “Si quis videtur inter vos sapiens esse in hoc saeculo stultus fiat ut sit sapiens. Sapientia enim huius mundi stultitia es apud Deum” (‘If anyone among you seems to be wise in this age, let him become a fool so that he may be wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God’).\textsuperscript{47} The folly of worldly wisdom is a theme in the \textit{Soliloquies}, as expressed, for example, in the prayer at the beginning of Book One:\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ðu} us wel lerdest \textit{þæt} we ongeatan \textit{þæt} us wæs fremde and lene \textit{þæt} ðæt we iu wendon \textit{þæt} ure agen were, \textit{þæt} ys weoruldwela; and \textit{þu} us ðæc lærdest \textit{þæt} we ongeatan \textit{þæt} ðæt ys ure agen \textit{þæt} we ieo wendon \textit{þæt} us fremde were, \textit{þæt} ys, \textit{þæt} heofonrice \textit{ðæt} we ða forsawon.
\end{quote}

(You have taught us well that we should understand that that was foreign and temporary which we once thought was our own, that is worldly wealth; and you have also taught us that we should understand that that is our own which we once thought was foreign to us, that is the heavenly kingdom which we have forsaken.)

While this is not original to the Old English version, it is a theme which permeates the \textit{Soliloquies}, in both Latin and Old English. The theme is reiterated near the end of Book One, when Reason tells Augustine that he must despise honours of the world as strongly as possible in order to attain “ðam cræfte þe ðu wilnast to wittanne” (‘the skill which you want to

\textsuperscript{46}Gatch, “King Alfred’s Version of Augustine’s \textit{Soliloquia},” p. 28. Carnicelli, \textit{King Alfred’s Version}, p. 100, notes that this passage is also reminiscent of the Old English Boethius.

\textsuperscript{47}1 Cor. 3.18–19, Weber, \textit{Biblia Sacra}, p. 1772.

\textsuperscript{48}Carnicelli, \textit{King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies}, p. 52.5–9.
know’). Clemoes argues that Alfred uses the word *craft* in this passage, as well as in his translation of Boethius’ *Consolation of Philosophy*, to signify the particular sort of wisdom that exchanged worldly for divine wisdom, allowing the soul to commune with God. In Alfredian texts, *craft*, Clemoes writes, “was the operative word in the creative relationship between each soul and God.” Nicole Guenther Discenza, too, shows that the translator of the Old English *Consolation of Philosophy*, whom she identifies as Alfred, uses the term *craft* to unite the spiritual and practical. She argues that to the more common meanings of *craft*, “strength”, “skill” or “power”, Alfred added the unprecedented meaning “virtue” by using it to translate the Latin *virtus*, as in the translation of a prayer from the *de Consolatione*, “Hatiað yfel and fleoð swa ge swiðost mægen; lufiað cræftas” (“Hate evil and flee it as much as you can; love virtues’). Alfred unites the concepts of power, skill and virtue in the one word *craft*, she writes, the pursuit of which is the journey to God. In the Old English *Boethius* the concept *craft* inspires practical images used to elucidate the author’s points, as for example, his observation, “Se wyrhta is god; þæs cræft ic þær herige on” (“The workman is God; here I praise his craft”). Discenza comments on the Old English author’s use of *craft* in such images:

In uniting the different concepts his usage of *craft* evokes, Alfred goes beyond Boethius. Moreover, the positive value the Old English text puts on physical skill is unthinkable in the Latin text, but not valuing physical skill was unthinkable to Anglo-Saxons. Alfred can use imagery drawn from occupations because he treats such labor as comparable to spiritual strivings: both fulfill the responsibilities given one by God.

---

49 Ibid. p. 78.30.
Thus, in the Old English *Boethius*, as in the Preface to the *Soliloquies*, skill at physical labour is identified with the pursuit of God, a comparison also used by Paul in 1 Corinthians 3 when he compares himself to a *sapiens architectus*.

Further evidence suggesting that the translator used 1 Corinthians to develop some of his additions to the *Soliloquies* comes from another passage in the Old English *Soliloquies*, the ship and anchor metaphor mentioned above, which states that the three anchors of the ship of the mind are faith, hope and charity. These three anchors, can, of course, be traced back to the famous passage in 1 Corinthians 13 about charity, “nunc autem manet fides spes caritas tria haec maior autem his est caritas” (‘now faith, hope and charity remain, these three. But the greater of these is charity’). The anchor metaphor is developed at some length, culminating in the quotation from 1 Cor. 3.9 discussed above, which may have prompted the translator to continue the parallels with 1 Corinthians in his Preface, by adapting Paul’s building metaphor in chapter three to his own context.

I suggest, then, that the Alfredian translator used 1 Cor. 3.9–14 as a source inspiring him to develop the building metaphor in his Preface to the *Soliloquies*. Further, I would like to suggest another source which may have alerted him to the building metaphor in 1 Corinthians 3 and prompted him to apply it to the gathering of written sources for his study and translations. Asser’s account of Alfred’s enchiridion states that Alfred’s handbook was almost full, so Asser added another quire. As they gathered more passages to copy into the book, this

---

55 In Alfred’s discussion of the anchor earlier in Book One, he mentions the anchors which fasten the eyes of the mind on God; these anchors are “wysdom, and eadmeto, and wærscype, and gemetgung, rihtwisnes and mildheortnes, gesceadwisnes, gestadþines and welwilnes, clennes and forheafdnes.” (wisdom, and humility, and prudence and moderation, righteousness, and mercy, discretion, seriousness, benevolence, purity and continence; Carnicelli, *King Alfred’s Version*, p. 62.7–10). In his translation of Gregory’s *Cura Pastoralis*, Alfred compares the mind to a ship, which cannot stand against the current unless it has rowers or an anchor. Here the rowers and anchor refer to good works (Sweet, *King Alfred’s West Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care*, p. 445.12).
56 Carnicelli, *King Alfred’s Version* pp. 67.1–69.4.
quire, too, grew full, Asser relates, and describes the collection of passages in the book as follows: 57

Sicut scriptum est “super modicum fundamentum aedificat iustus et paulatim ad maiora defluit,” velut apis fertilissima longe lateque gronnios interrogando discurrens, multitomos divinae scripturae flosculos inhianter et incessabiliter congregavit, quis praecordii sui cellulas densatim replevit.

(Just as it is written, “The just man builds on a modest foundation and gradually proceeds to greater things,” or like the busy bee, wandering far and wide over the marshes in his quest, eagerly and relentlessly assembles many various flowers of Holy Scripture, with which he crams full the cells of his heart.)

Both Smyth and Keynes and Lapidge state that the source of the section in quotation marks, about the man building on a modest foundation, is unknown. 58 Keynes and Lapidge also note that the second part, about the busy bee, is drawn from Aldhelm’s “description of his method of compiling the prose De virginitate—purpureos pudicitiae flores ex sacrorum voluminum prato decerpens, ‘plucking crimson flowers of purity from the meadow of holy books.’” 59 Augustine Casiday points out that Aldhelm praised the nuns at Barking for their beelike industry in roaming through the fields of scripture, collecting and interpreting it for the benefit of others, 60 a task which sounds remarkably like that which the Alfredrian translator views himself as accomplishing by making translations of the works of the Church Fathers, and which he likens to gathering wood for building, rather than to gathering nectar. In addition to the flower-gathering imagery being drawn from Aldhelm, it seems quite possible that the first part of Asser’s quotation, regarding building upwards from a foundation, is also inspired

57 Stevenson, Asser’s Life, §88; Translation from Keynes and Lapidge, Alfred the Great, p. 100.
by Aldhelm’s prose *De virginitate*, for in stating his intention to compose a verse counterpart to the prose, Aldhelm writes:  

Heroicis exametrorum versibus eiusdem praeconium pudicitiae subtiliter comere Christo cooperante conabor et, velut iactis iam rhetorics fundamentis et constructis prosae parietibus, cum tegulis trochaicis et dactilicis metrorum imbricibus firmissimum culmen caelesti confisus suffragio imponam.

(I shall try to adorn the celebration of this same chastity accurately, with Christ cooperating, in the heroic measures of hexameter verse, and, as if the rhetorical foundation-stones are now laid and the walls of prose are constructed, with trochaic tiles and dactylic shingles of metres, I shall build, confident in heavenly approbation, a very strong roof.)

While Asser’s statement is not a direct quotation of Aldhelm’s, it certainly paraphrases the idea of beginning with a foundation and building upwards from it to a higher level. Both Asser and Aldhelm, like the Alfredian translator, use a building metaphor to represent construction of a literary work. Moreover, like the reference to God and Christians as co-workers, Aldhelm’s reference to building with *Christo cooperante* and with heavenly support is reminiscent of 1 Cor. 3.9. This parallel is supported by Aldhelm’s use of the term *fundamentum*, for in 1 Cor. 3.10, Paul refers to himself, the co-worker with Christ, as building a foundation. Asser tells how Alfred loved to hear and memorise English poems, and these seem to have included poems by Aldhelm, for we learn from William of Malmesbury that Alfred knew and appreciated highly Aldhelm’s vernacular poetry. Aldhelm’s prose and verse *De virginitate* were both very popular, oft-quoted and imitated works in Anglo-Saxon

---


62 Interestingly, Aldhelm’s use of *cooperante* is closer in etymological meaning to the Greek *συνεργοί* and the Old English *mydwyrhta* than to the Vulgate *adiutores*. See also footnote 35 in this chapter, for further discussion of these terms.


64 William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum anglorum*, p. 336. Also see Orchard, *Poetic Art*, p. 5.
England. Asser’s bee quotation from Aldhelm’s prose *De virginitate* makes it clear that he knew the work well, and it is likely that he shared his knowledge of it with the King. Consequently, it is quite possible that the Alfredian translator knew Aldhelm’s building metaphor and was in part prompted by it to compose his own imagery on the same theme in his Preface. He may also have recognised a reference to 1 Cor 3.9 and 10 in Aldhelm’s comments and expanded on this Pauline passage, using it to guide the composition of his own building metaphor. These two sources, the Bible and Aldhelm, were apparently two of Alfred’s favourite fonts of wisdom. As already mentioned, according to Asser some of the content of Alfred’s enchiridion consisted of passages copied from the Bible. He is associated with the translation of the first fifty psalms into English, and Abels argues that Alfred may have deliberately modelled himself on the biblical King Solomon. Perhaps the building imagery describing how wisdom is gathered from the Fathers, builds an image based on material gathered from two of Alfred’s favourite sources, the Bible and Aldhelm.

The Preface is constructed with literary skill and imagination. Its careful composition is evident, for example, in the unusual vocabulary (e.g. *kicglas, stuþansceaftas* and *lohsceafa*), alliteration (e.g. *þara weorca þe ic wyrcan cuðe, þa wlitegostan treowo; fetige hym þar ma, and gefeðrige hys fegrum gerdum; heora ealra earnunge*) and eight sets of

---

65 See Orchard, *Poetic Art*, p. 239.
66 In fact, it is probable that Alfred worked on the composition and translation of his works with the help of his scholarly entourage, which included Asser, as well as Grimbold, Plegmund, Werferth and John the Old Saxon. In the *Soliloquies* itself Alfred may be hinting at this by adding to Augustine’s expression of the need for solitude when writing down all his contemplations, that he also needs “fæawa cuðe men and creftige mid þe, ðe nan wiht ne amyrdan, ac fultmoden to þinum crefte” (a few wise and skilled men, who would not at all hinder you, but help you in your skill), Carnicelli, *King Alfred’s Version*, p. 49. 20–1. It is even possible that Alfred and Asser worked on the building metaphor in the Preface together.
69 Carnicelli, *King Alfred’s Version*, p. 47.1.
70 Ibid. p. 47.3; pp. 8–9; and pp. 16–7.
paired phrases within eighteen lines of printed text, five of which pairs set up a dichotomy between the temporal and eternal worlds:

ægðer ge wintras ge sumeras (47.11)  
(both in winter and in summer)

ægðer ge on þisum lænan stoclife ... ge eac on þam ecan hame (47.13–4)  
(both in this borrowed dwelling-place ... and in the eternal home)

ægðer ge þisne weig gelimpfulran gedo þonne he ær þissum wes, ge huru mines modes eagan to þam ongelihte þæt ic mage rihtne weig aredian to þam ecan hame (47.17–48.2).  
(both make this way better than it was before, and also illuminate the eyes of my mind so that I can find the right way to the eternal home)

eac on þare lade and eac on þære bytlinge (48.4–5)  
(both in the carrying and also in the building)

ægðer ge on se ge on lande (48.8)  
(both on the sea and on land)

ge þissa lænena stoclife ge þara ecena hama (48.10).  
(both this leased dwelling-place and the eternal home)

ðe ægðer gescop and ægðeres wilt (48.11)  
(he who created both and rules both)

ge her nytwyrde to beonne, ge huru þider to cumane (48.12)  
(both to be useful here and especially to arrive there)

Each of the pairs is set up and drawn to the reader’s attention by the repetition of ge ... ge or ægðer ... ægðer. In several cases the idea compared is expressed in a balanced number of words, syllables and/or rhythm, and corresponding word pairs, as in, for example,  
ge þissa lænena stoclife ge þara ecena hama (48.10), where the following words are paired:  
ge ... ge, þissa ... þara, lænena ... ecena, stoclife ... hama. The balance of the word pairs serves to enhance the contrast of the opposing earthly and heavenly homes. In the last example, ge
her nytwyrde to beonne, ge huru pider to cumane (48.12), as well as using a balance of word pairs, ge .. .ge, her ... huru, nytwyrde ... pider, to ... to, beonne...cumane, the word pairs are further enhanced by the use of alliteration and rhyming (her ... huru, nytwyrde ... pider, and beonne ... cumane). These opposing pairs signal one of the major themes of the Soliloquies, the rejection of worldly wisdom in order to gain divine wisdom. The word nytwyrde in the last pair also expresses a guiding principle for the Preface writer, his wish to be useful. It appears again in Book One of the Soliloquies, first, in the Tiberius fragment, where the word nytwyrðost appears instead of Vitellius’ rihtwyrðost in the opening prayer and again further on in Book One:

Ælle þas weorlde ic lufige, ælc ðinc be ðam dæle þe ic hyt nytwyrðe ongyte, and huru þa þing swiðost þe me to wisdome fultumiað.

(All this world I love, each thing in the way in which I consider it useful, and especially the things which most help me to wisdom.)

Usefulness is also a prominent theme in another Alfredian translation, the Cura pastoralis. The word nytwyrðe appears several times in this text, for example, “ac ðence ælc mon ær hu nytwyrðe he sie & hu gehiersum ðæm ðe he ðonne mid ryhte hieran scyle on ðam ðe he ðonne deð” (‘but let every man consider before how useful and obedient he is to those he is bound to obey in his actions’).

---

71 Logeman, ‘Anglo-Saxonica Minora,’ p. 512, where the relevant section of the text reads, “and gefultume ne þæt ic symle þene rad aredige þe þe licwyrðe sy and me fremfull and þearflic si for bam lifum and betst and nytwyrðost sy.” Assuming that the ne should be me as it is in Carnicelli’s edition, a translation might read, “and help me that I always choose the counsel that is pleasing to you and beneficial and profitable for me for both lives and is best and most useful.” The passage corresponds to p. 56.2–3 in Carnicelli’s edition. Also see Hudson, ‘King Alfred’s Version,’ pp. 474–5.

72 Carnicelli, King Alfred’s Version of St. Augustine’s Soliloquies, p. 76.14–6.


74 Sweet, King Alfred’s West Saxon Version of Gregory’s Pastoral Care, p. 57.12–4.
The translator of the *Soliloquies* expresses in his Preface that his prime goal in this life is to be useful, so that he can attain eternal glory. He strove to be useful and loved those things which were useful in his quest. This included the writings of the Church Fathers, the wood which he gathered to build a structure which would in turn be useful to others on the way to the eternal home. In a completely different context, John D. Niles makes a comment which may shed light on the appeal of the building metaphor in the quest to be useful. The Anglo-Saxons, Niles writes, “conceived of a human being as one who ... identifies aesthetic beauty with the craftsmanship that shapes the things of nature into new forms, who sees the whole of nature as a field for human use.” Perhaps this sentiment led the Alfredian translator to focus on Paul’s building metaphor in 1 Cor. 3, and Aldhelm’s in *De virginitate* and prompted him to transform their images into his own building metaphor in the Preface to the *Soliloquies*.

The Preface strikes a rather intimate note, giving the reader a glimpse into the innermost aspirations of its author, of the means with which he sought to serve God and of the eternal rest he hoped his lifelong devotion to God would gain him. In his quest to be useful, he used the tools which God provided for him, the writings of the Fathers, created new tools by making his own translations, and strove to be a *tol* himself, a *mydwyrhta*, working with God. The Preface is a testimony to its author’s devotion to God and his commitment to being a useful and powerful *tol* for God by studying and translating the works of the Bible and the Church Fathers. If, as I contend, the translator of the Old English *Soliloquies* did indeed base the imagery in the Preface on 1 Cor. 3.9–14 and was influenced, too, by Aldhelm’s building metaphor in the prose *De virginitate*, it is also a testimony to his literary skill and imagination in constructing from his sources a metaphor particularly apropos to his own culture, time and

---

place. The Apostle Paul’s letters to the Corinthians, and his comparison of himself to a wise architect, inspired in the Alfredian translator an image of himself following in Paul’s footsteps as someone building on the foundation of Christian teaching and by doing so attaining the wisdom to build a strong kingdom.
Although Ælfric flourished almost a century after Alfred, and more than two centuries after Boniface, his writings show that he, too, saw himself as an imitator of Paul, albeit in a different capacity. Ælfric, who has been called “his country’s foremost teacher,” was probably born c. 950, and became an oblate educated under Æthelwold at Winchester. He stayed at Winchester as a monk and priest until 987 when he was sent to Cerne Abbas. In 1005 he was appointed abbot of the abbey of Eynsham where he seems to have remained until his death. Although there is no direct evidence, it is commonly assumed that he served as a teacher at Winchester and Cerne Abbas, a reasonable conclusion based on the evidence of his having written a grammar which he addressed to *vobis puerilis tenellis* (‘your tender little boys’) presumably the young boys he was teaching in the monastery. He further specifies that it is intended for “inscientibus puerulis, non senibus” (‘ignorant little boys, not old men’). The Grammar was complemented by his Glossary and Colloquy, all written between 992 and 1002. Although Ælfric is popularly labelled “the Grammarian” and is viewed as a teacher of Old English and Latin, instructing boys in the monastery, a closer look at his own idea of the role of a teacher both for himself and for others, reveals that his understanding of this role

---

5 Ibid. p. 1.
6 Clemoes, “Chronology,” p. 213.
7 In *Iter: Gateway to the Middles Ages and Renaissance*, http://www.itergateway.org/, the first two subject headings for Ælfric are Ælfric Grammaticus Abbot of Eynsham and Ælfric the Grammarian, Abbot of Eynsham.
was broader than we generally conceive of it. Clemoes comments that Ælfric was carrying out a “plan to provide the means of religious education in the vernacular.”8 Several modern scholars have commented that Ælfric modelled his own role as a teacher on Alfred and Æthelwold. Menzer, for example, argues, “Ælfric’s Grammar is, perhaps, a continuation or an echo of Alfred’s attempt at universal education.”9 Sisam writes of Ælfric’s teaching work, “It was a plan for education in the vernacular comparable to Alfred’s plan a century earlier, but more systematic and concentrated on the advancement of religion.”10 Like Alfred, Ælfric was intent on teaching Christian doctrine and making it accessible to the English people. As a lareow, the common Anglo-Saxon word for teacher, Ælfric saw his role as encompassing more than just teaching boys Latin and Old English grammar. An examination of Ælfric’s writings shows that in many ways he identified himself with the Apostle Paul as a lareow, his mission, like Paul’s, to make the Christian message and way of life accessible to as many people as possible. To begin, we will examine Ælfric’s use of the word lareow for further clarification about whom Ælfric called a teacher, the role of these teachers, and his motivation for being a teacher.

According to the Dictionary of Old English the world lareow (teacher) occurs more than 300 times in the corpus of Ælfric’s writings.11 The frequency alone of Ælfric’s use of the word reveals that it was a very important one for him and one which he discusses a great deal in his writings. Sixteen of these occurrences appear in the Grammar, three in the Colloquy and one in the Glossary. In these cases lareow is used as a translation of either magister or doctor. In the Grammar, for example, the sample Latin vocative sentence, “O magister, doce me

---

8 Clemoes, “Chronology,” p. 213.
10 Kenneth Sisam, Studies in the History of Old English Literature, p. 301.
11 DOE, http://tpor.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/.
“aliquid” (‘O master, teach me something’) is translated, “eala ðu lareow, tæce me sum ðing”.  

In his *Grammar* Ælfric gives two examples of specific teachers, *Donatum, þam lareowe* (‘Donatus, the teacher’),  
whose grammatical works, the *Ars Minor* and *Ars Maior*, were staples for medieval Latin students,  
and *se lareow Priscianus*,  
the fifth-century author whose intermediate-level grammar, *Excerptones de Prisciano*, Ælfric says he drew on for his own grammar.  
The occurrences of the word *lareow* in the *Grammar*, *Glossary* and *Colloquy*  
which we have just discussed comprise 20 of the more than 300 instances of *lareow* in Ælfric’s Old English corpus,  
a rather small proportion of the whole.  
An examination of the remainder of the occurrences reveals quite a different role for the *lareow* from that in Ælfric’s grammatical works, outside of which in almost every case the *lareow* is not a teacher of boys in school,  
but what we would call in modern English a preacher, teaching Christian doctrine.  

There is a clear difference between the teachers Ælfric names in the grammatical texts and those mentioned by name outside of the *Grammar*, none of whom functions primarily as a schoolteacher or grammarian like Donatus and Priscian do.  
The list of named teachers  
comprises many famous figures in Christian history, beginning with Christ himself,  
whose rule Ælfric refers to as “ures lareowes cristes regol” (‘the rule of our teacher Christ’)  
and who gave *bysne eallum lareowum* (‘an example for all teachers’).  
The idea of Christ as a teacher is, of course, drawn from the Gospels themselves, where the disciples (from *discipulus*, student) call Jesus, *Rabbi*, or in Greek *didaskalos*, both of which titles we would

---

17 ÆCHom II, p. 281.
18 ÆCHom II, p. 132.
translate as teacher, and which are commonly rendered as *magister* in Latin. Christ in turn chose his disciples, and “hi sǐpban gelærde and to lareowum gesette” (‘afterwards taught them and made them teachers’). The apostles are also named as teachers, who were “gecorene and gesette lareowas eallum mæcynne” (‘chosen and established as teachers for all mankind’). Other examples of well-known figures whom Ælfric calls teachers are Moses, John the Baptist, St. Augustine the *æþela lareow* (‘noble teacher’), “Beda se snotera lareow” (‘Bede the clever teacher’), Haymo, Amalarius, Jerome, Benedict and above all, Paul *ðeoda lareow* (‘the teacher of the gentiles’), whom Ælfric calls a *lareow* at least 26 times in his writings. These figures fall into two general categories. In the first category fall early Church leaders who were instrumental in the initial spread of Christianity. They were learned in that they were taught Christian doctrine by Christ, but not necessarily in the sense of the *lareowas* who appear in the *Grammar*. The second category is comprised of later Church fathers, for example Augustine, Jerome and Gregory who were in fact learned in a scholarly sense as well as in Christian doctrine, although in general their literary knowledge is not emphasized. Bishops and masspriests are also called *lareowas*.

Ælfric devotes no small portion of his texts to discussing the role of these *lareowa*, who are often compared to shepherds. In his homily for the Nativity, for example, “Þa hyrdas

---

19 For example, Matt. 22:36 and John 20:16.
21 ÆCHom II, 3, p. 163.
22 ÆCHom I, 23, p. 22.
23 ÆCHom II, 3, p. 20.
25 ÆCHom II 24, p. 138.
26 ÆCHom I 8, p. 15.
27 ÆCHom II 5, p. 237.
29 ÆCHom II, 11, p. 103.
30 ÆCHom II, 4, p. 35.
31 ÆHom, xviii, p. 597.
Ælfric’s collections of homilies make clear that he considers himself one of these teachers, whose role is both to proclaim Christian teaching to the laity and to train other teachers so that there will be more who can teach as he does. In the preface to the first series of homilies Ælfric declares: 36

Ure Drihten bebead his discipulum þæt hi sceoldon læran and tæcan eallum þeodum ða ðing þe he sylf him tæhte; ac ðæra is nu to lyt ðe wile wel tæcan and wel bysnian ...

(Our Lord commanded his disciples to instruct and teach all people the things which he himself taught; but of these there are now too few who want to teach well and set a good example .... It appeared to me that I would not be guiltless if I would not declare to other men, by writings, the evangelical truth, which he himself spoke and afterwards revealed to holy teachers.)

He has been chosen by God for this task, he continues, and like the Apostle Paul, is God’s assistant. 37 Ælfric sees the need for instruction as especially important “on þisum timan, þe is

32 ÆCHom I, 2, p. 193.
33 E.g ÆCHom I, 17, p. 89.
34 ÆHom xviii, p. 597.
36 ÆCHom I, preface, p. 176.
37 ÆCHom I preface, p. 177.
geendung þyssere worulde” (‘at this time, which is the end of the world’). Particularly notable because it is uncharacteristic for a preface, is a lengthy description in the first series preface of the various trials and tribulations which he suggests humankind will be faced with in the near future. Their imminence makes the teacher’s role particularly critical, for only those “þurh boclice lare getrymmed” (‘strengthened through book learning’) will be preserved in faith to the end. The second series homily “On the Nativity of Several Apostles” reiterates Ælfric’s concern that there are too few teachers. The teacher, Ælfric writes, prepares the way of God when he preaches the words of life to men. Comparing the teacher/preacher to a reaper, he writes, “Efne nu þes middaneard is mid sacerdum afylled ac swa ðeah on godes geripe feawa heora beoð wyrcende … Symle sceal þæt læwede folc gewilnian and æt gode biddan þæt he him gode lareowas foresceawige þe magon ðurh halwende lare hi tihtan to ðan ecan life,” (‘even now this world is filled with priests, but, nevertheless, in God’s reaping few of them are working … Ever should the lay folk desire and pray to God that he provide them with good teachers, who by salutary instruction may stimulate them to everlasting life’). Ælfric has taken up the calling to be one of these teachers. In his homilies, Ælfric both instructs the laity himself and exhorts priests to take up the same mission. Catholic Homily II, 19 in particular illuminates the role Ælfric saw himself being called to fulfill as a teacher to both the church leaders and to the laity, and makes explicit the teaching which he conveyed to them, using Paul’s speech in the Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli as a framework.

38 Ibid. p. 174.
39 Ibid. p. 175.
40 ÆCHom II, 36, p. 305.
Both Blickling XV and Ælfric’s Catholic Homily I, 26 include the section of the *Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (BHL 6657)\(^{41}\) in which Nero asks Paul, who has seemingly been standing silently and idly by while Peter has been busily engaged in verbal and magical combat with Simon, “Forhwon ne sprecst þu Paulus?” (‘Why don’t you say anything, Paul?’). Both Blickling XV and Ælfric follow the Latin version of Paul’s response fairly closely, which consists of an outline of his social teaching towards various segments of society, the rich, middle-class, and poor, children, husbands, wives, slaves and masters. Each address appears to be based, albeit in some cases rather loosely, on a reference to one of Paul’s letters.\(^{42}\) The social teaching seems oddly out of place in the context of a battle of magical powers, but reflects the iconic image of Paul as a teacher of Christian behaviour.

We can tell that Ælfric saw didactic value in the passage outlining Paul’s teaching, for he used it again in Catholic Homily II, 19,\(^ {43}\) for *Laetania Maiore*, the Rogationtide Monday homily. This homily, more than any other, it seems, exemplifies the role of the teacher in Ælfric’s mind. He opens the homily by declaring, “Læwede menn behofiað þæt him lareowas secgon ða godspellican lare ðe hi on bocum leornodon, þæt men for nytennysse misfaran ne sceolon” (‘Laymen require that teachers should impart to them the evangelical lore which they have learned in books, that men should not err through ignorance’).\(^ {44}\) The period of Rogation was an important one for Ælfric as evidenced by the inclusion of three homilies for it in each of his two series, and Rogationtide homilies were traditionally directed to the laity in particular. In ÆCHom II, 19 Ælfric actually addresses several segments of society, both lay

---


\(^{42}\) For a detailed listing of the sources see Malcolm Godden, *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, EETS s.s. 18 (London, 2000), pp. 520–9 and Cross, “Literate Anglo-Saxon, pp. 26–8, 33–6, and in Table 4.1 below.

\(^{43}\) ÆCHom II, pp. 180–9.

\(^{44}\) ÆCHom II, 19, pp. 1–3.
and clerical. Ælfric uses the paragraph outlining Paul’s teaching in BHL 6657 as a framework for the various societal groups he addresses, and expands on the teaching for each by adding his own more detailed knowledge of Paul’s epistolary teachings.45

A comparative examination of these three texts which used Paul’s speech as printed in BHL 6657,46 namely Blickling XV,47 ÆCH 1, 2648 and ÆCH II, 19,49 is helpful to understand the possible relationships amongst them. A comparison of Paul’s speech in Blickling XV and BHL 6657 shows that the Blickling author followed the Latin quite closely, largely verbatim, except for omitting the sections on negotiatores (businessmen), as well as masters’ behaviour toward slaves and slaves’ obedience to masters. Ælfric’s version in ÆCHom I, 26 also follows the Latin closely, in some cases more closely than Blickling XV, but often with different Old English vocabulary. Like Blickling XV he removes the address to negotiatores but unlike Blickling he includes the instruction for masters and slaves. The lexical differences between Ælfric and Blickling would be expected if the authors were working independently from a Latin version, or possibly from two different Old English translations. In Ælfric’s second use of Paul’s teaching passage, in ÆCHom II, 19, he uses some of the same vocabulary but it is not identical and he varies the order of the groups addressed, presumably to suit the needs of his homiletic agenda. In other words, it seems that Ælfric was not copying the speech verbatim from ÆCHom I, 26 when composing ÆCHom II, 19. There are, though, many lexical similarities consistent, perhaps, with oral transmission.

45 Godden, Commentary, p. 519.
46 Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, pp. 151–3.
49 ÆCHom II, 19, 180–9.
The Pauline speech from BHL 6657 would, in fact, be an ideal candidate for a memorable oral tradition, since it is repetitive, each section beginning with docui (I taught) in the Latin, and expresses fundamental Christian doctrine. It could easily be seen as a catechetical passage, required to be memorized by initiates. Paul is cast in a similar teaching role in Ælfric’s version of the Passio Sancti Dionysii (ÆLS I.29). After being introduced at the beginning of the passion as the deoda lareow, Paul proclaims to Dionysius the basic tenets of the Christian faith in the following creedal utterance: \(^{50}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{þone god ic eow bodige ðone þe ge hatað uncuðne} \\
\text{he is acenned of marian þam mæran mædene} \\
\text{and he prowode deað sylf-willes for mannum} \\
\text{and arás of deaðe þurh his drihten-lican mihte} \\
\text{he astah eac to heofonum to his halgan fæder} \\
\text{and sitt on his swiðran hand soð god and soð man} \\
\text{þurh þone synd geworhte ealle þincg on worulde} \\
\text{and he cymð to demenne ælcum be his dædum} \\
\text{on ende þyssere worulde mid wuldor-fullum englum}
\end{align*}
\]

(The God whom I preach to you whom you call the unknown god
was born of Mary the famous virgin
and he willingly suffered death for men
and rose from death through his divine power
and ascended to heaven to his holy father
and sits on his right hand, true God and true man,
through whom all things in this world were made
and he will judge each man according to his deeds
at the end of this world with glorious angels.)

Ælfric, taking advantage of the popular lexical collocation of the words geleafa (faith) and lif (life) in Old English poetry, \(^{51}\) relates that after Paul had thus geleafan þær bodode (‘preached the faith’), Dionysius “gelyfde on þone lifigendan god” (‘believed in the living God’), and

\(^{50}\) ÆLS, Vol. 2, pp. 170–2.

went on to be baptized. He then followed Paul for three years and ultimately became bishop of Athens. The Pauline teaching outlined in the Passio Petri et Pauli is perhaps similar in function to this creedal teaching formula in the Passio S. Dionysii, where an instructional, catechetical paragraph is embedded in a lengthy passion narrative. Paul’s speech in the Passio Petri et Pauli is followed by this creedal speech of Peter’s:

'Ego unum esse deum patrem in Christo salvatore cum sancto spiritu creatorem omnium rerum praedico, qui fecit caelum et terram, mare et omnia quae in eis sunt, qui verus rex est, et regni eius non erit finis. (I preach that there is one God the father in Christ the saviour, with the holy spirit, the creator of all things, who made heaven and earth, the sea and all which are in them, who is the true king and of whose kingdom there will be no end.)

This outline of the most basic tenets of Christianity, set in the context of Nero’s instruction in the Christian faith through the speeches of Peter and Paul, establishes a tone of instruction which Ælfric picked up on and carried over into his Rogationtide homily, ÆCHom II,19.

Cross’s analysis of this homily expresses the opinion that Ælfric may well have been working from memory in his interweaving of the Pauline speech from the Passio and the biblical passages with which he chose to supplement ÆCHom II,19, along with his own additions. This hypothesis would also explain how Ælfric could have different vocabulary from Blickling XV in some places and the same in others. Cross, as an adjunct to his discussion of this homily, includes an appendix which lists the content of the various versions,
along with the biblical reference(s) which likely inspired each section. Following is a tabular summary of Cross’s list of comparisons:

**Table 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BHL 6657</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>Blickling XV</th>
<th>ÆCHom I, 26</th>
<th>ÆCHom II, 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>se invicem diligent</em> (love one another)</td>
<td>Romans 12.10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Matthew 22.37–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>divites</em> (the rich)</td>
<td>1 Timothy 6.17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Luke 11.14 and Matthew 16.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>mediocres</em> (the middle class)</td>
<td>1 Timothy 6.8</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>pauperes</em> (the poor)</td>
<td>2 Cor. 6.10?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Romans 12.12?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>patres</em> (fathers)</td>
<td>Ephesians 6.4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>filios</em> (children)</td>
<td>Col. 3.20</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eph. 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also Mt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>possidentes reddunt tributum</td>
<td>owners pay taxes</td>
<td>No but cf. Rom 13.7?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>negotiatores</td>
<td>businessmen</td>
<td>Again cf Rom 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>uxores</td>
<td>wives</td>
<td>Eph 5.22, Cf Col. 3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>viros</td>
<td>men/husbands</td>
<td>Eph. 5.25, Col. 3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>dominos</td>
<td>masters</td>
<td>Col. 4.1, Eph. 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>servos</td>
<td>slaves</td>
<td>Col. 3.22, Eph. 6.5,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

56 See Cross, “The Literate Anglo-Saxon,” p. 99 for further discussion on this point. Cross argues that only the beginning of the sentence on masters and slaves has survived in the manuscript and that a line (the one referring to slaves) has been omitted. Robert Getz, (*Four Blickling Homilies*, unpublished PhD Dissertation, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, 2008), p. 238, concurs, positing the loss of words about slaves and masters corresponding to the Latin text between two instances of “þæt hie” due to eyeskip. See also Morris, *Blickling*, p. 185, l. 28.
In addition to instructing the groups mentioned in Paul’s speech, Ælfric gives instruction to kings, judges, the sick and to bishops, who “sceil læran his leoda symle, mid boclicere lare, and him bysnian wel” (‘should always teach his people with book-learning, and set a good example for them’), and to both bishops and masspriests, who “sind to bydelum gesette þæt hi læwedum folce geleafan bodian” (‘are set as preachers so that they may preach the faith to lay people’). He further instructs bishops and priests,” Hu mæg se ungelæreda lærowdom healdan and læwedum folce fægre bodian? ... Lange sceal leornian se ðe læran sceal … Se bið mære lærow ðe mannum bodað and eac mid weorcum him wel him wel gebysnað” (‘How can the unlearned perform the function of a teacher and preach well to the lay folk … He who is to teach must learn long … He is a great teacher who preaches to men and also sets a good example for them with works’). These passages make clear that for Ælfric the lærow is not functioning as a magister in the sense of a schoolteacher, but as a preacher who proclaims Christian teaching. The people Ælfric expects to be the lærowas in his society are the bishops and priests, for they are the ones charged with teaching the faith to lay people. In ÆCHom II.23, he explicitly states that the lærow is godes bydel (‘God’s preacher’), and when relating Gregory’s sending of missionaries to England, he calls them both bydelas and lærowas, as though the terms are synonymous: “Þæra bydela naman sind þus gecigede Augustinus, Mellitus, Laurentius, Petrus, Iohannes, Iustus, þas lærowas asende se eadiga papa Gregorius” (‘The names of the preachers are thus called Augustine, Mellitus, Laurentius, Iohannes, Iustus, these teachers the blessed pope Gregory sent’). One word, lærow, is used to refer to both preachers and teachers in the modern English senses of the different meanings.

57 ÆCHom II, 19, p. 183.
58 ÆCHom II, 19, p. 183.
59 ÆCHom II, 19, p. 183.
60 ÆCHom II, 23, p. 215.
61 ÆCHom II, 9, p. 77.
of those words. Perhaps they were synonymous because in tenth-century Anglo-Saxon England Christian learning was the only kind of learning available. Lees points out that didacticism in Ælfric’s culture meant a single tradition of knowledge and reason, namely Christian, and education was restricted to the clergy and aristocracy, predominantly in Latin. The only form of vernacular education was from the vernacular homilies. If this is true, then there was no education but Christian instruction for those who could not read Latin. Hence the lareow would be both a schoolteacher and an instructor in the faith.

Like a prophet, however, Ælfric realizes that his message is often not a welcome one. Again in the homily for Rogation Monday in the second series (ÆCHom II, 19), when addressing the bishops and priests, Ælfric warns that the prophets were despised for their message and teachers should be prepared for the same response. Perhaps Ælfric is trying to reinforce his own morale as much as any of the priests’ or bishops’ who are listening, for in the same homily Ælfric, after instructing married people to avoid intercourse after menopause and during pregnancy, writes, “Þis is swiðe hefigtyrne eow to gehyrenne. Gif we hit forsuwian dorston, ne sæde we hit eow” (‘This is very burdensome for you to hear. If we dared to be silent about it, we would not have said it to you’). In his first series homily on the circumcision of the Lord (ÆCHom 1, 6), after teaching that Christian men must observe circumcision spiritually, because it symbolizes a decrease of lust, Ælfric admits that this teaching seems foolish for unlearned men to hear, “ac gif hit him dyslic þince þonne cide he wið god þe hit gesette, na wið us þe hit secgað … Ac us is acumendlicor eower gebelh þonne ðæs ælmihtigan godes grama gif we his bebodu forsuwiað” (‘But if it seems foolish to him, let him chide God, who established it, not us, who say it … to us your displeasure is more

---

63 ÆCHom II,19, p. 184–5.
tolerable than the anger of Almighty God, if we do not announce his commandments”).

