

Ælfric's Use of his Sources in the Preface to Genesis, together with a Conspectus of Biblical and Patristic Sources and Analogues

Mark Griffith

The preface to Genesis by Ælfric which,¹ in three surviving manuscripts,² precedes either his translation of the first half of Genesis or the OE *Hexateuch*, is an independent composition in the form of a letter to Ælfric's patron, the caldormann Æthelweard. The immediacy of the circumstances which gave rise to this letter, the directness of its epistolary style, and the inclusion of some autobiographical material may give the impression that it is an original piece of writing. Perhaps because of this, no systematic study of its sources has ever been made and its editors have been content to point out only the obvious quotations from the first chapter of Genesis and the allusions to other parts of the Pentateuch. However, the introduction to the symbolic interpretation of the Old Testament which forms the main body of the letter is heavily dependent on Biblical exegesis known to Ælfric. It is the purpose of this article to examine his use of scripture and patristics in this text, showing in particular how these sources cast light on the meaning of the preface.

Ælfric's preface is the first English introduction to a translation of any part of the Old Testament and the first English text to deal with the issue of Scriptural translation into the vernacular. Its closest generic antecedents are, accordingly, the various prefaces by Jerome to the Vulgate translations of the Old Testament (some of which are also epistolary), and those of his letters which deal with the translation of Scripture.³ It is likely that these prefaces were known to Ælfric.⁴ Here, then, we might expect to find material that has influenced the preface. After his initial greeting to Æthelweard, for example, Ælfric expresses his grave concern about undertaking the

translation: *þæt weorc is swiðe pleolic*, he states. Similar anxiety is loudly voiced by Jerome at the beginning of his preface to Genesis. After noting that he has been entreated by his friend Desiderius to translate the Pentateuch from Hebrew into Latin, Jerome straightaway remarks that “the work is certainly hazardous” (*periculosum opus certe*).⁵ The same sentiment is found in virtually identical phrasing in the same structural position in both prefaces. The danger they speak of, of course, arises from their belief that the Bible was divinely inspired and its wording sacred. Although this echo could, therefore, have arisen from a coincidence of attitude, rather than from direct borrowing, the common ground between the two proves to be broader than this single theme. Ælfric's approach to Scriptural translation, as R. Marsden has noted,⁶ was also probably conditioned by Jerome's theorisings about this in the letter to Pammachius (No. 57), for both writers commit themselves to a theory of quasi-literal translation of the divine word. We dare not change the order of the Vulgate, says Ælfric, *except* on those occasions where we must do so in order to conform to the syntax of English:

...heo is swa geendebyrd, swa swa God silf hig gedihte þam writere Moise, and we ne durren na mare awritan on Englisc þonne þæt Liden hæfþ, ne þa endebirdnisse awendan, buton þam anum þæt þæt Leden and þæt Englisc nabbað na ane wisan on þære spræce fadunge. Æfre se þe awent oþþe se þe tæcþ of Ledene on Englisc hæbbe his agene wisan, elles hit biþ swiþe gedwolsum to rædenne þam þe þæs Ledenes wisan ne can.⁷

The qualification (*buton þam anum...*) shows an approach not too dissimilar to Jerome's:

Read and consider the short preface dealing with this matter which occurs in a book narrating the life of the blessed Antony: “A literal translation from one language into another obscures the sense...My version always preserves the sense although it does not invariably keep the words of the original”...That secular and church writers should have adopted this line need not surprise us when we consider that the translators of the Septuagint, the evangelists, and the apostles, have done the same in dealing with the sacred writings.⁸

Ælfric accepts, as does Jerome, that the rules of the language into which the translation is being made must be followed in order to preserve the sense of the original. It seems likely, therefore, that Ælfric's anxiety—the almost inevitable consequence of this theory

of translation when applied to a sacred text, and the over-riding emotion of his preface—is Hieronymian in origin, even though no doubt genuinely felt.⁹

Accordingly, it is not surprising that one of the key sources for the preface is a work ascribed to Jerome in the Middle Ages (though now regarded as spurious), *Breviarum in Psalmos*, for there is a close and sustained similarity of idea and of wording between the allegorising of Psalm 95:2 in this text and the passage in the preface comparing the body and the Bible. In an interpretation which may seem to us strained but which is highly characteristic of the style of exegesis, the psalm commentator compares the bipartite structure of the Bible with the binary nature of some parts of the human body, and finds scriptural justification for this in the psalm's injunction to praise the Lord *day by day*:

Nolite eum tantum laudare in ueteri testamento, ne sitis Iudaei; nolite eum tantum laudare in nouo testamento, ne sitis Manichaei. Laudate illum diem de die, hoc est, in ueteri et in nouo testamento... Quia scriptum est: *Adnuntiate diem de die salutare eius*. Propterea et apostoli bini mittuntur, propterea non habemus unum oculum sed duos, propterea duas habemus aures, propterea duas nares, propterea duo labia, propterea duas manus, duos pedes... et corporis nostri membra duorum testamentorum sacramenta testantur.¹⁰

[Do not praise Him only with the Old Testament, you are not Jews; do not praise Him only with the New Testament, you are not Manichæans. Praise Him *from day to day*, that is in the Old and in the New Testament... Because it is written: *Shew forth His salvation from day to day*. For this reason, moreover, the apostles are sent two by two. For this reason, we do not have one eye but two, for this reason, we have two ears, for this reason, two nostrils, for this reason, two lips, for this reason, two hands (and) two feet... And the parts of our body testify to the mysteries of the two Testaments.]

