

The Sources of the Pembroke 25 Homiliary

by
Thomas N. Hall

Cambridge, Pembroke College 25 is one of ten surviving manuscripts that preserve at least parts of a sermon collection known as the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres, a collection compiled somewhere in Frankish territory, perhaps in the vicinity of Tours, during the ninth or early tenth century.¹ This collection was first studied in detail by Henri Barré, who named it the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres because the oldest known witness is a manuscript that was once in the possession of the abbey of Saint-Père-en-Vallée at Chartres, where it may have been written in the late tenth or early eleventh century.² However, that Chartres manuscript, which today bears the shelfmark Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, 25, was all but destroyed in 1944 when Chartres was bombed, so scholars interested in this homiliary have had to turn elsewhere to learn about its contents, and it happens that of all the surviving manuscripts, Pembroke 25 provides the fullest and most reliable guide to the original collection.³ The ten surviving manuscripts of the collection can be listed as follows, in rough chronological order, with brief summaries of contents and references to important studies:

1. **Chartres, Bibliothèque municipale, 25, fols. 119–162** (Saint-Père, Chartres, s. x/xi): burned in 1944; the original number of sermons is unknown. The only account of the manuscript's contents published before 1944 appears in the *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome XI: Chartres* (Paris, 1890), p. 12, which reads in its entirety: 'Fol. 119–162. Recueil d'homélies; le début manque. Commencement de la première qui soit complète: "XXXII. Omelia in die sancto Pascels (*sic*). Spiritus Sanctus per prophetam populo Christi . . ." La fin manque, les feuillets 157–162 sont mutilés.' The sermon identified in this description corresponds to Pembroke 25 art. 33, which is rubricated 'xxxii. Omelia in die sancto Paschae' and has the same incipit. The Chartres fragments are newly described by J. E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King's College London Medieval Studies 1 (London, 1987), pp. 45–9.
2. **Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Add. 127/12** (England, s. xiⁱⁿ): a central bifolium containing one complete sermon and the beginning of another (= Pembroke 25 arts. 15 and 16). Described by N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. II: Abbotsford–Keele* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 316–17.
3. **Chicago, Newberry Library, 1** (southwestern France [?Moissac], s. xi¹), formerly Cheltenham, Phillips 1326: a collection of seventy-eight sermons, of which four (arts. 65, 67, 77, 78) are paralleled in the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25 arts. 75, 77, 56–63, 64). Described by H.

¹ The argument for the collection's geographical origin at or near Tours was put forward by Fr. Dolbeau, 'Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge', *Scriptorium* 42 (1988), 255–7.

² H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre*, Studi e testi 225 (Vatican City, 1962), pp. 17–18.

³ On the bombing of Chartres, see R. Joly, 'Bombardement de Chartres, 26 mai 1944', *Bulletin de la Société archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir* 47 (1995), 48–55.

Schenkl, *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica*, 3 vols. in 1 (Vienna, 1891–1908; rpt Hildesheim, 1969), no. 1182; M. P. Cunningham, ‘Contents of the Newberry Library Homiliary’, *Sacris Erudiri* 7 (1955), 267–301; H. Barré, ‘Sermons marials inédits “in Natali Domini”’, *Marianum: Ephemerides Mariologiae* 25 (1963), 39–93, at 50–56; P. H. Saenger, *A Catalogue of the Pre-1500 Western Manuscript Books at the Newberry Library* (Chicago, 1989), pp. 3–9.

4. **London, British Library, Royal 5. E. XIX, fols. 21–36** (Salisbury, s. xi^{4/4}): twelve sermons (= Pembroke 25 arts. 76, 1, 2, end of 27, 77, 29, 34, 36, beginning of 39, 37, 52, 53). Described by G. P. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Royal and King’s Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1921) I, 118; and by T. Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 1992), p. 145.
5. **Cambridge, Pembroke College 25** (Bury St Edmunds, s. xi^{ex} or xi/xii): ninety-six sermons according to the detailed description by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 19–43, who relies on H. Barré, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l’école d’Auxerre*, Studi e testi 225 (Vatican City, 1962), pp. 17–18, for the enumeration of arts. 1–77.
6. **Grenoble, Bibliothèque municipale, 278 (470)** (Grande-Chartreuse, s. xii): ten sermons (= Pembroke 25 arts. 20, 38, 36, 40, 24, 93, 16, 15, 29, and 92). Brief summary of contents without identification of individual sermons in the *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Départements. Tome VII: Grenoble* (Paris, 1889), pp. 112–13.
7. **Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 3794, fols. 18r–31r** (?Germany, s. xii): the Carolingian Homiliary of Beaune, containing 106 sermons in all, of which seven (= Pembroke 25 arts. 15–21) derive from the Saint-Père collection. The manuscript’s contents are thoroughly described by R. Étaix, ‘Le sermonnaire carolingien de Beaune’, *Revue des études augustiniennes* 25 (1979), 106–49, whose study formed the basis for the detailed inventory of contents in the *Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits latins. Tome VII (N^{os} 3776 à 3835): Homéliaires* (Paris, 1988), pp. 155–66.
8. **Cambridge, St John’s College 42 (B. 20), fols. 13r–62v and 70v–71v** (?Worcester, s. xii): fols. 13r–62v contain a set of sixty-five sermons, sixty-three of which derive from the Saint-Père Homiliary (= Pembroke 25 arts. 3–5, 7–27, 29–48, 50–55, and 65–76); then at the beginning of a second set of sermons at fols. 70v–121r there appears a sixty-fourth sermon from the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25 art. 89). Fullest description of the manuscript’s contents, but with very few identifications, by M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of St John’s College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 57–64. The connection between these sermons and Pembroke 25 is discussed by J. E. Cross, ‘Wulfstan’s *De Anticristo* in a Twelfth-Century Worcester Manuscript’, *Anglo-Saxon England* 20 (1991), 203–20, who catalogues the second set of sermons.
9. **Lincoln, Cathedral Library, 199, fols. 213–345** (England, s. xii^{med}–xii^{3/4}): sixty-six sermons total, including sixty-two that derive from the Saint-Père collection (= Pembroke 25 arts. 1–5, 7–27, 29–48, 50, 52–63, 65–7). Thorough description by R. M. Thomson, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Lincoln Cathedral Chapter Library* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 159–61.
10. **Oxford, Balliol College 240, fols. 56–136** (England, s. xiv): ninety-four sermons total (= Pembroke 25 arts. 1–27, 29–48, 50–96). Brief summary of contents but without identification of

individual sermons by R. A. B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford, 1963), p. 261.