Clare Lees’ observation that “Ælfric seems to have embraced his Christian mission enthusiastically and obediently,” would seem to be true given the volume of his writings; however, on occasion we are led to question whether he would rather have kept silent but could not because he considered it his duty and responsibility before God to instruct both priests and laymen. Greenfield and Calder contrast Wulfstan’s energetic public nature and crusading spirit with the “private, speculative, and intellectual Ælfric,” suggesting that perhaps Ælfric did not welcome the role of public preacher, but knew it was his duty due to his scholarly learning.

Ælfric remarks in several places that he will be held accountable before God if he, who has the ability, does not teach the laity and instruct other teachers in the faith. This is especially apparent in his homily De Populo Israhel. In this homily recounting the biblical journey of the Jews in the wilderness, Ælfric uses the example of Moses’ and Aaron’s roles as God’s representatives on earth to reiterate that in Anglo-Saxon England bishops and priests are the ministers of God and are appointed as teachers to instruct the people of God. It is the duty of the teacher to tell the people the laws of God and the duty of the people to respect and obey the bishops and priests without reproaching them. Like the murmuring Jews who were consumed by fire for their disobedience and disrespect, “hit bið swyðe hearmlic þam ðe huxlice tælð bisceopas and sacerdas þe syndon godes bydelas, and to lareowum gesette to lærenne godes folc” (‘It will be very ill for him who contemptibly reproaches bishops and priests, who are the ministers of God, and who are appointed as teachers for instructing the

---

64 ÆCHom I, 6, pp. 226–7.
people of God’). Ælfric concludes the homily by again stressing that the story of the Jews’ murmuring is an example for *ure beterunge*, for, he says, there are now many who say that they “nelleð godes lare gehyran, þelæste hi sceolon habban maran wita gif hi witon ða lare and gif hi nellað don swa swa Drihten bebyt” (‘do not want to listen to God’s teaching lest they shall have more punishment if they know that teaching and if they do not desire to do just as the Lord commands’). Paraphrasing Paul’s argument in Romans 1, Ælfric points out that not knowing the teaching of God is no excuse for disobedience, for the nature of God is visible to all through His creation. This warning applies to the unlearned who wish to avoid God’s teaching, but Ælfric reveals that for him it also provides the justification for his own need to preach to his nation the teaching of God: “Se man þe hæfð lare on his leodscype genoge, and mæg ða gehyran butan micclum geswince, and nele hi gehyran, ne Gode gehyrsumian, næfð he nane beladunge wið ðone leofan Drihten” (‘The one who has sufficient learning in his nation and can hear it without great effort, and desires not to hear it, nor to obey God, has no excuse in the eyes of the dear Lord’). Ælfric, of all Englishmen alive at his time, is the one with “sufficient learning in his nation”. If he does not obey God and transmit his learning by teaching the laity and urging the clergy to learn and pass on the teaching as well, he will have no excuse before God. Lees comments, “English preaching is shaped by Ælfric’s historical setting,” and like the Apostle Paul whose letters address particular issues troubling a certain congregation, Ælfric has been prompted by the lack of Christian teaching in his nation and by the excuses some were making so that they could ignore what little teaching there was, to become a *lareow* and to encourage other priests and bishops to do the same. Ælfric, like the

68 ÆHom 21.401.
69 Ibid. 21.416.
Apostle Paul did, makes it his mission to provide to all the true teaching so they can have no excuse by saying that they cannot understand the *gewrit* (scripture).\(^7\)

In order to make teaching available to all Ælfric had not only to preach but to do so in the vernacular, so that no one could make the excuse that they did not know Latin. Moreover, Ælfric strove to promote a consistency in orthography, inflectional forms, syntax and word usage which had not previously existed in Old English. Gneuss sees evidence of Ælfric’s concern for linguistic regularity in the earliest manuscript of the Catholic Homilies whose preparation, Gneuss goes on to say, was overseen by Ælfric himself, and which preserved, “more than 19,000 forms, from a total of 1,511 Old English substantives ... whose inflectional endings, for case and number, show virtually no departures from their respective inflectional models.”\(^7\) This effort on Ælfric’s part was undoubtedly intended as another way, in addition to writing in the vernacular, to make Christian teaching accessible and comprehensible to those of the religious community who were not well-versed in Latin.

Not only did Ælfric write in the vernacular and strive for linguistic regularity, but he deliberately chose a brief and uncomplicated style to relate his message. Ælfric states in the Latin preface to the first series of Catholic Homilies that he is writing “ob aedificationem simplicium ... ideoque nec obscura posuimus verba, sed simplicem Anglicam” (‘for the edification of the simple ... and therefore we have not used obscure words but plain English’).\(^7\) In the second series Latin preface he writes:

> festinavimus hunc sequentem librum ... interpretare, non garrula verbositate, aut ignorantis sermonibus, sed puris et apertis verbis linguae huius gentis, cupientes plus

---

\(^7\) ÆHom 21.406.  
\(^7\) Helmut Gneuss, *Ælfric of Eynsham: His Life, Times and Writings, OEN Subsidia* 34, (Michigan, 2009), 17–8, quotation on p. 18.  
\(^7\) ÆCHom I, Latin preface, p. 173; also see Jonathan Wilcox, *Ælfric’s Prefaces*, Durham Medieval Texts 9 (Durham, 1994) for editions of and commentary on the prefaces to Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies.
prodesse auditoribus simplici locutione quam laudari artificiosi sermonis compositione, quam nequauqam didicit nostra simplicitas.  

(We have hurried to translate the following book, not with garrulous verbosity, or with unfamiliar diction, but with pure and clear words of the language of this people, desiring rather to be useful to the hearers than to be praised in the composition of an artificial speech, which our simplicity has not at all learned.)

Nichols points out that here Ælfric is using technical rhetorical terms (*utilitatem, garrula verbositate, obscura verba, ignotis sermonibus, puris et apertis verbis*) to explain the style he has chosen to use.  

His goal is not to impress the reader with his own intellectual and rhetorical capabilities, but to make the teaching of God clear and understandable to all.  

Although this sounds eminently sensible and obvious to modern ears it was a radical departure from the Anglo-Latin hermeneutic style popularized especially by Aldhelm and characterized by archaisms, neologisms and graecisms intended to impress the reader with the writer’s learning, which was the style Ælfric would likely have been trained in while at Æthelwold’s school at Winchester. Lapidge comments, “whatever Ælfric’s intellectual debt to his master [Æthelwold] in other respects, there was one respect in which he was entirely independent: he rejected outright Æthelwold’s propensity for ostentatious and obscure vocabulary.” He goes on to say, however, that Æthelwold used an ostentatious style for his Latin writings only, but expressed a concern for clarity of expression when writing in English. Ælfric may have been prompted to use an unaffected and clear style in translation by the influence of his teacher.  

He went even further, however, by extending the need for clarity to his Latin writings as well, perhaps because of his sense of mission as a teacher who was sensitive to the poor state of
Latin learning in his nation. If he hoped to reach bishops and priests as well as the laity, he needed to write in a style they could understand.

Ælfric’s Latin Letter to the monks of Eynsham, for example, is an adaptation of the Regularis Concordia, the Winchester-sanctioned customary based on the Regula S. Benedicti. Most likely written by Æthelwold or under his influence, the Regularis Concordia (c. 972–3) is written in large part in a simple style befitting an instruction manual but is framed by a preface and epilogue in the “inflated hermeneutic style” and hermeneutic elements intrude throughout in “passages that suggest Æthelwold’s own personal judgments or recommendations.” Ælfric’s version, however, includes none of the epilogue, the parts of the preface which he has retained are rewritten in clear, succinct language, and the body of the text is also clarified using more active and direct language (finite instead of infinitive verbs and active rather than passive constructions, for example), thus making the whole much more easily readable, and in the opinion of Jones, more appealing stylistically. Ælfric’s text was addressed to monks, most of whom probably would not have been experts in the hermeneutic style and his goal was to impart a practical message to them, namely how to conduct the Office, not to impress them with his own literary capabilities. Bullough points out that Ælfric’s Grammar and Colloquy reflect a genuine concern for his pupils and a desire for them to acquire a real fluency in Latin and that this concern, “reflects his [Ælfric’s] own unease with Latin, which he always felt to be an alien language, mastered only with difficulty and anguish.” This assessment of Ælfric’s lacking Latinity seems surprising in one renowned as

79 See for example the Old English preface to Ælfric’s Grammar, Zupitza, p. 3.
81 Ibid., pp. 143–63.
a grammarian and teacher, and is perhaps controversial. Ælfric’s writings also, for example, prompted Gneuss to characterize Ælfric as having “an all-encompassing linguistic skill and command, in Latin as well as English,”84 which he sees as the decisive factor in Ælfric’s choice of linguistic style.85 Jones, too, comments on the stylistic felicity with which Ælfric rewrote the Regularis Concordia, seeing it as evidence of Ælfric’s skill with the Latin language.86 Nevertheless, whether Ælfric always felt uncomfortable writing Latin or enjoyed an easy facility with it, Bullough’s comments underline just how difficult it would have been for Anglo-Saxons to write or even to understand Latin and why Ælfric felt it was so important for him to write in clear Latin and to use the vernacular when possible if he was to fulfill his mission as a teacher for his nation.

While Æthelwold was likely a strong influence on Ælfric as a writer and schoolteacher, it becomes apparent in Ælfric’s homilies that as a lareow, a teacher whose duty it is to preach the Christian doctrine to his nation, a figure like the Apostle Paul, “the teacher of all nations” was an important role model for Ælfric. Paul’s duty was to spread Christian teaching to all the people in the earliest days of the Church. Ælfric intends to make his own teaching available to all, just as Paul did by preaching to all nations, to make sure that no one has the opportunity to say that Christian teaching was not available to them. Paul is called a lareow at least 23 times in Ælfric’s writings,87 far more than any other single named individual teacher and is usually called the deoda lareow, the teacher of the Gentiles or nations. Of course, this title is the way

84 Gneuss, Ælfric of Eynsham, p. 17.
85 Ibid. p. 19.
87 http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca/myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/; the citations in question, listed using the DOE citation system are: ÆCHom1,6 (228.113 and 230.183); ÆCHom 1,17 (App, 541.217); ÆCHom 1,22 (361.190); ÆCHom 1,27 (400.4); ÆCHom II, 4 935.173); ÆCHom II, 12.2 (123.464); ÆCHom II, 22 (190.1); ÆCHom II, 43 (324.183); ÆCHom II, 45 (337.77); ÆLS (Eugenia, 24); ÆLS (Auguries, 1); ÆLS (Denis, 1 and 6); ÆHom 7 (203); ÆHom 20 (14, 70 and 90); ÆHom 21 (390); ÆHomM5 (Ass 6, 106); ÆHomM8 (Ass 3, 238); ÆHomM 12 (Brot 1, 246); and Ælet 4 (SigezewardZ, 1212).
in which Paul referred to himself, for example in 2 Tim. 1:11 where he identifies himself as “preacher, and Apostle, and teacher of the gentiles,” or *magister gentium* in Latin. As with the identification of Christ as a *lareow*, Ælfric’s name for Paul is based on biblical tradition. Just like the Latin word *gens* the Old English word *þeod* can mean people, nation, or more specifically, Gentiles. It is possible that in his identification with Paul, Ælfric is thinking of the word *þeod* in the more general sense of “nations” or “people”. Just as Paul is the teacher of the nations, so Ælfric is the teacher of his nation, of his people. Thus when Ælfric addresses *læwede men* in his Rogationtide Monday homily in the second series of Catholic Homilies, he bases his exhortations to the different segments of society on Paul’s teachings to the same groups of people. Ælfric’s address to fathers and children, for example, is drawn from Ephesians 6:1–4, and is introduced by, “Se ðeoda lareow læerde manna bearn” (‘the teacher of the nations instructed the children of men’).88 His instructions for the rich are similarly introduced and here the teaching is drawn from 1 Tim. 6:17–9. Ælfric refers to Paul’s teaching six times in this homily, each time giving instruction to a different segment of lay society. Paul’s teachings, addressed to the gentiles trying to adopt a Christian lifestyle are the prototype for Ælfric’s laymen, just as Paul is a model teacher for Ælfric. Ælfric’s imitation of Paul could also have accounted in part for his inspiration to use the vernacular for preaching, for just as Paul “translated”, in the literal sense of carrying across, the Jewish religion of Christianity to the Gentiles, thus crossing the cultural divide, so Ælfric translated Christian teaching from the remote and obscure Latin language to Old English for his nation.

     Of course Ælfric was neither the first nor the only person of his age to write homilies in the vernacular. There are the mid-to-late tenth-century Vercelli and Blickling homilies predating Ælfric’s, and the contemporaneous and slightly later homilies of Wulfstan, for

88 ÆCHom II,19, p. 186.
example. Wulfstan, too, uses the term *lareowas* in his homilies to refer to those preaching Christian doctrine. In his homily for the consecration of bishops, for example, he calls bishops the “bydelas and Godes lage lareowas” (‘preachers and teachers of God’s law’). The difference, however, between Ælfric and Wulfstan regarding teachers seems to be mostly one of emphasis and elaboration of the role. The word *lareow* appears only six times in Wulfstan’s writings, as opposed to more than 300 in Ælfric’s. As we have seen, Ælfric also takes care to explain the precise responsibilities of the role and seems to have viewed it as much more of an urgent and pressing need for his people.

Ælfric and Wulfstan also differ in their use and presentation of material from the Apostle Paul’s epistles. Ælfric mentions Paul’s name numerous times in his writings, and regularly cites Paul by name as his source when quoting from one of his epistles. In ÆCHom I, 6, for example, he introduces a quotation from Galatians 3.29 with, “swa swa se ðeoda lareow Paulus cwæð” (‘just as Paul the teacher of the gentiles says’). Here, in fact, he has added Paul’s name, for his source, Bede, referred to Paul merely as the “apostle”. In Wulfstan’s writings, however, Paul’s name is very seldom found. In his homily *Secundum Marcum* (Bethurum V), discussing suffering to come at the end of the world, he does introduce a reference to 2 Tim. 3.1–5 with, “forðam nu is se tima þe Paulus se apostol gefyrn foresæde. He sæde hwilum þam biscope Tymothee þat on ðam endenyhstan dagum þissere
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90 *DOE*, http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/; the citations are in the following locations, using the DOE citation system: Whom 17 (32, 36 and 43n); WPol 2.1.1 (Jost, 42); WPol 6.1 (Jost, 10) and WPol 6.2 (Jost, 147 and 151).
91 See, for example, footnote 87 in this chapter.
92 See Appendix B, p. 256, which cites 84 times when Ælfric uses Paul’s name and quotes from one of his epistles.
93 The Ælfrician quotation is found in ÆCHom I, 6, p. 228. For the Bedan source see Godden, *Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, p. 50.
94 http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/, accessed March 2010. The DOE lists citations of Paul’s name in Wulfstan’s writings at WHom 5 (14); WPol 2.12 (Jost, 35) and WPol 6.2 (Jost, 144).
worulde beoð frencelice tida for manna synnum” (‘because now is the time which Paul the Apostle previously foretold. He said once to the bishop Timothy that in the last days of this world there will be perilous times because of the sins of men’). As Orchard has pointed out, however, this passage is likely drawn from a homily by Ælfric, a unique version of Catholic Homily 1.17 in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 188 (s. xi or perhaps xi\(^ {2/4} \)). This borrowing supplements Godden’s list of eighteen Ælfrician texts used by Wulfstan in his writings, which Godden argues were accessed by Wulfstan from small selections of Ælfrician material resembling Oxford, Bodleian Hatton 115 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178, rather than the previously held hypothesis, namely that Wulfstan personally commissioned them from Ælfric. Godden’s comment, “Quite why Wulfstan found it so difficult to write a homily without having one of Ælfric’s to use as a starting point is hard to say,” is telling as to the extent of Wulfstan’s borrowing from Ælfric, and a further potential borrowing to add to Godden’s list will be discussed in chapter five on the *Passio Petri et Pauli*. Because Wulfstan seldom acknowledged his sources, it is not easy to determine just where he found the inspiration for his material. Orchard observes that Wulfstan names a patristic source only once (*Gregorius*, Bethurum Xc. 48) while, “Ælfric fairly peppers his writings with dozens of the names of the more than one hundred authorities he cites and echoes.” This is certainly true of Ælfric’s acknowledgements of the Apostle Paul’s epistles used in his writings, and reflects, too, one suspects, the dearth of references to Paul in Wulfstan’s works. It is remarkable, then, that Wulfstan did not excise the Pauline

---

98 Ibid. p. 343.
acknowledgement in his homiletic passage on the end times, and may, as Orchard notes, reflect the extent to which Wulfstan is relying heavily on Ælfric here.\(^{100}\)

In addition to numerous references to Paul’s letters in his writings, Ælfric’s high opinion of Paul and his desire to imitate him is demonstrated by his homily dedicated to the \textit{Natale Sancti Pauli}, the Nativity of the Apostle Paul, (June 30), Catholic Homily 1.27. The homily consists largely of an outline of Paul’s conversion and ministry. According to Godden the sources of the homily are elusive, but it is clear that it is distinctly hagiographic in content and tone.\(^{101}\) Ælfric begins with the epistle for the day, Acts 9.1–19 (which relates Paul’s persecution of the Christians and his subsequent conversion), then goes on to describe Paul’s ministry as set out in Acts, and fills out his account with reference to 2 Corinthians 11. 25–7, outlining Paul’s tribulations and hardships, and 2 Corinthians 12.2–4, alluding to his excursion to the third heaven (the subject of the \textit{Visio Sancti Pauli}). In this section of the homily, Ælfric takes pains to stress that although Paul was involved in persecuting Christians prior to his conversion, he did so \textit{þurh his nytennysse} (‘through his ignorance’) and “nis ðeah-hwæðere be him geraed, þæt he handlinga ænigne man acwealde” (‘it is not, however, read of him that he killed anyone with his own hands’).\(^{102}\) He persecuted Christians “na mid niðe, swa swa ða Iudeiscan dyde” (‘not with hatred, as the Jews did’), but rather his persecution was “þurh ware ðære ealdan aé” (‘through defence of the old law’).\(^{103}\) Godden comments that Ælfric’s stand in support of Paul is in fact contrary to Augustine’s portrayal of Paul as particularly savage prior to his conversion, and “it has no parallel in [Ælfric’s] sources, though it is difficult to believe that he was not prompted by some so far untraced text.”\(^{104}\) In fact, a parallel defence of Paul is

\(^{100}\) Ibid. p. 340.
\(^{102}\) ÆCHom 1, 27, p. 400.
\(^{103}\) Ibid. p. 402
\(^{104}\) Godden, \textit{Introduction, Commentary and Glossary}, p.224.
found in the *Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (BHL 6657), where it is said of Paul, “non erat per invidiam inimicus fidei nostrae sed per ignorantiam” (‘he was not an enemy of our faith through hatred but through ignorance’), and in the same paragraph, “persecutio eius non ex aemulatione fiebat, sed ex defensione legis” (‘his persecution came not from rivalry but from a defence of the law’). The parallel terms, hatred, ignorance and defence of the law, all falling in the same paragraph of the *Passio*, in a similar context of defence of Paul’s character, and in a text which Ælfric used as the main source for the homily immediately preceding this one (Catholic Homily I, 26, on the passion of Peter and Paul) all strongly argue in favour of its being the source behind Ælfric’s defence of Paul.

Ælfric further speaks in Paul’s favour in this homily by calling him the *gecorenan cempan* (‘chosen champion’) and the *godes cempan* (‘champion of God’), labels Ælfric typically applied to the heroes of his saints’ lives. He ends the Pauline section of the homily by emphasizing that of all the apostles, Paul alone “seðe wæs on woruld-cræfte teld-wyrhta, nolde ða alyfdan bigleofan onfon, ac mid agenre teolunge his and his geferena neode foresceawode” (‘who was by worldly craft a tent-maker, would not receive the permitted support, but with his own toil provided for his own and his companions’ needs’). Ælfric uses this discussion of Paul’s *hand-cræfte* to transition into the gospel reading for the day, Matthew 19.27–9, in which Jesus tells the disciples that in reward for giving up worldly things they will be made judges at the last judgment. He discusses this text in the context of the monastic life, in which, like Peter who was a *fiscere* (‘fisherman’) and gave up his *craeft* to follow Jesus, monks forsake all worldly things. These monks “beoð fulfremede, and to ðam

105 Lipsius and Bonnet, p. 153.
106 Ælfric, *Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies, the First Series Text*, p.401.
107 Ibid., p.401.
108 ÆCHom 1, 27, pp. 400–4.
109 ÆCHom 1, 27, p. 404.
110 ÆCHom 1, 27, pp. 404–5.
apostolum geendebyrde” (‘have been perfected, and are ordained with the apostles’), they will be in the assemblage “þæra apostola and heora efenlæcendra,” (‘of the apostles and their imitators’) as judges over all others. Not all gecyrred (‘monastic’) men are the same, however, Ælfric continues, for there are those who merely feign giving up worldly things all the while keeping back part of their property. All monks, Ælfric admonishes in his concluding sentence, must shun such evil examples, and geeuenlæcan þam apostolum (‘imitate the apostles’). It must be assumed that Ælfric himself was aspiring to this apostolic imitation. Indeed, as an examination of Ælfric and his attempt to be a teacher in the Pauline tradition has shown, he was striving for just such an ideal, and hoped to spread Christian doctrine just as Paul had, making it available and accessible to all. As Biggs argues, “Ælfric understands the apostles to link his own teaching to Christ’s” and includes himself amongst the gecorenan, (chosen) a term he applied to Paul in his homily for the Natale Sancti Pauli. Biggs has further argued that Ælfric makes a special point of stressing that Paul is the one who passed on to Luke the knowledge he needed to write his gospel by mentioning Paul’s role in teaching Luke in his homily on the Passion of Peter and Paul. Ælfric, too, it seems, sees himself as following in the apostolic line by, like Luke, acquiring from Paul a direct link to se Hælend (the Saviour) who taught Paul mid onwrigenysse (by revelation).

\[\text{111} \ \text{ÆCHom} 1, 27, \text{p. 407.} \\
\text{112} \ \text{ÆCHom} 1, 27, \text{p. 406.} \\
\text{113} \ \text{ÆCHom} 1, 27, \text{p. 407.} \text{On the translation of gecyrredum see Petra Hofmann, “pam Gecyrredum Mannum in Ælfric’s Homily ‘Natale Sanete Pauli’ (ÆCHom 1.27),” N & Q 56 (2009), 14–16, where it is argued that the traditional translation of gecyrred as ‘converted’ is not correct here, and should be translated as ‘monastic’ given this option as one of the meanings listed in the DOE and the context of the homily, in which Ælfric is contrasting different types of monks, not the converted and the unconverted.} \\
\text{114} \ \text{ÆCHom} 1, 27, \text{p. 409.} \\
\text{115} \text{Biggs, “Ælfric’s Andrew and the Apocrypha,” JEGP 104 (2005), 473–94, at p. 487.} \\
\text{116} \text{Ibid., p. 488; ÆCHom 1, 27, p. 401.} \\
\text{117} \text{Biggs, “A Picture of Paul,” p. 183-4.} \\
\text{118} \text{ÆCHom 1, 26, p. 395; also see Biggs, “A Picture of Paul,” p. 183.} \]
Ælfric’s concept of a lareow, then, involves imitation of the apostles, Paul in particular, and is thus more that of a preacher than a schoolteacher. Nevertheless, the two concepts, that of a preacher and a learned teacher, are ideally intertwined in the role Ælfric wishes to play in the fostering of Christian education in Anglo-Saxon England. Ælfric stresses throughout his works that “book learning” is critical if someone is going to be a teacher of Christian doctrine. He asks in the preface to his Grammar, ”Hwanon sceolon cuman wise lareowas on godes folce, buton hi on iugoðe leornion?” (‘Whence shall come wise teachers among the people of God, unless they learn in their youth?’).119 In the second series Rogationtide Monday homily, he asks, “Hu mæg se ungelæreda lareowdom healdan and læwedum folce fægre bodian?” (‘How can the unlearned hold a teacher’s authority and aptly preach to the lay-folk?’).120 There can apparently be no arguing against these rhetorical questions in Ælfric’s mind. He urges the bishops and priests, “Lange sceal leornian se ðe læran sceal and habban geðincðe and þeawfæstnysse ðy læs ðe he forlæde ða læwedan mid him” (‘Long shall he learn who is to teach and have authority and obedience lest he mislead the laity with himself’).121 In the preface to his first series of homilies he emphasizes that it is boclise lare (book-learning) which will save people at the end of the world. In the first series homily for the Nativity, lareowas receive their knowledge about the humanity of Christ through boclise lare.122 So teachers must not only be learned, but they must be learned in a literary sense. The critical element of literary education for the teacher unifies the two seemingly variant meanings of the lareow in Ælfric’s writings. In the Grammar the lareow is equivalent to the Latin doctor or magister, the schoolteacher, and in the homilies he is a preacher. For Ælfric the two functions ideally should be combined in the same individual,
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119 Zupitza, Grammatik und Glossar, p. 3.
120 ÆCHom II, 19, p. 183.
121 ÆCHom II, 19, p. 183.
122 ÆCHom I, 2, p. 102.
although, as he observed, this was not usually the case in tenth-century England. The lareow should, like himself, be an extremely well-educated individual, preferably in Latin as well as Old English, and should use this learning to preach Christian teaching to those who were not so learned. “Stæfcræft is seo cæg, ðe ðæra boca andgit unlicð” (‘Grammar is the key which unlocks the meaning of books’), Ælfric observes in the preface to his Grammar,\textsuperscript{123} and Sisam argues that the Grammar was a necessary part of Ælfric’s “plan of instruction”, which included the Catholic Homilies to meet the needs of parishes, De temporibus anni for priests, the Grammar to enlarge the number of those who could read Latin and the Lives of Saints to make saints’ legends more widely known.\textsuperscript{124} As Ælfric argues in the preface to the Grammar, he believes that sacred doctrine will lose its fervour and decay if no one can “dihtan oððe asmeagean anne pistol on leden” (‘compose or thoroughly interpret a letter in Latin’).\textsuperscript{125}

From Ælfric’s writings emerges a picture of him as a teacher whose goal was to teach Christian knowledge and action to the laity and to increase Latin knowledge for the clergy. The clergy would then be able to impart their increased knowledge to their own congregations, for the salvation of the souls of all. It seems reasonable to us, looking back at the beginnings of the vernacular tradition and educational reforms 100 years before Ælfric, that Alfred and Æthelwold would have been the figures Ælfric was imitating as he attempted to teach the laity and clergy. Nevertheless, while their example and the example of other vernacular homilists likely allowed him to conceive of the possibility of writing in the vernacular, the evidence of Ælfric’s homilies, shows that as a lareow, a teacher imparting Christian doctrine, in his own mind Ælfric’s role models were Christ, the Church Fathers, and especially the Apostle Paul, whose letters demonstrate that he was himself a learned writer and rhetorician. These are the

\textsuperscript{123} Zupitza, Grammatik und Glossar, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{124} Sisam, Studies, p. 301.
\textsuperscript{125} Zupitza, Grammatik und Glossar, p. 3.
people Ælfric cites as exemplary lareowas, the ones whom he is consciously imitating in his role as a teacher. The next chapter will turn in more detail to a subject which has been touched on briefly already in the preceding discussion of Paul and Ælfric, the Passio Petri et Pauli, and will demonstrate once again just how important a link ties these two figures, both striving to be the magistri gentium, ðeoda lareowas, teachers of the people.
Part B: Apocryphal Literature on the Apostle Paul

Chapter 5. The Passio Petri et Pauli

Thus far we have focussed largely on the use of Paul’s canonical letters; however, particularly in the later Anglo-Saxon period, the most frequent references to Paul involve not his biblical epistles, but rather apocryphal literature, either from the Visio Sancti Pauli (which will be the topic of the next chapter), or the story of his passion, which will be dealt with in this chapter. In the passion he is usually paired with Peter: Peter and Paul, “the ultimate Roman saints.”¹ The pairing reflects the popularity of the tradition that Peter and Paul had been martyred on the same day in Rome at Nero’s command. The most detailed account of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul comes from the fourth century Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli (BHL 6657)² which describes at length Peter’s and Paul’s confrontation with Simon Magus before the Emperor Nero at Rome, culminating first in Simon’s death, and then in the martyrdom of Peter and Paul on the same day. The story also appears in other Latin versions, namely, using Lipsius’ and Bonnet’s titles, the Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli (brevior, BHL 6667);³ the Actus Petri cum Simone (BHL 6656);⁴ and the Rescriptum Marcelli (BHL 6060).⁵ Textual evidence shows that the traditions surrounding Peter’s and Paul’s martyrdom seem to have been popular among Anglo-Saxon authors. Unlike the canonical

² Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, I.119–77. For the background of this work and its influence in Anglo-Saxon England, see Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha, ed. Frederick M. Biggs (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2007), p. 52.
³ Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, pp. 223–34.
letters, none of which was translated in its entirety into Old English, translations of often sizeable extracts of the account of the passion of Peter and Paul appear in several Anglo-Saxon texts, both in Latin and Old English.

According to Aideen O’Leary, BHL 6657 had arrived in Anglo-Saxon England as part of a collection of apostolic apocrypha by about the year 700. She argues that in his Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum Bede’s comment, “cum ille qui praefatas apostolorum passiones scripsit ipse se certissime incerta et falsa scripsisse prodiderit,” (‘when he wrote the aforementioned passions of the apostles he most definitely revealed that he had written uncertain and false things’), displays his personal familiarity with such a collection. She points out that Aldhelm, too, made use of apostolic passiones in his fourth Carmen ecclesiasticum and De virginitate. In particular, the poem on Peter in his Carmen ecclesiasticum IV.1 refers to Peter’s conquest of Simon Magus and his martyrdom:

Insuper et magicum falsi fantasma Simonis
Funditus evacuans tetras detruxit in umbras
Romanum vulgus solvens errore vetusto,
Quia praecelsa rudis scandit fastigia turris
Atque coronatus lauri de fronde volavit,
Sed mox aethereas dimittens furcifer auras
Cernuus ad terram confrectis ossibus ambro
Corruit, et Petro cessit victoria belli;
Qui cruce confixus gaudens tormenta luebat
Horrida crudelis passurus vulnera ferri;
Quem Deus aeternis ornamat iure triumphis
Arbiter omnipotens ad caeli culmina vexit.

9 Ehwald, Aldhelmi Opera, p. 20.
(and moreover, the magic spectre of Simon the false one he drove away entirely into the hideous shadows, releasing the Roman people from ancient error. Simon climbed the lofty gables of a rude tower and crowned with a frond of laurel flew, but soon breathing his last, the thief fell face-first to the ground with all his bones broken and the victory of the war fell to Peter; who fixed to a cross, rejoicing, endured torments about to suffer the horrid wounds of the cruel iron; whom, adorned with eternal triumphs by right, God the omnipotent judge carried to the heights of heaven.)

Although O’Leary admits that Aldhelm made use of Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum, the New Testament accounts, and possibly Jerome’s De Viris Illustribus in this composition, she argues that Aldhelm’s account closely resembles BHL 6657 in details and vocabulary, a comparison to which we shall return later in this chapter. Lapidge and Rosier agree that the major source for Aldhelm’s apostolic accounts is Isidore’s De ortu et obitu patrum, supplemented at times by other sources. For the account of Peter and Simon, they suggest the apocryphal Actus Petri cum Simone as an additional source. O’Leary suggests that Bede’s hymn on Peter and Paul, along with his hymns for Andrew and John the Baptist also used details from a collection of apostolic passiones. It is clear that both Aldhelm and Bede were aware of the traditions about Peter and Simon Magus (although not necessarily involving Paul), suggesting that these accounts were circulating in England in some form, whether oral or written, by 700.

The Old English Martyrology (c. ninth century), too, includes an entry for Peter and Paul for June 29, which states that they were both killed by Nero in Rome, Peter on the cross.
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and Paul by the sword. Again, there is no mention of Simon Magus. Christine Rauer lists among the martyrologist’s sources Jerome’s *Vita S. Pauli* (BHL 6596) and Pseudo-Isidore’s *De oritu et obitu patrum*, both of which may have been relevant for an account of Peter and Paul, but she does not list BHL 6657, and indeed the account in the Martyrology includes no information which would necessitate knowledge of it.

Peter and Paul are also paired in Cynewulf’s *Fates of the Apostles*. O’Leary comments that Cynewulf’s *Fates of the Apostles* provides “surprisingly meaty” narratives about the Apostles, although for Paul and Peter it only says that they were deprived of life by Nero in Rome:

Sume on Romebyrig,  
Frame, fyrdhwate, feorh ofgefón  
Þurg Nerones nearwe searwe,  
Petrus ond Paulus.

(Some, in the city of Rome  
Bold, brave, gave their lives  
by Nero’s treacherous tricks,  
Peter and Paul.)

This information, as discussed above, was widely known, and are the sorts of details about the apostles which, “as a religious of his period Cynewulf would have heard ... on their feast-days.” J.E. Cross has argued that Cynewulf gained his information for the poem from full accounts of the apostles, such as the pseudo-Abdias collection; however as yet no one has

---
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been able to identify the particular collection which he used.\textsuperscript{19} Although the details are rather slim for Peter and Paul and, as Cross points out, are all available in the separated accounts of Peter and of Paul in pseudo-Abdias (and are so few that they could be the result of nothing more than an oral tradition about their martyrdom), he further argues that the fact of their pairing in Cynewulf’s poem hints at the use of a Marcellus account (e.g. BHL 6657), where the two are linked.\textsuperscript{20} While it is difficult if not impossible to identify the sources and origin of the tradition of Peter’s and Paul’s martyrdom at Rome and their dealings with Simon Magus, it is important to note that traditions pairing them and describing their martyrdom were known in Anglo-Saxon England by the seventh century and seemed to have been quite popular.

While we cannot be sure about the sources for the earlier texts about Peter and Paul, there are several tenth-century and eleventh-century texts for which we can be fairly certain that the author’s source was indeed BHL 6657. These include Blickling Homily 15; two of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies, I, 26 and II, 19, the latter of which was discussed in the previous chapter; a small section of Ælfric’s \textit{De auguriis}; a largely ignored interpolation into Wulfstan’s homily \textit{De temporibus antichristi};\textsuperscript{21} and the early ninth century Book of Cerne, which includes Peter’s prayer from BHL 6657, the relevant portion of which was printed in the first chapter of this study.

A close examination of many of the actual details and translations of these versions originating from Anglo-Saxon England shows that they differ in several respects. I would like to begin with a superficial comparison of the different versions of the account, and proceed to

\textsuperscript{20} Cross, “Cynewulf’s Traditions,” p. 170.
a detailed comparative examination in an attempt to understand better the source relationships amongst them.

The most detailed accounts of the story are found in Blickling XV\textsuperscript{22} and Ælfric’s Catholic Homily I, 26,\textsuperscript{23} both of which include a fairly full account of the events found in BHL 6657, and to a large degree the same events as each other. Both texts relate the preaching of Peter and Paul in Rome and their success in converting people to Christianity, including Livia (Nero’s wife), Agrippina (Agrippa’s wife), and Nero’s servants. Both move on to the rivalry between Peter and Simon. Various miracles which Simon and Peter perform are retold, including an incident in which Peter proves his prescience to Nero by being prepared with two halves of a barley loaf, broken and blessed in eucharistic fashion, up his sleeves when Simon conjures up two ferocious dogs to set against Peter. The dogs vanish when they see the loaves.\textsuperscript{24} Perhaps the most important element of BHL 6657 for this study, which both include, is Nero’s questioning of Paul as to why he is silent, and Paul’s summary of his epistolary teaching in response,\textsuperscript{25} which was discussed in the preceding chapter on Ælfric. Both accounts then relate Simon’s attempted flight from a tower, his fall and death, and finally, the condemnation of Peter and Paul to death and their martyrdom. Robert Faerber notes one intriguing feature shared by the two texts: both Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26 omit the first nine paragraphs of BHL 6657 (Paul’s involvement in the rivalry between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in Rome), which is notable since they follow the text relatively closely otherwise. He suggests this may be due to their having available a shared Latin source which

\textsuperscript{22} Morris, \textit{Blickling}, pp. 171–93.
\textsuperscript{23} ÆCHom I, pp. 388–99.
\textsuperscript{24} Morris, \textit{Blickling}, p. 181; ÆCHom I, 26, p. 394–5.
\textsuperscript{25} Morris, \textit{Blickling}, p. 183–5; ÆCHom I, 26, p. 395–6.
did not include this section. Another, related, excision from the texts of both Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26 is the (admittedly repetitive and tedious) dispute between Peter, Paul and Simon over circumcision which follows the outline of Paul’s teaching. In this same section of BHL 6657 is a defence of Paul by Peter, outlining his personal history of persecuting the Jews, which he is said to have done through ignorance and devotion to the law rather than hatred of the Jews and a retelling of his miraculous conversion. There is a nod to this section in Blickling XV at this point in the text, in the form of the inclusion of the first few lines of Peter’s defence of Paul, and in the mention of manegu geflitu (‘many conflicts’) which followed, although the topic of the dispute, namely circumcision, is not specifically mentioned. ÆCHom I, 26 has no mention of the dispute at all, nor does it include Peter’s defence of Paul, but Ælfric was certainly aware of the defence, for as discussed in the last chapter, he included it in his homily on the Nativity of Paul, ÆCHom 1, 27. Interestingly, the details of the defence which he uses in ÆCHom 1, 27 are taken from the point of the defence in BHL 6657 at which Blickling XV left off. The excision of the Jewish/Christian disputes in the Old English versions of BHL 6657 suggest that if there was a common Latin or Old English source behind both Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26, it had eliminated the sections of the text dealing with issues pertaining to Jewish/Christian controversy as irrelevant in a later Christian and, perhaps, an Anglo-Saxon context. Ælfric’s awareness of the section of the text in which Peter defends Paul’s pre-conversion behaviour leads to the suspicion that if the author of Blickling XV and Ælfric did share a truncated version of BHL 6657, as Faerber suggests, Ælfric also had access to BHL 6657 in a fuller or even complete form.