Ælfric incorporates the substance of this as follows:

Is eac to witanne þæt sume gedwolmen wæron þe woldon awurpan þa caldan æ, and sume woldon habban þa caldan and awurpan þa niwan, swa swa þa Iudeiscan doð. Ac Crist self and his apostolas us tahton ægðer to healdenne þa caldan gastlice and þa niwan soðlice mid weorcum. God gesceop us twa eagan and twa earan, twa nosþirlu and twegen weleras, twa

handa and twegen fet, and he wolde eac habban twa gecyðnissa on þissere worulde geset, þa ealdan and þa niwan.

[It should also be known that there were certain heretics who wished to discard the old law/Testament, and some wished to retain the old and discard the new, as the Jews do. For Christ himself and his apostles taught us both to abide by the old in the spiritual sense and [to hold to] the new in [our] deeds. God gave us two eyes and two ears, two nostrils and two lips, two hands and two feet, and he also wanted to have two testaments placed in this world, the old and the new.]

Both allude to groups of people who accept only one of the two Testaments and whose example is therefore to be avoided by Christians. Both invoke the limbs of the body and the organs of the five senses in the same descending order, for the same purpose, to justify the duality of the Bible. There can be no doubt, then, that the one is a source of the other, and the immediateness of the source is made the more certain by the absence of this allegory from other patristic writings. *Breviarum in Psalmos* is not mentioned by those who have written on Ælfric's sources,¹¹ but it should, nonetheless, be added to the list of works to which the homilist had access, at least in part. J.D.A. Ogilvy notes that "it seems to have reached England by s. x,"¹² and H. Gneuss also records a ninth century copy in his list of manuscripts written or owned in England before 1100.¹³

Ælfric, however, departs from the particulars of the *Breviarum* passage in some interesting respects. Though the Manichaeans may have prompted the general remark about heretics who "wished to discard the old law," Ælfric does not elsewhere accuse them of antinomianism. In the homily "Nativitas Domini" he speaks of them as Gnostics who deny the incarnation and the immaculate conception.¹⁴ Those who "wished to reject the new law" are not for him the Jews, but, so it seems, an historical group of Christian heretics who held beliefs that the Jews still do (ll. 101-2, "sume *woldon* habban þa ealdan and awurpan þa niwan, swa swa þa Iudeiscan *doð*"). There is, then, a new balanced opposition in the preface between two types of heresy (where *Breviarum* contrasts heretics and non-Christians), and an emphasis too on the pastness of these heresies (where *Breviarum* implies at least the near contemporaneity of the Manichaeans).¹⁵ Finally, *Breviarum* speaks of the actions of Jews and Manichaeans, praising only this or that Testament, but Ælfric appears to locate the error of his heretics specifically in their intentions rather than their actions: *woldon* awurpan, "they *wished* to discard," not "they discarded" (ll. 100-1). He goes on to under-

line this in the conclusion to this section, perhaps with a hint of word-play: “we sceolon awendan urne *willan* to his gesetnissum.”¹⁶

This treatment of the source suggests that Ælfric, though he alludes to them only in general terms, has certain specific heresies in mind. As Grundy has pointed out, “among the Old English homilists Ælfric is alone in showing any interest in heresy,” but it is generally trinitarian heresies, and particularly Arianism, that he speaks against.¹⁷ He does not refer elsewhere to groups who rejected parts of Scripture. Those who wished to reject the New Testament, the ones added to the source, were obviously a very unusual group of Christians. They can only have been extreme judaizers who belonged to the church in its earliest days before its schism with Judaism. Only one sect seems to fit this bill. According to chapter 27 of Book III of Eusebius’ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, a work available in the West in the translation by Rufinus, the Ebionites “thought it was necessary to reject all the epistles of [St Paul], whom they called an apostate from the law; and they used only the so-called Gospel according to the Hebrews and made small account of the rest.”¹⁸ If this identification is correct, then the particular antinomians that Ælfric has in mind may not be the Manichaeans, but those mentioned by Eusebius shortly afterwards (in chapter 29), the Nicolaitans, who “commit fornication without shame”—licentiousness being commonly attributed to those who rejected the law.¹⁹ In this connection, it should be noted, given Ælfric’s remarks on the abuse of clerical celibacy earlier in the preface, that in the eleventh century, the name of Nicolaite came to be attached to married priests, probably because of Eusebius’ remarks about Nicolaus and his wife.²⁰ Haymo, a writer certainly known to Ælfric, briefly mentions both these groups in his *Epitome* of Rufinus’ translation.²¹

Both texts rejected by these heretics—the two Testaments—are central to the preface, the Old more visibly than the New. Editions of the preface refer readers to the Old Testament verses quoted and paraphrased by Ælfric here, but none is complete and none contains much in the way of further remarks on his use of this material, perhaps because nothing seems obviously unusual about the input from this part of the Bible. Even in this regard, however, Ælfric proves capable of some surprises.²² The *tægel* of the beast in the sacrifice may serve as illustration:

And was beboden þæt se tægel sceolde beon gehal æfre on þam nytene æt þære offrunge for þære getacnunge þæt God wile þæt we simle wel don oþ ende ures lifes: þonne biþ se tægel geoffrod on urum weorcum.

The source for this is Leviticus 3.9-10:

And they shall offer...a sacrifice to the Lord: the fat and the whole rump [*caudam totam*], with the kidneys, and the fat that covereth the belly and all the vitals and both the little kidneys, with the fat that is about the flanks, and the caul of the liver with the little kidneys.