The exact contents of the original collection are difficult to determine in part because the contents of the oldest-known manuscript (Chartres BM 25) are now almost entirely lost to us and were in fact already damaged and incomplete before the 1944 bombing, to judge from the 1890 catalogue description, which states that nearly half the collection was missing at that time and the final six folios were *mutilés*. But Barré, relying on the existence of parallel texts in four other manuscripts (Pembroke 25, St John's 42, Royal 5. E. XIX, and Paris lat. 3794), deduced that the original Saint-Père collection must have contained a total of seventy-seven sermons, corresponding to Pembroke 25 arts. 1–77.⁴ This number requires some interpretation since it does not in actuality represent seventy-seven complete and independent sermons. To begin with, Barré overlooked the Easter Sunday sermon at Pembroke 25, fols. 75v–77r, which comes between the texts he numbered arts. 32 and 33; this sermon was later designated art. 32a by Cross in his revised 1987 inventory, bringing the total number of items in this part of the manuscript to seventy-eight.⁵ In addition, three other items that might properly be regarded as individual texts were divided by Barré into multiple sermons to accord with the divisions and numbering in the manuscript: thus the ninth-century sermon for All Saints beginning 'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis' occupies arts. 56–63, while arts. 68–72 comprise a single cluster of (unsourced) moral injunctions, each ending with a separate benediction, and arts. 78–88 consist of a single composite sermon on the canonical hours based on Hrabanus Maurus's *De clericorum institutione*, Gregory the Great's *Regula pastoralis*, and the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*. If we count each of these three groups of lections as a single item, and if we include the omitted art. 32a, then the number of sermons in this part of the manuscript (the part containing Barré's arts. 1–77) drops to fifty-seven (77 + 1 [art. 32a] - 7 [63 - 56] - 4 [72 - 68] - 10 [88 - 78]). In addition, however, one sermon in Pembroke 25, the Palm Sunday sermon which Barré and Cross both designated art. 28, appears only in Pembroke 25 and in no other manuscripts of the collection (and in fact nowhere else that I know of), so that it is entirely possible that this sermon is a late addition to the collection that should not be counted among the original contents of the Saint-Père Homiliary. If so, a renumbering of the conjectured contents of the original Saint-Père collection would take us down to fifty-six sermons.

A further complication is the fact that three later manuscripts of the collection contain sermons that also appear in Pembroke 25 but that *follow* art. 77, which Barré thought marked the outermost limit of the original collection. St John's 42, probably from twelfth-century Worcester, contains a copy of Pembroke 25 art. 89, a 'Predicatio communis omnibus populis' that employs the familiar trope of the seven joys of heaven and a short *ubi sunt* passage, both devices frequently exploited by Anglo-Saxon homilists. Grenoble 278, from twelfth-century Grande-Chartreuse, contains incomplete copies of Pembroke 25 arts. 92 and 93, the first a sermon based on Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 16, and the second a sermon based on Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis*. And most impressively, the fourteenth-century English manuscript Balliol 240 contains a total of ninety-four sermons that match up, sermon for sermon, with every single item in Pembroke 25 save two, omitting only Pembroke 25 arts. 28 and 49, although the index of contents at the beginning of Balliol 240 does include a listing for art. 49, so that Balliol 240 comes very close to replicating the

⁴ Barré was evidently unaware of Canterbury Add. 127/12, Grenoble 278, Lincoln 199, and Balliol 240.

⁵ Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King's College London Medieval Studies 1 (London, 1987), p. 32.

entire contents of Pembroke 25. Without going into detail, it would appear that a likely explanation for the state of the manuscript evidence is that some manuscripts reflect an original Carolingian collection of seventy-seven sermons (according to Barré's numbering), whereas others reflect an expanded collection of ninety-six sermons best represented in English manuscripts. Only Pembroke 25 contains all seventy-seven sermons from the original collection, and only Pembroke 25 contains all ninety-six sermons from the expanded collection, and this is why it is the most important witness to the collection as a whole.

Scholars of Anglo-Saxon England have become increasingly curious about the Saint-Père Homiliary as we have come to realize that several different copies or versions of this collection were in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries which provided the Latin sources behind a number of Old English homilies. As Cross demonstrated in his 1987 monograph on Pembroke 25, the eight Old English homilies known as Assmann Homilies XI and XII, Belfour Homily VI, Tristram Homily III, and Vercelli Homilies III, XIX, XX, and XXI all translate select passages or whole sermons from the Saint-Père collection. These textual relationships can be mapped out as follows:

Assmann Homily XI (*HomS* 13) lines 1–67, 72–9 : P25 art. 20
 Assmann Homily XI (*HomS* 13) lines 79–144 : P25 art. 21
 Assmann Homily XII (*HomS* 16) lines 5–7, 81–158 : P25 art. 23
 Belfour Homily VI (*HomS* 15) 50/1–3, 50/7–52/5, 52/8–23, 54/14–17, 54/25–56/12, 56/23–58/15 : P25 art. 22
 Vercelli Homily III (*HomS* 11.2) [entire] : P25 art. 22
 Tristram Homily III (*HomS* 45) lines 38–48, 66–190, 193–241 : P25 art. 41
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 1–11 : P25 art. 1
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 46–8 : P25 art. 34
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 61–7 : P25 art. 36
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 69–85 : P25 art. 38
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 85–7 : P25 art. 91
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 88–97 : P25 art. 38
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 106–48 : P25 art. 36
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 149–64 : P25 art. 40
 Vercelli Homily XIX (*HomS* 34) lines 173–6 : P25 art. 42
 Vercelli Homily XX (*HomS* 38) lines 28–34 : P25 art. 52
 Vercelli Homily XX (*HomS* 38) lines 35–56 : P25 art. 22
 Vercelli Homily XX (*HomS* 38) lines 57–179 : P25 art. 93
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 1–4 : P25 art. 91
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 20–5 : P25 art. 24
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 29–32 : P25 art. 40
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 43–5 : P25 art. 39
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 48–55 : P25 art. 91
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 57–86 : P25 art. 90
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 87–125 : P25 art. 34
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 239–42 : P25 art. 50
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 242–7 : P25 art. 25
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 249–52 : P25 art. 48
 Vercelli Homily XXI (*HomM* 13) lines 253–6 : P25 art. 42