27 The defence of Paul is found in Lipsius and Bonnet, pp. 153–4, and the circumcision debate runs from pp. 153–60.
28 Morris, Blickling, p. 187.
29 ÆCHom 1, 27, p. 402.
The main differences between Blickling XV and Catholic Homily I, 26 lie in the more literal presentation found in Blickling, which often follows the wording of BHL 6657 more closely; in the omission from ÆCHom I, 26 of Pilate’s letter summarizing the life and death of Jesus;\(^{30}\) and in the addition at the beginning of Ælfric’s account of historical details about Peter’s ministry.\(^{31}\) Importantly, too, Ælfric inserts after these historical details, but before the story from BHL 6657, a section on Peter’s ministry and struggle against Simon in Rome prior to Paul’s arrival, drawn, according to Godden, from the Letter of Marcellus (Rescriptum Marcelli, BHL 6060, AASS Mai, 3, 9–10).\(^{32}\)

The third Anglo-Saxon source to include an extended narrative of the passion of Peter and Paul is an interpolation in the Wulfstan homily entitled De temporibus antichristi. This interpolation is not included in Bethurum’s edition of the homily, but is found in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Hatton 113(s. xi\(^2\))\(^{33}\) and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201 (s. xi\(^{3/4}\))\(^{34}\), and has now been made available by Joyce Tally Lionarons.\(^{35}\) As Lionarons points out, the Wulfstan interpolation is a shortened version of the Latin story of the passion, but which Latin version is uncertain. There are differences in diction and sentence structure; some parts are left out entirely, for example Paul’s role and his teaching section; and others are abbreviated, such as Peter’s prayer during Simon’s flight. Peter’s and Paul’s martyrdom are also not mentioned. When Simon falls, he ‘bursts apart’ but not into four pieces as in BHL 6657. Lionarons also notes that the interpolation is introduced by a reference to the “ða

\(^{30}\) Morris, Blickling, p. 177–9.
\(^{31}\) ÆCHom 1, 26, p. 389; see Godden, Introduction, pp. 209–15 regarding the sources of this introduction. Faerber, pp. 271–3, also discusses Ælfric’s introduction, which he sees as Ælfric’s attempt to set a historical tone, rather than a legendary one, for the homily.
\(^{34}\) Gneuss, Handlist, p. 34.
geogeleras on egypta lande” (‘magicians in the land of Egypt’) who led many astray, presumably referring again to Jamnes and Mambres. Lionarons suggests that the Wulfstan interpolator may have been using a different translation and perhaps a different Latin source than BHL 6657.  

A parallel between the Wulfstan interpolation and another use which Ælfric makes of the Passio Petri et Pauli, however, sheds some light on the source for the interpolation. In Ælfric’s De auguriis, in his Lives of Saints collection, he makes a brief yet clear reference to the passion of Peter and Paul, cited as a warning of the ways in which the devil works through sorcerers to destroy people. BHL 6657, conveniently for Ælfric, affords two examples of such magicians, both of whom Ælfric refers to by name, the false sorcerer Simon who struggled against Peter, and the sorcerers Jamnes and Mambres, who deceived Pharaoh and to whom Paul refers when he is warning Nero not to listen to Simon. Ælfric’s warning is as follows (parallels between the version in Ælfric’s De auguriis and the version in the Wulfstan interpolation which follows below are in bold):  

\[
\text{Fela sædon þa dry-men þurh deofles cræft.}
\]

Iamnes and mambres swa swa moyses awrat.
and hi pharao forlærdon mid heora lotwrencum.
oððæt he adranc on ðaere deopan sæ.
eall swa eac symon se swicola dry
swa lange he wan wið petre oð þæt he wearð afyllled
ða þa he wolde fleon to heofonum þæt he on feower tobærst
and swa ferde waelhroh mid wite to helle.
\[
\text{Fela oðre forferdon þe folgodon dry-cræfte}
\]
swa swa we on bocum rædað ac heora racu is langsum.

(The sorcerers, Jamnes and Mambres, said many things through the devil’s art, just as Moses wrote,  


120
and they led Pharaoh astray with their tricks, 
until he drowned in the deep sea.
In the same way Simon the deceitful sorcerer
struggled against Peter for a long time until he was caused to fall
when he wanted to fly to heaven, so that he burst apart into four pieces
and thus the cruel man went with misery to hell.
Many others have died who followed sorcery
Just as we read in books, but their story is lengthy.)

Ælfric both begins the first sentence and includes in the concluding sentence of this excerpt
the word *fela* (‘many things’), signalling that this portion is to be taken as a unit, forming an
envelope of the portion of his text taken from the *Passio Petri et Pauli*. Both sentences also
include the word *craeft* referring to the work of the evil sorcerers he is warning against. In the
last sentence he alludes to other, lengthier writings detailing similar evil-doers.

The Wulfstan interpolator’s version of these details are as follows (parallels with the
Ælfric passage are, again, in bold): 38

> Fela þinga dydan ða geogeleras on egypta lande þurh drycraeft; ongean þæt ðe 
> moyses þurh godes mihta þær fela wundra worhte. And swa we habbað be 
> manegum geraed ðe gehwar þurh drycraeft mid deofles fultume men mistlice 
> dweledan.

(Many things the magicians did in the land of Egypt through sorcery; against
which Moses worked many wonders through the power of God. And so we have
read in many places that men everywhere have been led astray in various ways
through sorcery with the help of the devil.)

> He stah up to ðam stepele and of ðam stepele hof upp on lyfte swylce he wolde wið 
> þæs heofonas weard ... þa forleton hy hine  and he hreas nyðer and feoll þæt he eall 
> toþærst.

(he climbed up to the tower and from that tower rose up into the air heavenward just
as he wanted ... then they released him and he rushed downwards and fell so that he
burst apart entirely.)

---

Eac we habbað on bocum gerað þæt fela oðra deofles manna wide væron þe godes þegnas oft þurh deofles crafþ swyðe geswencton and folc swyðe gedwealdon, ac hit þincð us to langsum nu to gereccanne.

(We have also read in books that there were many other men of the devil far and wide who greatly tormented the servants of God through the art of the devil and led astray many people, but it seems to us too lengthy now to relate.)

A comparison of these portions of *De temporibus antichristi* with the portion of Ælfric’s *De auguriis* printed above shows similarities in content and vocabulary which suggest the likelihood that Ælfric and the Wulfstan interpolator were working in part from the same source here, or perhaps that the Wulfstan interpolator was dependent on *De auguriis* for the parts of his account which are common to both. The three elements of Ælfric’s account, the comparison with Jamnes and Mambres; the death of Simon; and the information that others perished through witchcraft but their tales are too long to tell — all appear in *De temporibus antichristi*, and in the same order, with additional material interposed in Wulfstan. Moreover, not only is the content similar, but much of the vocabulary (17 elements) is shared. This would indicate that the two authors were working from a common Old English, not Latin, source, one which condensed the tale of Simon and Peter (and possibly Paul), began with a comparison of Simon to Jamnes and Mambres, and referred to the longer version as too long to tell. That both speak of the other longer tale being read in books, tells us that there was a longer version written down and available to the composer of the condensed version. The Wulfstan interpolation in particular suggests that there may even have been a collection of stories (possibly including *De auguriis* itself) concerning deofla who led people astray, which included the stories of Simon and Jamnes and Mambres, among others.

Three possible source-relationships spring to mind: 1. both authors shared a common condensed Old English version of the tale, Ælfric choosing only the barest details of it and
Wulfstan using it perhaps in its entirety; 2. both authors shared a common condensed source which Ælfric used as is and the Wulfstan interpolator supplemented with another version (perhaps BHL 6657 or an Old English version of it) to provide the extra details in his account; 3. one author (Ælfric or the Wulfstan interpolator, likely the latter) was reliant on the other’s account; in other words, Ælfric’s version in De auguriis is the condensed account, which, as in option 2, Wulfstan supplemented with details from another version.

Malcolm Godden lists 18 Ælfrician texts which were used in Wulfstan’s writings. Godden argues that, contrary to the previously held supposition that Wulfstan gained access to most of his Ælfrician material directly from Ælfric himself, Wulfstan’s borrowings were drawn from collections of small selections of material resembling Hatton 115 and Cotton, Corpus Christi College 178. Orchard concurs, and observes that unlike Ælfric, who generally signalled his debts, “Wulfstan relied on a variety of texts in producing his speeches and sermons, but rarely signals them.” Orchard’s reading has led him to add another borrowing to Godden’s list, a passage from an Ælfrician sermon (ÆCHom 1.17) in CCCCC 188, which is echoed in Bethurum V. 8–26 (CCCC 201). Given the similarities in content and the shared lexical items between the passages discussed above from De auguriis and De temporibus antichristi, and the fact that De auguriis is found in CCC 178, one of the manuscripts which Godden identifies as a source collection for Wulfstan’s sermons, it seems reasonable to supplement once again Godden’s list of passages in Wulfstan that come from an Ælfrician source with this excerpt from De auguriis.

The inclusion of Jamnes and Mambres in both accounts is of some interest in itself. Frederick M. Biggs and Thomas N. Hall observe that the pair of magicians Jamnes and Mambres appear in several places in Anglo-Saxon texts. Besides the reference in *De auguriis*, Biggs and Hall note references to them in the pre-Conquest manuscript, London, BL, Cotton Tiberius B. V; in the illustrated *Hexateuch*; in the Old English translation of Orosius’s *Historiae adversum paganos*; and in the anonymous ‘Life of St. Margaret’. 43 To this list should be added the interpolation in Wulfstan’s *De temporibus antichristi*, in which Jamnes and Mambres are not referred to by name, but are nonetheless unmistakably the “geogeleras on egypta lande,” whom Moses worked miracles against.

Biggs and Hall show that the Old English versions share a feature of the Jamnes and Mambres story not in the Latin version, that of the magicians drowning in the Red Sea along with the Egyptians. Both *De auguriis* and the Old English Orosius include this detail. The Old English Orosius reads: 44

Þa þæt gesawon þa Egypte, hy ða getrymedon hyra dryas Geames and Mambres and getruwedon mid hyra dryçæftum þæt hi on ðone ðone þæm sæfærelde wæron, þa gedurfon hi ealle and adruncon.

(When the Egyptians saw that, their magicians Jamnes and Mambres exhorted and persuaded them with their magical arts so they might travel on the same path. When they then were within the passage of the sea, then they all perished and drowned.)

Biggs and Hall read the Old English Orosius as saying that the magicians drowned along with the rest of the Egyptians in the Red Sea. This, they say, is a distinguishing feature of the Old English tradition and may have been suggested by the *Passio Petri et Pauli*, 45 in which Paul

---

compares Simon to the magicians leading Pharaoh and his army astray and “they” being drowned in the sea in the same sentence: 46

Hic [Simon] enim homo pessimus est, et sicut Aegyptii magi Iamnes et Mambres qui Pharaonem et exercitum eius miserunt in errorem, quousque demergerentur in mari.

(For this man [Simon] is the worst sort, and is just like the Egyptian magicians Jamnes and Mambres who sent Pharaoh and his army into error, until they were drowned in the sea.)

Neither of these cases, though, needs to be read as saying that Jamnes and Mambres themselves drowned in the Red Sea. As to the drowning of the magicians, the texts are ambiguous at best. Whatever the fate of the magicians, the destruction of the Egyptians by drowning, and their being brought to this sorry state by the influence of Jamnes and Mambres is the emphasis of all the texts dealing with the tale.

Biggs and Hall also refer to Blickling XV in this context, rightly pointing out that the homily, while it includes the fullest Old English translation of the passion of Peter and Paul from BHL 6657 and includes Paul’s warning to Nero, leaves out the reference to Jamnes and Mambres. 47 While this is true, Blickling XV nonetheless leaves in an allusion to the watery fate of the Egyptians, in which the author of BHL 6657 continues the theme of drowning by stating of Simon, “nam quantum se exaltari putat ad caelos, tantum demergetur in infernos inferioribus, ubi est fletus et stridor dentium” (‘for to the extent that he thinks to exalt himself to the heavens, to that degree he will be plunged into the infernal depths, where there is weeping and grating of teeth’). 48 This is rendered in Blickling XV as, “Witodlice swa swiþe swa he weneþ sylf þæt he sceole to heofenum ahafen weorþan, swa swiþe he biþ bedyped on þa neþemestan helle witu, þær biþ a wop and hrop and toþa gristbitung” (‘Truly, as quickly

46 Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, p. 149.
48 Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, p. 149.
as he thinks that he will be raised up to heaven, so quickly will he be plunged into the lowest miseries of hell, where there is weeping and lamentation and grating of teeth’). 49 Simon will suffer the fate that the Egyptians suffered, being drowned in the depths of hell. The Blickling translator even expanded on the degree of torment, adding hrop in addition to wop and toþa, to create an aural and visual rhyming triad of woeful sounds. While we may never be able to know why the translator of Blickling XV left out the reference to Jamnes and Mambres, it seems likely that if the Jamnes and Mambres tradition were well known in Anglo-Saxon England, as it seems to have been, Blickling’s bedyped metaphor would function as an allusion to the story of the Egyptians’ drowning in the Red Sea and the role of Jamnes and Mambres in their destruction.

Audrey L. Meaney suggests the Isidorean part of Hrabanus’ De magicis artibus as the prompt for Ælfric’s mention of Jamnes, Mambres and Moses, and that the Bible, specifically Acts 8.9–24, was the source for his information on Simon Magus. 50 A quick glance, however, at Acts 8.9–24, shows that this passage does not speak of Simon’s death at all. References to both Jamnes and Mambres and the death of Simon appear, of course, in the Passio Petri et Pauli, making it appear likely that Ælfric derived this section from his knowledge and reading of this apocryphal story. The actual death of Simon is very similar in both De auguriis and BHL 6657, in that both describe Simon as ending up in four parts after his fall. De auguriis records Simon’s death thus, “he wearð afylled ða þa he wolde fleon to heofonum þæt he on feower tobærst,” (‘he was cast down when he wanted to fly to heaven and he burst into four parts’), 51 which is very similar to this description in BHL 6657, “et in quattuor partes fractus

49 Morris, Blickling, p. 185.
quattuor silices adunavit” (‘and he fell, and broke into four parts’).\footnote{52} Ælfric could, then, have gotten this detail from a Latin version of BHL 6657 or possibly from another, more complete Old English translation such as the langsum one he refers to in De auguriis, or in a fully set-forth English version, such as he refers to in his introduction to the story in ÆCHom I, 26, where he states, “We wyllad æfter þysum godspelle eow gereccan þæra apostola drohtnunga; and geendunge mid scortre race, for ðan de heora þrowung is gehwær on engliscum gereorde fullice geendebyrð” (‘After this gospel, we will recount to you the lives and end of the apostles in a shorter account, because their passion is everywhere fully set forth in the English language’).\footnote{53} Faerber suggests with respect to this quotation that it should be understood as distinguishing three separate aspects of the Passio Petri et Pauli, namely the lives, the end, and the passion of the apostles, of which three Ælfric intends to emphasize that he will relate the lives (drohtnunga) and end (geendunge) of the apostles, but not their passion (þrowung) since it (the passion alone) has been recorded in detail elsewhere.\footnote{54} This reading, however, is not tenable, because the comparative adjective scortre (shorter, misprinted as scorte in Faerber’s quotation of it) linked to drohtnunga and geendunge, forms a unit which is compared against the fullice account of the þrowung. The life and ending are to be taken as a unit equivalent to the passion, and only the length of the accounts is compared. Ælfric is clearly distinguishing his own shorter version with a previously existing longer account. This may be the same one he is referring to at the end of his excerpt from the passion in De auguriis, which may be the Blickling XV version as Getz suggests,\footnote{55} or it may be another lost text.

\footnote{52 Lipsius and Bonnet, Acta, p. 167.}
\footnote{53 ÆCHom I, 26, p. 391.}
\footnote{54 Faerber, “Les Acta,” p. 265.}
\footnote{55 Getz, Four Blickling Homilies, p. 207.
A comparison of the relevant sections of *De auguriis* and the Wulfstan interpolation, suggests then, the possibility that there could have been another, or more than one, Old English translation of the passion story of Peter and Paul beyond the ones currently extant. Further comparison of the various Latin and Old English texts, would be a necessary next step in testing this possibility. One useful place to begin such a comparison is Simon’s death scene, since it is in all of the versions from Anglo-Saxon England, and is clearly a crucial juncture in the account. Following are the relevant sections from the Latin *Actus Petri* (BHL 6656), the *Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (BHL 6657), the *Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (brevior, BHL 6667) and the versions from Anglo-Saxon England, namely Aldhelm’s poem on Peter, Blickling XV, Ælfric’s CH I, 26, and the Wulfstan interpolation.

**Actus Petri (6656):** En subito in alto visus est omnibus videntibus in tota urbe sup omnia templum et montes. Respiciens autem Petrus et ipse mirabatur talem visum. Petrus vero clamavit ad dominum Iesum Christum dicens: Si passus fueris hunc quod conatus est facere, omnes qui crediderunt in te scandalizantur, et quaecumque dedisti per me signa erunt fincta. Citius ergo, domine, fac gratiam tuam et ostende omnibus qui me adtendunt virtutem tuam. Sed non peto moriatur, sed aliquid in membris suis vexetur. et continuo caecidit ad terram, fregit crus in tres partes. Tunc eum lapadantes omnes fidentes et conlaudantes dominum.56

**Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli (BHL 6657):** Tunc ascendit Simon in turrim coram omnibus, et extensis manibus coronatus lauro coepit volare ... Petrus dixit: Adiuro vos, angeli Satanae ... ut eum ex hac hora iam non feratis, sed dimittatis illum. Et continuo dimissus ceclidit in locum qui Sacra Via dicitur, et in quattuor partes fractus quattuor silices adunavit qui sunt ad testimonium victoriae apostolicae usque in hodiernum diem.57

---

56 Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, p. 83. (So suddenly he was seen on high over all the temples and mountains of the whole city by everyone who was watching. Now Peter looked up and was amazed at such a sight. Indeed, Peter shouted to the lord Jesus Christ, saying, “If you allow this fellow to do what he is trying, all who believe in you will be given cause to stumble, and whatever signs you have done through me will seem false. Quickly, then, lord, use your grace, and show your virtue to all those who attend me. But I do not seek his death, but that he be injured bodily.” And immediately he fell to the earth, and his leg broke into three parts. Then all the faithful were throwing stones at him and praising the lord.)

57 Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, pp. 165–7. (Then Simon climbed the tower before all, and with his hands outstretched, crowned with a wreath of laurel, he began to fly ... Peter said, I adjure you, angels of Satan ... that from this hour you no longer bear him up but to send him down. And immediately having been released, he fell...
Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli (*brevior*, BHL 6667): Simon autem ascendens turrem extensis manibus coepit in altum volare ... Petrus autem iterum faciem elevans in caelum extensis manibus ait: Increpo vos, daemonia qui eum fertis, per deum patrem omnipotentem et per ilesum Christum filium eius, ut sine mora eum dimittatis ... Cumque hoc diceret, venit Simon ex alto in terram, et crepuit medius; nec tamen continuo examinatus est sed fracto debilitatoque corpore.58

Aldhelm: Qui praecelsa rudis scandit fastigia turris
Atque coronatus lauri de fronde volavit,
Sed mox aethereas dimittens furcifer auras
Cernuus ad terram contractis ossibus ambro
Corruit, et Petro cessit Victoria belli.59

Blickling XV: Þa beforan eallum Þæm folce astag Simon on þone torr, and açenedum earmum, mid lawere gebeagod, ongan fleogan on Þa lyfte ... Petrus ...
locode Þa up wið Simones and cwæþ, ‘Ic eow halsige scucna englas, ge þe hine on þære lyfte beraþ to beswicenne ungelæaffula manna heortan, þurh God Ælmihtigne ealra Scyppend and þurh Hælendne Crist, se þe on ðone þriddan dæg fram deaþe aras, ic bebeode þæt ge hine of þisse tide leng ne beran, ac hine anforlætan.’ And hie Þa sona hine forletan, and he gefeol on ðone stocce be þære stænenan stræte þe is haten Sacra via, and tobeærst on feower dælas. Da genaman men eft Þone stoc on weg and feower syllice stanas on þære ðican stowe alegdon, to gemynede and to cyþnesse þæs apostolican siges oþ þysne andweardan dæg.60

ÆCHom I, 26: Se dry astah ðone tor ætforan eallum folce and astrehtum earmum.
Ongan fleogan on Þa lyfte ... Þa besæah petrus to þam fleondam dry; þus cweþende; Ic halsige eow awyriede gastas on cristes naman þæt ge forlæton þone dry. þe ge betwux eow feriða; and Þa deoflu þærrihte hine forleton. And he feallende tobeærst on

---

58 Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, pp. 231–2. ( But Simon, ascending a tower, with his hands outstretched began to fly on high ... But Peter, lifting his face towards heaven again, with his arms outstretched said, ‘I rebuke you demons who hold him up, through God the omnipotent father and through Jesus Christ his son, release him without delay ... And when he said this, Simon came out of the sky onto the earth and creaked in the middle; but he did not die immediately.)

59 Ehwald, *Aldhelmi Opera*, p. 20. (Who, climbed the lofty gables of a rude tower and crowned with a frond of laurel flew, but quickly sending away the heavenly airs, soon the thief sank, having fallen to the earth with broken bones and the victory of the war fell to Peter.)

60 Morris, *Blickling*, pp. 187–9. For a more recent edition of Blickling XV, see Getz, *Four Blickling Homilies*, pp. 168-86. This portion of the text is on pp. 181-2 of Getz’ edition. (Then before all the people Simon, crowned with laurel, ascended the tower and, with his arms outstretched, began to fly in the air ... Peter looked up towards Simon and said, ‘Through God almighty the creator of all and through Jesus Christ, who on the third day rose from death, I command you angels of the devil, do not bear him up any longer, but release him. And immediately they released him and he fell on the stake on the stone street which is called the Sacra Via, and burst into four parts. Then men took away the scaffolding and laid four wondrous stones in the same place as a reminder and witness of the apostolic victory until the present day.)
feower sticcum. ða feower sticcu clifodon to feower stanum þa sind to gewitnysse þæs apostolican siges oð ðysne andweardan ðæig. 61

Wulfstan: [15] And þær eall þæt folc on locode he stah up to ðam stepele and of ðam stepele hof upp of lyfte swylce he wolde wiþ þæs heofonas weard ... ða sanctus petrus beseah raðe æfter ðam up to þam lyfte and clypode hludre stefne and ðus cwæð: Ic halsige eow deofles gastas þe þæne deofles mann geond þa lyft feriað and ðurh þæt menn bepæcað, þæt ge þurh godes ælmihtiges bebod hine nu ða forlætan þæt he næfre leng mid his mane menn ne beswice. Sona swa he hit gecweden hæfde, þa forleton hy hine and he hreas nyðer and feoll þæt he eall tobærst. 62

As Aldhelm’s account is earlier than the other Anglo-Saxon texts being compared here, and was almost certainly based on a Latin version of the passion story, it is the most sensible place to begin. A closer look at Aldhelm’s poem compared with Isidore’s information on Peter (a suggested source for Aldhelm’s account of the passion of Peter), 63 the Actus Petri, and BHL 6657, shows that only Aldhelm and BHL 6657 mention Simon climbing a tower, and the detail that he wore a crown of laurel. When Simon falls, BHL 6657 tells us Simon “cecidit in locum qui Sacra Via dicitur” (‘fell in the place which is called the Sacred Way’) and broke into four parts, 64 while in the Actus Petri he cedidit ad terram (‘fell to the earth’) and broke into three parts. 65 In Aldhelm he “cernuus ad terram confractis ossibus ambro corruit” (‘fell face-first to the earth with all his bones broken’). 66 The Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli brevior stresses, “nec tamen continuo examinatus est, sed fracto debilitatoque

61 ÆCHom, pp. 396–7. (The magician climbed the tower before all the people and with outstretched arms began to fly in the air ... Peter seeing the magician flying, spoke thus: I adjure you wicked spirits on the name of Christ that you release the magician whom you bear up between you. And the devils immediately released him and he having fallen, burst into four pieces. The four pieces formed four stones which are a witness of the apostolic triumph until the present day.)
62 http://webpages.ursinus.edu/jlionarons/Wulfstan//iv.html. Section [15] And as all the people looked on he climbed up the tower and leapt from the tower into the air as if he would meet the ruler of heaven ... Then Saint Peter looked quickly up to the sky and cried out in a louder voice and said, “I command you spirits of the devil, you who are carrying the devil’s man around the sky and are deceiving people by doing so, that by almighty God’s command you let him go now so that he may no longer deceive people with his crimes. As soon as he said this they let him go and he fell down so that he burst apart.
63 See notes 10 and 11 above.
64 Lipisus and Bonnet, Acta, p. 167.
65 Ibid. p. 83.
66 Ehwald, Aldhelmi Opera, p. 20.
corpore … post paululum cum diabolo eius anima discessit in gehennam,” (‘and he did not die right away, but with his body broken and weakened ... after a little while his spirit departed to gehenna with the devil’).\textsuperscript{67} Isidore merely states that Peter, “Simonem etiam magicis artibus coelum conscendentem ad terram elisit,” (‘knocked Simon, even as he was ascending into the sky with his magical arts, to the earth’).\textsuperscript{68} This comparison suggests that Aldhelm did indeed have sources in addition to Isidore. The mention of the laurel crown, paralleled only in BHL 6657, makes it most likely that he had that source or one related to it. As well as similar content, Aldhelm’s poetic description of Simon’s death shares some lexical commonalities with BHL 6657 at this point in the story. All of BHL 6657, 6667, and Aldhelm use the root word \textit{frango} to refer to the state of Simon’s body after his fall, and use the term \textit{turris} to refer to the tower, but only BHL 6657 and Aldhelm, as mentioned above, include the detail that Simon was crowned with laurel, and they both use the terms \textit{coronatus} and \textit{laurus}. In addition, both Aldhelm and BHL 6657 use the verb \textit{volare} of Simon’s flight, \textit{dimittere} for the onset of his fall, and conclude their descriptions by referring to Peter’s \textit{victoria} over Simon. These lexical similarities are even more compelling considering Aldhelm’s prodigious vocabulary, including his frequent use of “arcane,” and “esoteric” lexical selections,\textsuperscript{69} and the “characteristic striving after aural effects and vivid tone,”\textsuperscript{70} in his poetry. Aldhelm’s reference to \textit{ossibus} is not directly paralleled in any of the other texts, but it is certainly suggested by the other accounts. It also seems possible that many of the details about Peter and Simon may have been in general circulation in Anglo-Saxon England, perhaps in oral form as well as written, and Aldhelm could have included some of his details based on memory. In short,

\begin{itemize}
\item Anon, \textit{Passio Apostolorum Petri et Pauli}, Lipsius and Bonnet, \textit{Acta}, p. 232.
\item Orchard, \textit{Poetic Art}, p. 17.
\end{itemize}
while it appears that more work needs to be done to compare in close detail these texts and possibly others to determine whether or not Aldhelm used an apostolic passion collection or not, based on content and lexical similarities, it seems reasonable to conclude that he almost certainly had access to BHL 6657 in some form and used it as his main source for the poem. The comparison suggests that he may also have had BHL 6656 and 6667 for reference.

The other versions to be compared are all written in Old English, and so are more difficult to compare with the Latin, but easier to assess against each other. The following table places in parallel the accounts in Blickling XV, ÆCHom I, 26 and *De temporibus antichristi*, colour-coded as outlined in the key, to show the textual relationships amongst the three texts (Words which ÆCHom I, 26 or *De temporibus antichristi* have in common with Blickling XV are in bold. Words in ÆCHom I, 26 which differ from Blickling XV and words which ÆCHom I, 26 and Wulfstan share are in italics.  

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blickling XV</th>
<th>ÆCHom I, 26</th>
<th>De temporibus antichristi [15]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ða beforan eallum þæm folce astag Simon on þone torr, and aþenedum earmum, mid lawere gebeagod, ongan fleogan on þa lyfte. ...Petrus...locode þa up wið Simones and cwæþ, ‘Ic eow halsige scucna englas, ge þe hine on þære lyfte beraþ to beswicenne ungeleaffiulra</td>
<td>Se dry astah ðone tor ætforan eallum folce and astrehtum earmum. Ongan fleogan on þa lyft</td>
<td>And þær eall þæt folc on locode he stah up to þam stepele and of þam stepele hof upp of lyfte swylce he wolde wiþ þæs heofonas weard ... ða sanctus petrus beseah raðe æfter þam up to þam lyfte and clypode hludre stefne and þus cwæð: Ic halsige eow deofles gastas þe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ða beseah petrus to þam fleondam dry; þus cweþende; Ic halsige eow awyriede</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

manna heortan, þurh God Ælmihtigne ealra Scyppend and þurh Hælendne Crist, se þe on ðone þriddan dæg fram deaþe aras, ic bebeode þæt ge hine of þisse tide leng ne beran, ac hine **anforlætan**.’

And hie þa sona hine **forlætan**, and he **gefeol** on þone stocc be þære stænenan stræte þe is haten Sacra via, and **tobærst** on feower dælas. Ða genaman men eft þone stoc on weg and feower syllice stanas on þære ilcan stowe alegdon, to gemynde and to cyþnesse þaes apostolican siges op þysne andweardan dæg.

gastas on **cristes** naman þæt ge **forlæton** þone dry. þæt ge betwux eow **feriað**;

and þa deoflu **bærrihte** hine **forlæton.** And he **feallende tobærst** on feower sticcum.

þæne deofles mann geond þa lyft **feriað** and ðurh þæt menn bepæcað, þæt ge þurh godes ælmihtiges bebod hine nu ða **forlætan** þæt he næfre leng mid his mane menn ne beswire. Sona swa he hit gecweden hæfde, þa **forleton** hy hine and he hreas nyðer and **feoll** þæt he eall **tobærst**.

ða feower sticcu clifodon to feower stanum þa sind to **gewitnyssse þæs apostolican siges oð þysne andweardan dæg.**
Being able to compare these three texts in parallel format affords their closer comparison and the opportunity to observe various aspects of the relationships amongst them. Their interrelationship is, of course, dependent on the relative dates of the various texts, and is complicated by the fact that there is debate over the dating of the Blickling homilies. Internal dating places them as no later than the late tenth century; however Hans Schabam considers a range in dates anywhere from 875-925 as possible, and Getz concurs with this proposed period as a possibility for the homilies which he discusses, including homily 15. Given these dating caveats, yet proceeding on the basis that the Blickling homilies fall within the earlier 25 years of Schabam’s range, Blickling XV would be the earliest of the extant Old English translations of the passion story of Peter and Paul in the table above. If this were so it would not be possible for the Blickling version to have relied on ÆCHom I, 26 or the Wulfstan interpolation, but they could theoretically have been dependent on Blickling XV. An examination of the section of Blickling XV which deals with Simon’s flight and death, quickly reveals that the account is based on BHL 6657, and resembles it very closely. It includes the same details about the tower, the laurel wreath, Peter’s command to the demons to release Simon, and Simon’s fall and his resulting bursting into four pieces. In many cases it appears to be a verbatim translation. One exception is the addition of on þa lyfte (‘in the air’), following ongan fleogan (‘he began to fly’) for the Latin coepit volare, a minor change in itself, yet intriguing in that it is not in the Latin accounts but is in all three Old English versions (and is the only example of a parallel of this precise nature). Another difference in the Blickling version is the addition to BHL 6657’s mention that Simon fell in the Sacra Via, of the highly alliterative observation that he fell “on þone stocc be þære stænenan stræt” (‘on the stake by

---

72 Based on internal evidence, in which homily XI states that it was written 971 years after Christ, Morris, Blickling, p. 119.
the stone street’). This detail is not found in BHL 6657, 6656, or 6667 (see pp. 124-5 for these Latin accounts). This part of the text is discussed in some detail by Getz, who posits that it reflects some confusion over the exact cause of Simon’s death, and consequent rewriting of the text. He first notes that stocc was likely a misreading of stow (place), which would be the expected translation of the Latin locum. He also argues that stænenan stræte reflects knowledge of the Latin silices (‘paving stones’), as does the phrase syllice stanas (‘extraordinary stones’) two lines later.74 Thus the writer/copyist of the Blickling text as it currently stands may have been trying to reconcile confusion over whether Simon was killed by a stake (as Blickling XV now reads), or by falling onto stones (as in the Latin). Getz comments that the silices in the Latin text “are not a man-made memorial,”75 and yet the detail in the Latin that the stones became a “testimonium victoriae apostolicae usque in hodiernum diem” (‘witness of the apostolic victory up to the present day’) may have played a part in the choice of syllice to describe the stones in the Blickling text.

It seems clear that Ælfric’s retelling in Catholic Homily I, 26 is also based ultimately on BHL 6657, but more loosely and in a condensed form. The main details are the same, but the laurel crown is omitted and Peter’s prayer is shorter, his lengthy invocation of God and Christ in Blickling XV being abbreviated to on cristes naman (‘in Christ’s name’). There is no mention of the name of the street into which Simon fell, or of the alliterative confusion of the stake and stone found in Blickling XV. Ælfric retains, however, BHL 6657’s and Blickling’s reference to the four stones remaining to the andweardan daeig (‘present day’) as a reminder of Peter’s victory. This latter detail, as well as the fact that Ælfric followed the wording of the

75 Ibid. p. 243.
Latin very closely for the sections he did include even though his account is condensed, demonstrate that ultimately the BHL 6657 tradition is behind his account as well.

While the ultimate basis for Ælfric’s account is clear, a more interesting and perplexing question is whether or not Ælfric wrote his version working from a Latin source, an Old English source, oral remembrances or perhaps all three. A comparison of Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26 shows not only that the details are similar, albeit fuller in Blickling, but also that many of the words are identical. Of the 73 words in this portion of Ælfric’s text, 26 are the same as or based on the same root as Blickling’s words. Further, Ælfric’s account tells that Simon “ongan fleogan on þa lyfte”, wording which is identical to Blickling’s, including identical Old English lexical items, and the words on þa lyfte, the detail which we saw above is not in BHL 6657. This evidence would suggest either that Ælfric was working from Blickling (assuming that it predates ÆCHom I, 26) or that they shared the same Old English, not Latin, source. Ælfric mentions at the beginning of his retelling of the Peter and Paul story in Catholic Homily I, 26 the existence of a longer Old English text of the passion, in contrast to his scortre account, and he alludes to a lengthy set of stories about sorcerers such as Simon in De auguriis. Perhaps one of these now lost texts was the source for the story of Peter and Paul in both Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26.

Curiously, though, there are several instances in the description of Simon’s downfall in ÆCHom I, 26 in which Ælfric seems to be following the text in Blickling XV word for word but then uses a different, synonymous word for the word in the Blickling account. For example where Blickling uses Simon’s name, Ælfric uses dry. Other examples are:
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blickling</th>
<th>Ælfric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aþenedum</td>
<td>astrehtum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locode</td>
<td>beseah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scucna englas</td>
<td>awyriede gastas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beran</td>
<td>feriað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðælas</td>
<td>sticcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyþness</td>
<td>gewitnysse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the high number of similar lexical items (26) between the two accounts, these variations should probably be seen not as an indication that Ælfric did not share a common source with Blickling XV (or indeed Blickling XV itself) but rather that he varied his presentation from his source, as he was wont to do. Ælfric may have deliberately altered Blickling’s vocabulary in the places mentioned above, or have been using additional sources which he combined with the Blickling source. In fact, an examination of the occurrence of the six pairs of words in the above list using the DOE Web Corpus, shows that in four of the six cases, Ælfric used the word in the second column proportionately far more frequently in his writings than the one in the first column, even when it is compared against all uses in Old English. For example, Ælfric uses the word *aþennan* in any form only twice in his works, which amounts to two percent of its uses in the Old English corpus. He uses the word *astreccan*, however, 76 times, which accounts for thirty-seven percent of its occurrences in Old English. Similarly, his usage of the word *locode* and its other forms account for only six percent of its occurrences in Old English, while his use of the word *beseah* accounts for twenty-eight percent of its use in the corpus.\(^76\) This evidence supports the possibility that Ælfric may simply have been expressing

his predilections in diction by altering the vocabulary in his source in these cases, and need not
diminish the likelihood that he was using a “Blickling” source for his version of the passion of
Peter and Paul.

Based on the overall evidence of this selective comparison of Catholic Homily I, 26 with BHL 6657 and Blickling XV, there is no need for Ælfric to have had the Latin at hand. All of his account of this section could have come from Blickling or a related Old English source and this fact is a strong case for the conclusion that Ælfric was either working from Blickling XV or from a common Old English source or both. While he may have had the Latin, his possession or use of it cannot be proven from this section of the text.

Wulfstan’s version, like the other Old English versions, seems to have a BHL 6657 background, but interestingly in light of Ælfric’s dependence on Blickling or a Blickling-like source, does not share much vocabulary with Blickling XV. It does, though, use several of the words in ÆCHom I, 26 which are not in Blickling, for example besæah, gastas, and feriað. Curiously, like the other two Old English versions it includes “lyfte”, which is not in the Latin. Our earlier comparison of Wulfstan’s version, demonstrating its similarities with Ælfric’s De auguriis, can be supplemented by noting here that the Wulfstan interpolator’s account includes an interesting addition in which after it is mentioned that Simon began to fly, the author adds, “swylce he wolde wið þæs heofonas weard” (‘as though he wanted to fly towards heaven’), an explanation which is not in BHL 6657, Blickling XV or ÆCHom I, 26, but is in De auguriis, where it is mentioned that Simon was cast down “ða þa he wolde fleon to heofonum” (‘when he wanted to fly to heaven’). Again, beyond the repetition of the idea, the lexical similarities are suggestive of a shared Old English source. If, as suggested above, the Wulfstan
interpolator and Ælfric shared a condensed Old English source, perhaps this idea was included there, or again, the Wulfstan interpolator could have had *De auguriis* itself at his disposal.

Lionarons argues that the Wulfstan version is based on a different Latin source than Blickling and/or ÆCHom I, 26 and cites as support the fact that Nero’s name is never used in the Wulfstan version while it is in the others. Perhaps rather than another Latin source, however, a different Old English source was being used, one which left out Nero’s name. If there were a condensed Old English source it may well have omitted the emperor’s name in the interest of brevity, or perhaps in the *langsum* collection of stories about magicians and devils which both Wulfstan and Ælfric allude to, the emperor’s name was left out in order to make the story more applicable to other time periods. The author of the Wulfstan text does seem to take pains to emphasize that the story is presented as an example of how devils tried to deceive people, warning, for example, “7 micel þeárf þa ðe þæs timan gebidað þæt hi wære beon 7 þæt hi gemyndige beon þæra þinga þe deofles menn oft ær þurh drycraeft drugon” (‘and those who live in this time have great need to be wary and to be mindful of the things which men of the devil often used to perform through sorcery’).