The OE *Hexateuch* renders this “And bringon Drihtne þone rysel and tægel and gelyndu.”²³ All editors, however, gloss *tægel* simply as “tail,” possibly because *Bosworth-Toller* and its *Supplement* do not allow any sense for this word other than “the tail of an animal.” As the *Supplement* renders *gehal* by “whole, unbroken,” it is clear that the narrow definition of *tægel*, “a distinct flexible appendage to the trunk,” is meant. This is also the sense given in the only published translation: “...it was commanded that the tails of the sacrificial animals should always be whole.”²⁴ However, the description in the source, the use of *tægel* in the *Hexateuch* and the parallel between *tægel...gehal* (l. 88) and *caudam totam* make it evident that the word must more broadly signify the “rump, hind-quarters or tail-end” of the beast which is to be cut away all in one piece in the sacrifice. As this widening of the sense of *tægel* may owe its origin to the influence of the source passage, it is perhaps worth noting that the second use of the word in the preface to signify the end of the good life may have been influenced by the extended sense of *cauda*, “the extreme part, ‘tail’ of anything,”²⁵ for *OED* does not record “tail” in the generalised sense “the terminal or concluding part of anything” before the fourteenth century.²⁶

A trained Benedictine of the Reform was, however, unlikely to refer extensively to the Old Testament without displaying an awareness of its patristic interpretation. When Ælfric cites Genesis 1:26, “Let us make man in our image and likeness,” he interprets it as follows:

Mid þam þe he cwæð “Uton wyrcean” ys seo þrinnis gebicnod; mid þam þe he cwæð “to ure anlicnisse” ys seo soðe annis geswutelod: he ne cwæð na menifealdlice, “to urum anlicnißsum,” ac anfealdlice, “to ure anlicnisse.”

Of this passage Mitchell and Robinson remark: “In what follows, Ælfric (who was a grammarian) concentrates on the significance of grammatical number in the scriptural passage.”²⁷ They are probably correct to see a link with Ælfric’s grammatical interests here, but it would be quite wrong to infer from their statement either that he invented this interpretation, or that he derived it from a grammatical source. Such views go

back at least to the second century and the works of Justin Martyr who saw “Christ as one of the people included in the plural number of the verb in the statement “Let us make man in our image,” as the person intended on a number of occasions when the Bible said that God appeared to someone...as one of the men who visited Abraham...and so on.”²⁸ Its earliest appearance in a text possibly available to Ælfric is in Basil’s *Hexaemeron* (which he might have known in the Latin translation by Eustathius):

“And God said let us make man.” Tell me is there then only one Person? It is not written “Let man be made,” but “Let us make man”...Listen to the continuation, “In our image”...to Whom does he say “in our image,” to whom if it is not to Him who is “the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person” (Hebrews 1:3)...“So God created man.” It is not “They made.” Here Scripture avoids the plurality of the Persons...²⁹

But Ælfric might also have known very similar discussions of this verse in Jerome’s *Epistola ad Damasum* and Augustine’s *De Genesi ad Litteram*. Expressions of the same idea that are somewhat closer in phrasing to the preface are found in Bede’s *In Genesim* (quoted verbatim by Hrabanus in his *Commentaria in Genesim*), pseudo-Bede’s *In Pentateuchum* and Alcuin’s *Interrogationes Sigewulfi* (the source for this being Bede’s *In Genesim*).³⁰ A long tradition, accordingly, lies behind Ælfric’s statement, showing it to be entirely orthodox. The grammatical style of exegesis is even older and has Scriptural sanction:

Now the promises were pronounced to Abraham and to his “issue.” It does not say “issues” in the plural but in the singular, “and to your issue”; and the issue intended is Christ (Galatians 3:16).

The discussion of singular and plural, and the contrast between what Genesis does and does not say is exactly the same as Ælfric’s.

The notes to the editions offer much less on the author’s use of the New Testament.³¹ But the New Testament proves to be as important a source as the Old, though the author rarely quotes from it verbatim, and does not flag his source for the reader. For example, after the analogy between the Bible and the body, there is the following statement (lines 106-8) which masquerades as part of the reason for the divine institution of the two Testaments: “for þan þe...he nænne rædboran nafð, ne nan man þearf him cweþan to: ‘Hwi dest þu swa?’” Ælfric has here adapted and yoked together two verses from Romans:

11.34: For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?

9.20: O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: "Why hast thou made me thus?"

These verses are themselves an adaptation of two verses from the Old Testament, Isaiah 40:13-14: "...who hath been his counsellor, and hath taught him? With whom hath he consulted and who hath instructed him?" Ælfric, however, follows Romans rather than Isaiah in his inclusion of a version of the fictitious question from the impertinent man who dares to interrogate his God. The point of this is to warn the reader against a literal-minded response to the strangeness of God's decision to place two books in this world which must be read in completely different ways. The use of the New Testament in a discussion about the beginning of the Old should not surprise us, for vital to the argument is the belief that the Old Testament must be understood in the spiritual or symbolic sense and the New in the literal. As the two speak of the same truth, the New Testament becomes the key which unlocks the symbolic meaning of the Old and so a number of the borrowings from the Old Testament are juxtaposed with references to the New that guide our understanding of the prior text. As this is the standard patristic view of the relationship of the two testaments, these allusions to the New Testament are themselves often brought into focus through the lens of patristic interpretation. For example, after his comments on the role of the Holy Spirit in the creation, Ælfric remarks more generally (lines 60-2) on the powers of the third person of the Trinity:

and gif hwa forsihð þa forgifnisse þe se Halga Gast sylð, þonne bið his synn æfre unmyltsiendlic on ecnyse.