Collectively these eight Old English homilies translate or paraphrase passages from no fewer than twenty sermons in the Saint-Père collection, corresponding to Pembroke 25 arts. 1, 20, 21, 22, 23,

24, 25, 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 48, 50, 52, 90, 91, and 93. Vercelli XIX and XXI in particular are virtuoso examples of what are often referred to as composite homilies, stitched together from multiple sources. Vercelli XIX is concocted from bits of nine different sermons in the Saint-Père Homiliary; Vercelli XXI draws from eleven.⁶ Most of the Saint-Père sermons consulted by these Anglo-Saxon homilists come from the first half of the collection, but the author of Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI made use of Pembroke 25 arts. 90, 91, and 93, so he must have had access to an expanded version of the collection like that in Pembroke 25 and Balliol 240.

The fundamental questions that we wish we could answer about when and where anonymous Old English homilies were written, by whom and for what purpose, are notoriously resistant to clear and satisfying answers, but these eight Old English homilies probably represent the work not of eight different authors or compilers but just three, since current wisdom holds that the three texts known as Assmann XI and XII and Belfour VI were all probably written by the same author,⁷ whereas Vercelli III was probably written by a different author, and the four homilies known as Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI were all probably written by a third author working in Canterbury in the late tenth century.⁸ It is conceivable that all three homilists were working at the same time and in the same place and had access to the same library resources, but that is not very likely, and it may be more realistic to suppose that these three homilists were writing in different ecclesiastical centers using different materials. If that is the case, then each of these authors had a separate copy of the Saint-Père Homiliary at his disposal, which means that there must have been at least three separate copies of the collection circulating in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries when these eight Old English homilies were written. It may not be possible to pinpoint the actual copies used by each of these homilists, but a plurality of copies in late Anglo-Saxon libraries can be posited and placed in a relative chronology to one another. First, if one of these Old English homilists (the author of Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI) was writing in Canterbury during the pontificate of Archbishop Dunstan between 959 and 988, as Professor Scragg has elegantly argued, then the earliest copy of the Saint-Père Homiliary that we can locate in England was in Canterbury by the 980s. A second witness to the collection that we can place in England is Canterbury, Cathedral Library, Additional 127/12, now a fragment consisting of two folios containing parts of two sermons that date to the early eleventh century.⁹ A third witness is the string of twelve sermons embedded in BL Royal 5. E. XIX, which was produced at Salisbury in the final quarter of the eleventh century.¹⁰ A fourth witness is Pembroke 25 itself, which was written at Bury St Edmunds near the end of the eleventh century, possibly during the abbacy of Baldwin (1065–

⁶ See the source notes in the lower deck of the edition by D. G. Scragg, *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS o.s. 300 (Oxford, 1992), pp. 315–26 and 351–62.

⁷ The common authorship of Assmann XI and XII and Belfour VI (as well as Brotanek Homily II) is asserted without careful demonstration by K. Jost, *Wulfstanstudien*, Schweizer Anglistischer Arbeiten 23 (Bern, 1950), pp. 178–82. Jost's argument is weighed and cautiously accepted by Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 232–5.

⁸ The common authorship of Tristram III and Vercelli XIX, XX, and XXI is convincingly demonstrated by D. G. Scragg, 'An Old English Homilist of Archbishop Dunstan's Day', in *Words, Texts, and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. Korhammer (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 181–92.

⁹ N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. II: Abbotsford–Keele* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 316–17.

¹⁰ G. P. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Royal and King's Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1921) I, 118; T. Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 1992), p. 145.

1097/8). And somewhere in this mix were the two copies of the collection consulted by the author of Vercelli III and the author of Assmann XI and XII and Belfour VI. For over a century before Pembroke 25 was written, in other words, multiple copies or versions of the Saint-Père Homiliary were available in England, and the contents of this collection should therefore be of interest to anyone curious about the Latin ecclesiastical literature that was being copied and read and translated in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

A substantial number of the sources of the collection were identified by Cross in 1987, but a few of his identifications now require qualification or correction. I begin by listing the sources and analogues which Cross identified in his inventory of the manuscript's contents in alphabetical order along with an indication of which articles in the manuscript borrow or quote from each source-text:

- Adomnán, *De locis sanctis* [arts. 31, 50]
 Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis* [arts. 20, 22, 23, 25, 48, 91, 93, 94, 95]
 Alcuin, *De vita s. Martini* [art. 65]
 Alcuin, *Sermo de transitu s. Martini* [art. 66]
 Amalarius, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* [arts. 16, 31]
 Ambrose, *In Lucam* [art. 15]
 Antiphons and Responses, many probably taken from the Pseudo-Gregorian *Liber Responsalis*:
 Hesbert, *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, nos. 1474 [art. 55], 1552 [art. 14], 1553 [art. 14], 1554 [art. 14], 1566 [art. 49], 1768 [art. 14], 1788 [art. 14], 2762 [art. 49], 2925 [art. 15], 3078 [art. 15], 3093 [arts. 5, 7], 3105 [art. 49], 3425 [art. 9], 3678 [art. 14], 3757 [art. 55], 3852 [art. 51], 4079 [art. 41], 4091 [art. 7], 5062 [art. 14], 6129 [art. 1], 6165 [art. 49], 6535 [art. 55], 6715 [art. 55], 6759 [art. 15], 6821 [art. 13], 6826 [art. 55], 6851 [art. 49], 6854 [art. 51], 6858 [art. 7], 6859 [art. 5], 6867 [art. 49], 7068 [art. 7], 7199 [art. 51], 7455 [art. 51], 7569 [art. 7], 7834 [art. 55]
 Apparitio s. Michaelis archangelis (BHL 5956b) [art. 55]
 Augustine, *Sermo* Mai 80 [art. 30]
 Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* [art. 29?, 32a]
 Bede, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* [art. 41]
 Bible [*passim*]
 Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum* [art. 33]
 Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 3 [arts. 1, 24], *Sermo* 13 [arts. 23, 47], *Sermo* 16 [art. 92], *Sermo* 57 [arts. 18, 24, 34], *Sermo* 146 [art. 19], *Sermo* 183 [art. 20], *Sermo* 187 [arts. 2, 3], *Sermo* 188 [arts. 2, 4, 21], *Sermo* 194 [art. 13], *Sermo* 197 [art. 18], *Sermo* 199 [art. 21], *Sermo* 202 [art. 29], *Sermo* 207 [art. 38], *Sermo* 208 [art. 39], *Sermo* 216 [arts. 2, 44], *Sermo* 223 [art. 73], *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]
 Catechesis Celtica [arts. 26, 27, 29]
 Collectio canonum Hibernensis [arts. 1, 22, 25, 37, 78–88, 90, 91]
 Cyprian, *De mortalitate* [art. 63]
 Dynamius Patricius of Marseille, *Epistola ad discipulum* [art. 89]
 Eusebius/Rufinus *Historia ecclesiastica* [art. 35]
 Gildas, *De excidio Britanniae* [art. 90]
 Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew [art. 11]
 Gregory the Great, *Hom. 2 in Evang.* [art. 26], *Hom. 8 in Evang.* [art. 6], *Hom. 12 in Evang.* [art. 76], *Hom. 15 in Evang.* [art. 17], *Hom. 29 in Evang.* [art. 41], *Hom. 30 in Evang.* [art. 43]
 Gregory the Great, *Regula pastoralis* [arts. 78–88]
 Hrabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione* [arts. 22, 31, 32, 43, 48, 78–88]
 Isidore, *Etymologiae* [arts. 54, 55]
 Jerome, *In Mattheum* [arts. 26?, 27?, 30, 33]
 'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis' [arts. 56–63]

Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]
Passio ss. Petri et Pauli (BHL 6657) [art. 45?]
Passio s. Andreae apostoli (BHL 428) [art. 67]
Protevangelium of James (BHL 5342c) [art. 51]
 Pseudo-Abdias *Apostolic Histories* [art. 10]
 Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 112 [art. 12], *Sermo* 123 [art. 7], *Sermo* 136 [arts. 14, 34, 42], *Sermo* 160 [art. 35], *Sermo* 167 [art. 33], *Sermo* 193 [art. 7], *Sermo* 195 [art. 7], *Sermo* 204 [art. 46], *Sermo* 210 [art. 8], *Sermo* 215 [art. 8], *Sermo* 64 *ad fratres in eremo* [art. 20]
 Pseudo-Basil *Admonitio ad filium spiritualem* [art. 90]
 Pseudo-Bede, *Expositio in primum librum Mosis* [art. 30?]
 Pseudo-Bede, *Sermo* 70 [art. 64]
 Pseudo-Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 17 [arts. 1, 30, 34]
 Pseudo-Cyprian, *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* [art. 90]
 Pseudo-Hildefonsus, *Sermo* 4 [art. 15]
 Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 24 [art. 74], *Sermo* 78 [art. 75], *Sermo* 88 [art. 73]
 Pseudo-Melito *Martyrdom of John* (BHL 4320) [arts. 9, 10]
 Sermons in Munich, clm 6233 [arts. 11, 12, 14, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 50]
 Sulpicius Severus, *Vita s. Martini* [art. 65]
 Theodulf of Orleans, *Capitula* [arts. 18, 20, 21, 22, 23]
Transitus Mariae (W recension, BHL 5352b–n) [art. 49]
 Vienna Commentary on Luke [art. 15]
Visio s. Pauli [art. 42?]

Cross was right about most of these, and by any reckoning this is an impressive group of texts that were available to a single author working in the ninth or early tenth century, when the original collection was written.¹¹ That a single author was responsible for at least the vast majority of the first seventy-seven sermons in Pembroke 25 is obvious from the numerous stylistic traits that recur throughout the collection and from the author's habit of employing the same passage from the same source-texts again and again from one sermon to the next. For instance, a passage on the Creed from Caesarius's *Sermo* 3 is quoted in Pembroke 25 art. 1 and again in art. 24. A passage from Book VII of Isidore's *Etymologies* quoted in art. 54 is also quoted in art. 55. The All Saints sermon beginning 'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis' is divided up and used in its entirety for eight sermons from art. 56 to art. 63 and is also briefly quoted in art. 55. Two extracts from the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* quoted in art. 22 are quoted together in art. 37 as well. There is also a very unusual compositional feature that unites many of these sermons in that at least eleven of them quote antiphons and responses from the monastic Office.¹² Cross counted thirty-five antiphons and responses quoted within the collection; at least two more should be added to his tally. Not every sermon in the Saint-Père collection is an original composite sermon produced by our single mystery author. A dozen are wholesale unrevised copies of already-existing sermons (arts. 3, 4, 6, 29, 32a, 38,

¹¹ I hasten to point out that Professor Cross made all of his remarkable source discoveries long before there were any online searchable databases of ancient and medieval texts such as we have today. He made those discoveries by reading widely and remembering what he had read.