Lionarons also gives as evidence for her theory the differences in diction and sentence structure between the Wulfstan interpolation and other accounts. One of two examples she cites for support is found in the various expressions of Simon’s demand that a tower be built for him:

**BHL 6657**: Simon dixit: lube turrim excelsam fieri ex lignis et trabibus magnis, ut ascendam in illam ... Tunc Nero praecepit in campo Martio turrim excelsam fieri, (Simon said: Command a high tower to be made out of wood and great beams, so that I may ascend it ... Then Nero ordered the high tower to be made in the campus Martius).

---

79 Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, p. 163.
Blickling XV: On þa æfter þon het Neron gewyrcean mycelne tor of treowum and of mycclum beamum. (And after that Nero ordered a large tower to be made out of wood and large beams).\textsuperscript{80}

ÆElfric: Nero ... het þa ðone tor mid micclum ofste on smeþum felda aræran. (Nero ... then commanded a tower to be raised with great speed in a smooth field).\textsuperscript{81}

Wulfstan: Simon ...  het þa aræran ænne stipel (Simon then commanded a tower to be raised).\textsuperscript{82}

Once again, the Blickling version is very close to BHL 6657, merely combining two separate commands for the tower to be built in the Latin, but otherwise is a fairly direct translation. ÆElfric’s version shows similarities and differences to Blickling in content and vocabulary. Both use the words Nero, het, tor, and micel, yet ÆElfric does not include any word referring to the making of the tower equivalent to fieri (BHL 6657) or gewyrcean (Blickling), and does not specify what the tower is to be made of as the authors of Blickling and BHL 6657 do. Instead ÆElfric focuses on the raising of the tower using the verb aræran. Furthermore, ÆElfric specified the location of the tower in the smeþum felda, which presumably corresponds to BHL 6657’s campo Martio. No location is mentioned in Blickling. These two seemingly inconsistent observations, namely that ÆElfric’s version seems dependent on Blickling yet also alludes to a detail in the Latin, could be explained if he had both sources, or if he was referring to another earlier Old English source which included mention of the tower’s location, a source which both he and the writer of the Blickling homily shared, perhaps the langsum retelling ÆElfric referred to in De auguriis and (if the two were one and the same)/or the fullice geendebyrd (‘fully set forth’).\textsuperscript{83} Old English version he writes of in his introduction to the passion in ÆCHom I, 26. Their sharing of such a source would also explain the close

\textsuperscript{80} Morris, Blickling, p. 187.
\textsuperscript{81} ÆCHom I, 26, p. 396.
\textsuperscript{83} ÆCHom I, 26, p. 391.
similarity, yet occasional differences, in wording and content between Blickling XV and ÆCHom I, 26, in the broader story of Simon’s death discussed above.

In the Wulfstan version of the sentence referring to the building of the tower, we can see that the narration is clearly condensed, but other than changing the Old English word for tower from *tor* to *stepel*, the condensation is quite close to Ælfric’s sentence in the use of the words *het* (although this is also in Blickling) and *araeran*. Once again the Wulfstan version is closer to Ælfric’s homily than to Blickling. This could be explained if the two authors shared a condensed Old English source as well as being in possession of a longer source, either in Latin or Old English. It is also possible, of course, as mentioned above, that the Wulfstan interpolator had at hand Ælfric’s versions themselves (as shown above, it is likely that he did have *De auguriis*), in addition to another or others in Latin or Old English. The shared vocabulary here, as well as the other lexical similarities the various texts share, would also be consistent with their sharing another Old English translation, an earlier Old English version of the Peter and Paul passion story, one which is no longer extant.

The existence of an Old English translation of BHL 6657 which predated Blickling XV is also supported by the fact that all four Old English sources (Blickling XV, ÆCHom I, 26, *De temporibus antichristi*, and *De auguriis*) use the word *tobaerst* to describe Simon’s miserable fate. The inclusion of *lyfte* in Blickling, ÆCHom I, 26 and *De temporibus antichristi* with no equivalent in BHL 6657 is further evidence that a common Old English source was available to these authors. According to the DOE Web Corpus the words *fleogan* and *lyft* are used in conjunction nine times out of approximately 250 occurrences where they are separate in the Old English corpus, demonstrating that it was neither necessary, nor even

---

common, for the two words to appear together. The Old English source the authors shared may have been the *langsum* one which Ælfric in *De auguriis* and the Wulfstan interpolator in *De temporibus antichristi* allude to. It may also have been the one or ones which Ælfric refers to when he introduces his account of the passions of Peter and Paul, which, one might suggest, could have been the version of the story in Blickling XV, for it is a much fuller account than Ælfric’s. Yet Ælfric states that the story is “everywhere” fully set forth in the English language, while the existence of only one manuscript of Blickling XV argues against its being a very popular or widespread homily. Given all of the evidence presented here, it seems more likely that while Ælfric may have been familiar with Blickling XV, he also had at hand (an) Old English version(s) which preceded Blickling XV, a fuller translation which may not correspond precisely to any of the extant Latin or Old English versions. In favour of this hypothesis is that Blickling XV, although fuller than Ælfric’s version, also leaves out some details, for example the mention of Jamnes and Mambres, a reference which Ælfric left out of ÆCHom I, 26, but which he included in *De auguriis*, thus demonstrating that he was aware of its connection with the passion of Peter and Paul. The similarities between the Wulfstan interpolator’s account and both ÆCHom I, 26 and *De auguriis* suggests that the interpolator accessed the tale via these two Ælfrician versions, creating a *catena*, as it were, of source relationships beginning with an earlier Old English source derived from BHL 6657 which was then used by the Blickling author and Ælfric, whose account was in turn the source for the section of *De temporibus antichristi* which retells the passion of Peter and Paul.

The foregoing analysis is based largely on a comparative analysis of the passage covering the death of Simon. This comparison has been performed as an example of the sort of examination which could be instrumental in uncovering the textual relationships amongst the Old English versions of the story of the passion of Peter and Paul. In order to go further,
though, one would have to examine the whole of the texts. A brief look at the section dealing
with the dogs and the loaves, for example, suggests a different scenario. Here, both the
Blickling author and Ælfric in Catholic Homily I, 26 seem to be translating verbatim from the
Latin, but use different Old English vocabulary. Where the Latin reads, *subito nusquam
conparuerunt* (‘suddenly they appeared nowhere’),\(^{85}\) Blickling records, “sona onweg gewitan
and nahwær æteowdon” (‘immediately they went away and were visible nowhere’)\(^{86}\) whereas
Ælfric writes, “hi ðærrihte of heora gesihðe fordwinon” (‘they immediately disappeared from
their sight’).\(^{87}\) Thus it appears as though for the Latin *subito* one author used the Old English
word *sona* while the other used the synonym *ðærrihte*. Similarly Nero’s question, “Tu Paule,
quare nihil loqueris” (‘You, Paul, why do you say nothing?’)\(^{88}\) appears as “forhwon ne sprecst
ðu, Paulus” (why do you not speak), in Blickling\(^{89}\) and “hwi ne cwest ðu nan word” (‘why do
you not say any word’) in Ælfric.\(^{90}\) Here we find for the Latin *loqueris* one text uses *sprecst*,
while the other *cwest*, and for the Latin *quare*, one *forhwon*, the other *hwi*. These sorts of
differences suggest the possibility either that Ælfric and the author of the Blickling homily
were each translating directly from a Latin source or that they were working from two
different Old English translations, perhaps ones coming from different regions or times and
thus exhibiting dialectical differences. Possibly the most likely scenario, given this last
comparison together with all the evidence assembled here, including the aforementioned
observation that Ælfric (in ÆCHom 1, 27) used Peter’s defence of Paul found in BHL 6657
(and in wording very close to the Latin) which is missing from Blickling XV, is that the
Blickling author and Ælfric shared an earlier Old English source but that Ælfric also had the
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\(^{85}\) Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, p. 143.
\(^{87}\) ÆCHom I, 26, p. 395.
\(^{88}\) Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta*, p. 149.
\(^{89}\) Morris, *Blickling*, p. 183.
\(^{90}\) ÆCHom, I, 26, p. 395.
Latin source before him and at times translated freely from it. For a definitive conclusion an analysis of the whole text and an examination of the various manuscripts of each Latin and Old English version would be necessary, a project worthy of a separate project on its own. Another complicating factor is the potential existence of a widespread oral tradition of the passion, a good possibility given Ælfric’s statement that the story was everywhere fully set out in English. Such oral transmission may have influenced each Old English author’s account.

No matter which sources these authors relied on for their version of the *Passio Petri et Pauli*, however, the fact that this story is extant in several different forms and texts from Anglo-Saxon England, including three different homilies, prayers, poetry, and saints’ lives, bespeaks its popularity, attraction, and perceived usefulness in the minds of Anglo-Saxons. In the next two chapters, we will examine another popular Pauline apocryphal text, the *Visio Sancti Pauli*, and then the ways in which these narratives about Paul were perceived and used in Anglo-Saxon England.
Chapter 6. The *Visio Sancti Pauli*

A second important Pauline apocryphal text in Anglo-Saxon England, in addition to the *Passio Petri et Pauli* is the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. This originally Greek text was most likely written in Egypt by a Copt no later than the middle of the third century. The original Greek version has not survived, but it was transmitted in several different Latin versions, both the ‘long Latin versions’ of which there are three texts available, and numerous redactions, which at times both abbreviate and interpolate. It was translated into many different languages, including a Greek translation based on the Latin, Syrian, Coptic, Russian, Slavonic, Arabic and Armenian, and, especially important for our purposes here, Old English. Its chief sources are the Apocalypses of Peter, Elias, and Zephaniah, and its popularity made it a means of transmitting to future generations the material of these sources. It describes Paul’s descent into Hell and ascent into Heaven to see the punishments and rewards various sorts of sinners and saints received and was presumably inspired by Paul’s statement in 2 Cor. 12.2–4:

Scio hominem in Christo ante annos quattuordecim, sive in corpore nescio sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, raptum eiusmodi usque ad tertium caelum. Et scio huiusmodi hominem sive in corpore, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit, quoniam raptus est in paradisum et audivit arcana verba quae non licet homini loqui.

(I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven, whether in the body or out of the body I do not know, God knows. And I know that this man was caught up into paradise, whether in the body or out of the body I do not

---

4 Silverstein, VSP, p. 3.
know, God knows, and he heard things that cannot be told, which man may not utter).

Wilhelm Schneemelcher aptly comments, “in 2 Cor. 12 Paul tells of being caught up into Paradise and this gave someone who was familiar with the apocalyptic tradition the opportunity of putting in Paul’s mouth what he himself knew or thought about the next world. “6 After 388 A.D. a preface relating the text’s miraculous discovery beneath the foundations of Paul’s house in Tarsus was added to the text of the visions which was presumably intended to further the connection with Paul, perhaps for added authority for the text, and also perhaps to answer questions about why, if it was indeed Pauline, the Visio had not been discovered earlier.7

In spite of its putative Pauline authority, and the fact that, according to Silverstein, “there is nothing in the Apocalypse as we know it that need have made it especially repugnant to the orthodoxy of the day,”8 the work did not enjoy easy acceptance by church authorities, for reasons which will be discussed below. Sozomen spoke against the preface, suggesting it was invented by heretics, since he himself had never heard of such a discovery, and Augustine said of the account of the visions:9

Qua occasione, vani quidam Apocalypsim Pauli, quam sane non recipit Ecclesia, nescio quibus fabulis plenam, stultissime praesumptione finixerunt; dicentes hanc esse unde dixerat raptum se fuisses in tertium coelum et illic audisses ineffabila verba quae non licet homini loqui. Utcumque illorum tolerabilis esset audacia, si se audisses dixisset quae adhuc non licet homini loqui: cum vero dixerit, quae non licet homini loqui; isti qui sunt qui haec audaeant impudenter et infeliciter loqui?

(On which occasion, certain foolish people created an Apocalypse of Paul, which, of course, the Church does not receive, filled with I do not know what stories, saying this is whence he said he had been taken into the third heaven and there had heard unspeakable words which it is not permitted for man to speak. However, their

8 Silverstein, VSP, p. 4.
9 Silverstein, VSP, p. 4; from Tractatus in Evangeliwm Joannis, xcviii, p. 8 (Migne, P.L. XXXV, 1885).
audacity would be tolerable, if it had said he had heard what yet it was not lawful for men to speak; but when it says the things which are not permitted to man to say, who are they who dare, impudently and unhappily, to say these things?)

Official denunciation of the work by church leaders is found in the *Decretum Gelasianum* which includes it among apocryphal works which were not accepted.\(^{10}\)

Nonetheless, in spite of the disparagement of the *Visio Pauli* by the Church and its leaders, Silverstein comments of it, “the importance of Paul increased from the eighth century, so that it became one of the chief formative elements in the development of the later legends of Heaven and Hell,” culminating in Dante’s *Divina comedia*.\(^ {11}\) Silverstein attributes its popularity to three factors: first, by combining material from several apocalypses it achieved an inclusive text which none of the others had managed; second, its similarity to the other apocalypses lent authority to its claim to contain Paul’s own inspired words as well as a familiarity which was couched in simple terms, uncomplicated by intricate theological points; and third, unlike other apocryphal texts which dealt with eschatology, the *Visio Pauli* treated of the time immediately following the death of individuals’ souls, “a matter of imminent concern to the living.”\(^ {12}\) The manuscript history of the *Visio Pauli* thus reveals a literary paradox in its transmission, in that it was officially rejected but became one of the most popular and most widely transmitted apocryphal texts in the history of the Christian church. It was both unauthorized and somewhat heterodox in its inclusion of purgatory, but was at the same time highly appealing and useful in addressing the issue of the fate of the soul immediately following death. Anthony Hilhorst comments that the *Visio* was the classic expression of the idea of individual judgment at the time of death, an idea which throughout


\(^{11}\) Silverstein, *VSP*, p. 3.

\(^{12}\) Ibid. p. 5.
the Middle Ages gradually replaced the idea of a general judgment at the end of time. Its
usefulness in the development of this change helps to explain its success.\textsuperscript{13} These features
resulted in its being extremely popular among less highly placed Christians, and especially it
seems, to judge by the proliferation of redactions of the text, among Christian writers,
preachers and teachers. As Milton McC. Gatch observes, the recognition of its popularity and
usefulness for parenetic and didactic purposes resulted in the development of numerous
redactions and derivative forms of the text.\textsuperscript{14}

The earliest full-length, long Latin version (i.e. not a Redaction) of the \textit{Visio} was likely
written in the sixth century, although perhaps as early as the late fourth, but this version does
not survive and the earliest extant long Latin version (P) is from the eighth century (Paris, B.
N. F., Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1631).\textsuperscript{15} Another long Latin version, from a St. Gall manuscript, and
thus dubbed St. G., dates to the ninth century and is independent of P, thereby demonstrating
that the tale was not dependent on a single manuscript for its transmission.\textsuperscript{16} A third long Latin
version survives in the fourteenth century manuscript Vienna, Codex 362, which is in turn
independent of both P and St. G.\textsuperscript{17} The redactions, based on the sixth-century long Latin
translation and written most likely between the ninth and the twelfth centuries,\textsuperscript{18} show that it
was a text which was easily extracted from, abbreviated, and interpolated, and also that it was
used in a homiletic setting, since the redactions leave out the preface relating the discovery of
the work in Tarsus and replace it with a homiletic opening, such as this exhortation
introducing Redaction I, “oportet vos, fratres karissimi, amare delicias paradisi et timere penas

\textsuperscript{15} Silverstein, \textit{VSP}, pp. 5–6.
\textsuperscript{16} Silverstein, \textit{VSP}, p. 6; Healey, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{17} Healey, \textit{Old English Vision of St. Paul}, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{18} Silverstein, \textit{VSP}, pp. 9 and 12.
inferni” (‘it is fitting for us, most beloved brothers, to love the delights of paradise and to fear the punishments of hell’).19

Virginia Brown has discovered a manuscript witness to Redaction I in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Borg. lat. 86, a collection of texts suitable for a homiletic setting, many of which are template texts suitable for use at funerals. The Visio text, however, which is unfortunately not complete and is missing the ending, was, Brown argues, “not likely to have been delivered as a funeral homily. On such an occasion it would have been neither consoling nor tactful to dwell on the torments of the damned—it was likely to have been used when the purpose was de (rather than pro) defunctis,” and probably would have ended as the homilies around it with an “exhortation to the living to avoid the pains of hell by honouring God and leading a good life.”20 The redactions also show that the redactors’ main interest in the text involved the poenas inferni, rather than the delicias paradisi, since except for Redaction VI, they all eliminate the heavenly elements of the text, and preserve the hellish ones.21 Perhaps the homilists and preachers felt it was more effective for moral transformation to threaten parishioners with the torments of hell rather than to focus on the rewards of heaven. Gatch also observes that, contrary to expectations and normal practice, the Redactions tend to simplify the original text, perhaps in order to focus on its usefulness as a teaching tool, and in order to avoid a discussion of controversial theological issues involving purgatory.22 Thus far

19 Ibid. pp. 40 and 109, n.2.
21 Silverstein, VSP, p. 40.
twelve different branches of redaction traditions have been identified, attesting to the vast popularity of the *Visio* throughout the Middle Ages.

The popularity of the *Visio* in Anglo-Saxon England was especially strong as evidenced by the fact that of the forty-seven extant manuscripts of the Redactions of the *Visio*, twenty-one are English. In addition to these there is an Old English translation of the *Visio* found in the late eleventh-century or early twelfth-century Bodleian MS Junius 85–6, folios 3r to 11v, edited by Healey. The translation is not based directly on any of the three extant long Latin versions as its source. As Healey shows, the Old English version preserves original material which is not included in P, but is in St. G., although on the whole P and the Old English correspond more closely than do St. G and the Old English. Additionally, however, there is one example where neither P nor St. G correspond to the Old English, demonstrating that the Old English version used as its source another, non-extant, Latin recension. This section does show up in the Russian and Syriac texts, so it cannot be an Old English addition but must be from an original Latin source.

The Old English translation of the *Visio* is accompanied in the manuscript by a collection of homilies. Healey points out that the collection may be regarded as “a compilation in some way associated with preaching to the laity.” One of the homilies in Junius 85–86, from folios 40v–61v, includes portions of the *Visio* translated “freely” into Old

---

30 Ibid. p. 15.
English, “meaning for meaning, rather than word for word.”\textsuperscript{31} It is a composite homily on tithing, the middle section of which is a portion of the \textit{Visio}, flanked by a tithing sermon of Caesarius of Arles, \textit{De reddendis decimis}.\textsuperscript{32} This homily is also found in the Blickling collection\textsuperscript{33} as homily number IV, of which Healey says the content of the relevant section is so close to the \textit{Visio} “that one suspects that the homilist had it in front of him as he wrote.”\textsuperscript{34} Although the two are ultimately derived from the same source, they are independent of one another; Junius, albeit a later manuscript, was not copied from Blickling IV. Rather, both appear to have been translated from a Latin exemplar.\textsuperscript{35}

Blickling homily IV is based largely on Caesarius’ \textit{De reddendis decimis} but according to the \textit{Fontes Anglo-Saxonici} database it draws four of its passages from the \textit{Visio} as follows:\textsuperscript{36}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Blickling} & \textbf{Latin (Silverstein)} \\
41.32: Se þe buton ælmaessan and fæstenne leofað, se bið on helle cwelmed. & 157.26–7: Hi sunt qui non soluerunt Ieiunium statutis temporibus, et qui non porrexerunt manus suas pauperibus. \\
(41.32: Whoever lives without almsgiving and fasting, will die in hell.) & (157:26–7: Whoever does not give alms at the established times, and who do not offer their own hands to the poor.) \\
43.24–5: þonne bið he geteald to þære fyrenan ea, and to þæm isenan hoce. & 142.11–13: et respexi adhuc in flumine igneo, et vidi illic hominem senem deduci et trahi; et demerserunt eum usque ad ienuam. Et advenit angelus tartaruchus habens ferrum in manibus suis.
\end{tabular}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} All references to the Blickling Homilies are taken from Morris, \textit{The Blickling Homilies}.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Healey, \textit{Old English Vision of St. Paul}, p. 52.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Willard, “Blickling-Junius,” p. 67.
\end{itemize}
(43.24–5: Then he will be assigned to the fiery river and the iron hook.)

(142:11–13: and I gazed into the fiery river, and I saw that old man being led and dragged. And they submerged him up to his knees. And the angel Tartaruchus arrived with iron in his hands.)

43.26–45.2: he gesawe naht feor from þæs mass-preostos sidan, þe we ær bufan emb spræcon, þæt he wære getogen mid þon isnan hoc on þære picenan æ, oþerne ealdne man; and þone læddon feower swyrgründe englas mid mycelre reþnesse, and hine besencton on þa fyrenan ea æt his cneowa; and hie hine hæfdon

gelþreatodne mid fyrenum racentum þæt he ne moste gecweþan, ‘Milsa me, God.’ Þa cwæþ se æþela lareow to þæm engle þe hine lædde, ‘Hwæt is þes ealda man?’ Se engel him to

cwæþ, ‘Hit is an biscop se dyde mare yfel þone göð; he onfeng for worulde mycelne noman, and þæt eal forheold, and his

Scyppend þe him þone noman forgeaf.’ Þonne sægde, Sanctus Paulus þæt se biscop nære miltsiende wydewum, ne steopcildum, ne nanum Godes þearfan; þa wæs him forgolden æfter his agenum gewyrhtum.

(43.26–45.2: Not far from the side of the priest about whom we spoke above who was dragged with the iron hook into the pitchy river, he saw another old man;

and four dark angels led him with great savageness, and submerged him in the fiery river up to his knees; and they harnessed him

with fiery fetters so that he could not say, ‘Have mercy on me, God.’ Then the noble teacher said to the angel who led him, ‘Who is this old man?’ The angel said to Him, ‘It is a bishop who did more evil than

142.19–28: Et vidi alterum non longe alio sene, quem adducebant eum festinatione currentem quattuor angeli maligni, et dimserunt eum usque ad genua in flumine igneo; et lampades ignea percutebant faciem eius sicut porcella; et non permisserunt dicere,

‘Miserere mei.’ Et interrogavi,

‘Quis est hic, domine?’ Et respondit angelus et dixit,

‘Hunc quem vides episcopus fuit, et non consumavit bene episcopatum suum, sed quidem nomen accepit magnum et non est egressus in sanctitate eius qui donavit ei nomen; et in omni vita sua non fecit iudicium iustum, et viduis et pupillis non misertus est. Nunc autem retributum est ei secundum opera sua.

(142.19–28: And he saw not far away another old man, whom four malicious angels were leading running along in a hurry, and they submerged him up to his knees in the fiery river; and torches of fire were striking his face like a little pig; and they were not allowing him to say, ‘Have mercy on me.’ And I asked, ‘Who is this, master?’ And the angel answered and said, ‘This man you see was
good.’ He began in the presence of the world with a great name and forsook it all, and his Creator, who gave the name to him.’ Then Saint Paul said that the bishop had not been merciful to widows nor to orphans, nor to any of God’s poor; so he was repaid according to his own works.)

45.13-14: þonne se masse-preost oþþe se Biscop wære gelæded on ece forwyrd.

(45.13-4: When the priest or the bishop was led into eternal destruction.)

As this comparison shows, the homily, which is eight pages long in Morris’ edition, and has about thirty-seven lines per page (twenty-two and thirty-three on the first and last pages), draws eighteen of its lines from the Visio, not a large proportion of the complete homily. In addition, two of the lines are repeated. Nevertheless, the content of these lines is closely modelled on the Latin text; in three of four cases, according to Fontes Anglo-Saxonici once again, the St. Gall text. The wording is similar in many lines although there are enough differences (for example the mention of the iron hook in the Old English twice) to show that if the Old English text was composed with a copy of the Latin in front of him, it was not any of the Latin texts currently extant. The fact that one reference seems closer to Silverstein’s Redaction II suggests that the compiler of Blickling IV had a Latin copy of the Visio which did not correspond perfectly to any of the particular versions, but to one which is now lost.

An additional reference to the Visio is found, it seems, in the passage added as number XVI in Morris’ edition, labelled a “fragment”. The fragment should likely be included as a part of Homily IV, and according to Paul Acker it, “employs eschatological topoi which also

37 Morris, Blickling, p. 195.
derive ultimately from the *Visio Pauli.*”38 He bases his identification on three elements common to both texts, namely the going out of the soul from the body, found in the beginning of the Blickling passage, “þonne þæs monnes saul ut of his lichoman gangeþ” (‘when this man’s soul goes out of his body’); the soul’s preference of earthly pleasure to God, including drinking and ornamentation; and the lamentation the soul will feel when his past life is revealed, all themes found in the fifteenth chapter of the *Visio.*39 The identification of this text as based on the *Visio* adds another eleven lines to the tally of *Visio* content in Blickling IV, to make twenty-nine lines in total.

Even though the compiler does not use a great deal of the *Visio* text, he does make a definite point of drawing to his audience’s attention the fact that he is referring to the words of the Apostle Paul. By way of introducing his first reference to the apocalypse, the Blickling author opens his quotation with “Swa Sanctus Paulus cwæþ þætte”40 prompting Healey to comment that the passage, “directed toward the laity, [is] introduced as if it had the authority of scripture.”41 The second and third references are likewise attributed by name to Sanctus Paulus. Paul is referred to by name twice in the third, longer, quotation, for the benefit of his hearers and also likely to augment the authority and impact of his text. In the fourth reference, however, the compiler introduces Paul as *se goda lareow* (‘the good teacher’),42 without naming him. In addition, in the middle of the third passage, Paul is also called *se æþela lareow* a title which several times throughout the rest of the homily the compiler uses when he is quoting Caesarius of Arles. Morris translates this term as “the eminent teacher” or “the

40 Morris, *Blickling,* p. 41, l. 34..
excellent teacher”. Although the *Dictionary of Old English* lists a number of meanings for the term æþela, in conjunction with lareow it recommends the meaning “learned teacher”.

The following chart outlines the attributing epithets used by the compiler for the various quotations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quoting Caesarius</th>
<th>Quoting Paul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 Æþela lareow</td>
<td>41 Sanctus Paulus cwæþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Æþela lareow</td>
<td>43 Sanctus Paulus, thrice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Æþela lareow</td>
<td>æþela lareow once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Æþela lareow</td>
<td>45 goda lareow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanctus Paulus sægde þæt Crist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sylfe bebude Moyse þæt he oþrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lareowum sægde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47 Halga lareow

49 Æþela lareow

49 Æþela lareow

51 Æþela lareow

The homilist refers several times to the æþela lareow. Morris, in his translation of Blickling IV, assumed the title referred to Paul, and went so far as to add Paul’s name to his translation where the homilist used merely æþela lareow. In the particular passages where Morris added Paul’s name, however, the quotations introduced by this label are actually from Caesarius of Arles. Wright observed of this misattribution, “It was but natural that Morris, in editing the Blickling text, should have interpreted the references to an unnamed authority in Parts 1 and 2 as likewise intending to designate St. Paul. This æþela lareow of the tithing sections of the discourse, parts 1 and 3, is not St. Paul but rather Caesarius, archbishop of Arles, of the first

43 Ibid. p. 44, l. 21
45 Morris, *Blickling*, p. 38, l. 7; p. 40, l. 8.
decades of the sixth century.”46 As was discussed in the earlier chapter on Ælfric, *magister gentium* was the title Paul gave to himself in 2 Tim. 1.11, and the corresponding title *œoda læreow* was the title Ælfric applied to Paul and the role he adopted for himself. The title of *læreow* was well established for Paul in Anglo-Saxon England.

The addition of the term *æþela* to *læreow* as an epithet applied to Paul was common in Anglo-Saxon literature, as a search on the *DOE* Web Corpus of the term *æþela læreow* demonstrates.47 The Web Corpus shows thirty-two uses of the word pair aside from the eight in Blickling IV. Of these, eighteen are used in conjunction with Paul’s name.48 The Pauline examples occur in a variety of texts, namely the Vercelli homilies, the Old English *Regula pastoralis*, Bishop Wærferth’s Old English *Dialogues of Gregory*, the Life of Guthlac, an Old English gloss on Aldhelm’s *De laude virginitatis* and Old English glosses on Latin hymns. The Old English translation of Gregory’s *Regula pastoralis*, for example, translates both *doctorem gentium* and *magister egregius* as *æþela læreow sanctus Paulus*.49 Aldhelm’s *egregrii dogmatiste* is rendered in the Old English gloss as *æþelran læreowes*.50 Six other occurrences of the epithet refer to different noble teachers cited by name (Augustine, Albinus, Jerome and Jesus)51 and in the context of a homily about the particular teacher (Andrew).52 In these cases the teacher’s identity is clear, so there is no possible confusion with the Apostle

---

47 *DOE*, http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/.
48 In the following locations (the citations are in the format used in the *DOE* Web Corpus, http://tapor.library.utoronto.ca.myaccess.library.utoronto.ca/doecorpus/): LS 10.1(Guth), B3.3.10.1; GD 2 (C) B9.5.4 (two occurrences); GDPref and 4 (C) B9.5.6; Mart 5 (Kotzor) B19.5; HyGl2 (Milfull) C18.2 (two occurrences); HyGl3 (Gneuss) C18.3; HomS 3 (ScraggVerc8) B3.2.3; HomM 11 (ScraggVerc 14) B3.5.11; CP B9.1.3 (5 occurrences); GD 2 (H) B9.5.10.2 (two occurrences).
51 ÆHomM 8 (Ass 3) B1.5.8 (Augustine); ÆIntSig B1.6.1 (Albinus); Rec 10.8 ( Först) B16.10.8 (Jerome); ÆHom 13 B1.4.13 (Se Hælend).
52 ÆCHom 1,38 B1.1.40.
Paul. In seven other cases the term is used of an unspecified individual.\textsuperscript{53} The preponderance of the term’s use to refer to the Apostle Paul, and its occurrence in a wide range of texts make Morris’ attribution of the name to Paul understandable. Moreover, it is quite possible that as Morris did, the audience listening to Blickling IV would also naturally associate the epithet æþela lareow with Paul. Three of the examples in which the epithet æþela lareow is used to refer to Paul are found glossing a stanza of a hymn about Paul. Twice in the glosses of the Durham Hymnal (dated c. 1000)\textsuperscript{54} the Latin address Doctor egregie Paule (‘excellent teacher, Paul’) is glossed “lareow eala, o, þu æþele” (‘Oh teacher, oh you excellent one’).\textsuperscript{55} In a third gloss of a variation of the same stanza “O Paule, egregie doctor” (‘O Paul, excellent teacher’) is rendered “Eala þu æþele lareow” (‘Oh, you excellent teacher’).\textsuperscript{56} In these cases Paul’s name is omitted in the Old English gloss, suggesting that the glossator decided his name was unnecessary for understanding that the excellent teacher in question was Paul, and that the title æþele lareow would naturally be understood to refer to him. These hymns on Paul were likely sung for Nocturn and Vespers of the Nativitas Pauli,\textsuperscript{57} and since this stanza has survived in three different hymnic settings it was likely popular and oft-sung. Whether it was sung exclusively among monks or was heard by a more general congregation, it was likely familiar to many and so it would seem reasonable to presume that numerous Anglo-Saxons would have been exposed to both the titles Doctor egregie Paule and æþele lareow in reference to Paul.\textsuperscript{58}

Further, the wide range of other texts in which the term æþele lareow occurs, homilies, lives

\textsuperscript{53} HomS 12 B3.2.12; HomS 17 (BHom5) B3.2.17; GDPref and 4 (C) B9.5.6; AldV 1 (Goossens) C31.1; CP B9.1.3; CP (Cotton) B91.3.1; LawLude B14.54


\textsuperscript{55} Inge B. Milfull, Hymns, 87.4, p. 332 and 105.1, p. 376.

\textsuperscript{56} Helmut Gneuss, Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter (Tübingen, 1968), hymn 87.4.

\textsuperscript{57} Milfull, Hymns, p. 377.

\textsuperscript{58} Assuming that both Latin and Old English were used in the liturgy. It is clear that Old English was used for preaching in homilies, but the amount of Old English used in the liturgy is unclear. The issue is discussed in Mary Clayton, “Homiliaries and Preaching in Anglo-Saxon England,” Peritia 4 (1985), 207–42.
of saints, poetic treatises and well-known instructional texts, argues that it was not an epithet isolated to one individual writer or location.

If it would have been natural to associate the term æþele lareow with St. Paul, why would the writer of Blickling IV not make clear, as other writers did when using the term, that it actually referred in this case to Caesarius of Arles? One possibility is that the compiler himself (or the Old English translator) did not know to whom it referred and assumed it referred to Paul since the middle part of the homily did certainly use Paul’s words as found in the *Visio*. Another possibility is that the compiler did know that he was quoting Caesarius of Arles, but was deliberately vague as to the identity of the æþela lareow because if the words were those of Paul, they might be considered to hold more weight and persuasive power coming from an apostle himself, rather than from a lesser known, and less important, homilist. This latter hypothesis is additionally supported by the use of the term æþela lareow to refer to Paul and his *Visio* in the middle of the third quotation. Here the epithet is definitely used to refer to Paul, since the author is quoting the *Visio* and names Paul in two other places in the same quotation. Paul’s words are also introduced by the term goda lareow in the fourth reference. Whether by an unintended misattribution or a deliberate attempt at deception, it seems quite possible that the compiler of the homily was identifying the æþela lareow with Paul, and intended his audience to do the same. Willard points out that Caesarius’ *De reddendis decimis* was quoted frequently in tithing literature, but was often misattributed to Augustine of Hippo. In one redaction of the material it is attributed to Felicitarius of Arles, in another to Maximus of Tours.59 Given this confusion, it seems unlikely that the compiler could assume the audience of Blickling IV would know who the original writer of the material in the homily was, and it is even credible that the compiler himself would be unsure of its

author. Rather, it would seem more likely, given the relative frequency of the epithet to indicate Paul as compared to other lareowas, as well as the evidence from Old English hymns that the epithet æþela lareow without Paul’s name appended to it was used to refer to Paul in liturgical settings, that if the compiler had wanted the audience to know that the authority in the homily was not Paul he would have needed to specify the name of the particular æþela lareow to whom he was referring. The compiler’s/ Old English translator’s use of the same term to refer to the author of both the sections quoting Caesarius of Arles and one of the sections quoting the Visio suggests that he intended the audience to attribute the whole homily to Paul, thus adding extra authority to his words.

Willard posits that De reddendis decimis was translated into Old English for lay consumption before the adoption of official tithing legislation and “may well have played an important part in the adoption of tithing legislation,” a movement consistent with tenth-century concern for reform. Whether this homily was itself instrumental in such reforms or just reflects the movement toward such legislation, its compiler and/or Old English translator used the figure of the Apostle Paul and the authority his name invoked to impress his point on his audience by naming Paul directly in section two of the homily and perhaps also by suggesting that he was the authority behind parts one and three.

The use of the Visio in Blickling IV shows one example of an author who explicitly cited and directly quoted from this apocalypse. The text was extremely adaptable and widely used by compilers and authors wishing to excerpt ideas in order to prove a theological point, educate on the pressing question of the fate of the soul after death, or threaten listeners and readers with the vivid and terrifying consequences of not following Christian injunctions. For

the most part, however, the borrowings seem to have been of ideas rather than direct
quotations, and are difficult to identify definitively due to the many and varied redactions of
the text. Daniel Anlezark, for example, sees the influence of a long version of the *Visio* as
playing a part in *Solomon and Saturn II* both in the mention of guardian spirits contending
over evil angels for the souls of the living, as well as in the depiction of hell as cold and wet.61
Ananya Jahanara Kabir observes that the *Visio* is the first text to make clear the identification
of the third heaven with paradise, and these as distinct from the highest, or seventh heaven.62
The distinction between paradise/the third heaven and the seventh heaven was picked up, she
argues, by the “Three Utterances” homilists in Hatton 114 (s. xi²)63 and Junius 85/86 (s.
xi<sup>med</sup>)64 in the reference to the good soul’s sojourn in an interim paradise.65 Charles D. Wright
cites three motifs in the Vercelli homilies as deriving ultimately from redactions of the *Visio*,
namely the Hanging Sinner, the Men with Tongues of Iron and the Monster of Hell, motifs
introduced as characteristics of a hell reminiscent of Paul’s description of the ineffability of
his vision, which “nænig man mæg mid his wordum asecgan” (no man can tell about with
words).66 Patrick Sims-Williams discusses its importance as one of three key sources (along
with the *Vita S. Fursei* and the vision of Drythelm, themselves influenced by the *VSP*) behind
the Vision of the Monk of Wenlock which is detailed in Boniface’s letter to Eadburg,67 in, for
example, the depiction of angels and demons struggling for a soul at its deathbed, the
personification of vices and virtues, the arrangement of the fiery pits of hell, and the idea of a

61 Daniel Anlezark, “The Fall of the Angels in *Solomon and Saturn II*,” *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in
62 Ananya Jahanara Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, CSASE 32 (Cambridge,
63 See Gneuss, *Handlist*, p. 100 for date.
64 Ibid, p. 101, for date.
respite from hell. In many of these cases the impact of the *Visio* may be able to be explained as the result of indirect influence, reminiscences, or even oral tradition. The idea of hell as *wælcealde* (‘deadly cold’), *wintre beðeahte* (‘covered in winter’), and full of water in *Solomon and Saturn II*, for example, may reflect the influence of the *Visio* on the general impression of the nature of hell rather than evidence that the writer of the poem had a redaction of the *Visio* before him.