This appears to blend Matthew 12.32:

But he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.

With Mark 3.29:

But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin.

However, the specifying of this blasphemy as the sin of rejecting forgiveness derives from *Sermon 71* of Augustine:

Now perfect love is the perfect gift of the Holy Spirit. But the first gift is that which is concerned with the remission of sins...Against this gratuitous gift, against the grace of God does the impenitent heart speak. This impenitence then is *the blasphemy of the Spirit, which shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come* (Matthew 12:32).³²

Both the New Testament and its exegesis are sources for different aspects of Ælfric's interpretation of the beginning of Genesis.

A further illustration is provided by Ælfric's allusion to Genesis 18:1-5 as an example of how the image of the Trinity appears in the Old Testament: "Eft comon þri englas to Abraham and he spræc to him eallon þrim swa swa to anum" (ll. 68-9). But the Vulgate does not say here "three angels," but "three men" (*tres viri*), and Ælfric's translation of this accordingly reads "ðry weras." Their interpretation as angels is to be found in *The City of God*, Book 16, chapter 29, in which Augustine states:

God also appeared to Abraham by the oak of Mamre in the guise of three men who were undoubtedly angels ...Hence it is much more credible that Abraham recognised the Lord in the three men, and Lot in two, and that they both spoke to him in the singular number, even though they thought the men to be men...But surely there was some quality in them so outstanding, though they seemed to be men, that those who offered them hospitality could not doubt that the Lord was present in them, as often happens in the case of the prophets. And this is the reason why they sometimes addressed them in the plural, and sometimes, using the singular, addressed the Lord in their persons. Moreover the Scripture states that they were angels, not only in this book of Genesis in which the tale is told but also in the epistle to the Hebrews, which says in praise of hospitality: "Thereby some have even entertained angels unawares."³³

Although Augustine may here be following an Old Latin reading of 18:2,³⁴ his phrasing does not suggest that he is quoting this verse, but interpreting it on the basis of information derived from a later part of the story, *viz.* chapter 19:1, where, in a sudden shift, the men are re-identified as angels, a statement confirmed by Hebrews 13:2. At least two other writers certainly known to Ælfric interpret the men in much the same way, probably ultimately through Augustine's influence: Haymo, in homily 56 of *Homiliae de Tempore*, Dominica Quinta in Quadragesima, says that Abraham

saw three angels who symbolised the Holy Trinity, and he seems to be following in this Gregory's *Homiliae in Evangelia*, Homily 18, in which Gregory remarks:

Then indeed, Abraham saw the day of the Lord when he entertained three angels symbolising the supreme Trinity, whom he received with profit; likewise, he spoke to the three as if to one, for, though there are three persons of the Trinity, there is an essential unity of the Godhead.³⁵

This passage is probably the immediate source for the statement in the preface because the phrasing *he spræc to him eallum þrim swa swa to anum* closely follows Gregory's *sic tribus quasi uni locutus est* rather than Haymo's *tres enim vidit, et unum adoravit*. This is also very nearly the phrasing previously used by Ælfric in homily 13 of the Second Series of the *Catholic Homilies*, "Dominica Quinta in Quadragesima," which here follows the same Gregorian homily:

Abraham se heahfæder underfeng þry englas (*tres angelos hospitio suscepit*) on his gesthuse on hiwe ðære halgan ðrynnysse (*in figura summæ Trinitatis*) to ðam he spræc swa swa to anum (*tribus quasi uni locutus est*).³⁶

The reference to the men as "angels" in the preface appears to be casual, or at least it is their number rather than their identity which is vital to Ælfric's argument. It therefore does not seem very likely that he is consciously quoting from Gregory at this point, but more probably remembering material used in the writing of the *Catholic Homilies*. Although this reference to Abraham may seem a simple allusion to Genesis, it is certainly very far from this, being wrapped up with other verses of Scripture and interpretative matter from Augustine and Gregory which Ælfric has absorbed most thoroughly.

The influence of patristics is also discernible in the juxtaposition of verses from the Old and New Testaments, for specific verses from the one part of Scripture had long been paired by the Church Fathers with "sister" verses, as it were, from the other. Exegetes disrupted the narrative and chronological order of the Bible and subordinated it to a new symbolic order. Whilst the immediate source for such paired verses is clearly the Bible, it is equally clear that the Bible is not the immediate source for their pairing, which is patristic. Biblical quotations, therefore, may have the Bible as both an immediate and antecedent source, with quotations being drawn directly from Scripture and indirectly through patristic intermediaries. A particularly good example is provided by Ælfric's remarks on Genesis 1:1 and Christ's answer to the

Jews (ll. 47-54). No part of the Old Testament received more exhaustive or more inventive analysis from the Church Fathers than the first chapters of Genesis, so that we should not expect originality from Ælfric in his handling of this verse, nor should we expect his sources to be readily ascertainable because many of these commentaries quote extensively from earlier ones. For the source of Christ's statement, Mitchell and Robinson, and Wilcox too, refer the reader to verses in Revelations in which Christ speaks of himself as the Alpha and the Omega.³⁷ In fact, however, Ælfric is quoting John 8:25: "They said therefore to him: "Who art thou?" Jesus said to them: "The beginning who also speak unto you."