¹² Intriguingly, an eleventh- or twelfth-century hand has added a neumed response 'Adiutor meus esto domine ne derelinquas me deus salutaris meus' on a page of the Vercelli Book (fol. 24v) following the conclusion of Vercelli Homily IV: see N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (1957; rpt with a supplement, Oxford, 1990), p. 461 (no. 394 art. 4).

39, 56–63, 66, 74, 76, 77). But the majority do appear to be original compositions by a single individual, and if that is the case, then he was an individual who had access to what by ninth- or tenth-century standards was a formidable library.

What can we say about the nature of that library? For one thing, many of the texts included in it are standard works of Christian instruction or biblical exegesis that were widely available at the time. Amalarius's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, Ambrose on Luke, Augustine on John, Bede on Acts, Cassiodorus on the Psalms, the Eusebius/Rufinus *Ecclesiastical History*, Isidore's *Etymologies*, Jerome on Matthew — all of these are in broad circulation in the ninth and tenth centuries and would have been regarded as requisite reading for anyone who considered himself learned in Christian literature. Of the thirty or so sermons which the compiler had access to, most were standard reading texts for the monastic night Office transmitted in the two great homiliaries compiled in the eighth century by Alan of Farfa and Paul the Deacon.¹³ Seventeen of these texts could have come to the compiler by way of the Homiliary of Alan of Farfa (AF):

- AF I.5 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 195 [art. 7]
- AF I.7 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 123 [art. 7]
- AF I.8 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 193 [art. 7]
- AF I.19 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 210 [art. 8]
- AF I.31 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 112 [art. 12]
- AF I.52 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 199 [art. 21]
- AF I.93 = Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* CXX.1–5 [art. 32a]
- AF II.2 = Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 160 [art. 35]
- AF II.17 = Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]
- AF II.39 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 216 [arts. 2, 44]
- AF II.84 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 187 [art. 3]
- AF II.85 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 188 [art. 4]
- AF II.94 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 223 [art. 73]
- AF II.95 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 88 [art. 73]
- AF II.102 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 24 [art. 74]
- AF II.103 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 78 [art. 75]
- AF II.106 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]

Ten could have come by way of an augmented version of Paul the Deacon (PD):

- PD I.24 = Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 8 in *Evang.* [art. 6]
- PD I.71 = Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 15 in *Evang.* [art. 17]
- PD II.17 = Maximus of Turin, *Sermo* 90 [art. 37]
- PD II.28 = Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 29 in *Evang.* [art. 41]
- PD II.33 = Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 30 in *Evang.* [art. 43]
- PD II.106 = Pseudo-Maximus, *Sermo* 78 [art. 75]
- PD II.122 = Gregory the Great, *Hom.* 12 in *Evang.* [art. 76]
- PD II.127 = Caesarius, *Sermo* 227 [art. 77]
- PD add. = 'Legimus in ecclesiasticis historiis' [arts. 56–63]

¹³ The contents of these two great homiliaries were reconstructed by R. Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux: Analyse de manuscrits*, Biblioteca degli 'Studi Medievali' 12 (Spoleto, 1980), pp. 127–221 (for Alan of Farfa) and pp. 423–78 (for Paul the Deacon).

PD add. = Pseudo-Bede, *Sermo* 70 [art. 64]

So once again a substantial number of the collection's sources are broadly representative of established reading practices throughout Frankish territories. Instead, what really stands out in this inventory of source-texts is the rarer and more unusual items, and I propose to comment on just a few of these before calling into question one of the sources Cross identified for a passage in art. 30.

One group of texts that one might not expect to find in the book cupboard of just any and every late Carolingian ecclesiastical center is the cluster of biblical apocrypha represented by four sermons in Pembroke 25 which are adaptations of the *Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew*, the *Protevangelium of James*, the *Transitus Mariae*, and a chapter on the death of the apostle John from the Pseudo-Abdias *Apostolic Histories*. The sermon based on the *Protevangelium* is the rarest of all. This is an abbreviated Latin version of the Greek *Protevangelium* adapted as a sermon for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin which, apart from its inclusion in manuscripts of the Saint-Père Homiliary, is elsewhere attested in only three manuscripts. All three of those manuscripts are of the twelfth century or later and may depend ultimately on the Saint-Père collection for this item, so that it is quite possible that the Saint-Père Homiliary is responsible for the entire transmission history of this exceptionally rare Latin translation of a Greek apocryphon.¹⁴ A fifth apocryphal text, the *Visio Pauli*, was claimed by Cross as a source for Pembroke 25 art. 42, an Ascension Day sermon,¹⁵ but the passage in question merely recounts the tortures suffered by the damned in hell, a theme that appears in plenty of sermons of the tenth and eleventh centuries, including Tristram Homily III, Vercelli Homily IX, and the Old English Rogationtide sermon known as Bazire & Cross Homily IV, so these torments of hell need not be traced directly to the *Visio Pauli*. I think we can strike the *Visio Pauli* off the list of sources for the Saint-Père Homiliary.

Two other source-texts are worth drawing attention to because of their limited transmission history. First, art. 55 is a sermon for the feast of St Michael based on the *Apparitio sancti Michaelis archangelis* designated by the Bollandists as *BHL* 5956b.¹⁶ *BHL* 5956b is known only from a single copy in a manuscript from the mid-twelfth century produced in Normandy at Caen, now Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 703B, fols. 100v–101r.¹⁷ Apart from that one twelfth-century manuscript, this sermon in the Saint-Père Homiliary is our only witness to the text, and on the basis of stylistic features which the Michael sermon has in common with other sermons in the Saint-Père Homiliary, Cross argued that the copy in the Vatican manuscript in fact derives from the Saint-Père Homiliary.¹⁸

Second, art. 89 is a sermon addressed to preachers (*sancti praedicatores*) offering instruction on

¹⁴ See J.-D. Kaestli, 'Le Protévangile de Jacques en latin: État de la question et perspectives nouvelles', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 26 (1996), 41–102, at 47–52; and Kaestli, 'Le Protévangile de Jacques latin dans l'homélie *Inquirendum est* pour la fête de la Nativité de Marie', *Apocrypha* 12 (2001), 99–153.