Healey gives an extended discussion of the impact of the *Visio* on Old English literature. She discusses three of the most important motifs in the *Visio* which are developed in Old English literature, the Body–Soul Legend, the Respite of the Damned and the Correspondence of Punishment to Sin. Healey divides the Body-Soul Legend into two parts, the going out of souls, and the address of the soul to the body, both of which were developed, prompted in large part it seems by the influence of the *Visio*, in several different ways and in various manuscripts in Old English. The Body-Soul Legend, like the motif of the Respite of the Damned, addressed the thorny issue of the fate of the soul after death, in particular questions surrounding belief in judgment of souls immediately after death as opposed to at Judgment Day, and the even more perplexing question of their treatment between these two times. The fact that it dealt with these issues made it very popular in homilies. The third motif, the Correspondence of Punishment to Sin, which was also popular in homilies, appears, for example, in the pseudo-Wulfstan homily Napier 46, and in the Vision of the Monk of Wenlock. In addition, we have already seen its influence on Blickling IV, in the first quotation from the *Visio*, which states, “Sanctus Paulus cwæþ þætte God hete ealle þa
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aswæman æt heofenes dura, þa þe heora cyrican forlætaþ and forhycggaþ þa Godes dreamas to
geherenne” (‘Saint Paul said that God commanded all those who forsake their church and
neglect to hear the songs of God, to pine at the door of heaven’s kingdom’).72 It is also behind
the third, longer quotation, in which the priest who is slow in driving the devil out of a man
will be assigned to “þone fyrenan ea, and to þæm isenan hoce” (‘to the fiery river and the iron
hook’),73 and the bishop who did more evil than good is “on þa fyrenan ea æt his cneowa” (‘in
the fiery river up to his knees’).74

The theme of the Correspondence of Punishment to Sin is also behind the one area of
the Visio’s influence which has captured the most attention, its influence on the monster-mere
passage in Blickling XVI, a homily on St. Michael,75 and the issue of whether or not the
passage is connected in some way with Beowulf. The passage in question is, according to the
author of the homily, a description of the fate of souls who would not cease from sin before
their life’s end. The elements in common with Beowulf are in bold: 76

Swa Sanctus Paulus wæs geseonde on norðanweardne ðisne middangeard, þær ealle
wætero niðergewitað, and he þær beseah ofer ðæm wætere sumne harne stan; and
wæræn norð of ðæm stane awexene swiðe hrimige bearwas, and ðær wæræn þystro-
genipo, and under þæm stane wæs nicra eardung and wearga. And he geseah þæt
on ðæm clife hangodan on ðæm isigean bearwum manige swearte saula be heora
handum gebundne; and þa fynd þara on nicra onlicnesse heora gripende wæron, swa
swa grædig wulf; and þæt wæter wæs sweart under þæm clife neoðan; and betuð
ðæm clife on ðæm wætre wæræn swylce twelf mila, and ðonne ðæ twigo forburston
þonne gewitan þa saula niðer þa ðe on þæm twigum hangodan, and him ofnigon ða
nicras.

72 Morris, Blickling, p. 41. 33–6
73 Ibid. p. 43.24–5
74 Ibid. p. 43.29–30.
75 Morris, Blickling, pp. 196–211; the homily in question, named “To Sanctae Michaheles Mæssan” or in the
English translation “The Dedication of St. Michael’s Church,” is referred to as number XVI everywhere except in
Morris’ 1967 reprinted edition where it is number XVII, because of the addition of a fragment in the sixteenth
position. The fragment is widely considered to have been properly a part of Blickling homily IV, and so is
generally disregarded as a separate homily.
76 Morris, Blickling, pp. 209.29–211.5.
(As Saint Paul was looking towards the northern part of the earth, where all the waters descend, he saw over the water a hoary stone; and north of the stone had grown very rimy groves. And there were gloomy mists; and under the stone was the abode of monsters and accursed creatures. And he saw that on the cliff hanging in the icy groves there were many swarthy souls with their hands bound; and the devils in likeness of monsters were gripping them just like greedy wolves; and the water that was under the cliff beneath was dark. And between the cliff and the water there were as many as twelve miles, and when the branches broke, then the souls who hung on the branches went down and the monsters took hold of them.)

Morris was the first to write about the similarity between a description of hell in Blickling XVI and the description of Grendel’s mere in Beowulf, observing, “this passage seemed very familiar to me and I was at once struck by its resemblance to the description of the lake in Beowulf, of which it is probably a direct reminiscence.” The passages from Beowulf in question are as follows and the common elements with Blickling XVI are highlighted:

```
Hie digol lond             1357b
warigeað, wulfhleoþu,     windige næsses,
frecne fengelad,  þær fyrgenstream
under næssa genipu níber gewiteð 1360
flod under foldan.        Nis þæt feor heonon
milgemearces,        þæt se mere standeð;
ofer þæm hongiað         hrinde bearwas,
wudu wytum fæst      wæter oferhelmað.
þær mæg nihta gehwæm niðwundor seon, 1365
fyr on flode.  (lines 1357b–66)

.  .  .
neowle næssas,           nicorhusa fela;  (line 1411)
```

77 Morris, Blickling, vii.
They dwell in that secret land,
hillsides inhabited by wolves, windy cliffs,
the perilous marsh-path, where the mountain stream
under the mists of the cliffs descends,
a flood under the earth. It is not far from there,
in miles that the lake stands,
over which hang rimy groves,
a wood fast by its roots overshadows the water
there may be seen each night a dire wonder,
fire on the flood.

Precipitous cliffs, many houses of monsters;

Until he suddenly found the mountain trees
leaning over a hoary stone,
a dismal wood; water stood below
bloody and troubled.

The common features have been summarized in the following chart, created by Carleton Brown and used now by several writers:79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blickling XVI</th>
<th>Beowulf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þær ealle wætero niðergewitað</td>
<td>ðær fyrgenstream niþer gewiteð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer ðæm wætere sumne hárne stán</td>
<td>fyrgenbeamas ofer harne stan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of ðæm stáne awexene swiðe hrimige bearwas</td>
<td>ofer þæm hongiað hrinde bearwas (1363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðær wæron þystrogenipo nicra eardung</td>
<td>under næssa genipu (1360a) nicorhusa fela (1411b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 þæt wæter wæs sweart under þæm clífe neoðan</td>
<td>wæter under stod dreorig ond gedrefed (1416–17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Blickling homily ends after the passage describing Saint Paul’s vision, and Rowland Collins calls it a peculiar ending, considering the passage to be a diversion from the rest of the text.\textsuperscript{80} Richard Freeman Johnson, however, in an examination of legends about Saint Michael in English literature, put forth the opinion that the passage is carefully anticipated, with several of its features mentioned earlier in the homily, for example \textit{twelf mila} (‘twelve miles’),\textsuperscript{81} \textit{þystro-genipo} (‘dark mists’);\textsuperscript{82} the \textit{clife} (‘the cliff’);\textsuperscript{83} the \textit{hrimige wuda} (‘rimy wood’);\textsuperscript{84} and a quotation from Hebrews 1.14 concerning the function of angels,\textsuperscript{85} introduced as Saint Paul’s words:\textsuperscript{86}

\begin{quote}
‘Qui ad ministrum summis.’ Englas beoð to ðegnunge gæstum fram Gode hider on world sended, to ðæm ðe þone ecean eðel mid mode & mid mægene to Gode geearniað, þæt him syn on fultume ða þe wið þæm awergdum gastum syngallice feohtan sceolan.
\end{quote}

Angels are ministering spirits sent here into the world from God, to those who with their mind and strength deserve an eternal home with God, so that they be a help to those who must fight continually against accursed spirits.

Freeman suggests that this quotation and its mention of \textit{awergdum gastum} (‘accursed spirits’) may have prompted the homilist to link Paul, St. Michael (whom the author recommends his audience to call upon to help fight off the evil spirits), and the description of hell in the \textit{Visio}.\textsuperscript{87} Moreover, he notes that the \textit{VSP} was instrumental in the development of St. Michael’s

---

\textsuperscript{80} Collins, “Blickling Homily XVI,” p. 62.
\textsuperscript{81} Morris, \textit{Blickling}, p. 197, l. 21.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid. p. 203, l. 8.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid. p. 207, l. 20.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid. p. 207, l. 27.
\textsuperscript{85} Richard Freeman Johnson, \textit{Saint Michael the Archangel in Medieval English Legend} (Boydell, 2005), p. 54.
\textsuperscript{86} Morris, \textit{Blickling}, p. 209, ll. 21–7.
\textsuperscript{87} Freeman, \textit{Saint Michael}, pp. 54–5.
legendary role as intercessor, and the mention of St. Paul in the Latin account of Saint Michael’s interventions, BHL 5948, may have provided another link.88

The *Visio* passage is introduced by the Old English author as having a Pauline source, but in spite of this, Morris’ attribution of the passage to a Beowulfian source was not challenged until 1935 when Silverstein pointed out that the description in Blickling XVI is consistent with Redaction II of the *Visio* in the details of the unrepentant sinners hanging from trees, the dark water, the deep pit, the trees; and, was, as the Old English author himself informed his audience, taken from the *Visio*.89 The one main difference between the *Visio* and Blickling XVI is that the trees are fiery in the *Visio* and icy in Blickling. Since *Beowulf* also has icy trees, Silverstein concluded that *Beowulf*, “furnished merely a transforming suggestion.”90 The issue was not solved, however, by Silverstein’s pronouncement, and the discussion was renewed by Carleton Brown three years later. Brown, assuming an eighth-century date for *Beowulf*, pointed out that the ninth-century Redaction II of the *Visio* was too late to have influenced *Beowulf*, and if one looked at the other redactions, the only common element was trees, for in the *Visio* the trees are fiery with sinners hanging from them; in *Beowulf*, icy with no sinners. Trees are clearly not a sufficiently distinctive feature to define any sort of dependence and Brown concluded that the *Visio* and *Beowulf* are independent, while Blickling XVI represents a fusion of the two. Since the Blickling manuscript is dated c. 1000, Brown assumed that its writer would likely have known *Beowulf* and recalled phrases from it which he used to alter the passage from the *Visio*.91

Almost fifty years later, in 1984, Rowland Collins, liberated by the early 1980’s debate surrounding the dating of *Beowulf*, and the new possibility of a late dating of it, once

88 Freeman, *Saint Michael*, pp. 24, 55, 70.
89 Silverstein, *VSP*, p. 11.
90 Ibid. p. 11.
91 Morris, *Blickling*, p. 119, l. 2.
again questioned the connections amongst these three texts. Collins raised three objections to the theory that the Blickling homilist was influenced by *Beowulf*: first, the homilist cites only Paul as his source and not *Beowulf*; second, if he were influenced by *Beowulf* one would expect a closer imitation of the poem, in more poetic, rhythmic language; and third, the phrases in Blickling XVI which are shared with *Beowulf* are spread out in the poem over sixty lines of verse, whereas in the *Visio* they are contained in one passage, and it is unlikely, he argued, that five uncommon vocabulary elements would be condensed into four lines of prose in the homily. Collins answered these objections by proposing that, using the internal date of 971 for the Blickling manuscript given in Homily XI and the slightly later date of the *Beowulf* manuscript at c. 1000, it is quite possible, particularly given the monastic context in which the *Beowulf* manuscript was likely copied, that its scribe was familiar with Blickling XVI and was thus influenced by it. Kevin Kiernan concluded, in fact, that the Beowulf manuscript and the Blickling Homilies manuscript came from the same scriptorium because they, “share the same odd features in the sheet arrangement of the gatherings and the size of the writing grids are virtually identical.” Their both originating in the same scriptorium would explain, “in the best possible way why the description of Grendel’s mere is so like the description of Hell in Blickling Homily 16. The *Beowulf* poet had access to this manuscript of homilies, which is dated internally in the year 971. *Beowulf* must have been composed after that.”

93 Kevin S. Kiernan, “The Legacy of Wiglaf: Saving a Wounded *Beowulf*,” in *The Beowulf Reader*, ed. Peter S. Baker (New York, 1995), pp. 195–209, at p. 208. Perhaps further support for Kiernan’s hypothesis lies in the observation that the two examples of Old English texts which seem to be direct borrowings from the *Visio* are both found in the Blickling Homilies, homily IV, discussed above, and homily XVI. For a further discussion of the similarities between the manuscripts, and confirmation that Kiernan’s hypothesis should remain a possibility for consideration, see Matthew T. Hussey, “The Possible Relationship of the *Beowulf* and the Blickling Homilies Manuscripts,” *N & Q* 56.1 (2009), 1-4. For reservations about Kiernan’s hypothesis, see Andy Orchard, *A Critical Companion to *Beowulf**, (Cambridge, 2003), p. 22, who points out that there are at least three other manuscripts with a similar combination of scribal hands, and therefore the combination may not have been unusual for the time period.
the other way around. Collins, points out, however, that this influence would not necessitate a late date for the composition of *Beowulf*, merely that the work was modified after 971. Thus, Kiernan and Collins concluded what seemed difficult to fathom, namely that what had come to be the most famous work in Old English literature, and what had been assumed to be one of the earliest works of English literature, could have been influenced by the often less than completely orthodox, and to moderns, largely unknown, Blickling Homilies.

The discussion did not end with Collins’ analysis, however, partially due to the continued discovery of additional Redactions of the *Visio*. M.E. Dwyer in 1988 published an article announcing an “Unstudied Redaction of the *Visio Pauli*” in Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, Pal. lat. 220, dated to the early ninth century, in an Anglo-Saxon hand with Anglo-Saxon abbreviations, which she called Redaction XI. Wright, studying the Redaction further, noticed internal evidence in spelling and content that suggested an Irish origin for the manuscript. He proposed that perhaps Redaction XI was compiled for a house of nuns judging by a change in a description in paragraph viii of the recipient of certain torments being a virgin, instead of the church officers found in other redactions. One other modification in Redaction XI proved important for the debate over the relationship amongst the *Visio* and Blickling XVI, for this newly found Redaction is closer to Blickling XVI than any others in that it is the only one which combines the description of sinners hanging from trees with that of a river below them filled with terrible monsters, a fact previously unnoticed because the description of hell in Blickling XVI derives from two separate scenes in the other redactions. Wright noted by means of a more detailed comparison of Blickling XVI with all the extant

---

95 Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, p. 111.
redactions of the *Visio* that in Redaction XI “some of the crucial features of this composite scene had indeed been combined in a Latin text at least a century prior to the composition of the Blickling homily.”98 Until the discovery of Redaction XI, these two details had not been found together in any version of the *Visio* except the passage in Blickling XVI,99 prompting the assumption that, as in so many other cases with the *Visio*, the author had altered the text to suit his own purposes. This new discovery suggested that the account in Blickling XVI is not a composite of different redactions, but was actually drawn from an account similar to Redaction XI. Wright concluded:100

> The evidence of Redaction XI, together with a close examination of the previously edited redactions, allows us to reconstruct the source of Blickling Homily XVI from surviving texts in greater detail than has hitherto been possible. It combined the trees from the Hanging Sinners scene with the fiery river and demonic beasts from the Bridge of Hell, locating this composite scene at the confluence of Oceanus. It efficiently employed the trees of the hanging punishment as the mechanism for dropping souls into the demon-infested waters from a cliff.

Like Blickling XVI, *Beowulf* shares with Redaction XI of the *Visio* the common features of trees growing atop a cliff above water infested with monsters.

> In order to test whether or not the *Beowulf*-poet, like Blickling XVI, drew these details from a redaction of the *Visio*, Wright sought other distinctive verbal echoes between the two texts, beyond those also shared by Blickling XVI, and found some potential commonalities, for example the “flumen igneum et fervens” (‘fiery and boiling river’) in six of the redactions of the *Visio* and the fiery waters of the lake in *Beowulf*. Wright suggests the possibility of a common vernacular version of the *Visio* shared by both writers (presumably similar to

---

98 Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, p.121.  
100 Wright, *The Irish Tradition*, p. 131.
Redaction XI, whose early ninth-century date means that the features shared between *Beowulf* and the *Visio* may even have been combined in a redaction early enough to influence an eighth-century *Beowulf*, and concludes:101

If no single one of these details proves that the *Beowulf* poet drew independently on the *Visio S. Pauli*, the cumulative weight of the parallels I have listed (none of which occurs in Blickling XVI) suggests the presumption that he did. Brown’s opinion that the description in *Beowulf* is ‘wholly independent’ of the *Visio* can no longer be sustained.

Thus there seems to be no necessity to presume that the *Beowulf* poet was familiar with Blickling XVI or the other way around. Peter Clemoes agrees, and suggests that while the *Beowulf* poet may have heard Blickling XVI or a homily similar to it, he may have been familiar with a “loosely standardized vernacular sub-literary description of hell”,102 the basis for which could have been the *Visio* as it influenced the vision tradition in Anglo-Saxon England.103 It is well known that the *Visio* and its ideas were widely used by medieval writers, and in fact, judging by current manuscript evidence, the relative plethora of attestations of the *Visio*, as compared with there being only a single manuscript extant of each of the Blickling Homilies and *Beowulf*, makes it more plausible to suppose that, as for modern readers, the *Visio* was more widely available to medieval writers than either of the other two texts.

If the *Beowulf* poet did use a vernacular version of the *Visio* for his account of the monster-mere, it was not a case of simple copying, however, as Orchard has pointed out, for “he has overlaid the original with a number of extra details which lend extraordinary
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101 Ibid. pp. 133–6, quotation at p. 136.
vividness, both physical and psychological, to his own particular depiction,” for example his description of the fire seen on the waters beneath the icy grove and his expression fyr on flode (line 1366), a collocation commonly found elsewhere only in homiletic literature. Moreover, a similar description of hell as a place of fire with serpents at the bottom of a cliff occurs in the Old English texts Judith, and Christ and Satan, suggesting that the image was a characteristically Old English vision of hell. There is also a description reminiscent of Beowulf in the Old English Letter of Alexander to Aristotle, as Orchard has noted, of a monster-mere containing nicra mengeo (‘a multitude of water-monsters’). The rarity of the term nicor, found only in Blickling XVI, Beowulf, and the Letter of Alexander to Aristotle, as well as other parallels between Beowulf and the Letter, have led Orchard to posit a connection between the latter two texts, and to conclude of the Beowulf poet’s depiction of the monster-mere that whether it, “was drawn from the Letter of Alexander to Aristotle or from some vernacular rendering of the Visio S. Pauli (or both), [it] may represent a significant blend of imported Latin and native germanic elements, the whole strongly influenced by the Christian homiletic tradition.” Getz, too, speculates that the similarities amongst these texts reflect, “participation in a fund of ideas common to the Anglo-Saxon imagination,” rather than a specific and identifiable source relationship. The history of debate over the parallels amongst the Visio, Blickling XVI and Beowulf, and now the addition of the previously unconsidered connections raised by Orchard’s nuanced reading of the Letter of Alexander to Aristotle, points out the challenges facing anyone trying to sort out the source relationships behind

104 Orchard, Pride and Prodigies, discussion of the Visio, Blickling XVI and Beowulf from pp. 37–47, quotation at p. 42.
105 Ibid. p. 40–1.
106 Ibid. p. 45; also see Orchard, Critical Companion to ‘Beowulf’, p. 33 regarding nicor and pp. 25–39 for a discussion of further parallels.
107 Orchard, Pride and Prodigies, p. 47.
108 Getz, Four Blickling Homilies, p. 265.
these texts and the necessity of remaining open to new, and perhaps neither simple nor
direct, influences and dependencies. Sims-Williams comments in his discussion about the
Vision of the Monk at Much Wenlock, “the development of the otherworld genre is one
of the great themes of medieval literary history and it is tempting to tell the story in terms
of a succession of major ‘precursors of Dante’.” As he points out, however, and as
must have been the case with the VSP, many different copies and redactions, alone and in
compilations, were circulating at various times and places, often mere fragments
dissociated from the main text. It is impossible to know the precise connections and
influences of the Visio on other texts given these complexities; these intricacies probably
lie behind the difficulty in tracing precise relationships between the Visio and the monster
meres in Blickling XVI and Beowulf.

While an examination of Redaction XI may not be able to tell us conclusively about
the relationships amongst Beowulf, Blickling XVI and the Visio, its Irish origins do add weight
to the conclusion that the Visio was a popular text in Britain. Wright comments on the insular
connections of Redactions IV, VI and XI, noting that IV is particularly associated with
England and VI, like XI, with Ireland, because of similarities with Irish vision literature, for
example the Fís Adamnán (Vision of Adamnán). He concludes, “the Visio was a seminal text
which insular authors turned to for imaginative and memorable descriptions of hell, but one
which they felt free to modify and embellish in distinctive and characteristic ways.”110 The use
of content from the Visio in Blickling IV and XVI, as well as in several other Old English
homilies (e.g. pseudo-Wulfstan Homily 46 and Vercelli 9) and visions (e.g. Boniface’s epistle
10 about the monk at Wenlock, the life of Guthlac, and Bede’s lives of Fursey and

Drythelm),\textsuperscript{111} and its popularization of the Body and Soul theme,\textsuperscript{112} are all further evidence of its popularity and adaptability for use in homiletic and visionary settings. The connection with \textit{Beowulf}, depending on the direction of dependence, could also be evidence of the popular influence of the imagery in the \textit{Visio} in the minds of Anglo-Saxons.

In spite of its popularity (or perhaps because of it) and its obvious acceptance by many Anglo-Saxon homilists two of the writers whom we have looked at already in the context of the \textit{Passio Petri et Pauli} in chapter five, Aldhelm and Ælfric, did not approve of it. Aldhelm expressed his disapproval (although not without some regret, Silverstein suggests\textsuperscript{113}) thus: \textsuperscript{114}

\begin{quote}
Nonne ob purae integritatis praerogativam tertium polum peragrants, supernorum civium arcana castis obtutibus contemplatur, et coelestis militiae abstrusa ineffabili rerum relatu rimatur, licet Revelatio, quam dicunt Pauli, in nave aurea florentis paradisi delicias eundem adisse garriat? Sed fas divinum vetat catholicae fidei sequipedas plus quidpiam quam canonicae veritatis censura promulgat credere, et caetera apocryphorum deliramenta velut horrisona verborum tonitura penitus abdicare et procul eliminare, orthodoxorum Patrum scita scriptis decretalibus sanxerunt.

(Does he not, on account of the privilege of his pure integrity, journeying through the third heaven, contemplate the secrets of the supernal citizens with chaste glances, and search into the mysteries of the celestial army with an ineffable account of events, although the \textit{Revelatio Pauli}, as they call it, says nonsensically that he arrived in a golden ship to the delights of a flowering Paradise? But divine law forbids followers of the catholic faith from believing anything more than what the censure of canonical truth promulgates, and the statutes of the orthodox fathers in decretal writings have condemned the other writings of the apocrypha as delirious tracts to be thoroughly rejected and completely eliminated as a frightening thunder of words.)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{111} Healey, “Apocalypse of Paul,” pp. 68–9.
\textsuperscript{113} Silverstein, \textit{VSP}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{114} Ehwald, \textit{Aldhelmi Opera}, p. 256.
Aldhelm’s mention of the golden ship was at one time viewed as evidence that he was using either a long Latin version, or possibly the Greek, because mention of the ship was not found in any of the redactions known at the time, but the discovery of Redaction XI, which does include the ship, introduces the possibility that Aldhelm was using this redaction, a hypothesis strengthened by the insular connections of Redaction XI. Consistent with Augustine and the *Decretum Gelasianum*, Aldhelm, in his account of Paul for the prose *De virginitate*, highlights Paul’s traversing of the third heaven, but makes sure to emphasize that absurdities such as Paul’s arriving in Paradise in a golden ship are not sanctioned by the orthodox fathers in decretal writings and are forbidden by divine law to followers of the catholic faith.

Ælfric also rejects the text, and gives his explanation as a preface to *ÆCHom* II, 20. He begins by quoting the canonical reference to Paul’s heavenly vision from 2 Cor. 12.2–4 and then comments, “Humeta rædað sume men ða leasan gesetnysse ðe hi hatað paulus gesihðe nu he sylf sæde þæt he ða digelan word gehyrde þe nan eorðlic mann sprecan ne mot?” (How can some men read the false composition, which they call Paul’s vision, when he himself said that he heard secret words, which no earthly man can speak?). Ælfric’s argument was perhaps inspired by Augustine’s objections cited near the beginning of this chapter (pp. 146–7). Nonetheless, judging by the appearance of the *Visio* in other Anglo-Saxon texts as well as the numerous manuscripts and redactions with insular connections, it

115 Silverstein, *VSP*, p. 6. Or perhaps through indirect knowledge of the Greek, gained while he was at the school of Theodore and Hadrian in Canterbury. See, for example, Lapidge, “The Career of Aldhelm,” *ASE* 36 (2007), 15–69, at pp. 31 and 47–8 for a discussion of Aldhelm in Canterbury.

116 Kabir, *Paradise*, pp. 16 and 55; also see Healey, “Apocalypse of Paul,” p. 68.

117 *ÆCHom* II, 20, p. 190.

118 Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Library*, pp. 253–4 and 291 cites Augustine’s *Tractatus in Euangelium Ioannis* xcviii.8, where his objection to the *Visio* is found, as the source for Ælfric’s comment on the *Visio* and in fact lists the work as available in several Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and as a work cited numerous times by Ælfric.
was well-known and very popular in Anglo-Saxon England despite Aldhelm’s and Ælfric’s objections.

The main reason Augustine, Aldhelm, and Ælfric objected to the *VSP* was that it contradicted Paul’s own claim that what he saw in his vision of heaven was ineffable. In fact, the Apostle Paul of the *Visio* is uncharacteristic of the canonical Paul found in his letters in many ways. In the previous chapters we have seen him depicted in Old English literature as an athlete, an exiled missionary, a wise architect and a teacher, who set a clear example for Anglo-Saxon writers to imitate. In the *Passio Petri et Pauli* he is the authority Nero turns to for basic Christian teaching. The Pauline letters themselves depict a man who was very knowledgeable, opinionated and authoritative, who was able to make such compelling declarations as, “in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 8. 37–9). Yet the *Visio* presents a very different Paul, one who rather than being an agent is merely an instrument for the revelation of the nature of heaven and hell. As Sims-Williams has commented, unlike the *Vita S. Fursei* or the monk of Wenlock who in their visions are confronted by their own sins and are fought over by angels and demons for their souls, in the *VSP* Paul is a “detached observer”. The Paul of the *Visio* is, not unlike the bewildered Scrooge in Dickens’ *A Christmas Carol*, *swīðe wundriende* (wondering greatly) as he is led in a state of passivity from one sight to the next, asking questions which opportunely necessitate the angel’s explanation of what is before them. For example upon encountering
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119 Sims-Williams, *Religion and Literature*, pp. 252 and 256.
merciless angels, Paul asks, “Wealdend, hwæt syndan ðas?” (‘Sir, who are these?’).\textsuperscript{121}

Throughout the text, the angel’s commands to Paul to look at a certain sight provide the opportunity for the angel’s description of what he sees. In contrast to the irony of a silent Paul in the \textit{Passio Petri et Pauli} who when asked by the nescient Nero why he is silent, gives an authoritative and compelling synopsis of the teachings of Christianity based on his own letters, the Paul in the \textit{Visio} is a subservient follower, who when asked by the angel in the Latin St. Gall version of the \textit{Visio}, \textit{Vidisti haec omnia?} (‘Have you observed all these things?’) answers only, \textit{Ita, domine} (‘Yes, sir’).\textsuperscript{122} Paul functions as a convenient vehicle for the presentation of the revelations in the vision, divorced from his own character and authority as it is evidenced in his canonical letters. His apostleship and sainthood also immunize him from any threat of attack from the wrathful angels and demons, so that he is not subject to the struggles of other visionaries such as the monk at Wenlock. It is interesting to note, too, that in the Old English version, Paul is not even presented as the writer of the vision, for the first-person account in Latin is turned into a third-person report of his experience. For example, the Latin, “Et respexi in altum et uidi alios angelos” (‘and I looked on high and I saw other angels’) becomes in Old English, “Paulus ða eft locode on heannesse, and he ðær geseah oðre ænglas” (‘Paul then again looked on high and there saw other angels’).\textsuperscript{123}

Paul’s passivity and detachment are perhaps not in themselves surprising, especially given his heavenly company in the \textit{Visio}; however, they do contrast sharply with the other ways in which the Apostle Paul has been presented in Anglo-Saxon literature, in which his very distinctive character and teachings have been adopted, imitated, and used by several key figures in Anglo-Saxon England as an inspiration for their lives and work. The content of

\textsuperscript{121} Healey, \textit{Old English Vision of St. Paul}, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{122} Silverstein, \textit{VSP}, p. 135.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. p. 66 (Latin) and 67 (Old English).
Blickling IV with its portrayal of the Paul of the *Visio* as the *æþela lareow* perhaps demonstrates an attempt by an Anglo-Saxon author to return to Paul some of the authority which he lacks in the *Visio S. Pauli*, and is another reflection of the role which Paul played in Anglo-Saxon literature as a figure to be turned to for instruction and imitation.

Even if the character of Paul himself is not a critical element of the *Visio S. Pauli*, however, the work was extremely popular in the medieval world and, it seems, especially in Anglo-Saxon England. Objections from Augustine, Aldhelm and Ælfric and the fact that it is apocryphal did not seem to hinder its popularity for use in homilies, in particular as an exhortational device for inspiring congregations to good Christian behaviour. Along with the *Passio Petri et Pauli*, it provides another example of a non-canonical text on Paul which gained in popularity over the Anglo-Saxon period. The next chapter will examine the concept of the apocrypha in Anglo-Saxon England in order to gain a clearer understanding of just how Anglo-Saxons may have viewed these two texts on Paul, whether their status as apocryphal may have affected their use and what effect the different natures of the two texts may have had on their acceptance or rejection.
Chapter 7. Perceptions of Pauline Apocryphal Literature in Anglo-Saxon England

Thus far we have studied two individual examples of apocryphal texts on Paul, the *Passio Petri et Pauli* and the *Visio Sancti Pauli*. Along with other New Testament apocrypha,¹ both texts were well-known in Anglo-Saxon England and seemed, based on the evidence of their occurrence in many different texts, to have become increasingly popular over the Anglo-Saxon period. They were not, however, equally accepted as orthodox. The *Passio* was used without comment or apology by many Anglo-Saxon authors, including Aldhelm and Ælfric, both of whom, on the other hand, objected strongly to the use of the *Visio*. Both texts were noncanonical, so why was one accepted and the other rejected? Why was the *Visio* so popular even though it was not endorsed by leading church authorities? As Healey has commented, “The Anglo-Saxon church had an ambivalent attitude towards New Testament apocrypha. On the one hand, there is popular and frequent use of apocryphal literature; on the other, there is ecclesiastical censure of it.”² Her observation rings especially true with respect to an examination of the inconsistent attitudes towards Pauline apocryphal texts. This chapter will examine Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards Pauline apocryphal texts in an attempt to understand how these texts would have been perceived and why they were so attractive, yet at times so controversial.

In addition to the *Passio Petri et Pauli* and the *Visio S. Pauli*, there is another apocryphal text related to Paul that we have not mentioned as yet, but which should be

---

documented here before turning to a general analysis of non-canonical Pauline texts: the so-called Epistle to the Laodiceans. The text printed below is an edition published by Thomas N. Hall which is based on the copy of the letter found in the “Royal Bible”, BL, Royal I. E. VIII (S. England, s. x/xi). The parallels with Philippians are shown in the first column to the right of the text and the parallels with other Pauline texts (mostly Galatians) in the second column to the right of the text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Paulus apostolus non ab hominibus neque per hominem sed per Iesum Christum, et Deum Patrem omnipotentem, qui suscitavit eum a mortuis, fratribus qui sunt Laodiciae.</th>
<th>Gal. 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Gratia vobis et pax a Deo Patre et nostro Domino Iesu Christo.</td>
<td>Phil. 1.2 Gal. 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gratias ago Deo meo et Christo Iesu per omnem orationem meam, quod estis permanentes in eo et perseverantes in operibus eius, sperantes promissum in die iudicationis</td>
<td>Phil. 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neque enim destituant vos quorundam vaniloquia insinuantium, se peto ne vos avertant a veritate evangelii quod a me praedicatur.</td>
<td>Gal. 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Et nunc faciet Deus, ut qui sunt ex me ad profectum veritatis evangelii deservientes et facientes benignitatem eorum quae sunt salutis vitae aeternae.</td>
<td>Phil. 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Et nunc palam sunt vincula mea quae patior in christo; in quibus laetor et gaudeo.</td>
<td>Phil. 1.13,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Et hoc mihi est ad salutem perpetuam; quod ipsum factum orationibus vestris administrante Spiritu Sancto, sive per vitam sive per mortem.</td>
<td>Phil. 1.19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Est enim mihi vere vita in Christo et mori gaudium.</td>
<td>Phil. 1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Et ipse in vobis faciet misericordiam suam, ut eandem dilectionem habeatis et sitis unianimes.</td>
<td>Phil. 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ergo, dilectissimi, ut audistis praesentia mei, ita retinet et facite in timore Dei, et erit vobis pax et vita in aeternum;</td>
<td>Phil. 2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. est enim Deus qui operatur in vobis.</td>
<td>Phil. 2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Et facite sine retractatu quaeacumque facitis.</td>
<td>Phil. 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Et quod est, dilectissimi, gaudeite in Christo. Et</td>
<td>Phil. 3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

praecavete sordidos in lucrum.


15. Et quae sunt integra et vera et iusta et pudica et amabilia et sancta facite.

16. Et quae audistis et accepistis, in corde retinete, et erit vobis pax.

17. Salutate omnes fratres in osculo sancto.

18. Salutant vos omnes sancti in Christo Iesu.

19. Gratia domini nostri Iesu Christi cum spiritu vestro.

20. Et facite legi Colosensibus hanc epistolam et Colosensibus vos legite. Deus autem et Pater Domini Nostri Iesu Christi custodiat vos inmaculatos in Christo Iesu cui est honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum.

Amen. Explicit epistola ad Laodicenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>praecavete sordidos in lucrum.</td>
<td>Omnes sint petitiones vestae palam apud Deum.</td>
<td>Phil.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estote sensu firmi in Christo Iesu.</td>
<td>Et estote sensu firmi in Christo Iesu.</td>
<td>Phil. 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quae sunt integra et vera et iusta et pudica et amabilia et sancta facite.</td>
<td>Et quae sunt integra et vera et iusta et pudica et amabilia et sancta facite.</td>
<td>Phil.4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et quae audistis et accepistis, in corde retinete, et erit vobis pax.</td>
<td>Et quae audistis et accepistis, in corde retinete, et erit vobis pax.</td>
<td>1Thess.5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutate omnes fratres in osculo sancto.</td>
<td>Salutate omnes fratres in osculo sancto.</td>
<td>Phil.4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutant vos omnes sancti in Christo Iesu.</td>
<td>Salutant vos omnes sancti in Christo Iesu.</td>
<td>Phil.4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratia domini nostri Iesu Christi cum spiritu vestro.</td>
<td>Gratia domini nostri Iesu Christi cum spiritu vestro.</td>
<td>Gal. 6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et facite legi Colosensibus hanc epistolam et Colosensibus vos legite. Deus autem et Pater Domini Nostri Iesu Christi custodiat vos inmaculatos in Christo Iesu cui est honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen. Explicit epistola ad Laodicenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Col. 4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Paul, apostle, not by men nor through men but through Jesus Christ, and God the omnipotent father, who raised him from the dead, to the brothers who are at Laodicea. Grace to you and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ.

I give thanks to God in my every prayer, that you remain in him and persevere in his works, hoping for the promise at the day of judgment. Nor may vain speeches of any insinuating sort deceive you, but I ask that they would not turn you away from the truth of the gospel which was preached by me. And now may God grant that those who have come from me for the perfection of the truth of the gospel may serve and do kind works for the salvation of eternal life.

And now my chains which I suffer in Christ are obvious, for which I am happy and rejoice. And this is perpetual salvation for me; which very thing is accomplished by your prayers and the ministration of the Holy Spirit, whether through life or death. For I truly have life in Christ and joy in death. And he will work his mercy among you, so that you may have the same delight and be of one mind.

Therefore, most beloved, as you have heard in my presence, preserve yourselves and act in this way in the fear of God, and there will be peace and eternal life for you; for it is God who works in you. And do whatever you do without reluctance.

And so, most beloved, rejoice in Christ. And beware of those who are soiled by money. May all your prayers be made clear before God. And be firm in the consciousness of Christ. And do those things which are pure and true and just and chaste and loving and holy. And what you have heard and received, hold in your heart and you will have peace.

Greet all the brothers with a holy kiss. Greet all your saints in Christ Jesus. May the grace of the Lord Jesus be with your spirit. And have this letter read to the
Colossians and you read the letter for the Colossians. Now may God the father of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you spotless in Christ Jesus to whom is honour and glory in eternity.)

The letter of Paul to the Laodiceans is now generally agreed to be a forgery and not written by Paul at all, composed as it is of a pastiche of verses from other Pauline letters, mostly Philippians and Galatians. Meade calls it a “catena of Pauline passages,” which follows the outline of Philippians.4 Its writer was presumably prompted to compose it by the instruction in Colossians 4:16 (a letter itself now generally considered not to be a genuine Pauline letter) that the recipients should read the letter from Laodicea. The composition of the letter, using Pauline language and content, is most probably what allowed it to be considered a potentially Pauline text. It survives only in Latin, but is considered to have been originally written in Greek, likely between the second and fourth centuries. Its reception by the church was mixed. It is found in several Latin manuscripts of the New Testament even though Jerome denounced it as non-Pauline and it was condemned at the Second Council of Nicea in 787. It is also named, but rejected, along with the Epistle to the Alexandrians, in the Muratorian Canon due to falsified authorship.5 Gregory the Great, however, argued in its favour, stating that he believed Paul to have written fifteen letters but the Church wanted to include only fourteen of them since that number is twice the sacred number seven.6 Just as in other areas of the medieval world, the Epistle to the Laodiceans was not unknown in Anglo-Saxon England, as demonstrated by its presence in the Book of Armagh (where, as Hall notes, it is prefaced by the caveat, “incipit aepistola ad laudicenses sed hirunimus eam negat esse pauli”[‘here begins

---

the epistle to the Laodiceans but Jerome denies that it is a letter of Paul’]) and in the late tenth-century Royal Bible.\textsuperscript{7}

The inclusion of Laodiceans in the Royal Bible demonstrates that the epistle was extant in Anglo-Saxon England in Ælfric’s time and indeed he was familiar with it. In the *Letter to Sigeweard*, he writes:\textsuperscript{8}

Paulus se apostol awrat manega pistolas, for þan þe Crist hine gesette eallum þeodem to lareowe, and on soþre eufæstnysse he gesette ða þeawas, ðe þa geleafullan folc on heora life healdan, þa þe hig sylfes gelogiað and heora lif for Gode. Fiftyne pistolas awrat se an apostol to þam leodscipum, þe he to geleafan gebigde; ða sindon micle bec on þære bibliothecan and þa fremiað us to ure rihtinge, gif we þæs leoda lareowes lare folgiað. He awrat to þam Romaniscum anne, to Corinthios ii, eac to Galathas anne, to Ephesios anne, to Philipenses anne, to Thesalonicenses twegen, to Colosenses anne, eac to Ebreos anne, and to his agenum discipulum Timotheum twegen, and Titum anne, to Philemonem anne, to Laodicenses anne; ealles fiftyne, swa hlude swa ðunor, geleafullum folcum.

(Paul the Apostle wrote many epistles, because Christ established him as a teacher for all the nations, and in true righteousness he established the customs, which faithful people maintain in their lives, when they devote themselves and their lives to God. Fifteen epistles the Apostle wrote to the peoples whom he converted to the faith; they are great books in the Bible and they are good for our direction, if we follow the teaching of this teacher of the peoples. He wrote one letter to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one also to the Galatians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, two to the Thessalonians, one to the Colossians, also one to the Hebrews, and two to his own disciple Timothy, and one to Titus, one to Philemon, one to the Laodiceans; fifteen in all, as loud as thunder to faithful people.)