Because it provided the symbolic explanation for the words *in principio*, John 8:25 became a near obligatory twin for Genesis 1:1 in patristic literature on Genesis (whilst commentaries on John, though they associate Christ's answer to the Jews in 8:25 with his role in the creation, do not quote Genesis 1:1).³⁸ These two verses are discussed in conjunction in works by Ambrose, Augustine, Isidore and Bede, amongst others. Ælfric also yokes them together in similar, but not quite identical, discussions in *Alcuini Interrogationes Sigewulfi*, *Exameron Anglice* and in the homily "Nativitas Domini":

Alcuini Interrogationes Sigewulfi: Hu is to understandenne on anginne gesceop God heofenan 7 eorðan? Þæt angin is Crist, Godes Sunu, swa swa he sylf cwæð on his godspelle to þam Iudeiscum, þa þa hi axodon hwæt he ware. He cwæð: "Ic eom anginn þe to eow sprece." Þurh þæt anginn, þæt is þurh þone Sunu, gesceop se Fæder ærest þæt antimber of nahte of þam þe he syððan heofonan 7 eorþan geworhte.³⁹

Exameron Anglice: *In principio creauit Deus celum et terram*, ðæt is on Englisc: God ælmihtig gesceop ærest on anginne heofonan and eorðan...and ðæt angin is ðæs ælmihtigan Godes Sunu, on gastlicum andgite, swa swa ðæt godspell us segð: *Ego principium qui et loquor vobis*. Ðis cwæð se Hælend on his halgan godspelle: Ic sylf eom angin ðe eow to sprece. He sylf is soð anginn of ðam soðan anginne, and he is soð wisdom of ðam wisan Fæder...⁴⁰

VIII Kalendas Ianuarii Nativitas Domini: Se soðfæsta godspellere us sæde þurh God þæt þæt Word wæs on anginne mid þam ælmihtigan Gode: On anginne wæs þæt Word: 7 þæt angin is se Fæder, mid þam wæs þæt Word wunigen, 7 þæt Word is anginn, swa swa he eft sæde, *Ego principium qui et*

loquor uobis: Ic sylf eom anginn, ic ðe to eow sprece. Be þam awrat Moyses se mæra heretoga, *In principio fecit Deus celum et terram*: God geworhte on anginne heofenan 7 eorðan, 7 þæt anginn is his ancenneda Sunu, þurh þone he gesceop ealle gesceafta.⁴¹

MacLean, in his edition of Alcuin's *Interrogationes*, cites pseudo-Bede *In Pentateuchum* as the source for this passage;⁴² Crawford, in his edition of the *Exameron*, locates the source in Bede's *In Genesis*, though he refers the reader also to Ambrose's *Hexameron*;⁴³ and Pope, in his edition of the supplementary homilies, gives Augustine's *Sermo I* and *Sermo de Principio Genesis* as possible sources of the third, whilst noting also that Ælfric's words are "probably an independent elaboration."⁴⁴ It is indeed possible that Ælfric was aware of the popularity of this linking of Genesis and John and that his four statements on this subject were not consciously modelled on any one of these texts in particular. However, the identical phrasing of the translation from John in the preface and in the English *Interrogationes* (that is, *Ic eom anginn þe to eow sprece*) most closely renders *Ego sum principium, qui et loquor vobis*, the wording of pseudo-Bede *In Pentateuchum*.⁴⁵ Certainly, some other source for Ælfric's *Interrogationes* apart from Alcuin is necessitated by the fact that Alcuin's *Interrogationes* does not refer in this section on Genesis 1:1 to John 8:25. On the other hand, the Latin of the verse in *Exameron Anglice* and the homily "Nativitas Domini," *Ego principium qui et loquor vobis*, omitting *sum*, is exactly the wording Isidore uses in *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*. Though there is little difference here in the wording of pseudo-Bede and Isidore, the other texts that link Genesis 1:1 and John 8:25 either abbreviate Christ's answer to *Principium*, or give the verse in some other form (either *Initium/Principium quod et loquor vobis*, or *Principium, quia et loquor vobis*). Furthermore, the phrasing *swa swa he sylf cwæð on his godspelle to þam Iudeiscum* in *Alcuini Interrogationes*, shortened in the preface to *swa swa he sylf cwæþ to þam Iudeiscum*, is also closest to Isidore's *sicut ipse in Evangelio Judeis interrogantibus respondit*. Both pseudo-Bede and Isidore, then, appear to be likely sources for Ælfric's variations on this theme and his departure from Alcuin. Neither passage in Isidore or pseudo-Bede, however, goes on, as Ælfric does in the preface and *Exameron Anglice*, to identify Christ as wisdom. Augustine introduces this idea by reference to Psalm 103.24, *Omnia in sapientia fecisti* ("Thou hast made all things in wisdom"),⁴⁶ in the passage in *Sermo de Principio Genesis* where he connects Genesis 1:1 and John 8:25, and this further link is also made by two commentaries on John, Alcuin's *Commentaria*,⁴⁷ and pseudo-Bede *Expositio*.⁴⁸ Ælfric does not quote this psalm verse, but one can see that it lies behind the unexplained and abrupt transition in the preface from the statement that all creation

was formed through the Son [l. 53: *he gesceop ealle gesceafta þurh þone Sunu*] to the immediately following identification of the Son as wisdom [ll. 53-4: *se þe was æfre of him acenned, wisdom of þam wisan Fæder*], for the psalm verse yokes these two ideas together. Ælfric's remarks on Genesis 1:1, therefore, are not a slavish copying, or even a free paraphrase, of any one of these related sources but rather a compilation of material from several of them. Pope's description of this kind of writing as "independent elaboration," does, however, seem misleading, in that there is little or no independence and not very much elaboration either—but, rather, dependence on a whole tradition, scriptural and patristic, not on an individual author or text. This more complex use of sources played an important role in Ælfric's writing, especially when that writing was exegetical.