¹⁵ See Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25*, pp. 34 and 192–3.

¹⁶ *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina . . . Novum Supplementum*, ed. H. Fros, *Subsidia Hagiographica* 70 (Brussels, 1986), p. 645.

¹⁷ J. E. Cross, 'An Unpublished Story of Michael the Archangel and Its Connections', in *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*, ed. A. Groos with E. Brown, Jr., T. D. Hill, G. Mazzotta, and J. S. Wittig (New York, 1986), pp. 24–35, with an edition of the text at pp. 33–5 from the four known manuscripts (Pembroke 25, St John's 42, Balliol 240, and BAV Reg. Lat. 703B). The Vatican text corresponds to exactly half of the Saint-Père sermon (lines 1–41 out of 82 lines total in Cross's edition).

¹⁸ Cross, 'An Unpublished Story', pp. 28–9.

how to preach to the people. A passage from art. 89 on the vanity of the world which claims to be citing from a *tractator sapiens* ('a wise commentator') is adapted, as Cross pointed out, from a short thirteen-line text first printed by Angelo Mai in 1852 under the name of Dynamius Patricius (d. 601), a governor of Provence who was a friend and correspondent of Gregory the Great and evidently a man of some learning.¹⁹ Cardinal Mai printed this text as an *epistola ad discipulum* prefacing the *Ars grammatica* also once associated with Dynamius Patricius, but both the grammar and its prefatory letter have since come under scrutiny by scholars who are doubtful of the attribution, some associating the letter instead with another Dynamius, the fourth-century rhetorician Flavianus Dynamius of Bourdeaux. Leaving aside the question of authorship, which may remain unsettled for some time, the text (which is indisputably the source of these passages in Pembroke 25 art. 89) is indeed a rarity. Copies are known in only three manuscripts. How the Saint-Père compiler came upon it remains a mystery.

The source-work undertaken by Cross in the 1980s established a solid foundation for the study of the Saint-Père Homiliary, but inevitably there are a few places where corrections and refinements are in order. Several such corrections and refinements were put forward a year after Cross's monograph appeared by François Dolbeau in his 1988 review of Cross's book.²⁰ Dolbeau pointed out that the passage in art. 1 associating each of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit with a particular patriarch or prophet (*sapientia* in Adam, *intellectus* in Noah, *consilium* in Abraham, etc.), cumulatively embodied in Christ, derives from a sermon *De septiformi spiritu sancto*.²¹ Moreover, the interpretation of the gifts of the magi in art. 13 is taken from an unpublished Pseudo-Gregorian Commentary on the Gospels (RBM 4 3428–31). Art. 24 ends with a Doomsday scenario taken from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo Caillau-Saint-Yves* II.19. Arts. 33 and 42 both quote from Gennadius, *Libri ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*. Art. 63 quotes not from Cyprian, *De mortalitate*, as Cross thought, but from Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 209, which itself quotes Cyprian. And art. 88 concludes with a passage from Caesarius, *Sermo* 199, which is also quoted in art. 21. Most importantly, Dolbeau was able to show that some of these additional source-texts did not come to the Saint-Père compiler piecemeal but as part of a single florilegium, of which he identified two examples in ninth-century manuscripts. If the surviving witnesses to this florilegium are indeed reliable indicators of what the Saint-Père compiler had before him, then he had access to a manuscript containing Gennadius's *Libri*

¹⁹ The letter (inc. 'O quam dolenda condicio') was first printed by A. Mai, *Novae Patrum Bibliothecae* I (Rome, 1852), p. 182. It has since been edited by B. Löfstedt, 'Grammatisch-rhetorische Fragmente im Anonymus ad Cuimnanum', *Eranos* 88 (1990), 121–4; and by L. Munzi, 'Dinamio grammatico cristiano?', in *MOYΣA: Scritti in onore di Giuseppe Morelli* (Bologna, 1997), pp. 393–432, at 407–8. The letter is also quoted wholesale in the seventh-century Hiberno-Latin grammatical treatise known as the *Expositio Latinitas* by the Anonymus ad Cuimnanum, ed. B. Bischoff and B. Löfstedt, CCSL 133D (Turnhout, 1992), p. 16, lines 510–29, so it is possible that the Pembroke 25 sermon is based not on the letter directly but on the Anonymus ad Cuimnanum. On Dynamius's career and œuvre, see D. Norberg, 'Dynamie Patrice de Marseilles', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 1 (1991), 46–51; C. Jeudy, 'Fragments carolingiens de la grammaire de Dynamius (ms. Darmstadt 3303)', in *History of Linguistic Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. V. Law (Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1993), pp. 127–44; W. Berschin, 'Dynamius Patricius von Marseille († nach 597)', in Berschin, *Mittelateinische Studien* (Heidelberg, 2005), pp. 9–15; and M. Lapidge, 'Dynamius Patricius', in *Compendium Auctorum Latinorum Medii Aevi* (Florence, 2000–) III, 165.

²⁰ Dolbeau, 'Du nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge' (note 1 above).

²¹ This sermon is edited by A. Dufourcq, *Étude sur les gesta martyrum romains*, 5 vols., Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 83 (Paris, 1900–10; repr. 1988) IV, 226–8.

ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, a Gospel commentary attributed to Gregory the Great, and the sermon *De septiformi spiritu sancto*, all of which have been identified as sources for sermons in the Saint-Père collection. But that ninth-century florilegium also contained several additional texts that have not yet been identified as sources for the collection, including Isidore's *Allegoriae*, an exposition on the allegorical meanings of the word *gladius* ('sword') among the evangelists, and a set of *Quaestiones de litteris uel singulis causis* which explicates passages from Genesis. The Saint-Père compiler probably had these texts in his library, and further investigation into the sources of the collection may turn up parallels to them. These are prime candidates for additional sources of the collection.