It is interesting to note that Ælfric places Laodiceans last in his list of Pauline letters. A survey of J.B. Lightfoot’s list of medieval biblical manuscripts which include Laodiceans, particularly those of the eighth and ninth centuries, shows that it is most often found immediately following Colossians, a placement which seems most natural, since each letter is mentioned in the other. Of the Anglo-Saxon era insular versions, the Book of Armagh places it

\textsuperscript{7} Hall, “Epistle to the Laodiceans,” pp. 71–2, quotation at p. 71.
after Colossians, while in the Royal Bible, the one closest to Ælfric in time and location, Laodiceans follows Hebrews. The only medieval manuscript in Lightfoot’s list which places it last, as Ælfric does, is the non-insular, ninth-century manuscript Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 334, in which Laodiceans is a fragment.9 Perhaps Ælfric placed Laodiceans last in his list because that was where he found it in the bible(s) he was familiar with, bibles which may have been following in the tradition of the Bern manuscript. Then again, his placement of the epistle may reflect some doubt about its canonicity, but not enough to strike it from the list of Pauline letters. Laodiceans would certainly have fit in better along with the letters to communities, rather than to individuals, so its last place spot in Ælfric’s list may well be a signal that it is a dubious text. It is important to note, however, as do Frederick Biggs in his discussion of apocryphal texts in Anglo-Saxon England, and Richard Marsden in his examination of medieval biblical manuscripts, that complete bibles were relatively rare in the medieval world (the Royal Bible being one of only four extant from Anglo-Saxon England) and most people would have read biblical books separately or in partial groups, such as the Psalms or the Gospels.10 Moreover, when books were grouped or in a complete Bible, the order of the books varied, with over 200 different orders in manuscripts of complete bibles.11 Thus, Ælfric’s placement of Laodiceans in last position may be nothing more than a reflection of his not having read it as part of a collection of Paul’s letters or as part of a whole Bible.

Whether or not Ælfric was familiar with the Royal Bible itself, the facts that he is familiar with Laodiceans and that the letter is included in an extant copy of a bible which is

---


contemporaneous with Ælfric suggest the potential for Laodiceans to be available in Ælfric’s time. Biggs suggests the possibility that Ælfric believed there was a letter to the Laodiceans based on the reference to it in Colossians 4.16, but that when he mentions it in his list in the Letter to Sigeweard, he is referring to the lost, hypothetical letter rather than to the extant Laodiceans.12 This conjecture seems unlikely, however, given that there was at least one copy of it extant in England in Ælfric’s time and given its inclusion in other extant English bibles from the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, as well as the earlier copy mentioned above in the Book of Armagh.13 Hall argues:14

I think Ælfric had access to a bible that included Laodiceans among the Pauline epistles. I think he read this epistle and recognized in it its pervasively Pauline diction, and on these grounds I think he embraced it as an authentic Pauline composition ... I cannot imagine Ælfric naming this epistle among Paul’s letters and twice emphasizing that Paul wrote fifteen letters unless Laodiceans was part of the Bible as he had come to know it.

Hall’s observation is supported by the fact that in the Letter to Sigeweard Ælfric does not defend the letter, he merely lists it among the other Pauline epistles without remark, as though he is used to its inclusion in the Pauline letters. If he had objected to it one might expect him to comment negatively on it as he did with the Visio S. Pauli, or excise it from the list. If instead it was not generally part of the bible in his experience and he was championing it one might expect a defence of it, or at least a comment on its membership in his list. He merely mentions it as though its inclusion is the norm. On the other hand, Hall’s argument is undermined by Biggs’ contention that there were few complete bibles in Anglo-Saxon England and that most people read its books in isolation or small collections. If this were so, it may have been unlikely that Ælfric was used to any “bible” as a whole, be it one with or

14 Ibid. p. 79.
without Laodiceans, in which case its appearance on Ælfric’s list is all the more remarkable, for it suggests that he was actively endorsing it as a Pauline letter. One must also consider the possibility that Ælfric may simply have been copying or remembering a pre-existing list of biblical books, rather than making up his own, or referring to an actual bible.

If Ælfric thought about the authenticity of Laodiceans at all, there are several facets of the letter which would perhaps have deterred him from excluding it from the list of Paul’s letters. First, as Hall noted, it is actually ‘Pauline’ in that its content is entirely excerpted from the genuine letters. One of the several tools modern biblical scholars use to assess the authorship of putatively Pauline letters is the test of Pauline language, and, in fact, of the letters on Ælfric’s list, the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus is doubted to varying degrees, in part based on the dissimilarity of their language compared to the undisputed Pauline letters (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Philemon).\textsuperscript{15} Hebrews, in fact, unlike the genuine and deutero-Pauline letters, is internally anonymous, not even claiming to be written by Paul. By the test of language, Laodiceans would not be flagged as a forgery. Where it does differ from the other Pauline epistles, however, is in its content, because the other letters, in addition to the greetings and exhortations which we find in Laodiceans, were written to address particular issues causing trouble in the communities to which Paul wrote them. Much of their value and appeal for modern readers comes from the glimpse they give us into the situation of Paul and his churches. He often names individuals whom he knew when he was in the community, and the reader can variously hear concern, anger, shock, and love for his converts in his words. An examination of Philippians, for example, from which Laodiceans seems to have extracted its content in large part, shows that it deals with three different issues.

\textsuperscript{15} See, for example, Bart D. Ehrman, \textit{A Historical Introduction to the New Testament}, 4\textsuperscript{th} Ed. (New York, 2008), pp. 309–402.
concerning the church at Philippi (in fact it now seems quite possible that Philippians is actually an amalgam of three originally separate letters, one for each of the issues dealt with in the letter). Philippians 1.1–3.1 deals with Paul’s imprisonment (he is in chains, vinculis, 1.14), speculation on his fate (1.19–25), the necessity for the Philippians to stand uno spiritu uniamines (1.27, ‘united in one spirit’) and the possible arrival of Timothy and extended absence of Epaphroditus, whose illness kept him from going to them (2.19–30). The situational elements of this portion of Philippians are absent in Laodiceans. There is only a brief reference to Paul’s imprisonment in Laodiceans (v. 6, vincula mea, ‘my chains’), with no discussion of the outcome of Paul’s imprisonment (perhaps because by the time Laodiceans was written there was no longer any need to speculate on Paul’s fate), and no mention of Timothy and Epaphroditus at all. The next portion of Philippians, thought to be a fragment of another letter, running from 3.2–4.3, and dealing with warnings about foreign missionaries who were subverting Paul’s message, is entirely absent from Laodiceans, as is the third portion, running from 4.10–20, a letter of receipt and thanks for money sent to Paul. The author of Laodiceans extracts the main theological points about which Paul writes to the Philippians, those which are not specific to their current situation, namely that Christians have “vita in Christo et mori gaudium” (‘life in Christ and to die is joy’, v. 8; cf. Phil. 1.21) and Christians ought to remain uniamines (‘united’, v. 9; cf. Phil. 1.27). The letter has no central argument and the author is not addressing any particular issues. On the contrary, it is composed of what came to be Christian generalities and platitudes, such as gaudete in Christo (v. 13, ‘rejoice in Christ’); “estote firmi in Christo Jesu” (v. 14, ‘be firm in Christ Jesus’); and “facite in timore Dei, et erit vobis pax et vita in aeternum” (v. 10, ‘act in the fear of God and

17 See Koester, p. 138.
18 Ibid. p. 136.
there will be peace and eternal life for you’"). This is perhaps why the letter was able to slip past Ælfric’s critical, orthodox, judgment: it commits no offense against Christian theology, nor does it draw attention to itself in any other way. Thus, although Laodiceans is now apocryphal it may not have been considered so by Ælfric. If his opinion is to be taken as an indicator of general Anglo-Saxon opinion, and taking into account the extant English bibles which included it, Laodiceans may not have been viewed as an extra-canonical text in Anglo-Saxon England, in spite of objections from Jerome and biblical prefaces alerting readers to doubts about its authenticity.

Unfortunately, in an assessment of the status of apocryphal texts in Anglo-Saxon England, one limiting factor which arises is that very few authors other than Ælfric set out an opinion on the matter. Thus a study of these texts becomes to a large extent an examination of Ælfric. This is true especially for Laodiceans, but also for the Visio S. Pauli and the Passio Petri et Pauli. The only other Old English/Anglo-Latin author who makes a direct statement regarding a Pauline apocryphal text is Aldhelm, who, as we saw earlier, made clear his negative opinion of the Visio S. Pauli. Ælfric, too, censured this text explicitly, perhaps following Aldhelm’s example. The wide range of texts making use of the Visio argue, however, that it was actually very popular despite this censure. The weight of literary evidence, then, gives quite a different picture of the status of the text than one would get from reading Ælfric’s opinion of it. Turning to Laodiceans, once again, its inclusion in Ælfric’s list of Pauline letters would suggest that it was accepted and well-known in Anglo-Saxon England, at least among those who were well-educated. This is corroborated by its inclusion in the Royal Bible and the Book of Armagh. Whether it was considered as canonical by the wider population of monks, secular priests or the lay public is unknown. Unlike the Visio, which was fairly sensational and relatively easily recognizable, Laodiceans is not the type of
text that would attract attention and in fact, since it is composed of passages from other
Pauline letters, quotations from it could just as well have come from Galatians or Philippians,
for example. We can conclude, perhaps, that whether it was generally accepted as canonical or
not, it did not excite any controversy or imitation, in contrast to the Visio.

The Epistle to the Laodiceans, then, is a third Pauline apocryphal text (although one
which may in fact not even have been considered as apocryphal but which may have been a
familiar part of the bible for many) known in Anglo-Saxon England along with the Visio and
the Passio Petri et Pauli. Each text is very different from the others and each was accordingly
received very differently in Anglo-Saxon England. What was it, then, about each of these texts
which determined its status and use in Anglo-Saxon England?

One important issue to be dealt with in a discussion of the status of apocryphal texts in
Anglo-Saxon England and in the acceptance or rejection of various texts, is the actual
definition of an apocryphal text, both today and for Anglo-Saxons, if in fact such a term or
concept even existed at that time. Wilhelm Schneemelcher discusses the definition of
apocrypha thus:19

The New Testament Apocrypha are writings which have not been received into the
canon, but which by title and other statements lay claim to be in the same class with
the writings of the canon, and which from the point of view of Form Criticism
further develop and mould the kinds of style created and received in the NT.

He moves on to outline the types of works included in the category of New Testament
apocrypha, beginning with gospels intended either to replace the canonical gospels or to
expand on their content, and proceeding to texts which are:20

---

9.
20 Ibid. p. 59.
a matter of particular pseudepigraphical Epistles and of elaborately fabricated Acts of Apostles, the writers of which have worked up in novelistic fashion the stories and legends about the apostles and so aimed at supplementing the deficient information which the NT communicates about the destinies of these men. Finally, there also belong here the Apocalypses in so far as they have further evolved the ‘revelation’ form taken over from Judaism.

This last set of three categories of apocryphal texts, epistles, stories about the apostles, and apocalypses, rather conveniently correspond to the three apocryphal texts on Paul which we have discussed thus far and which were familiar to Anglo-Saxons, namely the pseudo-Pauline Epistle to the Laodiceans; the legendary tale of Peter’s and Paul’s battle with Simon Magus and their subsequent martyrdom, the *Passio Petri et Pauli*; and the apocalyptic revelation of heaven and hell, the *Visio S. Pauli*. All three of these texts fall into the category of New Testament Apocrypha, yet they were treated differently by Anglo-Saxon writers. The Epistle to the Laodiceans seems not to have attracted much attention. The other two texts, however, held a similar position in Anglo-Saxon England in that they both became popular inclusions in homilies, yet were different in that one, the *Passio*, was accepted without comment by Anglo-Saxon church leaders, while the other, the *Visio*, was defamed by the same authorities (namely Aldhelm and Ælfric). This raises two issues: 1. Why was one accepted and the other rejected by church authorities; and 2. Why did they both become popular even though their reception in orthodox circles varied greatly?

As mentioned above, we are unfortunately limited in assessing the answer to the first question by the inherent nature of most study of medieval attitudes about literature, that is the incidental and unsystematic nature of the extant evidence. For Anglo-Saxon England, we are once again reliant mostly on the opinions of Aldhelm and Ælfric, for they made direct statements about their opinion of the *Visio S. Pauli*. It is too simple and indeed misleading,
however, to assume based on their rejection of this text that they were opposed to apocryphal texts in general. Nevertheless this was often thought to be the case, especially with respect to Ælfric, who is generally perceived as an extremely orthodox member of the Christian faith.  

Both authors, in fact, made direct use of the *Passio Petri et Pauli*, thus demonstrating that they were not opposed to all apocryphal texts. Unfortunately, though, neither author makes a direct statement endorsing the *Passio*, and thus Anglo-Saxonists are given the opportunity to examine the various writings of each author in order to tease out the possible scenarios behind their use of apocryphal texts. Several modern scholars have addressed the issue of the attitudes of Old English authors toward apocrypha, at times in relation to Pauline texts, and also non-Pauline pieces, for of course, although this study focuses on Paul, there were several other non-canonical texts which were popular in Anglo-Saxon England, such as the gospel of Thomas, the passion of Andrew, and the Nativity of the Virgin Mary. The analyses of today’s scholars will also prove helpful in sorting out the opinions of Anglo-Saxon authors about Pauline apocryphal texts.

Before turning to the opinions of Aldhelm and Ælfric, though, one earlier Anglo-Latin writer who makes reference to apocryphal texts may be helpful, namely the Venerable Bede. As mentioned in chapter five on the *Passio Petri et Pauli* (p. 109), Bede demonstrates familiarity with apostolic passion accounts, and his comment on Acts 1.13 in his *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum* refers to them as “historiae in quibus passiones apostolorum continentur et a plurimis deputantur apocryphae” (‘histories in which the passions of the apostles are contained and which are considered apocryphal by most’).  

Bede again speaks of apocryphal books in a

---

passage of the *Retractatio* which this time pertains directly to Paul (although not to one of the
Pauline apocryphal texts discussed as part of this study):23

Cum ergo constet quod Paulus post annos tres suae conversionis venerit
Hierosolymam et apostolorum fuerit numero sociatus, existens adhuc, ut ipse scribit:
Ignotus facie ecclesiis Iudaee quae erant in Christo, errant multum qui apocryforum
libros sectando putant eum secundo post passionem domini anno in apostolatum
gentium cum Barnaba iam fuisse ordinatum.

(Since then it may be considered a fact that Paul came to Jerusalem three years after
his conversion and had there been associated in the number of the apostles, being
thus, as he wrote himself: unknown by face to the churches of Judea which were in
Christ, they err greatly, who by following books of the apocrypha, think that in the
second year after the passion of the Lord he had already been ordained with
Barnabas into the apostleship of the people.)

Judging by these two passages, Bede was well aware of apostolic passion stories, and, at least
in these cases, labelled them with the term *apocrypha*, a potentially derogatory moniker, as his
use of the term in the second citation suggests. Bede, judging by the latter passage, seems to
have considered reliance on apocryphal works to be a risky strategy, and he reveals that his
criteria for criticism of them is their contradiction of biblical information.

Bede, in addition to his use of the term *apocrypha* to discuss unreliable deeds of
characters in Acts, uses it several times in others of his works, in discussing the book of
Enoch and the Epistle of Jude, for example. He uses it to specify that a work is non-canonical,
and when used of biblical characters, he generally makes a point of emphasizing that the
apocryphal details are not to be trusted, or just plain untrue. Of the book of Enoch, for
example, he states:24

23 CCSL 121, p. 139.
epistolas catholicas expositio* (C). *In Epistolam Judaeae*, Col. 0129A.
Liber Enoch ... inter apocryphas Scripturas ab Ecclesia deputatur, non quia dicta tanti patriarchae abjici ullatenus possint, aut falsa debeant a estimari, sed quia liber ille qui sub nomine eius offeritur, non vere ab illo scriptus, sed sub titulo nominis eius ab alio quodam editus videtur. Si enim vere eius esset, non esset fidei sanae contrarius. Nunc autem quia multa incredabilia continet, in quibus illud est de gigantibus, quod non habuerint homines patres, sed angelos, merito doctis claret non esse viri veracis scripta quae mendacio sordent.

(The book of Enoch ... is counted among the apocryphal scriptures by the church, not because the sayings of such a patriarch can be rejected in any way, or because they ought to be considered false, but because the book which is presented under his name, not truly written by him, but under the title of his name seems to have been produced by some other person. For if it were truly his, it would not be contrary to the health of the faith. But now because it contains many unbelievable things, among which there is the tale about giants which do not have human fathers, but angels as fathers, it is rightly clear to the learned that these writings which appear worthless because of lying are not those of the genuine man.)

Thus Bede rejects the book of Enoch because it purports to be by a biblical character and contains what he considers false events. On the other hand, he accepts without negative judgment the details of the *passio* of St. George, and uses the passion as his source for his own account of the saint, “quamvis gesta passionis eius inter apocryphas connumerentur scripturas” (‘although the deeds of his passion are counted among apocryphal writings’).  

Presumably since St. George is not a biblical character and his passion does not purport to be biblical, neither can the tales of his life contradict scripture; therefore his passion, although apocryphal, is allowed to stand without criticism. Thus it appears that Bede, in fact, while he did generally label works as *apocrypha* when they were or, in his opinion ought to be, condemned by the church, also used the term in a more neutral way to refer to information about extra-biblical characters.
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Thus we know from Bede’s writings that he did not categorically reject works which
he labelled apocryphal. Nor did Aldhelm reject all non-biblical books, judging by his use of
details from the Passio Petri et Pauli. A.M.C. Casiday notes that Aldhelm condemns some
apocrypha, such as the Visio, as we have already seen, but accepts others, such as the Virtues
of John, which he draws on for his discussion of John the Evangelist in his De virginitate.26 It
has been discussed in chapter five that Aldhelm almost certainly used details from the Passio
Petri et Pauli for his poem on Peter and Paul in the Carmen Ecclesiasticum.27 Casiday argues
that Aldhelm had no “programmatic hostility” toward apocryphal texts,28 and proposes two
criteria which Aldhelm used to assess whether or not a non-canonical text was acceptable or
objectionable. In his assessment of its validity, Casiday proposes, Aldhelm first demanded that
an apocryphal text be consistent with canonical scripture and second, Aldhelm considered its
status with church authorities. On this second point, though, Casiday argues, Aldhelm seems
to have exhibited some flexibility, evaluating a work primarily on its own merits.29 Thus in the
case of the Visio, the work violates both of these points, for first, it contradicts Paul’s claim in
his letters that what he saw and heard in his vision was ineffable, and second, it was not
sanctioned by decretal writings.30 Casiday believes that Aldhelm used the term apocrypha in a
merely neutral fashion, adding deliramenta as he did to refer to the Visio for example,31 when
he was attacking a particular work.32 The Passio Petri et Pauli, on the other hand, did not
contradict scriptural details about Peter or Paul, and had not been criticized or rejected by
church authorities. Thus, like Bede, it would appear that for Aldhelm, it was not the status of

at p. 148.
27 See above, and Ehwald, Aldhelmi Opera, p. 20.
30 Ehwald, Aldhelmi Opera, p. 256.
31 Ibid. p. 256.
32 Casiday, “St. Aldhelm,” p. 156.
the work as non-canonical as such, but its contradiction of scriptural details that would
determine its acceptability. For both men, then, the *Passio* was safe to refer to for additional
information about Peter and Paul.

It would seem that Casiday may be correct in his conclusion that Aldhelm, and, we
may add, Bede, were not opposed to non-canonical works as such, and used them in their own
writings. Thus, when Aldhelm uses these works, at least the ones pertaining to Paul, he does
not label them with the term apocryphal. The times when Aldhelm does use the actual term
*apocrypha* he uses it to refer to texts or details from texts which fit the two criteria Casiday
cites for rejection of texts, that is when they contradict scripture and/or are rejected by
authority. Aldhelm uses the term *apocrypha* only three times in his writings, once to describe
the *Visio* as *deliramenta*, as cited above; then again a second time in the prose *De virginitate*,
when discussing the Hebrew traditions regarding Melchisedech, about which writings he
states, seemingly drawing from Jerome’s Commentary on Matthew,33 “apocryphorum enim
naenias et incertas frivolorum fabulas nequaquam catholica receptat Ecclesia” (‘the catholic
church does not at all receive the ditties of apocryphal writings and uncertain tales of
 trifles’);34 and a third time in the *Epistola ad Acircium* where there is again reference to an
apocryphal work as *frivola* (‘frivolous’).35 Thus each of the three times when Aldhelm used
the label *apocrypha*, as Casiday said, he is expressing a negative opinion about the work in
question. Casiday argues on this basis, and on Aldhelm’s willingness to use other apocryphal
texts such as the *Virtues of John* that Aldhelm “uses the word ‘apocrypha’ in a neutral way,”
and that for Aldhelm, “the term ‘apocrypha’ retains its etymological sense of coming from an
unknown source,” adding, “there is no evidence that he joined with ps.-Gelasius in using it as

35 Ibid. p. 188, l. 29.
a term of abuse.” Casiday is correct to point out that Aldhelm did not object categorically to all the texts which we call apocryphal; however he seems misguided in asserting that Aldhelm used the label *apocrypha* itself in a neutral way, since there is no case in which Aldhelm uses the term in a neutral or positive manner, but only derogatorily. The word is only used for texts Aldhelm disapproves of and the negative vocabulary surrounding it leaves the reader no doubt as to his rejection of the work under discussion. Thus it may be that while Aldhelm did not object to all works which we label apocryphal nor did he refrain from using them selectively, he reserved the actual term *apocrypha* for works which he considered ought to be rejected.

We find, then, that the two best known early Anglo-Latin figures, Bede and Aldhelm, both rejected and labelled as apocryphal texts which provided details that were contradictory to information in the bible. On the other hand, they seemed to accept as legitimate and acceptable as sources for their own writing, works which we call apocryphal but which, rather than gainsaying the bible, as Schneemelcher said, “added new material aimed at supplementing the deficient information which the NT communicates about the destinies” of biblical characters. This is the case with the *Passio Petri et Pauli*, whose details deal with matter that goes beyond the purview of the New Testament. We have also seen that the Latin term *apocrypha* for Aldhelm was a derogatory term, while for Bede it was not of necessity pejorative, although in practice, Bede more often than not used it of texts which were objectionable.

These two writers were, of course, writing in Latin. When analyzing later Anglo-Saxon writers, in particular those writing in Old English, one of the first issues to deal with, before moving to an analysis of their opinion of Pauline apocryphal texts, is the question of
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vocabulary. Was there a particular Anglo-Saxon term to translate the Latin word *apocrypha*? As happens rather frequently in Anglo-Saxon studies, we must rely largely on Ælfric to delve further into this question.

Old English glosses are potentially useful for determining the translation of a word from Latin into English. Biggs notes that the word *apocriforum* is glossed in two Old English manuscripts with the term *tweogenlicra gewrita* (‘doubtful writings’) and *tweoiendlicra gewrita*. In Aldhelm’s prose *De laude virginitate, apocriforum naenias*, is glossed *wiðerweardra gedwola*, and *wiðersacana* (‘blasphemies/blasphemous’) is the gloss for the word *apocriphorum* in the phrase *apocriphorum falsorum sacrorum*. A gloss in another manuscript, BL, Cotton Cleopatra A. iii contrasts, “sancta scriptura/halig gewrit” (‘holy writings) with *apocrifa/dyrngewrita* (‘hidden writings’). The *DOE* cites the use of the term *dyrnwrita* in Cotton Cleopatra as the only occurrence of this word in the Old English corpus, and, since *dyrnwrita* glosses the word *apocriforum*, cites its meaning as apocryphal books of the bible. The adjective *dyrne*, secret or hidden, was common, however, occurring 80 times in the Old English corpus. It often had a connotation of something hidden because it was evil, or sinful, for example with respect to the occult, adultery or fornication, and thus could be translated as furtive or stealthy. In this case it reflects the roots of the lemma *apocrypha*, which also means hidden or secret. In the third gloss, *wiðerweardra gedwola, gedwola*, which means error, is given the meaning “error in matters of faith or dogma” by the *DOE*, based on the gloss of Aldhelm. Used with the genitive plural *wiðerweardra*, of enemies or opponents,
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as Biggs points out, the phrase could be rendered “error of opponents”. Thus, these glossed translations all tend toward an understanding of the word apocrypha as a referent for heretical texts.

Further information about Old English words used to refer to what we label apocryphal texts comes from Ælfric’s writings and the meaning of these terms can be determined with more certainty, since there is a more definitive context in which to examine the vocabulary. As discussed in the previous chapter, Ælfric gave his opinion of the Visio in no uncertain terms when he wrote of it, “Humeta rædað sume men ða leasan gesetnysse ðe hi hatað paulus gesihðe nu he sylf sæde þæt he ða digelan word gehyrde þe nan eorðlic mann sprecan ne mot?” (‘How can some men read the false composition, which they call Paul’s vision, when he himself said that he heard secret words, which no earthly man can speak?’). Ælfric characterises the Visio as a leasan gesetnysse (‘a false composition’), clearly expressing his disapproval. It is not certain whether he was composing freely here or translating from a source, although Godden suggests that he may have gotten the idea for the basis of his censure from Augustine’s criticism of the Visio, which was cited in chapter six (pp. 146-7). We cannot be sure, then, in this instance, whether Ælfric intended the moniker leasan gesetnysse as apocrypha; however in another case, his homily on the Assumption of the Virgin, Ælfric does use the term to translate the word apocrypha. As Biggs has pointed out, the Latin source, Paschasius Radbertus, reads, “ne forte si venerit vestris in manibus illud apocryphum de transitu eiusdem virginis, dubia pro certis recipiatis,” (‘lest perchance that apocryphal text about the crossing over of the virgin should come into your hands and you accept doubtful things as certain’). Ælfric renders this, “þy læs ðe eow on hand becume seo lease gesetnyss. Þe
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44 ÆCHom II, 20, p. 190.
45 Godden, Introduction, Commentary and Glossary, p. 530.
Thus a survey of the various Old English words used to translate the Latin word *apocrypha* seems to indicate that there was no particular, generally agreed upon Old English word which was used for it, but a variety of makeshift phrases (*tweogenlicra gewrita, wiðerweardra gedwola, dyrnewrita, wiðersacana, leasan gesetnysse*), all of which, however, seem to have had some negative connotations. It is perhaps significant to note that there appears to have been no specific, technical, word for *apocrypha* in Old English, an observation which would seem to indicate that Anglo-Saxon writers and speakers had no specific concept of apocryphal writings and thus, one might assume, no definitive concept of just what constituted such writings. However, there seemed to be little controversy, at least amongst ecclesiastical authorities, about which of the non-canonical Pauline texts were to be rejected and which were to be accepted. What is also striking is that these terms were only used (by definition) to refer to works that were considered heretical and theologically erroneous. While in Latin texts, as when Bede refers to the passion of St. George, the word
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46 Cited in Biggs, “Introduction and Overview,” p. 19. Ælfric’s text is in ÆCHom 1, 30, p. 430.
“apocrypha” can theoretically be neutral, in Old English the terms which were used to refer to these erroneous texts cannot be neutral and are intended to cast an aspersion.

Ælfric declined entirely to use the Visio because it was a leasan gesetynysse (‘false composition’), and told his readers in no uncertain terms that he rejected it and why. That is not the case with the Passio Petri et Pauli. He has no derogatory label for it, but merely calls it a race (‘account’) and incorporates it as the main portion of his homily for the passion of the apostles Peter and Paul in ÆCHom I, 26. As previously mentioned, he prefaced his retelling of the tale with the explanation that he will present a “scortre race forðan de heora ðrowung is gehwær on Engliscum gereored fullice geendebyrd” (‘a shorter account because their suffering is fully set forth everywhere in the English language’). Scott DeGregorio’s paper discussing the changes which Ælfric made to the text, points out that in his version, “Peter is stylized as an incarnation of God’s power, setting up his confrontation with Simon and Nero to be read not as the conflict between men, but as a battle between God’s forces and the devil’s.”

He argues that Ælfric’s altered presentation, with its introduction from Matthew 16.13–19 setting up a discourse on Peter’s position as the foundation of the church, contrasts with Blickling XV, the other Old English homiletic account of the Passio, which sets Peter and Paul up as examples of the suffering of God’s preachers. DeGregorio seems to have gauged accurately the differing moods of the two texts by contrasting the suspense and emotive force of the Blickling version in which Simon and the apostles appear evenly matched until the end of the tale, with the more removed, “iconicized” version which Ælfric presents. It could be argued, however, that the tone of the Blickling text should also be seen as heavily ironic, since the
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47 ÆCHom 1, 26, p. 391.
49 Ibid. pp. 80–2.
audience knows that Simon is merely a pretender and the true heroes of the tale are Peter and Paul. Nero’s bewilderment is the mechanism used to heighten this irony and to provide the opportunity for the truth to be revealed in the end. DeGregorio is correct in pointing out that Ælfric was trying to dehumanize the apostles and emphasize their sanctity through the various changes which he made to the Latin text of the Passio; however, his attribution of Ælfric’s motivation behind the changes is somewhat misguided, due perhaps to a misreading of Blickling XV and the Latin texts. DeGregorio first proposes that Ælfric eliminated some of the episodes in order to avoid the impression that Peter was evenly matched with Simon by including too much back and forth combat between them. These episodes, however, rather than humanizing Peter, include many examples of Peter’s powerful speeches, and, as mentioned above, are characterized by dramatic irony in that the audience knows Peter is the superior one. Ælfric does not record, for example, this speech of Peter’s which appears in Blickling XV.50

Nu þu sylfa wast genog geare ðæt þu me oferswiðan ne miht; me þyncþ wundor mid hwylceræ byldo þu sceole beforan cininge gylpan þurh þinne drycræft þæt þu mæge Cristes þegnas oforswiðan.

(Now you yourself know well enough that you cannot overcome me; I am amazed with what boldness you boast before the king that through your sorcery you can overcome the servants of Christ.)

Secondly, DeGregorio views the emotions of the Apostles in Simon’s flying scene as a sign of “ineffectuality and human weakness,” 51 but the apostles’ reaction seems rather to be a sign of saintly compassion and sadness that they could not save Simon and end the evil which he represents, and instead must be instrumental in ending his life. DeGregorio’s final conclusion

50 Morris, Blickling, p. 175.
is that Ælfric felt he needed to revise the content of the Passio in the direction of sanctifying Peter in order to avoid gedwyld (heresy).

DeGregorio himself points out that Ælfric did not hesitate to express explicitly his objections to various apocryphal texts, and gives as examples his criticisms of the lives of the Virgin, of the Visio, and the life of Thomas the apostle. In his retelling of the Passio Ælfric does not voice any objection, but rather tells the audience clearly his reasons for revision: to shorten the tale because all of the details are already available and presumably quite familiar to his listeners. Given this assumed familiarity, one might conjecture that if Ælfric had objected to them, he would have stated clearly the reasons, as he had with other texts. Ælfric wanted to give an abridged version of the passion merely because he needed to shorten a lengthy (and at times admittedly repetitious) text to fit into the time allotted to a homily, and of course as was his wont so often, altered the text to reflect his own themes more suitably. In this case, as DeGregorio argues, his chosen theme was to present Peter and Paul as super-sanctified in comparison with the original text. This does not mean, however, that Ælfric viewed the original text as heretical. DeGregorio alludes to the mention of gedwyld (heresy) in contrast to the teachings of ða geleaffullan lareowas (the faithful teachers) in the introductory portion of Catholic Homily I, 26, as though it is evidence that Ælfric was anticipating the heretical nature of the apocryphal text he was about to relate. However, rather than interpreting these as references to heresy in the content of the Passio, they should be viewed in the context of the actual story, Peter’s and Paul’s combat against Simon, a notorious heretic. In his discussion of Matthew 16.13–19, Ælfric does mention false teaching several times, for example referring to leahtras and dwollic lar (‘sins and false teaching’); leasra
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53 Ibid. p. 97.
goda (‘false gods’); “leasan wenan dweligendran manna” (‘the false thought of erring men’); and mislicum gedwylde (‘various errors’) in contrast to Peter’s soðan geleafan (‘true belief’).54 The references to false doctrine and their contrast with the foundation of the church, Peter, are setting up the context for the story of Simon the heretic, and the main point of the Passio, that “swa hwa swa oðscyt fram annysse ðæs geleafan ðe Petrus ða andette Criste, þæt him ne bið getiðod naðor ne synna forgufenys ne infær ðæs heofenlican rices” (‘whosoever goes astray from the unity of the faith which Peter then confesses to Christ, to him will be given neither forgiveness of sins, nor entrance into the kingdom of heaven’).55 Simon is the one who went astray and to whom forgiveness could not be granted. The Passio demonstrates this principle, and although Peter and Paul felt sadness (in the Latin and Blickling texts) that they had to destroy Simon, they had no choice but to fell him. I see no textual evidence to suggest that Ælfric viewed any aspects of the Passio as heretical; rather he endorsed the text by retelling it in three separate works (ÆCHom I, 26, II, 19 and De auguriis), in more detail in Catholic Homily I, 26 than any other Old English source save the Blickling account.

Although Ælfric exhibited no objections to the Passio Petri et Pauli, the lives and passions of apostles, as opposed to other biblical figures or later saints, do present a particularly intriguing problem in the analysis of their standing as apocryphal texts, as Biggs, in his discussion of Ælfric’s presentation of Andrew’s passion, points out.56 They are saints and so their stories could fall under the category of hagiography, yet some details of their lives are recorded in canonical books. Thus, unlike St. George, the details of whose life Bede accepted as orthodox even though he labelled them apocryphal, information in legends about apostles such as Paul is subject to contradiction of biblical writings and thus may fall into the

54 ÆCHom I, 26, pp. 389–90.
55 ÆCHom I, 26, p. 391.
category of heresy. Further, it is ambiguous whether tales of the apostles should fall into the category of New Testament apocrypha, which according to Schneemelcher were, by definition, written before the close of the canon in the fourth century, or hagiography, which he places after the close of the canon and in the time of the rise of the imperial church.\(^{57}\) Biggs proposes that Ælfric may have viewed *vitae* and *passiones* of apostles as a separate genre from lives of other saints, and that the lives of apostles may not originally have been included in collections of saints’ lives. New Testament apocrypha, especially texts about Christ, Mary, and the apostles, as well as apocalypses, were all popular in later Anglo-Saxon England, and were frequently used in homilies\(^{58}\) (for example the *Visio S. Pauli*, the *Passio Petri et Pauli* and the *Transitus Mariae* in the Blickling collection). Biggs suggests, however, that it was Ælfric’s particular innovation to include the *vitae* of apostles in tandem with the pertinent gospel reading in homilies for their feast days, as he did for example with Paul in ÆCHom I, 26, and that this change may have led to their inclusion in the Cotton-Corpus Legendary.

Biggs sees Ælfric’s homiletic pairing of apostles’ *vitae* with gospel readings about them, along with other statements Ælfric makes about accounts of apostles and saints, as evidence that he did not view the *vitae* and *passiones* as sharply distinct from biblical books.\(^{59}\)

Further, Biggs argues that Ælfric did not view his own works in a different category from biblical books, since, according to Biggs, Ælfric believed that Christ’s teaching lives on in all true writings and in the words of faithful teachers. Thus, according to Biggs’ theory Ælfric’s own writings have the potential to be either canonical or apocryphal. Ælfric, Biggs writes, “views himself, in other words, as an apostle and his teaching as continuing the
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\(^{58}\) Biggs, “Introduction and Overview,” p. 23.

godspellican soðfæstnesse (gospel truth),”\textsuperscript{60} quoting Ælfric’s own words in the preface to his first series of Catholic Homilies.\textsuperscript{61} This view is entirely consistent with the findings of chapter four on Ælfric and Paul, in which it became clear that Ælfric viewed himself as an inheritor of Paul’s mission, and was positioning himself as a \textit{deo\textasciitilde{oda} lareow} for the Anglo-Saxons. We also saw his concern lest someone might corrupt his own writings, and “gebringe þa soðan lare to leasum gedwylde” (‘turn true teaching into false heresies’).\textsuperscript{62} Ultimately though, while Biggs seems correct in pointing out Ælfric’s belief that he has a critical role to play in the continuation of the spread of the gospel message and that he is concerned to avoid gedwyld, whether he would actually have equated his own writings with canonical ones seems questionable. He states that his writings should “cyðan ... ða godspellican soðfæstnysse” (‘make known the gospel truth’), not that they are the gospel. Even the term gedwyld may not mean apocrypha in a technical sense, but only heresy in the sense of erroneous, false or unorthodox teaching. Godden assigns the meanings “heresy”, “false belief”, and “folly” to the word gedwyld.\textsuperscript{63} The DOE lists the meanings “theological: error in matters of faith or dogma” and “heresy” for gedwyld, but not the meaning apocrypha.\textsuperscript{64} Perhaps it is presumptuous to assume that when Ælfric uses the word gedwyld to refer to certain writings, he is setting up those writings as apocrypha in contradistinction to canonical texts. It does seem as though he saw himself as continuing the message of the apostles, but he was quite aware of the books of the bible, as, for example, the Letter to Sigewead demonstrates. Moreover, as we saw from

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[60]{Ibid. pp. 476–488, quotation at p. 488.}
\footnotetext[61]{ÆCHom I, Preface, p. 176, “For swylecum bebodum wearð me geðuht þæt ic nære unscyldig wið god gif ic nolde oðrum mannum cyðan oþþe þurh gewritu ða godspellican soðfæstnysse þe he sylf gecwæð” (from such commands, it seemed to me that I would not be unguilty before God if I would not make known to other men either through words or writings the gospel truths which he himself said).}
\footnotetext[62]{Ibid. Preface, p. 177.}
\footnotetext[64]{DOE, http://doe.utoronto.ca, accessed December, 2009.}
\end{footnotes}
looking at Aldhelm’s and Bede’s uses of the word apocrypha, there was some variability as to the exact meaning of the word. Aldhelm seems to have used it only of works he considered heretical, while Bede uses it of both erroneous works and of those he accepted as legitimate. Since there appears to have been no individual word in Old English reserved to designate heretical writings and no precise translation of the word *apocrypha*, not to mention no consensus amongst Anglo-Latin writers as to the meaning of the word *apocrypha*, nor to the texts which received the label, it seems there is unfortunately not enough evidence to be able to determine Ælfric’s opinion of his own works as canonical or apocryphal, beyond the understanding that he wanted to avoid writing anything erroneous, and that he wanted to do his best to protect his works from corruption by others that might turn them into gedwyld.