The connection with the genre of *quaestiones* or *interrogationes* is worth pursuing further, for, in its terse handling of well known Scriptural difficulties, Ælfric's exegesis in the preface is reminiscent of this form.⁴⁹ The passage just mentioned from the OE paraphrase of Alcuin's *Interrogationes* uses phrasing that is very similar to that of the preface, which may suggest borrowing from one of the two English texts to the other. But opinions on the relative chronology of the two have varied. MacLean states that "when the *Interrogationes* was translated Ælfric's *Genesis* was not written,"⁵⁰ but Clemoes believed it likely that this text "was in fact supplied precisely to clothe *þa nacedan gerecednisse* about which Ælfric had such misgivings,"⁵¹ implying to the contrary that the translation of Genesis stimulated the paraphrase of Alcuin. The English *Interrogationes* breaks off with Genesis 22:1 and covers less than half of the questions in its source, which continues beyond 22:1 with questions on the later chapters of the book. This juncture, however, is not far from 24:22 where Ælfric's translation of Genesis ends. Both might be said to go "up to Isaac" as Æthelweard requested of Ælfric (ll. 3-4). Clemoes is surely right, therefore, that the version of *Interrogationes* was designed as a companion volume to the translation of Genesis, for this furnishes the most reasonable explanation for the translator's selectiveness in Englishing Alcuin's text. But this does not compel us to conclude that the companion piece was only undertaken after the completion of the preface.

Four questions and answers from the translation of Alcuin provide source material for parts of the commentary on Genesis in the preface. These are number 26 on Genesis 1:1, number 29 on Genesis 1:2, number 37 on 1:26, and number 87 on 4:10. The fourth most clearly demonstrates the closeness of the relationship between the paraphrase and the preface:

Int.: Quomodo vox sanguinis Abel clamat ad Dominum?

Resp.: [Id est] homicidii illius reatus in conspectu iusti apparebat.⁵²

[Qu.:How did the voice of Abel's blood cry out to the Lord?

Ans: The charge for that murder was prepared in the sight of the judge]

Ælfric's paraphrase differs substantially, however:

Hu cleopode seo stemn Abeles bloddes to Gode? Heo clypode swa þæt
Caines gylt wearð æteowed on Godes gesyhðe and gehwylces mannes
[dæda] clypiað to Gode and hine gewregað oððe gepingiað, þonne God hi
gesihð swa gode swa yfele.⁵³

It is the paraphrase, rather than Alcuin's text, that is the source for the abbreviated statement in the preface (lines 69-70):

Hu clipode Abeles blod to Gode buton swa swa ælces mannes misdæda
wregaþ hine to Gode butan wordum?

The shift of style in the preface is startling. Where the catechistic mode is a defining characteristic of the source text and of its translation too, it occurs only at this point in the preface and its appearance marks the temporary borrowing of, or slippage into, the genre of the source. Part of the reply here, the moral interpretation of Abel's blood as the sins of every man, is, however, found in Ælfric's version of Alcuin (where he appears to be following Bede) but not in Alcuin's own text. The translation must, therefore, be the immediate source, with the Latin an antecedent one, and so at least a part of Ælfric's *Interrogationes* must pre-date the composition of the preface. This may have been only a selection from Alcuin designed specifically for inclusion in the preface—the first gesture towards a new work, perhaps—rather than quotations from a separate work that had already been completed. Nevertheless, the most economical explanation of the available evidence suggests that there was some overlap between the composition of the translation of Genesis and the paraphrase of Alcuin's *Interrogationes*.

One can see various ways, then, in which a study of some of the preface's sources illuminates its meaning, the genres it incorporates, the manner of its composition, and its relation to other works by Ælfric. Source study does not simply reveal the library known to an author, it remains above all an indispensable tool for the literary interpretation of texts. Continued investigation in this field is vital if we are to increase our understanding of medieval works and their authors.

A Conspectus of Biblical and Patristic Sources and Analogues

A: Biblical Sources

Where part of the preface is loosely based on the Bible the source reference is given, either with an English translation, or with an indication of the theme of the allusion where the relevant section is too long for quotation. Full quotations from the Vulgate (together with English translation) are given where Ælfric follows the text more closely, except in those cases where he himself gives the Latin.

13-14. Jacob's four wives: Genesis 29:16-35, 30:1-26.

21-2. 1 Corinthians 5:11: Nunc autem scripsi vobis non commisceri, si is qui frater nominatur est fornicator aut avarus aut idolis serviens aut maledicus aut ebriosus aut rapax; cum eiusmodi nec cibum sumere [But now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator or covetous or a server of idols or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner; with such a one, not so much as to eat.]

32-4. Matthew 4:18-20: "Jesus saw two brethren, Simon who is called Peter and Andrew his brother...And he saith to them: 'Come ye after me...' And they immediately leaving their nets followed him." Cf. Luke 5.11: "leaving all things, they followed him." But note also the account of the selection of the apostles (rather than that of the first disciples), for Ælfric refers explicitly to *apostolas* and Christ's act of choosing is more explicit at that point: Luke 6:13-14, "he called unto him his disciples; and he chose twelve of them (whom also he named apostles): Simon, whom he surnamed Peter..."

33-4. Matthew 19:27, 29: "Then Peter, answering, said to him: Behold, we have left all things and have followed thee; what therefore shall we have?...[Jesus said] And everyone that hath left house or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundredfold and shall possess life everlasting." See also Luke 18:28-30.

46. Genesis 1:20-5: the creation of species.

47-9. Genesis 1:1: In the beginning God created heaven and earth.