Another place where Cross's claims about the sources of a particular sermon may now require rethinking is in art. 30, which is a sermon for Good Friday that begins by explaining the two-step process according to which God created all things. The opening paragraph of that sermon reads as follows (retaining manuscript punctuation):

OMELIA IN PARASCEUEN DE PASSIONE DOMINI · HOC PRIMUM omnium inquirendum est · humano generi · qualiter mundus a principio creatus et formatus est ab omnipotenti omnium conditore deo · et quomodo in peccato postea lapsus est · Et iterum per dei misericordiam redemptus et restauratus est · *Duas igitur res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus · Angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam · quę quidem ex nichilo facta processit* · qui autem *uiuuit in aeternum* · secundum materiae substantiam · *creauit omnia semel* · nihil non simul factum in omnibus creaturis reliquit · *non omnia uero ex nihilo condidit deus · sed quedam fecit ex nihilo · quedam ex aliquo* · Ex *nihilo* · angelos et informem materiam et *animas ex aliquo* · hominem et ceteras mundi creaturas ·

(‘A homily for Good Friday on the Lord’s Passion. It should first of all be asked by the human race how the world was created and formed from the beginning by God, the omnipotent creator of all things, and how it afterwards fell into sin and was once again redeemed and restored through God’s mercy. So, before any day, and before all time, God created two things: namely angelic beings and formless matter, which indeed came into being made from nothing. Moreover, he who lives in eternity created all things at once according to the substance of matter. He left nothing in that same instant unmade in all creatures. God did not create all things out of nothing, but some things he made out of nothing, some things out of something. Out of nothing [he created] angels and formless matter and souls; out of something [he created] man and other creatures of the earth.’)

This account of the process of creation, occurring simultaneously but in two sequential stages, can be traced back to Augustine, who explains in his *Confessions* and in his *On Genesis according to the Letter* that God created everything all at once in a single act, but that single act involved two separate steps: step one of that act involved the creation of angels and formless matter out of nothing, whereas step two of that act involved the creation of everything else from the formless matter that had just been created.²² In Augustine’s terms, the angels and formless matter have priority in origin but not in time since time did not yet exist and God created everything in eternity. This subtle but logical formulation of the process of creation was repeated and revised by many later writers, and Professor Cross thought that the author of Pembroke 25 art. 30 was basing his version of the story on the

²² For a succinct account of Augustine’s theory of creation, see S. Knuuttila, ‘Time and Creation in Augustine’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. E. Stump and N. Kretzmann (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 103–15.

Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis in PL 91, which falls within this Augustinian tradition and does indeed parallel many of the details in the Pembroke 25 sermon.²³ I suspect, however, that the sermon writer was not reading this Pseudo-Bede commentary, but instead was relying on another text based on the creation story in Isidore's *De differentiis rerum*, which is in fact the main source for this part of the Pseudo-Bede commentary. In the two passages printed below, the italicized phrases from Isidore in passage 2 are in agreement with the italicized phrases from the Pembroke 25 sermon just printed above. The italicized phrases from the Pseudo-Bede commentary in passage 1 below are in agreement with Isidore but not necessarily with the Pembroke 25 sermon. The phrases in bold-face in the Pembroke 25 sermon above and Isidore below occur only in these two texts and are sufficient indication that the sermon writer was not relying on the Pseudo-Bede Commentary.

1. Pseudo-Bede, *Comm. in Genesim*.

Quod ergo dictum est, In principio creavit deus caelum et terram, materiam totius creaturae ostendit, rationalis et corporalis, id est, angelorum et huius mundi. Vtrumque igitur fecit deus, id est materiam et formam, sicut uox et uerbum simul fit, quamuis uox prior sit origine. Denique scriptura ait, Qui fecisti mundum de materia informi. *Sed materia facta est de nihilo, mundi enim species de informi materia. Proinde duas res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus, angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam.* Quamuis enim omnia simul facta sunt. *Qui enim, inquit Salomon, uiuit in aeternum, creauit omnia simul.* Sed tantum, ut praediximus, origine materia informis formatam speciem, sicut uox uerbum antecedit. *Itaque non omnia ex nihilo fecit deus, sed quaedam ex nihilo, quaedam ex aliquo condidit deus. De nihilo mundum et angelos et animam, ex aliquo hominem et pecora et ceteras creaturas.*²⁴

(‘For thus it is said: In the beginning God created heaven and earth. He revealed the matter of every creature, rational and corporal, that is, of angels and of this world. And so God made both, that is matter and form, much as the voice and the word occur at the same time, although the voice is prior in origin. Scripture thus says: Who hast made the world from unformed matter. But matter is made from nothing; however, the substance of the earth [is made] from unformed matter. Consequently, before any day and before all time, God created two things, namely angelic creatures and formless matter, even though all things were created at once. For He who, Solomon says, lives in eternity created all things at once, but as we have said, only unformed matter preceded formed substance in origin, just as the voice precedes the word. Thus God did not make all things from nothing, but God created some things out of nothing, and some things out of something. From nothing [he created] the world and angels and the soul; out of something [he created] man and cattle and other creatures.’)

²³ The Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis (PL 91, cols. 189–286) is indexed by F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, 11 vols. (Madrid, 1950–1980) II, no. 1647; and by J. Machielsen, *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*. IIA: *Theologica, Exegetica* (Turnhout, 1994), no. 2027. The only two manuscripts of this work identified by M. M. Gorman, ‘The Encyclopedic Commentary on Genesis Prepared for Charlemagne by Wigbod’, *Recherches augustiniennes* 17 (1982), 173–201, at 178 note 27, are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale 9327–8 (s. ix¹, written near Paris), fols. 17–132, and Monte Cassino, Archivio 30 (s. x/xi), pp. 347–411.

²⁴ Pseudo-Bede, *Comm. in Genesim*, ed. M. Gorman, ‘The Commentary on the Pentateuch Attributed to Bede in PL 91.189–394’, *Revue Bénédictine* 106 (1996), 61–108 and 255–307, at 267.