Ælfric leaves no uncertainty in his writings that he did want to avoid gedwyld, but there has been some disagreement amongst modern Ælfrician scholars as to his criteria for assessing whether or not a text was to be accepted or rejected. Godden, prompted by Ælfric’s statement in the Preface of his first series of Catholic Homilies, “ic geseah and gehyrde mycel gedwyld on manegum Engliscum bocum” (‘I saw and heard much heresy in many English books’), to ask what these English books were and what was wrong with them, concluded that Ælfric was referring to homilies like those in the Blickling and Vercelli collections, and that he objected “not primarily to their theological ideas or their views on religious practices, but rather to their use of sensational narratives which were clearly fictitious and in some cases of dubious morality.” Examples of such passages are the *Visio S. Pauli*, the legend of St.

---

65 ÆCHom I, p. 2.
Andrew among the cannibals, which Ælfric omits, and the Passion of St. Thomas about which Ælfric comments.67

Thomes δρωμυνε we forlætæð unawritene, forðan ðe heo wæs gefyrn awend of Ledene on Englisc on leoð-wison; ac swa-ðeah se wisa Augustinus saede on sumere his trahtmunge, þæt an þing wære ungeleaflic on ðære race geset, þæt is be ðam byrle þe ðone apostol ear-plætte, and be ðam hunde ðe his hand eft inn-abær.”

(Thomas’s passion we leave unwritten because it has long since been translated from Latin into English in the form of a song; but nevertheless the wise Augustine said in one of his writings that one part was put in that story that was not to be believed, that is about the cup-bearer who struck the apostle’s ear, and about the dog which carried his hand in again.)

Ælfric’s comments on these passages led Godden to observe that Ælfric was familiar with “homilies full of apocryphal legends and unorthodox ideas, which he knew well and generally disapproved of,”68 but Godden fails to take into account passions which Ælfric does include, such as much of the passion of Andrew (ÆCHom 1, 38), and the Passio Petri et Pauli to which he expresses no objection and presents it even though it, too, was already well-known in English and some of the tales in it (for example Peter’s and Simon’s miracles, especially the two dog stories) might also be seen as far-fetched. It seems more accurate to say that Ælfric had qualms about certain unorthodox aspects of particular apocryphal legends, rather than that he disapproved of these stories in general.

Other Anglo-Saxons, it seems, did not share Ælfric’s qualms. The writers of several of the Blickling homilies, for example, had no trouble with the Visio, the passion of Andrew, or the Assumption of Mary, nor did the compiler of these homilies object to them. The evidence for the popularity of the Visio and its inclusion and adaptation in homilies, shows clearly that it was accepted by ecclesiastical members (presuming that these texts were written and copied

67 ÆCHom II, 34, p. 298.
by monks and priests). Clemoes argued that Ælfric’s distaste for certain texts and his fear of *gedwyld* reflect a stand for orthodox dogma in the face of an undiscriminating popular theology.⁶⁹

One common feature of the texts Ælfric does eschew, in fact, is their rejection due to a theological error perceived and expressed by earlier church authorities, in particular by Augustine. Like the rejection of the Passion of Thomas by Augustine, the *Visio* was criticised by Augustine due to its presumption to express what Paul claimed to be ineffable. Mary Clayton sees Ælfric’s reliance on authorities such as Augustine as the reason yet again for his condemnation of apocryphal stories of the birth and assumption into paradise of the Virgin Mary,⁷⁰ although she sees his objections as based solely on the weight of tradition, rather than on any particular theological errors.⁷¹ For example, of the assumption narratives, Ælfric asserts:⁷²

> Hwæt wille we eow swiðor secgan be ðisum symbeldæge, buton þæt maria cristes modor wearð on ðisum dæge of ðisum geswincfullum meddanearde genumen up to heofenan rice to hire leofan suna ðe heo on life abær mid ðam heo blissað on ecere myrhðe à to worulde. Gif we mare secgað be ðisum symbeldæge þonne we on ðam halgan bocum rædað þe ðurh godes dihte gesette wæron, þonne beo we ðam dwolmannum gelice, þe be heora agenum dihte oððe be swefnum fela lease gesetnysse awriton. Ac ða geleaffullan lareowas Augustinus, Hieroninus, Gregorius and gehwilce oðre þurh heora wisdom hi towurpon. Sind swa ðeah gyt ða dwollican bec ægðor ge on leden, ge on englisc. And hi rædað ungerade menn.

(What more shall we say about this feast day except that Mary the mother of Christ was on this day taken up from this toilsome world to the kingdom of heaven to her

---

⁷⁰ As with the *VSP* there are various versions of the *Transitus Mariae* dealing with her assumption into paradise, varying in their exact details about the nature and location of paradise, whether it is earthly or heavenly and whether Mary was assumed corporally and resurrected or not. For a more detailed explanation see Mary Clayton, *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1990); Kabir, *Paradise, Death and Doomsday*, pp. 43–9; Mary Clayton, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 25–100.
⁷² ÆCHom II, 29, p. 259.
beloved son whom she bore in this life, with whom she rejoices in eternal happiness
world without end. If we should say more about this feast day than we read in the
holy books which were set down through the dictation of God, then we are like the
heretics, who write many false texts about their own inventions or about their
dreams. But the faithful teachers Augustine, Jerome, Gregory and some others in
their wisdom reject them. Nevertheless, they are still heretical books whether they
are in Latin or in English. And ignorant men read them.)

The paranomasia in the last line, playing on the root *ræd*, highlights the inherent inconsistency
in Ælfric’s mind between reading, which would normally be limited to the well-educated, in
contrast to the ignorance of the uneducated, foolish or ignorant people (*ungerade*), who have
been fooled by heretical texts. This pair of related yet opposite words, along with the mention
of Latin and English in the previous line, points out the danger Ælfric saw in translating
theological texts into English, a danger which he expresses fear of with respect to his own
writings, invoking the name of Paul and his role as God’s assistant:73

Paulus se apostol cwæð; We sind godes gefylstan. And swa ðeah ne do we nan ðing
to gode, buton godes fultume; Nu bydde ic and halsige on godes naman gif hwá þas
bóc awritan wylle þæt hé hi geornlice gerihte be ðære bysene. Þy læs ðe we ðurh
gymelease writeras geleahtrede beon. Mycel yfel deð se ðe leas writ. buton he hit
gerihte.

(Paul the apostle said, “We are the assistants of God, and nevertheless we do nothing
good without the help of God. Now I ask and beg in the name of God, if anyone
copies this book that he will do it carefully according to the model, lest we be guilty
through careless writers. He does great evil who writes false things, unless he
corrects them.)

Texts, such as his biblical translations or homilies, could get into the wrong hands and be
misinterpreted, miscopied or otherwise corrupted. Apocryphal texts written in the vernacular,
such as the *Visio Pauli* or the *Transitus Mariae*, are made accessible to those who would not
be able properly to judge their orthodoxy, and perhaps would not be educated in, nor able to
read in Latin, the opinions of the church fathers such as Augustine on their dangers. Writing in

73 ÆCHom I, Preface, p. 177.
English to make Christian teaching accessible to the English people was something Ælfric obviously believed to be extremely important, and a cause in which he seems to have been the main proponent, yet there were dangers associated with it, in that the ungerade could get hold of the wrong texts and endanger their souls and the souls of others.

Similarly, Ælfric declined to write “be hyre acennednesse forðan þe hyt tocwædon þa wisan lareowas, and be hyre forðsíðe þe ða halgan boceras forbudon to secgenne” (‘about her [Mary’s] birth because the wise teachers forbid it, and about her going forth which the holy books forbid to speak of’). In addition, Clayton proposes that Ælfric refused to write birth narratives about Mary because they were prohibited in the Gelasian Decree. As with the Visio Pauli, so for the Marian narratives, Clayton sees Ælfric as having been more discriminating than many religious in his milieu. Just as the Visio was a popular text for homilies despite Augustine’s and Aldhelm’s condemnation, apocryphal legends about the Virgin Mary appear to have been accepted by the reformed monastic movement in England and read by monks, as evidenced, for example, by an illumination of a scene from apocryphal Marian legends in the Benedictional of Æthelwold. The Blickling collection also attests to the use of both Marian (homily I) and Pauline (homilies IV and XVI) apocryphal legends by composers and compilers of homilies in Anglo-Saxon England only slightly earlier than Ælfric’s time. Thus Clayton sees Ælfric’s censure of Marian legends, and we might add of the Visio S. Pauli, as “atypical of the Reform in general.”

We know that Ælfric is well known for his exceptional concern to avoid gedwyld but what reason did he have for his condemnation of these two particular apocryphal traditions which were accepted by his peers in general? Kabir suggests that his rejection of them may, as

---
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Clayton suggested, be based on Augustine’s opinion, but not simply because he was an authority to whom Ælfric deferred. Rather, Kabir argues that Ælfric followed Augustine on matters of the afterlife because he derived his own theology of heaven and hell from Augustine, who did not favour the model of a paradise separate from the heavenly kingdom, a separation which is a prominent part of the theology of both the Transitus Mariae and the Visio.77 The fact that Ælfric’s condemnation of the Visio mimics Augustine’s, supports Kabir’s conjecture. Both men object to it on the grounds that it contradicts Paul’s statement in 2 Cor. 12.2–4 without giving any explicit theological points of contention. Nevertheless, as Kabir points out, Augustine does address the issue of Paul’s travels to the third heaven in his De Genesi ad litteram, where he allegorizes the three heavens into three sorts of visionary experience, the corporal, the spiritual and the intellectual.78 Kabir shows that Ælfric, too, tried to eliminate the distinction between different levels of heaven by using the words neorxnawang (the usual word for paradise), rice (kingdom) and ece life (eternal life) synonymously in the Life of St. Martin. After studying Ælfric’s uses of the various terms for locations in the afterlife, Kabir concludes: 79

In Ælfric’s writing, therefore, paradise is firmly associated with the location of heaven and the bosom of Abraham, and, through this association, with a battery of scriptural citations, to convey precisely the opposite of what a reader might extrapolate from the Visio and the Transitus Mariae: the synonymy of paradise and heaven in the context of the soul’s fate after death.

Thus it may be that Ælfric was not so much relying on the authority of Augustine as an ecclesiastical leader to determine his stance regarding the Visio and the Marian apocryphal texts, as he was reacting against these texts because they were contrary to his theological

77 Kabir, Paradise, p. 15.
78 Ibid. p. 24.
beliefs about the afterlife, beliefs which he had developed from Augustine’s own stance. There is also no need to limit Ælfric to only one method of assessing whether a text was heretical or not, and indeed it seems unrealistic to try to do so. Biggs argues that Ælfric was not necessarily opposed to apocryphal sources but was concerned to avoid texts which perverted the bible.80 Clayton’s position is that he relied on the weight of authority in his use of sources.81 Kabir views him as using specific theological grounds to assess a text based on his own developed ideology.82 He may have used all three of these methods at various times, or considered them all together to make a judgment. In any case, he was unlikely to have had a predefined ‘rule’ for textual evaluation. With respect to the Pauline apocrypha, though, the Visio had no chance of gaining Ælfric’s approval on any of the grounds discussed above. It was condemned by church authorities, namely Augustine and Aldhelm, and it ran contrary to the received Augustinian position (favoured by Ælfric) that paradise should not be separated from the heavenly kingdom. Finally, it contradicted scripture by voicing what Paul claimed to be ineffable. The Passio Petri et Pauli, on the other hand, was not condemned by church authorities, did not contradict scripture, and did not contain any heterodox content, thus rendering it acceptable to Ælfric.

The plethora of textual attestations to the use of both the Visio S. Pauli and the Passio Petri et Pauli provide ample evidence of the popularity of these texts for use by homilists and preachers. The Visio revealed details of the afterlife which people were hungry for, and which preachers could use to fuel their exhortations and spur on their congregations to religious obedience and reform. The Passio supplied further information about two favourite apostles and a notorious heretic in the form of exciting and sensationalistic tales. Ælfric clearly

82 Kabir, Paradise, p. 15.
objection to the *Visio*, but it is perhaps revealing to realize that if his opinion of the text had not been preserved, our impression of the reception of this text in late Anglo-Saxon England would lie overwhelmingly in favour of its popularity and acceptance. As for the *Passio*, not even Ælfric could find fault with it. Paul was a popular figure in Anglo-Saxon England and the increasing interest in apocalyptic texts about him throughout the period show that people did not in any way limit themselves to finding out about him from the bible. On the contrary, they embraced information about him whether it was biblical or extra-canonical.
Chapter 8: Conclusion

This study has focussed on the figure of the Apostle Paul as he is depicted through worship and literature in Anglo-Saxon England. Paul was a figure of veneration in Anglo-Saxon religious praxis, appearing as the subject of prayers, hymns, and church dedications from the very onset of Christianity in England. Establishing a connection with early Church figures such as Mary, Peter, and Paul helped to forge a link with Roman Christianity, thus cementing the legitimacy of the Church in England. Interest in the Apostle Paul, however, went beyond this practical level, extending into all forms of Anglo-Saxon literature, where he appears in many capacities.

The introductory chapter touched briefly on the use of Pauline epistles by Bede and Aldhelm as examples of writers who took advantage of his letters as a rich mine of quotations for teaching in various contexts. Paul’s epistles, eminently practical and quotable, could be drawn upon to support almost any argument a theologian made, and as such can be found as the source, often acknowledged, just as frequently not, behind many an argument in Anglo-Saxon literature. Paul’s letters to the Corinthians were especially popular, as we saw, for example, by their use in Aldhelm’s teaching on virginity for the nuns at Barking, and by Alfred’s quotation of 1 Corinthians 3 in the Old English Soliloquies. I have deliberately avoided dwelling at length on isolated Pauline quotations since the focus of the current study is on Paul as a literary figure; however there is much work which could be done in this area, as there are most certainly many as yet unidentified Pauline references behind Anglo-Saxon literary texts. While authors often acknowledged their debt to Paul when they quoted from his letters, there are likely even more cases in which a writer was inspired by a Pauline text, but
does not quote it closely enough to signal it or for it to be immediately recognizable to the modern reader (many of whom may be less well versed in biblical lore than the medieval reader or listener). One new source discovery in this area has been documented here, Alfred’s use of 1 Cor. 3.9–14 as the likely inspiration for the building metaphor in his translation of Augustine’s *Soliloquies*. Another example of a recently discovered Pauline antecedent to an Anglo-Saxon text is found in Tristan Major’s observation of an allusion to 1 Corinthians 15 in the addition of the phrase *an eagan bryhtm* (‘the twinkle of an eye’) to the Old English version of Bede’s famous simile of the sparrow in the second book of his *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹ Yet another example of unacknowledged Pauline material as the source of an Anglo-Saxon text is Biggs’ identification of a string of Pauline epistolary material, including 1 Cor. 6.9–10, which lies behind a description of the fate of sinners at Doomsday in *Christ III* 1609–12.²

Beyond the use of verses from Paul’s letters as endless sources of inspiration for writers, however, Paul himself functioned as a representative figure to be imitated: as the first four chapters of the study have shown, he was an exemplary virgin and athlete for Aldhelm; a suffering missionary, source of authority, and font of solace for Boniface; a *sapiens architectus* for Alfred; and a model teacher for Ælfric. Perhaps the character of the Apostle Paul became so appealing to readers of his letters because he is one of the few biblical figures who is accessible through first person accounts of his own experiences. His conversion, struggles, victories and heartaches while trying to spread the message of Christianity, eloquently expressed in a full range of emotions, are poignantly recorded at the very time when he was suffering them, in the earliest days of Christianity, something which cannot be
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said of the gospels, which were written some generations after Jesus’ time. Boniface, going through similar struggles to Paul’s, identified his own feelings with Paul’s as expressed in his epistles, and in turn wrote letters about his own missionary challenges. Thus Boniface could worry with Paul, “Ne forte in vacuum curramus aut cucurrissemus,” (‘Lest we run or have run in vain’; Galatians 2.2), and could find with Paul *virtus in infirmitate* (strength in infirmity; 2 Cor. 12.9). Paul’s letters were additionally appealing to writers because they are stylistically among the more sophisticated books of the New Testament, as any new reader of Koine Greek can attest. Paul himself was a writer, and thus writers such as Boniface and Ælfric could relate to him on this level.

In addition to the appeal of Paul as a character viewed through his letters, the second part of this study discusses apocryphal texts about his life which added to his mystique and popularity. The martyrdom of Peter and Paul and the *Visio Sancti Pauli* were two quite different apocryphal traditions about Paul which became widespread in late Anglo-Saxon England. Their preservation in several forms and texts, ranging from the Latin poetry and prose of Aldhelm to several Old English homiletic texts, speaks to a level of general familiarity with these traditions. As discussed in chapters five and six, however, it appears, based on comparison of texts, that in addition to the manuscripts which have come down to us, Anglo-Saxon writers, especially Ælfric and the Blickling homilist, must have had access to other, no longer extant, recorded versions of the stories. Further work could indeed be done in order to add to our understanding of the complex relationships amongst these texts. Paul’s experiences as revealed in apocryphal texts seem to have been highly appealing to homilists as teaching and exhortational tools. The *Visio* was not considered orthodox by all but circulated.

---
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widely nonetheless, as evidenced by its numerous redactions and the many ways in which it influenced a variety of Anglo-Saxon texts. Ælfric’s statement that the *passio* of Peter and Paul is everywhere set forth in English, suggests that apocryphal traditions about Paul were widespread in Anglo-Saxon England in written form, but one might also infer that they were common knowledge, hinting at the existence of a strong oral tradition.

Anglo-Saxon homilists seemed to perceive the appeal of these traditions and the enticing details they provided as especially strong for the laity, and the Benedictine Reform emphasis on lay instruction may be a reason behind their popularity. Concern for the perceived approach of the end times may also have influenced the popularity of such traditions. Lionarons sees the interpolation of the Simon Magus episode into Wulfstan’s *De temporibus antichristi* as a sign that Christians felt a need to learn how to deal with the arrival of false prophets as the time of the apocalypse approached. The Wulfstan interpolator concluded his retelling of the wickedness of Simon Magus by warning:

Ge magan þeah be þissum anum geçnawan þa he ðurh deofol swilcne cræft hæfde ongean swylce gödes þegnas swylce wæs sanctus petrus 7 sanctus paulus, æthweg hit bìð þonne se deofol sylf cymð þe ana cann eall ðæt yfel 7 ealle þa drycraeftas þe æfre ænig man æfre geleornode.

(You may know by this alone what he [Simon], through the skill of the devil, did against such servants of God such as Saint Peter and Saint Paul, how it will be when the devil himself comes, he who alone knows all the evil and all the sorcery which any man ever learned.)

Ælfric, too, in *De auguriis*, used the example of Simon to warn against the wiles of the devil. Likewise, the *Visio S. Pauli*, especially as it appeared in later redactions with a focus on hellish torments, served as a warning of evils to come for those who were not believing Christians. Thus, Paul in the apocryphal texts served as an example to

---

encourage people to be aware of coming dangers and to remain strong against them, just as he did.

Whether Anglo-Saxons viewed Paul through the window of his letters, a view which provided a first hand account of his experiences as a missionary, writer and teacher, through visions of his heavenly travels, or through tales of his martyrdom, they saw a figure with whom they could identify, and who could inspire imitation, education, and exhortation. As Paul wrote about himself, for Anglo-Saxons he did indeed become *omnibus omnia* (‘all things to all men’, 1 Cor. 9.22).
Appendix A: The Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli,

with a Modern English Translation

The following appendix consists of the *Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli* (BHL 6657) as it is printed in Latin in Lipsius and Bonnet’s edition,¹ followed by my own modern English translation.

**Passio Sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli**

1 Cum venisset Paulus Romam, convenerunt ad eum omnes Iudaei dicentes: Nostram fidem, in qua natus es, ipsam defende. Non est enim iustum, ut eum sis Hebraeus ex Hebrais veniens, gentium te magistrum iudices, et incircumcisorum defensor factus tu cum sis cricuncisus, fidem circumcisionis evacues. Cum ergo Petrum videris, suscipe contra eius doctrinam, quia omnem observationem nostrae legis evacuavit, exclusit sabbatismum et neomenias et legitimas ferias exinanivit.

2 Quibus Paulus respondit: Me Iudaeum esse et verum Iudaeum, hine poteritis probare, cum et sabbatum observare et circumcisionem vere poteritis advertere. Nam sabbato die requievit ab omnibus operibus deus. Nos habemus patres et patriarchas et legem. Quid tale

praedicat Petrus in regno gentium? Sed et si forte aliquam vult introducere novam doctrinam, 
sine conturbatione et sine invidia et sine strepitu nuntiate ei, ut nos videamus, et in vestro 
conspectu illum ego convincam. Quod si forte doctrina eius fuerit vero testimonio et 
Hebraeorum libris munita, decet nos omnes oboedire ei.

3 Haec et his similia dicente Paule perrexerunt Iudaei ad Petrum et dixerunt ei: Paulus ex 
Hebraeis venit, rogat te ut venias ad eum, quoniam hi qui eum adduxerunt dicunt non eum se 
possit dimittere, ut videat quem vult, antequam eum Caesari insinuent. Audiens haec Petrus 
gaudio gavisus est magno et statim exsurgens perrexit ad eum. Videntes autem se prae gaudio 
fleverunt et in amblexibus suis diutissime morati invicem se lacrimis infuderunt.

4 Cumque Paulus illi omnem textum suorum casuum indicasset et qualiter navigii 
fatigationibus advenisset et Petrus dixisset illi, quas a Simone mago pateretur insidias, 
abscessit Petrus ad vesperum, mane die altero reversurus.

5 Cumque aurora diei daret initium, ecce Petrus adveniens invenit multitudinem 
Iudaeorum ante fores Pauli. Erat autem inter Iudaeos Christianos et gentiles infinita 
conturbatio. Iudaei enim dicebant: Nos genus sumus electum regale amicorum dei, Abrahae, 
Isaac et Iacob et omnium prophetarum, cum quibus locutus est deus, quibus ostendit mirabilia 
magna et secreta sua. Vos autem ex gentibus, nihil in semine vestro magnum, nisi in idolis et 
sculptilibus inquinati et execrabiles extitistis.

6 Haec et his similia dicentibus Iudaeis, gentes respondebant dicentes: Nos mox ut 
audivimus veritatem, reliquimus errores nostros et secuti eam sumus. Vos autem et paternas 
virtutes scistis et prophetarum signa vidistis et legem accepitis et mare pedibus siccis 
transistis, et inimicos vestros demersos vidistis et columna nubis vobis per diem in caelo 
apparuit et ignis per noctem, et manna vobis de caelo data est, et de petra vobis aquae
fluxerunt: et post omnia haec idolum vobis vituli fabricastis et adorastis sculptile. Nos autem nulla signa videntes credimus deum hunc, quem vos non credentes dereliquistis.

7 Haec et his similia contententibus dixit apostolus Paulus, non debere eos has contentiones inter se suscipere, sed hoc magis adtendere, quia complesset deum promissa sua, quae iuravit ad Abraham patrem nostrum, quod “in semine eius hereditarentur omnes gentes”: ‘non est enim personarum acceptio apud deum. quicumque enim in lege peccassent, secundum legem iudicarentur; qui vero sine lege deliquissent, sine lege perirent’. Est enim in humanis sensibus tanta sanctitas, ut bona laudet naturaliter et puniat mala, quae inter se invicem cogitationes aut accusantes puniat aut remaneret excusantes.

8 Haec et his similia Paulo dicente factum est ut mitigati essent et Iudaei et gentes. Sed principes Iudaeorum insistebant. Petrus vero his qui eum arguebant, quod synagogas eorum interdiceret, dixit: Audite, fratres, sanctum spiritum promittentem patriarchae David, quod de fructu ventris eius poneret super sedem suam. Hunc ergo cui dixit pater de caelis: ‘Filius meus es tu, eo hocie genui te’, hunc crucifixerunt per invidiam principes sacerdotum. Ut impleret autem redemptionem necessarium saeculo, permisit se haec omnia sustinere, ut sicut ex costa Adae fabricata est Eva, sic ex latere Christi in cruce positi fabricaretur ecclesia, quae non haberet maculam neque rugam.

10 Haec et his similia dicentibus Petro et Pauli pars maxima populorum credidit, et perpauci fuerunt, qui non crediderunt, qui et ipsi simulata fide, non tamen aperte possent eorum neglegere monita vel praecepta. Videntes autem maiores synagogarum et gentium pontifices sibi per praedicationem eorum finem specialiter fieri, egerunt hoc ut sermo eorum in murmurationem populi veniret. Unde factum est ut Simonem magum Neroni praeferrent et istos culparent. Innumerabiles enim populi dum converterentur ad dominum per praedicationem Petri, contigit etiam uxorem Neronis Liviam et Agrippae praefecti coniugem nomine Agrippinam ita converti, ut a latere se suorum maritorum auferrent. Per Pauli vero praedicationem multi deserentes militiam adhaerebant deo, ita ut etiam ex cubiculo regis venirent ad eum, et facti Christiani nollent reverteri ad militiam neque ad palatium.

11 Hinc populis seditiosam murmurationem agentibus Simon excitatus est in zelum, et coepit de Petro multa mala dicere, dicens eum magum esse et seductorem. Credebant autem illi hi qui mirabantur signa eius. Faciebat enim serpentem aereum movere se et lapideas statuas et aereas ridere et movere. Se ipsum autem currere et subito in aëre videri.

12 Contra haec Petrus infirmos curabat verbo. Caecos videre faciebat orando, daemonia iussu fugabat, interea et ipsos mortuos suscitabat. Dicebat autem ad populum, ut ab eius seductione non solum fugerent, sed etiam detegerent eum, ne viderentur diabolo consentire.

13 Sicque factum est ut omnes religiosi viri execrantes Simonem magum, sceleratum eum adsererent; Simoni vero adhaerentes Petrum magum, quod ipsi erant cum Simone, falso testimonio adfirmarent. Qui sermo usque ad Neronem Caesarem venit; et Simonem magum ut ad se ingrederetur praecipit.

14 Qui ingressus coepit stare ante illum et subito mutare effigies, ita ut fieret subito puer et posthaec senior, altera vero hora adolescentior. Mutabatur sexu, aetate, et per multas figuras

15 Tunc ingressus ad Neronem Simon dixit: Audi me, bone imperator. Ego sum filius dei, qui de caelo descendii. Usque modo Petrum qui se dicit apostolum solum patiebar; nunc ergo geminatum est malum. Paulus denique qui et ipse eadem docet et contra me sentit, simul dicitur cum eo prae dicare. Quos constat quia nisi de interitu eorum cogitaveris, regnum tuum stare non poterit.


17 Nero dixit: Deus omnem hominem monet et diligit; tu quare eos persequeris? Simon dixit: Istud hominum est genus, qui totam Iudaeam perverterunt, ne mihi crederent. Nero ad Petrum ait: Quare tam perfidi estis vos vel genus vestrum? Tunc Petrus ad Simonem ait: Omnibus inponere potuisti, mihi autem numquam; ipsos autem quos deceperas, per me deus de suo errore revocavit. Et cum expertum tibi sit, quod me superare non possis, miror qua fronte in conspectu regis te iactes, ut putes per artem tuam magicam Christi discipulos superare.

18 Nero dixit: Quid est Christus? Petrus dixit: Hic est, quem hic Simon magus se esse adfirmat; hic autem est homo nequissimus et opera eius diabolica. Si autem vis scire, bone
imperator, quae gesta sunt in Iudaea de Christo, accipe litteras Pontii Pilati missas ad
Claudium, et ita cognoscis omnia. Nero autem iussit eas accipi et in suo conspectu recitari.
Examplar epistolae.

19 Pontius Pilatus Claudio suo salutem. Nuper accidit quod ipse probavi, Iudaeos per
invidiam se suosque posteros crudeli condemnatione punisse. Denique cum promissum
haberent patres eorum quod illis deus eorum mitteret de caelo sanctum suum, qui eorum rex
merito diceretur, et hunc se promiserit per virginem missurum ad terras,
is itaque me praeside in Iudaea Hebraeorum deus cum venisset, et vidissent eum
ciaecos inluminasse, leprosos mundasse, paralyticos curasse, daemones ab hominibus fugasse.
Mortuos suscitasse, imperasse ventis, ambulasse siccis pedibus super undas maris et multa alia
mirabilia fecisse: cum omnis populus Iudaeorum dei filium hunc esse dicerent, invidia contra
eum ducti sunt principes sacerdotum et tenuerunt eum et mihi tradiderunt, et alia pro aliis mihi
de eo mentientes dixerunt, istum magum esse et contra legem eorum agere.

20 Ego autem credidi ita esse et flagellatum tradidi illum arbitrio eorum. Illi autem
crucifixerunt eum et sepulto custodes adhibuerunt. Ille autem militibus meis custodientibus die
tertio resurrexit. In tantum autem exarsit nequitia Iudaeorum, ut darent pecuniam eis dicentes:
Dicite quia discipuli eius corpus ipsius rapuerunt. Sed cum accepissent pecuniam, quid factum
fuerit tacere non potuerunt. Nam et illum resurrexisse testati sunt se vidisse, et a Iudaeis
pecuniam accepsisse. Haec ideo ingessi ne quis aliter mentiatur, et existimes credendum
mendariis Iudaeorum.

21 Cumque perlecta fuisset epistola, Nero dixit: Dic mihi, Petre, ita per illum omnia gesta
sunt? Petrus ait: Ita, non te fallo; sic enim est, bone imperator. Hic Simon plenus mendaciis et
fallaciis circumdatus, ut putet se qui homo est, etiam hoc esse quod deus est. In Christo enim
est omnis summa victoria per deum et hominem, quem adsumpsit illa maiestas
incomprehensibilis, quae per hominem hominibus dignata est subvenire. In isto autem Simone
sunt duae substantiae, hominis et diaboli, qui per hominem conatur hominibus inpedire.

23 Simon dixit: Miror te, bone imperator, hunc te alicuius momenti existimare, hominem
inpritum, piscatorem, mendacissimum, et nec in verbo nec in genere nec in aliqua praeditum
potestate. Sed ne diutius hunc patiar inimicum, modo praecipiam angelis meis, ut veniant et
vindicent me de isto. Petrus dixit: Non timeo angelos tuos, illi autem me poterunt timere in
virtute et confidentia Iesu Christi domini mei, quem te esse mentiris.

24 Nero dixit: Non times, Petre, Simonem qui divinitatem suam rebus adfirmat? Petrus
dixit: Divinitas in eo est qui cordis rimatur arcana. Dicat nunc mihi quid cogito vel quid facio.
Quam cogitationem meam, antequam hic mentiatur, prius tuis auribus insinuo, ut non audeat
adferri panem ordeaceum et occulto dari. Cumque hoc iussum fuisset occulte adferri et dari
Petro, Petrus dixit: Dicat nunc Simon, quid cogitatum, quid dictum, quidve sit factum.

25 Nero dixit: Vis ergo ut credam quia haec Simon ignorat, qui et mortuum suscitavit et se
ipsum decollatum post diem tertium repraesentavit, et quicquid dixit ut faceret, fecit? Petrus
dixit: Sed coram me non fecit. Nero dixit: Sed me adstante haec omnia fecit. Nam et angelos
iussit ad se venire, et venerunt. Petrus dixit: Ergo si quod maximum est fecit, quare quod
minus est non facit? Dicat quid cogitaverim et quid fecerim. Nero dixit: Quid dicis, Simon?
Ego me inter vos non convenio. Simon dixit: Petrus dicat, quid cogitem vel quid fecerim.

26 Simon dixit: Hoc scias, bone imperator, quia cogitationes hominum nemo novit nisi
unus deus. Ceterum Petrus mentitur. Petrus dixit: Tu ergo, qui filium dei te esse dicis, dic quid
cogitem; quid fecerim modo in occulto, si potes, exprime. Petrus enim benedixerat panem quem acceperat ordeaceum et fregerat et dextera atque sinistra in manica collegerat.

27 Tunc Simon indignatus quod dicere non posset secretum apostoli, exclamavit dicens: Procedant canes magni et devorent eum in conspectu Caesaris. Et subito apparuerunt canes mirae magnitudinis et impetum fecerunt in Petrum. Petrus vero extendens manus in orationem, ostendit canibus eum quem benedixerat panem; quem ut viderunt canes subito nusquam conparuerunt. Tunc Petrus dixit ad Neronem: Ecce ostendi tibi scisse me quid cogitaverit Simon, non verbis, sed factis; nam qui angelos promiserat contra me esse venturos, canes exhibuit, ut se ostenderet nos divinos angelos sed caninos habere.


31 Simon dixit: Credis, bone imperator, quia magus sum, eum mortuus fuerim et resurrexerim? Egerat enim perfidus Simon praestigio suo, ut diceret Neroni: Iube me decollari in obscuro et ibidem dimitti occisum, et si non tertia die resurrexero, scias me magum fuisse: si autem resurrexero, scias me esse filium dei.

32 Et cum hoc fieri iussisset Nero, in obscuro egit arte magica ut aries decollaretur; qui aries tamdiu Simon visus est quamdiu decollaretur. Decollatus autem in obscuro, eum scrutatus fuisset, qui eum decollaverat, et caput eius protulisset ad lumen, invenit caput berbicinum; sed nihil voluit regi dicere, ne se ipsum detegeret qui iussus fuerat hoc in abditis perpetrare. Hinc ergo dicebat Simon, se die tertia resurrexisse. Quia caput et membra berbicis tulerat, sanguis vero ibidem congelaverat. Et tertia die ostendit se Neroni et dixit: Fac sanguinem meum qui effusus est extergi: quia ecce qui decollatus fueram, sicut promisi, die tertia resurrexi.

33 Cum ergo dixisset Nero: Crastinus dies vos probabit; conversus ad Paulum ait: Tu Paule, quare nihil loquieris? Aut quis te docuit aut quem magistrum habuisti, aut qualiter in civitatibus docuisti, vel quales exstituerunt per tuam doctrinam? Puto enim nulam te habere sapientiam, nec virtutem aliquam posse perficere. Paulus respondit: Putas me contra hominem perfidum et desperatum magum maleficum, qui animam suam morti destinavit, cuius interitus et perditio cito adveniet, debere loqui? Qui fingit se esse quod non est, et arte magica hominibus ad perditionem inludit?
34 Huius tu verba si volueris audire vel fovere eum, perdes animam tuam et imperium tuum. Hic enim homo pessimus est, et sicut Aegyptii magi Iamnes et Mambres qui Pharaonem et exercitum eius miserunt in errorem, quousque demergerentur in mari: sic et hic per patris sui diaboli peritiam hominibus persuadet et multa mala facit per nicromantiam et cetera mala, si qua sunt apud homines, et sic multos incautos seducit ad temptationem imperii tui.

35 Ego autem verbum diaboli, quod per hunc hominem diffundi video, gemitibus cordis mei ago cum spiritu sancto, ut cito possit ostendi quid sit. Nam quantum se exaltari putat ad caelos, tantum demergetur in infernis inferioribus, ubi est fletus et stridor dentium.

36 De doctrina autem magistri mei, de qua me interrogasti, non eam capiunt, nisi qui fidem mundi pectoris adhibuerint. Nam quaecumque sunt pacis et caritatis, ea docui: per circuitum ab Hierusalem usque Illiricum replevi verbum pacis.

38 Haec autem mihi doctrina non ab hominibus neque per hominem aliquem data est, sed per Iesum Christum et patrem gloriae, qui mihi de caelo locutus est. Et dum me mitteret ad praedicationem dominus meus Iesus Christus, dixit mihi: ‘Vade et ego ero in te spiritus vitae omnibus credentibus in me; et omnia quaecumque dixeris aut feceris ego iustificabo’.

39 Nero his auditis obstupuit et conversus ad Petrum dixit: Tud quid dicis? Et Petrus ait: Omnia quaecumque locutus est Paulus vera sunt. Nam multi anni sunt, per quos accepi litteras ab episcopis nostris, qui sunt in universo orbe romano, et paene omnium civitatum episcopi scripserunt mihi de fatis et dictis eius. Nam cum persecutor esset legis Christi, vox eum de caelo vocavit et docuit veritatem, quia non erat per invidiam inimicus fidei nostrae sed per ignorantiam. Fuerunt enim ante nos pseudochristi, sicut est Simon, fuerunt et pseudoapostoli, fuerunt et pseudoprophetae, qui contra sacros apices venientes evacuare studuerunt veritatem. Et contra hos necesse erat agere hunc virum, qui ex infantia sua nihil aliud studii gesserat, nisi divinae legis scrutari mysteria, in quibus hoc didicerat, ut defensor veritatis et persecutor existeret falsitatis. Quia ergo persecutio eius non ex aemulatione fiebat, sed ex defensione legis, ipsa veritas eum de caelo adlocuta est dicens ei: ‘Ego sum veritas quam defendis: cessa me persequi, quia ego ipsa sum pro qua videris dimicare contra inimicos veritatis.’ Ergo cum cognovisset ita esse, deseruit quod defendebat et coepit defendere hanc quam persequebatur semitam Christi, qui est via pure ambulantibus, veritas nihil fallentibus et vita credentibus sempiterna.

40 Simon dixit: Bone imperator, intellege conspirationem horum duorum adversum me. Ego enim sum veritas et isti adversum me sapiunt. Petrus dixit: Nulla veritas in te est, sed ex solo mendacio omnia ista dicis et facis.
41 Nero dixit: Paule tu quid dicis? Paulus dixit: Quae a Petro audisti, hoc et a me dictum crede. Unum enim sentimus, quia unum habemus dominum Iesum Christum. Simon dixit: Putas me, bone imperator, cum his habere disputationem, qui adversum me consensum fecerunt? Et conversus ad apostolos dei dixit: Audite, Petre et Paule; si hic vobis nihil possum facere, veniemus ubi vos oportet me iudicare. Paulus dixit: Bone imperator, vide quales nobis minas ostendit. Petrus dixit: cur non inrides hominem vanum et alieni capitis, qui ludificatus a daemoniis putat se manifestari non posse?


49 Simon dixit: Audi, Caesar Nero, ut scias istos falsos esse et me de caelis missum: crastina die ad caelos vadam, ut hos qui mihi credunt beatos faciam; in istos autem qui me negare ausi sunt iram meam ostendam. Petrus et Paulus dixerunt: Nos olim vocavit deus ad gloriam suam; tu autem a diabolo vocatus ad tormenta festinas.

50 Simon dixit: Caesar Nero, audi me. Istos insanos a te separa, ut dum venero ad patrem meum in caelis, possim tibi esse propitius. Nero dixit: Et unde hoc probamus quia in caelum vadis? Simon dixit: Iube turrim excelsam fieri ex lignis et trabibus magnis, ut ascendam in illam; et cum in illam ascendero, angeli mei ad me in aëra venient: non enim in terra inter peccatores ad me venire possunt. Nero dixit: Volo videre, si imples quod dicis.