50-1. John 8:25: Dicebant ergo ei: "Tu quis es?" Dixit eis Iesus: "Principium qui et loquor vobis" [They said therefore to him: "Who art thou?" Jesus said to them: "The beginning who also speak unto you"].

52-4. Psalm 103:24: Omnia in sapientia fecisti [Thou hast made all things in wisdom]; 1 Corinthians 1:24: ...Christum, Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam [...Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God]; Colossians 1:15-17: [Filius] qui est imago Dei invisibilis primogenitus omnis creaturae, quia in ipso condita sunt universa in caelis et in terra, visibilia et invisibilia...Omnia per ipsum et in ipso creata sunt, et ipse est ante omnes et omnia in ipso constant [(The Son) who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature, for in him were all things created in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible...All things were created by him and in him and he is before all, and by him all things consist].

55-6. Genesis 1:2: And the spirit of God was carried over the waters.

59-60. See, perhaps, John 3:5: Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

60-2. Matthew 12:32: ...qui autem dixerit contra Spiritum Sanctum non remittetur ei neque in hoc saeculo, neque in futuro [...he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come]; Mark 3:29: qui autem blasphemaverit in Spiritum Sanctum non habet remissionem in aeternum, sed reus erit aeterni delicti [But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin].

64. Genesis 1:26: Et ait: "Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram" [Let us make man in our image and our likeness].

68-9. Genesis 18:1-5: Abraham speaks to three angels as if they were one. But Genesis here refers to men (*tres viri*) not to angels (and so Ælfric's translation): see Hebrews 13:2, "And hospitality do not forget; for by this some, being not aware of it, have entertained angels."

69-70. Genesis 4:10: Vox sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de terra [The voice of thy brother's blood crieth to me from the earth].

73-5. Genesis 37:27-8 and 41:25ff.: Joseph is sold into Egypt but saves the people from the famine.

75-9. Exodus 25-35: Moses' construction of the tabernacle, directed by God.

79-81. Exodus 25:1-4, 35:5-6 and 22-26: the Israelites are ordered to bring to it gold, silver, precious things and goat's hair, and do so.

82-3. Psalm 11.7: *Eloquia Domini, eloquia munda, argentum igne probatum* [The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried by the fire].

86-7. Exodus 29, Leviticus 1: the sacrifice in the tabernacle of various kinds of livestock.

87-9. Leviticus 3:9-10: *et offerent...sacrificium Domino: adipem et caudam totam, cum renibus, et pinguedinem quae operit ventrem atque universa vitalia et utrumque renunculum, cum adipe qui est iuxta ilia, reticulumque iecoris cum renunculis* [And they shall offer ...a sacrifice to the Lord: the fat and the whole rump, with the kidneys, and the fat that covereth the belly and all the vitals and both the little kidneys, with the fat that is about the flanks, and the caul of the liver with the little kidneys].

89-90. Matthew 10:22: But he that shall persevere unto the end, he shall be saved. See also Matt. 24:13, Mark 13:13.

104-7. Probably following 1 Corinthians 12:18: *Nunc autem posuit Deus membra unumquodque eorum in corpore sicut voluit* [But now God hath set the members, every one of them, in the body as it hath pleased him].

107-8. Romans 11:34: *Quis enim cognovit sensum Domini? Aut quis consiliarius eius fuit?* [For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?] and Romans 9:20: *O homo, tu quis es qui respondeas Deo? Numquid dicit figmentum ei qui se finxit: "Quid me fecisti sic?"* [O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it: "Why hast thou made me thus?"]. But see also Isaiah 40:13-14 and 1 Corinthians 2:16.

108-10. Ecclesiasticus 18:30: Leave thy own will and desire.

B: Patristic Sources:

Sources, whether certain or likely, are quoted in full and are given first, with references to translations noted where those are available. Analogues (i.e. passages showing identity or similarity of idea, but not of phrasing) are cited without quotation in broadly chronological order, but are not given for commonplace ideas. Some of these are likely also to have been sources, but this cannot be demonstrated from verbal congruence.

8-11, 19-20, the three ages of the law:

Isidore, *Etymologiarum Libri*, PL 82, Book VI, col. 248.

Bede, *Homiliae Genuinae*, PL 94, Homily 13, col. 69.

Amalarius, *Liber de Ordine Antiphonarii*, PL 105, chap. 15, col. 1270.

16-19, the necessity for bigamy and incest in the beginning:

Excerptiones Pseudo-Ecgberhti, PL 89, section 146, col. 397: Satis igitur manifestum est non posse filios Adam in primordio saeculi uxores accepisse, nisi proprias sorores aut propinquas consanguineas.⁵⁴

Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, CCSL 48, Book XV, chap. 16, pp. 476-77.

De doctrina Christiana, CSEL 80, Book III, chap. 19, p. 96.

Jerome, *Epistulae*, Ad Geruchiam, De monogamia (no. 123), CSEL 56, section 12, p. 85.

28-35, the wives of Peter and the apostles:

Jerome, *Libri duo adversus Jovinianum*, PL 22, Book I, section 26, col. 245.

46-7, the omission from Genesis of the creation of the angels:

Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, CCSL 48, Book XI, chap. 9, pp. 328-29.

47-52, Christ as the beginning and the wisdom of God:

a) with explicit linking of Genesis 1:1 with John 8:25:

Isidore, *Questiones in Vetus Testamentum: in Genesim*, PL 83, chap. 1, para. 2, col. 209: *In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram: Principium Christus est, sicut ipse in Evangelio Judaëis interrogantibus respondit: Ego principium, qui et loquor vobis. In hoc igitur principio fecit Deus caelum...*

pseudo-Bede, *In Pentateuchum*, PL 91, chap. 1, col. 190: *Principium igitur Christus est, qui in Evangelio dicit: Ego sum principium, qui et loquar vobis...*

Ambrose, *Hexaemeron*, CSEL 32.1, Sermo I, chap. 2, pp. 4-5.