2. Isidore, *De differentiis rerum* II.xi.30–1 (PL 83.74–5):

Sed materia facta est de nihilo. Mundi autem species de informi materia. Proinde *duas res ante omnem diem et tempus condidit Deus* omnipotens: *angelicam, videlicet, creaturam, et informem materiam; quae quidem* dum sit **ex nihilo facta, praecessit** tamen res ex se factas non aeternitate, sed sola origine, sicut sonus cantum. Nam *qui vivit in aeternum, creavit omnia simul*. Itaque *non omnia ex nihilo condidit Deus, sed quaedam ex aliquo, quaedam autem ex nihilo*. De *nihilo* mundum, *angelum et animas; ex aliquo hominem et caeteras mundi creaturas*.

(‘But matter is made out of nothing; however, the substance of the world [is made] out of formless matter. Accordingly, before there was any day or time, omnipotent God created two things: namely angelic creatures and formless matter. Indeed whereas it [formless matter] was made out of nothing, it nevertheless preceded things made from it not in eternity, but only in its inception, just as a sound [precedes] song. For he who lives in eternity created all things at once. Thus God did not create all things out of nothing, but some things out of something, and some things out of nothing. From nothing [he created] the world, angels, and souls; out of something [he created] man and other creatures of the earth.’)

What complicates this situation is the fact that this passage from Isidore which lies behind both the Pembroke 25 sermon and the Pseudo-Bede commentary is quoted or paraphrased by the authors of several other Genesis commentaries, including a number of commentaries of the seventh and eighth centuries that might have been available to the Saint-Père compiler, so this passage from Isidore was frequently recycled and exists in a number of permutations. In the four passages that follow, I offer representative parallels from the seventh-century *Liber de ordine creaturarum*, a Genesis commentary written in seventh-century Visigothic Spain, the eighth-century *Irish Reference Bible*, and an unpublished Commentary on the Creation and Fall in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908 (from a portion of the manuscript dated to the eighth century), all of which recognizably rely on this passage from Isidore on the creation of the angels and unformed matter out of nothing:

3. *Liber de ordine creaturarum* XV.8:

Ex his autem omnibus creaturis, quorum praestrinximus ordinem, quaedam ex aliquo, quaedam ex nihilo conditor fecit. Caelum enim et terram et mare et quae in his sunt facta ex informi materia condidit; ipsam uero informem materiam et angelorum ordines de quibus praediximus et animam humanam ex nihilo fecit.²⁵

(‘As regards all these things of which we have described the order, God created some of them from something and some of them from nothing. For it was from unformed matter that he created heaven and earth and the sea and all that was made in them; but this very unformed matter, and the angelic orders of which we have spoken, and the human soul, all these he made out of nothing.’)

²⁵ *Liber de ordine creaturarum* XV.8, ed. M. C. Díaz y Díaz, *Liber de ordine creaturarum: un anónimo irlandés del siglo VII* (Santiago de Compostela, 1972), p. 200; trans. by M. Smyth, *Understanding the Universe in Seventh-Century Ireland* (Woodbridge, 1996), p. 42.

4. Visigothic Commentary on Genesis:

Proinde igitur duas res ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus condidit deus, id est, angelicam creaturam et informem materiam, id est, quasi caelum et terram.²⁶

(‘Accordingly, before any day and before all time, God created two things: namely angelic creatures and formless matter, that is, just as heaven and earth.’)

5. *The Irish Reference Bible*:

Item, ante omnem creaturam creati sunt angeli, et ante angeli, diabolus. Item, ante omnem diem et ante omnem tempus, tres res condidit deus ex nihilo: primum, informis materia; secundo, angeli; tertio, anima Ade.²⁷

(‘Also, the angels were created before any creature; and before the angels, the devil [was created]. Also, before any day and before all time, God created three things out of nothing: first, unformed matter; second, the angels; third, the soul of Adam.’)

6. Commentary on the Creation and Fall in St Gall, Stiftsbibliothek 908 (*BCLL* 1260; *RBM A* 11054), p. 3:

Inde in libro Differentiarum Ysidorus clarissimae haec declarat dicens: Ante omnem diem et ante omne tempus duas res condedit deus, angelicam uidelicet creaturam et informem materiam.²⁸

(‘On this point, Isidore most clearly confirms these things in his *Book of Distinctions*, saying: Before any day and before all time God created two things: namely angelic beings and unformed matter.’)

The commentary in St Gall 908 even identifies Isidore by name as the progenitor of this idea. The point is, the Pseudo-Bede Commentary on Genesis is just one of several commentaries of the seventh and eighth centuries that look to Isidore for this information. The Pseudo-Bede text was not the immediate source of Pembroke 25 art. 30, but something quite close to it was, in all probability yet another commentary on the opening chapters of Genesis that was likewise based on Isidore but is now lost or unidentified. The seventh and eighth centuries spawned a virtual industry of Genesis commentaries in Italy, Spain, Ireland, Francia, and also England if we recall the work of Theodore and Hadrian and Bede, and most of these Genesis commentaries were indebted to Isidore’s *De differentiis rerum*. Another such commentary in the same general tradition as the Pseudo-Bede text and the St Gall 908 commentary might explain this passage in the Pembroke 25 sermon and would help underscore the challenges one faces in tracking down the sources of the Saint-Père

²⁶ M. Gorman, ‘The Visigothic Commentary on Genesis in Autun 27 (S. 29)’, *Études augustinienes* 30 (1997), 167–276, at 242.

²⁷ *Reference Bible* §98, ed. G. MacGinty, *The Reference Bible / Das Bibelwerk. Inter Pauca Problemmata de Enigmatibus ex Tomis Canonicis*, CCSM 173 (Turnhout, 2000), p. 43.

²⁸ I thank Charles D. Wright for bringing this passage to my attention.

collection.

This is just one minor adjustment to the picture that J. E. Cross painted in great detail of the background of this collection, and it illustrates his own conviction that source study is an ongoing process, refined and augmented and modified as scholars keep digging into the material and exploring textual relationships. Future study of the collection will no doubt adjust the picture I have just painted even further.