51 Tunc Nero praecepit in campo Martio turrim excelsam fieri et praecepit ut omnes populi et omnes dignitates ad istud spectaculum convenirent. Altera vero die in omni hoc conventu iussit Nero Petrum et Paulum ad hoc spectaculum praesentari, quibus sic ait: Nunc habet veritas apparere. Petrus et Paulus dixerunt: Non enim nos eum detegimus, sed dominus noster Iesus Christus, filius dei, quem hic se ipsum esse mentitus est.


caelum ascendo mittam ad te angelos meos et faciam te ad me venire. Nero dixit: Fac ergo, quae dicis.


56 Et aspiciens contra Simonem Petrus dixit; Adiuro vos, angeli Satanae, qui eum in aëra fertis ad decipiendum hominum infidelium corda, per deum creatorem omnium et per Iesum Christum quem tertia die a mortuis suscitavit, ut eum ex hac hora iam non feratis, sed dimittatis illum. Et continuo dimissus cecidit in locum qui Sacra Via dicitur, et in quattuor partes fractus quattuor silices adunavit, qui sunt ad testimonium victoriae apostolicae usque in hodiernum diem.

Nero dixit: Suspecto animo me esse fecistis ideoque vos malo exemplo perdam. Petrus dixit:
Non quae tu sis, sed quod promissum est nobis, necesse est consummari.

58 Tunc Nero dixit ad praefectum suum Agrippam: Homines inreligiosos necesse est male
perdere, et ideo cardis ferreis acceptis iubeo eos in Naumachia consumi et omnes huiusce
modi homines male consummari. Agrippa praefectus dixit: Sacratissime imperator, non congruenti
exemplo iubeo eos puniri. Nero dixit: Quare? Agrippa dixit: Quoniam Paulus innocens videtur;
Petrus autem homicidii reus est, insuper et inreligiosus. Nero dixit: Ergo quo exemplo
peribunt? Agrippa praefectus dixit: Ut mihi videtur, iustum est Paulo inreligioso caput
amputari: Petrum autem eo quod insuper homicidium perpetraverit, iube eum in cruce levari.
Nero dixit: Optime iudicasti.

59 Et deducti sunt Petrus et Paulus a conspectu Neronis. Paulus decollatus est in via
Ostiensi.

60 Petrus autem dum venisset ad crucem ait: Quoniam dominus meus Jesus Christus de
caelo ad terram descendens recta cruce sublimatus est, me autem quem de terra ad caelum
evocare dignatur, crux mea caput meum in terra debet ostendere, et pedes ad caelum dirigere:
ergo quia non sum dignus ita esse in cruce sicut dominus meus, girate crucem meam. At illi
verterunt crucem et pedes eius sursum fixerunt, manus vero deorsum.

61 Convenit autem innumerabilis multitudine maledicentes Caesarem Neronem, ita fure
pleni ut vellent ipsum Caesarum incendere. Petrus autem prohibebat eos dicens: Ante paucos
dies rogatus a fratribus abscedebam, et occurrat mihi dominus meus Jesus Christus, et adoravi
eum et dixi: Domine, quo vadis? Et dixit mihi: Sequere me, quia vado Romam iterum
Quousque introducam te in domum patris mei.

63 Statim ibi apparuerunt viri sancti, quos unquam nemo viderat ante nec postea videre potuerunt. Istri dicebant se propter ipsum de Hierosolymis advenisse, et ipsi una cum Marcello, inlustri viro, qui crediderat et relinquens Simonem Petrum secutus fuerat, abstulerunt corpus eius occulte et posuerunt sub terebinthum iuxta Naumachiam in locum qui appellatur Vaticanus.

64 Ipsi auem viri qui se dicebant de Hierololymis advenisse, dixerunt ad omnem populum: Gaudete et exultate, quia patronos magnos meruistis habere et amicos domini Iesu Christi. Sciatis autem hunc Neronem regem pessimum post necem apostolorum regnum tenere non posse.

65 Accidit autem post haec ut odium exercitus sui et odium populi Romani incurreret; ita statuerunt ut publice cathomis tamdiu caederetur, quousque ut erat meritus expiraret. Quodcum pervenisset ad eum consilium, inruit in eum tremor et metus intolerabilis, et ita fugit ut ulterius non apparuerit. Extiterunt autem qui dicerent, in silvis dum erraret fugiens frigore nimio et fame diriguisse et a lupis esse devoratum.

66 Sanctorum autem apostolorum dum a Graecis corpora tollentur ad Orientem ferenda, extitit terrae motus nimius. Et occurrit populus Romanus et comprehenderunt eos in loco, qui dicitur Catacumba via Appia miliario tertio; et ibi custodita sunt corpora anno uno et
mensibus septem, quousque fabricarentur loca in quibus fuerunt postia corpora eorum et illic revocata sunt cum gloria hymnorum et posita sancti Petri in Vaticano Naumachiae et sancti Pauli in via Ostiensi miliario secundo; ubi praestantur beneficia orationum in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

The Passion of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul

1 When Paul had arrived in Rome, all the Jews came to him saying, “Defend our faith into which you were born, for it is not fair that when you are a Hebrew coming from the Hebrews, you proclaim yourself a teacher of the Gentiles, and having made yourself a defender of the uncircumcised when you have been circumcised, you make the faith of circumcision void. When therefore you see Peter, speak against his doctrine because he has laid aside every observation of our law, he has excluded the Sabbath and new moon observations and cancelled lawful holidays.

2 Paul responded to these things, “In this way you will be able to prove that I am a Jew and a true Jew, when you are able to observe both the Sabbath and circumcision truly. For on the Sabbath day God rested from all his works. We have our fathers and patriarchs and the law. What sort of thing does Peter preach in the kingdom of the Gentiles? But also if by chance he wants to introduce some new doctrine, without disturbance and without jealousy and without a din announce it to him so that we may see, and I will refute him in your
presence. Because if by chance his doctrine is a true testimony and is fortified by the books of the Hebrews, it is fitting for all of us to obey it.”

3 While Paul was saying these and similar things, the Jews approached Peter and said to him, “Paul from the Hebrews has come, he is asking that you come to him, because those who are leading him say he is not able to send so that he may see whom he wants, before they bring him in to Caesar.” Peter hearing these things rejoiced with great joy and immediately getting up, went to him. When they saw each other they wept with joy and for the longest time remained in each others’ arms and wet each other with tears.

4 And when Paul had told Peter the whole story of his misfortunes, how he had arrived after the fatigues of the ship and Peter had told him what plots he was suffering from Simon the magician, Peter departed in the evening, about to return on the following day.

5 And when the beginning of day came, behold Peter, arriving, found a multitude of the Jews in front of Paul’s door. Now there was a great disturbance between the Christian Jews and Gentiles. For the Jews were saying, “We are the royal, chosen people of the friends of God, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and all of the prophets, with whom God spoke, to whom he showed great miracles and his own secrets. But you from the Gentiles, there is nothing great in your seed but you have been contaminated by idols and statues and you have been accursed.”

6 After the Jews had said these and similar things, the Gentiles responded saying, “As soon as we heard the truth we abandoned our errors and followed it. But you and your fathers knew the virtues and you saw the signs of the prophets and received the law and you crossed the sea with dry feet, and you saw your enemies drowned and columns of cloud appeared in

2 Probably referring to the shipwreck described in Acts 27–28.
the sky for you throughout the day and columns of flame by night, and manna was given to you from the sky, and water flowed from the rock for you; and after all these things you created for yourselves the image of a heifer and you worshiped the statue. But we, seeing no signs, believed in this god, whom you abandoned, not believing.

7 While they were arguing these and similar things, the apostle Paul said they ought not to take up these arguments between each other, but rather should to attend to this, namely that God had fulfilled his promises which he had promised to Abraham our father, that “in his seed all the Gentiles would be adopted. For there is no esteeming of persons with God. For whoever had sinned in the law would be judged according to the law. But whoever had sinned without the law, would perish without the law.” For there is such great holiness in the human senses that it naturally praises good things and punishes evil, which in its own thoughts it either accusing, punishes or excusing, rewards.

8 Paul’s saying these and similar things caused both the Jews and Gentiles to be appeased. But the leaders of the Jews were persisting. But Peter said to those who were arguing against him because he was outlawing their synagogues, “Hear brothers the holy spirit promising the patriarch David that he would place someone from the fruit of your womb over his own seat. Therefore the one to whom the father said from the heavens, ‘You are my son, I have borne you today,’ the leaders of the priests crucified through treachery. So that he might fulfill the necessary redemption for ever, he permitted himself to undergo all these things, so that just as from the rib of Adam Eve was fabricated, so out of the side of Christ placed on the cross the church would be made, which would not have a spot or blemish.

9 “God opened this doorway for all the sons of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, so that they would be in the faith of the church and not in the faithlessness of the synagogue.
Therefore convert and enter into the joy of Abraham your father, because what God promised to him he has fulfilled. Whence also the prophet sang, ‘The Lord promised and he will not repent of it, you are a priest in eternity according to the order of Melchisedech.’ For he was made a priest on the cross when he showed the burnt offering of his own body and blood as a sacrifice for all eternity.”

10 When Peter and Paul had said these and similar things, a very large part of the crowd believed and there were very few who did not believe who also with pretended faith, nevertheless were not able openly to neglect their warnings and precepts. But the elders of the synagogues and the priests of the Gentiles seeing that their preaching would be the end of them in particular, caused their message to come into the murmuring of the people. Whence it happened that they brought Simon Magus to Nero and they blamed them [Peter and Paul]. For while innumerable people were converted to the Lord through the preaching of Peter it happened that Livia, the wife of Nero, and Agrippina, the spouse of the prefect Agrippa, were converted in this way, with the result that they removed themselves from their husbands’ sides. Indeed through the preaching of Paul many, deserting the army, were adhering to God, so that even from the bedroom of the king they were coming to him, and having been made Christians, they did not want to be returned to the army nor to the palace.

11 Thence, while the people were making a seditious murmuring, Simon was stirred up in zeal and began to say many evil things about Peter, calling him a magician and a deceiver. But those who were amazed at his signs believed him. For he was making an airy serpent move and stony and airy statues laugh and move and himself run and suddenly appear in the air.

12 Peter, on the other hand, cured the ailing with a word. He made the blind see by praying, he expelled demons by a command, and all the while he was reviving the dead. But
he was saying to the people not only that they should flee from his [Simon’s] deception but also that they should wipe him away lest they seem to consort with the devil.

13 And so it happened that all religious men were cursing Simon the magician, calling him a criminal. But the followers of Simon were calling Peter a magician, which those who were with Simon were affirming with false testimony. These accusations reached Nero Caesar and he ordered Simon the magician to approach him.

14 When he had entered he began to stand before him and suddenly to change form, so that he became suddenly a boy and afterwards an old man, but at another time a youth. He was changed in sex, age and ranted in many forms by the ministry of the devil. When Nero saw this he thought Simon was truly the son of God. But the apostle Peter was saying he was a thief, a liar, a magician, shameless, a criminal, an apostate and in all things which are commands of God an adversary of the truth and nothing would overcome him except that by the command of God, his manifest iniquity should be revealed before all.

15 When he had gone in to Nero, Simon said, “Hear me good emperor, I am the son of God, who has descended from heaven. Until now I have been putting up with Peter, who calls himself the only apostle; but now the evil is doubled. At last Paul, who also teaches the same thing and who judges against me, is reported to preach at the same time as him. It is the truth that unless you plan their elimination your kingdom will not be able to stand.”

16 Then Nero, abounding with fear, hurriedly ordered that they be led to him. But on the next day when Simon the magician and the apostles of Christ, Peter and Paul, entered in to Nero, Simon said, “These are the disciples of that Nazarene, for whom now it is not so well that they are from the people of the Jews. Nero said, “What is Nazareth?” Simon said, “It is a
city in Judea, which always acts against you. It is called Nazareth, and their master came from it.”

17 Nero said, “God instructs and loves every man. Why do you persecute them?” Simon said, “That man is the kind who perverted all of Judea, so that they would not believe me.” Nero said to Peter, “Why are you or your kind so treacherous?” Then Peter said to Simon, “You were able to trick them all, but never me. But those whom you have deceived, God has recalled from their error through me. And since it has been proven to you that you are not able to overcome me, I am amazed that you, with such boldness throw yourself in front of the king, as if you think that through your magical art you are able to overcome the disciples of Christ.”

18 Nero said, “What is Christ?” Peter said, “He is the one whom Simon the magician affirms himself to be, but he is the most evil man, and his works are devilish. But if you want to know, good emperor, what the deeds of Christ in Judaea are, have the letter of Pontius Pilate which was sent to Claudius, and thus you will know all.” Nero ordered the letter to be received and recited in his presence. Here is the letter:

19 Pontius Pilate sends greetings to Claudius. Recently it happened, which thing I myself have attested to, that the Jews, through treachery, punished themselves and their ancestors with a cruel condemnation. And finally when their fathers had promised that their God would send them his own holy one from heaven, who would be called their king by merit, and he promised that he would send this fellow to earth by means of a virgin,³

³ The Latin text breaks off here with an incomplete sentence, while the Greek text on the facing page continues (Lipsius and Bonnet, p. 137). The Latin resumes in the next paragraph.
And so, when I was ruling, the God of the Hebrews himself came into Judea, and they saw him give sight to the blind, cleanse lepers, heal paralytics, expel demons from people, raise the dead, command the winds, walk with dry feet over the waves of the sea and do many other amazing things. Since all the Jewish people were saying that he was the son of God, the chief priests were prompted by jealousy against him, seized him and handed him over to me and they said this and that about him to me, lying, saying that he was a sorcerer and acted contrary to their law.

Now I believed it to be so, and I handed him over to be beaten according to their judgment. But they crucified him and placed guards at his tomb. But he rose up on the third day, while my soldiers were guarding [the tomb]. The wickedness of the Jews burned so greatly that they gave money to the guards saying, “Say that his disciples took his body.” But when they had received the money which had been given, they were not able to be silent. For they attested that they had seen him alive again and had received money from the Jews. Therefore I have poured forth these things lest anyone else lie, and you think the lies of the Jews ought to be believed.

Now when the letter had been read, Nero said, “Tell me, Peter, were all these things done by him in this way?” Peter said, “Yes, I am not lying to you. For it is so, good Emperor. This Simon, filled with lies and surrounded by deception, thinks that he, who is a man, is what God is. For in Christ every highest victory is through God and man, which that incomprehensible majesty took on, which it was worthy to take up through man for men. But in that fellow Simon there are two substances, of man and of the devil, who through a man tries to hinder men.”
23 Simon said, “I am amazed at you, good Emperor, that you consider this fellow of any importance, this ignorant man, a fisherman, the worst liar, and neither in word, nor in rank, nor in any power foretold. But so that I don’t have to suffer this enemy any longer, now I command my angels to come and liberate me from him.” Peter said, “I do not fear your angels, but they can fear me in the strength and confidence of my lord Jesus Christ, whom you lyingly claim to be.”

24 Nero said, “Peter, do you not fear Simon, who affirms his own divinity with actions?” Peter said, “Divinity is in him who searches the mysteries of the heart. Now let him tell me what I am thinking or what I am doing. I will whisper what I am thinking in your ears before this fellow makes something up, so that he does not dare to make up what I am thinking.” Nero said, “Come here, and tell me what you are thinking.” Peter said, “Let Simon now tell what was thought, what said, what is to be done.”

25 Nero said, “Do you wish me then to believe that Simon does not know these things, who both raised the dead, and presented himself again on the third day after being beheaded, and whatever he said that he would do, he did?” Peter said, “But he did not do it in front of me.” Nero said, “But he did all these things in my presence; for he ordered angels to come to him and they came.” Peter said, “Therefore, if he did what is the greatest thing, why did he not do what is the least? Let him tell what I think and what I do.” Nero said, “What do you say, Simon? I cannot decide between you two.” Simon said, “Let Peter say what I think or what I do.” Peter said, “I will show that I know what Simon is thinking, when I do what he thinks.”

26 Simon said, “You know this, good Emperor, that no one knows the thoughts of men except the one God. Peter is inventing the rest.” Peter said, “You then, who say you are the son of God, say what I think; what I do now in secret, if you are able, reveal.” For Peter had
blessed barley bread which he had received, and broke it and gathered it in his right and left sleeves.

27 Then Simon, angry that he was not able to tell the secret of the apostle, exclaimed, saying, “Let large dogs come forth and devour him in the presence of Caesar.” And suddenly dogs of amazing size appeared and launched an attack on Peter. But Peter, extending his hands in prayer, showed the dogs the bread which he had blessed. When the dogs saw it suddenly they were nowhere to be seen. Then Peter said to Nero, “Look, I have shown you that I knew what Simon thought, not with words but with deeds; for he who promised angels would come against me produced dogs, with the result that he has shown he does not have divine angels but canine angels.”

28 Then Nero said to Simon, “What is it Simon? I think we have been conquered.” Simon said, “He did these things to me both in Judea and in all of Palestine and Caesarea, and by fighting against me often he learned that this was contrary to them. He learned this so that he could evade me. For no one knows the thoughts of men except the one God.” And Peter said to Simon, “Certainly you pretend that you are God. Why then do you not reveal the thoughts of everyone?”

29 Then Nero turned to Paul and said, “Why do you say nothing, Paul?” Paul answered, “Know this, Caesar, that if you release that sorcerer to do such things, great evil will increase for your country, and your kingdom will fall from its status.” Nero said to Simon, “What do you say, Simon?” Simon said, “Unless I demonstrate openly that I am God, no one will show me the veneration I deserve.” Nero said, “So why now do you delay and not show that you are God, so that these fellows may be punished?”
Simon said, “Order a high tower to be made out of wood, and let me climb up it, and I will call my angels and command them to carry me aloft in the sky to my father in the sight of all. Since those men are not able to do this, you will prove that they are ignorant.” Now Nero said to Peter, “Do you hear, Peter, what Simon has said? From this it will appear how great a power either this man or your God has.” Peter said, “Great Emperor, if you would like, you are able to understand that he is filled with a demon.” Nero said, “Why do you make for me a labyrinth of words? Tomorrow he will test you.”

Simon said, “Will you believe, good Emperor, that I am a sorcerer when I have died and been resurrected?” For the treacherous Simon had acted by his own magic, and said to Nero, “Order me to be beheaded in darkness and the severed head to be sent away at the same moment and if on the third day I have not arisen again, you will know that I am a magician. But if I have risen again, you will know that I am the son of God.”

And when Nero had commanded this to be done, he (Simon) caused in secret, by magical art, that a ram be beheaded; which ram, while Simon was visible, was being decapitated at the same time. But it was beheaded in the dark and when he examined it who had beheaded it and had brought its head to the light, he found the head of a wether; but he wished to say nothing to the king, lest he should reveal him who had ordered this to be perpetrated in secret. So Simon said that on the third day he had risen because he had taken the head and members of the wether where the blood had congealed. And on the third day he showed himself to Nero and said, “Make my blood which was poured out be wiped away, because look I who was beheaded have been resurrected on the third day.”

So when Nero had said, “Tomorrow he will show you,” having turned to Paul he said, “You, Paul, why do you say nothing? Who taught you, or whom did you have as a teacher, or
what sort of thing did you teach in the cities, or what sort of teachings are in your doctrine?
For I think you have no wisdom, nor are you able to accomplish any goodness.” Paul answered, “Do you think that I ought to speak against this treacherous man, this desperate evil magician, who has destined his own soul to death, whose death and perdition will arrive soon? Who has pretended that he is something he is not and who has fooled men by magical art for their perdition?

34 “If you are willing to hear his words or to support him, you will lose your soul and your empire. For this man is the worst and just as the Egyptian magicians Jamnes and Mambres who sent Pharaoh and his army wandering until they drowned in the sea, so also this fellow persuades men through the skill of his father the devil and he does many evil things through necromancy and other evil things, whatever such things there are among men, and so he seduces the many unwary people to the danger of your empire.

35 “But I see the word of the devil which is being poured out through this man. I act by the sighs of my heart with the holy spirit, so that as quickly as possible I have shown what he is. For as much as he thinks to exalt himself to the heavens, to that extent he will be drowned in the infernal depths, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

36 “But concerning the teaching of my master, about which you have asked me, no one receives it except those who hold the faith of a pure heart. For whatever there are of peace and love, I taught them; throughout the route from Jerusalem to Illyricum, I replenished the word of peace.

37 “I taught that people should love one another. I taught that they should come before one another with honour. I taught the famous and rich not to extol one another and to hope in the uncertainty of riches, but to place their hope in God. I taught the middle classes to be
content with their food and dress. I taught the poor to rejoice in their poverty. I taught fathers to teach their sons the discipline of the fear of God. I taught sons to obey their parents and beneficial admonitions. I taught landowners to pay tribute with care. I taught businessmen to pay taxes to the government. I taught wives to love their husbands and to fear them as masters. I taught husbands to be faithful to their wives, just as they want them to preserve modesty in every way. For just as a husband punishes an adulterous wife, so God, the father and creator of all things, himself punishes the adulterous husband. I taught masters that they should deal with their slaves mildly. I taught slaves to serve their masters faithfully as they should serve God. I taught the churches of believers to worship the one omnipotent, invisible, and incomprehensible God.

38 “But these teachings were not given to me by people nor by any man, but through Jesus Christ and the father of glory, who spoke to me from heaven. And when he sent me to preach my Lord Jesus Christ, he said to me, ‘Go and I will be the spirit of life in you for all those believing in me; and all the things which you say or do, I will justify.’”

39 Nero was stunned when he heard these things, and having turned to Peter said, “What do you say?” And Peter said, “All the things which Paul has said are true. For there are many years in which I have received letters from our bishops, who are in the whole Roman empire, and the bishops of nearly all of the cities have written to me about his deeds and words. For when he was a persecutor of Jesus Christ, a voice called him from heaven and it taught him the truth, because he was not an enemy of the faith through malice but through ignorance. There were before us pseudo-christs, just as Simon is, there were also pseudo-apostles, and there were pseudo-prophets, who coming against the sacred doctrines were eager to make the truth seem empty. And against these it was necessary for this man to work, who from his
infancy had done nothing other than learn how to scrutinize the mysteries of divine law, among which he had learned this, that he should be a defender of the truth and a persecutor of falsehood. Therefore, since his persecution came not from rivalry but from a defence of the law, the truth itself spoke to him from heaven, saying, ‘I am the truth which you are defending. Stop persecuting me, because I am the one on behalf of whom you seem to struggle against the enemies of the truth.’ Therefore when he knew it to be so, he stopped what he was defending and began to defend the path of Christ which he had been persecuting, which is the way for those walking in purity, the truth for those telling no lies, and eternal life or those believing.”

40 Simon said, “Good emperor, understand the conspiracy of these two against me. For I am the truth and they rave⁴ against me.” Peter said, “There is no truth in you, but out of mendacity alone you say and do all things.”

41 Nero said, “Paul, what do you say?” Paul said, “The things which you have heard from Peter, believe also to have been said by me. For we are in agreement, because we have one lord Jesus Christ.” Simon said, “Do you consider me, good Emperor, to have this dispute with them, who have acted together against me?” And having turned to the apostles of God, he said, “Listen Peter and Paul; if I am able to say nothing against you here, let us go where it is fitting for you to judge me.” Paul said, “Good Emperor, see what sort of threats he shows us.” Peter said, “Why do you not ridicule the vain man and seize him as a foreigner, who, tricked by demons, thinks he is not able to be revealed?”

42 Simon said, “I am sparing you until I show my strength.” Paul said, “As if you are about to depart from here whole.” Peter said, “Unless Simon sees the strength of our lord Jesus

⁴ The verb in Lipsius and Bonnet’s text at this point is sapiunt; however, as one of the manuscripts attests to the reading saeviunt and this makes more sense in the context, I have chosen to accept this latter reading.
Christ, he will not believe that he is not Christ. “Simon said, “Most holy Emperor, do not believe them, because they are the ones who are circumcised and circumcise.” Paul said, “Before we recognized the truth, we believed in the circumcision of the flesh; but when the truth appeared by the circumcision of the heart we are circumcised and we circumcise.” Peter said, “If circumcision is evil, why are you circumcised?”

43 Nero said, “So Simon is also circumcised?” Peter said, Otherwise he was not able to deceive souls, unless he pretended he was a Jew and showed he was teaching the law of God.” Nero said, “You, Simon, as I see, lead with zeal and therefore you pursue them. For there is, as I see, a great zeal between you and their Christ, and I am wary lest you are proven wrong by them and you seem to be consumed by great evils.” Simon said, “You are seduced, Emperor.” Nero said, “What do you mean, ‘you are seduced’? This thing which I see in you I say, evidently you are the adversary of Peter and Paul and their teacher.”

44 Simon said, “Christ was not the master of Paul.” Paul said, “He taught Peter in person, he instructed me through a revelation. For since he accuses us of being circumcised, let him say himself why he is circumcised.” Simon said, “Why do you ask me this?” Paul said, “There is a reason that we are asking you.” Nero said, “Why are you afraid to respond to them?” Simon said, “Because circumcision was commanded by God at the time when I received it.”

45 Paul said, “Hear, good Emperor, what Simon has said? If then circumcision is good, why then do you hand us over for being circumcised, and why do you force us to be killed hastily?” Nero said, “But neither do I feel good about you.” Peter and Paul said, “Whether you feel good or badly about us does not matter. For it is necessary for us that what our master promised should happen.” Nero said, “What if I do not desire it?” Peter said, “It is not what you want but what he promised us.”
46 Simon said, “Good Emperor, these men cheat your clemency and embarrass you.” Nero said, “But neither have you yet convinced me about yourself.” Simon said, “With so many good deeds and signs demonstrated to you by me, I am amazed that you yet seem to doubt.” Nero said, “I neither doubt nor agree to anything of yours, but rather answer what I ask.”

47 Simon said, “I will say nothing to you at the moment.” Nero said, “You say this because you are pretending. And if I am able to do nothing to you, God, who is able, will do it.” Simon said, “I am not going to answer you now.” Nero said, “But I do not think you are anything, for I think you are a liar about everything. But what else? All three have shown your inconstant soul, and so you have made me doubt you in everything, so that I do not know whom I am able to believe.”

48 Peter said, “I preach that there is one God the father in Christ the saviour, with the holy spirit, the creator of all things, who made heaven and earth, the sea and all which are in them, who is the true king and of whose kingdom there will be no end.” Nero said, “Who is the king, the lord?” Paul said, “The Saviour of all the peoples.” Simon said, “I am he of whom you speak.; and know, Peter and Paul, what you want will not happen to you, namely that I think you worthy of martyrdom. Peter and Paul said, “things will never turn out well for you, Simon Magus, who are filled with bitterness.”

49 Simon said, “Hear, Caesar Nero, as you know these men are false and I was sent from the heavens. Tomorrow I will go to the heavens, so that I may bless those who believe in me. But I will show my anger to those who dare to deny me.” Peter and Paul said, “God once called us to his own glory; but you, called by the devil, hasten to torments.”
50 Simon said, “Caesar Nero, hear me. Separate yourself from those insane men, so that when I go to my father in the heavens, I am able to be favourably disposed towards you.” Nero said, “And how do we prove that you are going into heaven?” Simon said, “Order a high tower to be made out of wood and large beams so that I may ascend it; and when I ascend it, my angels will come to me in the air. For they are not able to come to me on earth among sinners.” Nero said, “I want to see if you will fulfil what you say.”

51 Then Nero commanded a high tower to be built in the campus Martius and commanded that all the people and all the dignitaries attend the spectacle. On the next day in this whole gathering, Nero ordered Peter and Paul to be present at this spectacle, to whom he spoke thus, “Now the truth has to appear.” Peter and Paul said, “We are not disclosing him, but our lord Jesus Christ, the son of God, whom he pretended he himself is.”

52 And Paul, having turned to Peter said, “It is my place to pray to God on bent knees, it is your place to pray if it seems to you he tries anything, because you were chosen first by the lord.” And with his knees bent, Paul prayed. Peter looking at Simon said, “Begin what you have started; because both your discovery and our calling approach. For I see Christ calling me and Paul.”

53 Nero said, “And where will you go against my will?” Peter said, “Where our lord summons us.” Nero said, “Who is your lord?” Peter said, “The Lord Jesus Christ, whom I see calling us.” Nero said, “So will you both go into heaven?” Peter said, “Where it pleases him who calls us.” Simon said, “So that you may know, Emperor, that those men are liars, as soon as I ascend into heaven, I will send my angels to you and I will make you come to me.” Nero said, “Do then, what you say.”
Then Simon ascended the tower in the presence of all, and with his hands extended and his head crowned with laurel, he began to fly. When Nero saw that he spoke thus to Peter, “That man Simon is true but you and Paul are deceivers.” To which Peter said, “Without delay you will know that we are the true disciples of Christ, and this man is not Christ but a sorcerer and an evil-doer.” Nero said, “Do you still persist? Look, you see him going into heaven.”

Then Peter, looking at Paul said, “Paul, raise your head and see.” And when Paul had raised his head, his eyes having filled with tears, and he saw Simon flying, he said, “Peter why do you stop? Complete what you have begun. For already our lord Jesus Christ is calling us.” And Nero hearing these things smiled and said, “Now they see themselves overcome and they are raving.” Peter said, “Now you will attest that we are not raving.” Paul said to Peter, “Do now what you were doing.”

And looking up towards Simon, Peter said, “I command you, angels of Satan, who support him in the air in order to deceive the hearts of unfaithful men, through God the creator of all and through Jesus Christ whom he raised from the dead on the third day, not to hold him up from this hour, but to release him.” And suddenly having been released, he fell into the place which is called the Sacra Via, and having broken into four pieces, he united four stones which are a testimony to the apostolic victory to this day.

Then Nero made Peter and Paul be held in chains; but the body of Simon he commanded to be carefully guarded for three days, thinking that he would be resurrected on the third day. Peter said to him, “He will not rise now, since he is truly dead and condemned to eternal punishment.” Nero said to him, “Who permitted you to do such a crime?” Peter said, “It was his dispute and if you understand, it is much better for him that he perish, lest he bear

---

5 The verb here is adunavit, for which one manuscript witness attests instead cruore madidavit (he wetted with gore).
such great blasphemies to God that he multiply his own punishment.” Nero said, “You have made me suspicious and so I will destroy you as an evil example.” Peter said, ‘Not what you want but what was promised to us must be completed.”

58 Then Nero said to his prefect Agrippa, “It is necessary for impious men to die badly, and so I order that with iron poles taken up, they be killed in Naumachia and that all men of this sort should have a bad end.” Agrippa the prefect said, “Most holy Emperor, you command that they be punished in an unsuitable manner.” Nero said, “Why?” Agrippa said, “Because Paul seems innocent; but Peter is a person charged with homicide, and above all is impious.” Nero said, “Then in what manner should he die?” Agrippa the prefect said, “It seems to me that it is just for the head of the impious Paul to be cut off, but order Peter, because he above all committed murder, to be raised on a cross.” Nero said, “You have judged very well.”

59 And Peter and Paul were led away from the presence of Nero. Paul was beheaded in the Ostensian Way.

60 But Peter when he had come to the cross said, “Since my lord Jesus Christ, who descended from heaven to earth was raised upright on the cross, but he deigned worthy to call me from earth to heaven, my cross ought to stretch out my head towards the earth, and direct my feet to heaven. Since I am not worthy to be on the cross in the same way as my lord, turn my cross.” So they turned the cross and fastened his feet upwards and his hands downwards.

61 But an innumerable crowd gathered, cursing Caesar Nero, so filled with fury that they wanted to burn Caesar himself. But Peter prevented them saying, “A few days ago, having been asked by the brothers, I was departing, and my lord Jesus Christ met me, and I worshiped him and said, ‘Lord, where are you going?’ And he said to me, ‘Follow me because I am going again to Rome to be crucified.’ And when I followed him, I returned to Rome. And he
said to me, ‘Do not be afraid, because I am with you, until I lead you to the house of my father.’

62 “And so, little sons, do not impede my way. Now my feet walk the heavenly way. Do not be sad, but rejoice with me, because today I arrive at the fruits of my labours.” And when he had said these things, he said, “Thank you, good shepherd, because the sheep which you gave me have compassion on me. I ask that they be partakers of your grace with me. I commend to you the sheep which you gave me, that they who hold to you, through whom I was able to rule this flock, not feel that they are without me.” And saying these things, he sent out his spirit.

63 Immediately there appeared holy men, whom no one had ever seen before, nor were ever able to see afterwards. They were saying that they had come from Jerusalem on account of him, and they together with Marcellus, a famous man who had believed and abandoning Simon had followed Peter, took his body in secret and placed it under the terebinth near Naumachia in a place which is called the Vatican.

64 But these men who said they had come from Jerusalem said to all the people, “Rejoice and exult, because you deserve to have great patrons and friends of the lord Jesus Christ. But you should know that this dreadful king Nero, after the death of the apostles, is not able to hold his kingdom.”

65 But it happened after these things that he incurred the hatred of his army and of the Roman people; so they stated that he should at last be beaten publicly on the shoulders until, as he deserved, he died. When the plan had come to him a tremor rushed upon him and an intolerable fear, and so he fled so that he did not appear outside. But there were those who said
that while he was fleeing, when he was wandering in the woods prostrate with excessive cold
and hunger, he was devoured by wolves.

66 But when the bodies of the holy apostles were being carried by Greeks to the East,
there was a great earthquake, and the Roman people met them and carried them into a place
which is called the Catacombs in the third mile of the Appian Way. And there the bodies were
guarded for one year and seven months until places were made in which their bodies were
placed, and there the bodies were placed with the glory of hymns and the body of Saint Peter
placed in the Vatican of Naumachia and the body of Saint Paul in the Ostensian way, in the
second mile, where benefits of prayers are being shown eternally. Amen.
Appendix B

Pauline Citations in Ælfric’s Homilies and Saints’ Lives

The following table lists occurrences in Ælfric’s homilies and Saints’ Lives in which Ælfric quotes from a Pauline epistle and introduces the quotation with Paul’s name. The instances were found by performing a search on the DOE Web Corpus,¹ while Godden’s commentary on the Catholic Homilies² as well as the Fontes database³ were used to assist in identifying the Pauline references. The Catholic Homilies are listed using Clemoes’ (ÆCHom I) and Godden’s (ÆCHom II) numbering system, and for each entry the numbers in brackets are the page and line number of the respective homily in Clemoes’ and Godden’s editions. All the other sources are listed using the DOE short titles and numbering system. The list does not include Pauline quotations which are not cited as Pauline, nor does it include cases in which in which Ælfric claims to be quoting from a Pauline epistle but for which a definitive reference was unable to be identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location in Ælfric’s Text</th>
<th>Pauline Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ÆCHom I, Pref (177.127)</td>
<td>1 Cor. 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆCHom I, 3 (203.140)</td>
<td>1 Cor. 13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆCHom I, 6 (228.113)</td>
<td>Gal. 3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆCHom I, 6 (230.183)</td>
<td>Col. 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆCHom I, 7 (234.63)</td>
<td>Eph. 2.14–17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Godden, *Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*.
ÆCHom I, 8 (244.82) 1 Cor. 5.13
ÆCHom I, 9 (255.191) 1 Tim. 5.6
ÆCHom I, 9 (255.214) 1 Cor. 7.29
ÆCHom I, 13 (282.38) Gal. 4.4–5
ÆCHom I, 13 (288.216) Gal. 3.29
ÆCHom I, 14.1 (295.154) Eph. 1.10
ÆCHom I, 16 (311.126) Eph. 4.13
ÆCHom I,17 (App) (536.39) Phil. 2.21
ÆCHom I,17 (App) (538.100) 2 Tim. 3.12
ÆCHom I,17 (App) (539.145) 1 Tim. 6.10
ÆCHom I,17 (App) (540.157) 2 Tim. 3.1-5
ÆCHom I,18 (323.187) 1 Tim. 6.7
ÆCHom I, 31 (449.295) 2 Cor. 12.7–9
ÆCHom I, 32 (454.95) 1 Cor. 6.15
ÆCHom I, 33 (459.23) Gal. 4.19
ÆCHom I, 34 (471.184) 1 Cor. 14.20
ÆCHom I, 35 (477.31) 1 Cor. 1.24
ÆCHom I, 37 (505.249) 2 Cor. 11.25
ÆCHom I,39 (521.25) Rom 13.11–14
ÆCHom I, 40 (529.131) 1 Thess. 4.16–18
ÆCHom II, 1 (5.91) 2 Cor. 11.2
ÆCHom II, 2 (17.190) 1 Cor. 6.9–10
ÆCHom II, 4 (34.161) Rom. 8.32
ÆCHom II, 12 (116.206) 1 Cor. 10.1–3
ÆCHom II, 15 (155.175) 1 Cor. 10.1–4
ÆCHom II, 15 (157.227) 1 Cor. 10.17
ÆCHom II, 15 (157.233) 1 Cor. 12.27
ÆCHom II, 15 (157.258) 1 Cor. 5.7–8
ÆCHom II, 16 (163.74)  Heb. 13.1–2
ÆCHom II, 19 (188.247)  Heb 12.5–6
ÆCHom II, 20 (190.1)  2 Cor. 12.2,4
ÆCHom II, 22 (208.61)  Rom. 13.1
ÆCHom II, 22 (209.106)  Rom. 1.4
ÆCHom II, 22 (209.111)  Rom. 8.30, Eph. 1.4
ÆCHom II, 23 (214.28)  1 Cor. 10.11
ÆCHom II, 24 (225.123)  1 Cor. 12.27
ÆCHom II, 24 (227.184)  Rom. 15.1
ÆCHom II, 26 (238.89)  Eph. 3.14–19
ÆCHom II, 26 (238.108)  1 Tim. 6.10
ÆCHom II, 28 (252.86)  1 Cor. 4.7
ÆCHom II, 29 (257.80)  1 Cor. 14.38
ÆCHom II, 36 (307.107)  1 Cor. 9.11
ÆCHom II, 39 (329.68)  2 Cor. 1.12
ÆCHom II, 39 (329.81)  2 Cor. 11.2
ÆCHom II, 40 (337.77)  Eph. 2.14
ÆCHom II, 40 (338.98)  1 Cor. 6.19, 3.17
ÆLS, Christmas (191)  1 Cor. 14.15
ÆLS, Forty Soldiers (308)  1 Cor. 3.9
ÆLS, Pr Moses (286)  1 Cor. 10.10
ÆLS, Auguries (1)  Gal. 5.16
ÆLS, Auguries (23)  Gal. 5.19
ÆLS, Auguries (216)  1 Cor. 10.21
ÆLS, Swithun (374)  Rom. 12.20
ÆLS, Maccabees (74)  Titus 1.15
ÆLS, Vincent (328)  Gal. 5.21
ÆHom 1 (107)  1 Cor. 1.24
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