Augustine, *Confessionum*, PL 32, Book XI, chap. 3-8, col. 811-13.

De Genesi ad Litteram, imperfectus liber, CSEL 28.1, para. 3, p. 461.

De Genesi contra Manichaeos, PL 34, Book I, col. 174.

Sermo de Principio Genesis, Morin: *Miscellanea Agostiniana I*, pp. 12-13.

Sermones de Scripturis, PL 38, Sermo I, chap. 2, col. 24-5.

Aponius, *Explanatio in Canticum Canticorum*, CCSL 19, Book VI, p. 150.

Bede, *Commentarius in Genesim*, CCSL 118A, Book I, pp. 3-7.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in Genesim*, PL 107, Book I, chap. 1, col. 444-7.

pseudo-Eucherius, *Commentarii in Genesim*, PL 50, Book I, chap. 1, col. 894.

Angelomus, *Commentarius in Genesim*, PL 115, chap. 1, col. 112.

b) without explicit linking of Genesis 1:1 with John 8:25:

Rufinus, *Origen: In Genesim, Homilia Prima*, PG 12, col. 145.

Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV*, CCSL 36, Tractatus XXXIX, para. 1, p. 345.

pseudo-Bede, *In S. Joannis Evangelium Expositio*, PL 92, col. 745.

Alcuin, *Commentaria in S. Joannis Evangelium*, PL 100, chap. 21, col. 864.

Interrogationes et Responsiones in Genesin, PL 100, col. 519, *int.* 26.

Haymo, *Homiliae*, PL 118, no. XXXVI, col. 235.

55-9, the Holy Spirit as vivifier of creation:

Eustathius, *In Hexaemeron S. Basilii, Latina Metaphrasis*, PL 53, Book II, para. 6, col. 886.

pseudo-Bede, *In Pentateuchum*, PL 91, chap. 1, col. 193.

Alcuin, *Interrogationes et Responsiones in Genesin*, PL 100, col. 519, *int.* 29.

60-2, the rejection of the forgiveness of the Holy Spirit is the ultimate sin:

Augustine, *Sermo LXXI*, PL 38, chap. 12, sections 19-20, col. 455.

63-7, grammatical analysis of number reveals the Trinity in Genesis 1:26:

Bede, *In Genesim*, CCSL 118A, Book I, p. 25: In eo enim quod dicitur, *faciamus*, una ostenditur trium operatio personarum; in eo uero quod sequitur, *ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, una et aequalis substantia eiusdem sanctae Trinitatis indicatur.

pseudo-Bede, *In Pentateuchum*, PL 91, chap. 2, col. 200: *Et dixit Deus: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, et reliqua usque *dies sextus*. Cum in aliis operibus Deus *Fiat*, hic *Faciamus hominem*, insinuans pluralitatem personarum, propter Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum; et tamen divinitatis unitatem intelligendam statim admonet dicens, *Et fecit Deus hominem*.

Alcuin, *Interrogationes Sigewulfi*, PL 100, col. 520: *Int.* 37. Cur plurali numero dixit: *Faciamus*? —*Resp.* Ut ostenderetur trium una operatio personarum...*Int.* 40. Cur iterum dixit: *Creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam*; cum antea dixisset: *ad imaginem nostram*?—*Resp.* Ut utrumque, et pluralitas personarum, et unitas substantia: insinuaretur.

Eustathius, *In Hexaemeron S. Basilii, Latina Metaphrasis*, PL 53, Book IX, para. 6, col. 965.

Jerome, *Epistulae*, Ad Damasum (no. 18B), CSEL 54, para. 4, p. 101.

Augustine, *De Genesi ad Litteram*, CSEL 28, Book III, chap. 19, para. 29, pp. 85-6.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in Genesim*, PL 107, Book I, col. 459.

68-9, Abraham sees three angels, but speaks to one, so indicating the Trinity:

Gregory, *Homiliae in Evangelia*, PL 76, Homilia XVIII, col. 1152A: Tunc quippe diem Domini Abraham vidit, cum in figura summæ Trinitatis tres angelos hospitio suscepit: quibus profecto susceptis, sic tribus quasi uni locutus est, quia etsi in personis numerus Trinitatis est, in natura unitas divinitatis est.

Haymo, *Homiliae de Tempore*, PL 118, Homilia LVI, col. 335: Sive aliter: Abraham diem Christi vidit, et gavisus est, quando in figura sanctæ Trinitatis tres angelos meridie hospitio suscepit. Tres enim vidit, et unum adoravit, quia in Trinitate unitatem credit.

Ambrose, *De Excessu Fratris Satyri*, PL 16, Book II, para. 96, col. 1342.

Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, CCSL 48, Book XVI, chap. 29, pp. 533-5.

De Trinitate, CCSL 50, part XVI, i, Book II, chap. 10-11, paras. 19-20, pp. 106-7.

pseudo-Bede, *In Pentateuchum*, PL 91, chap. 18, col. 238.

Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in Genesim*, PL 107, Book II, chap. 21, col. 551.

69-70, the voice of Abel's blood cries to the Lord as men's sins do:

Bede, *Hexaemeron*, PL 91, Book II, col. 66: *Vox sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de terra*: magnam vocem habet sanguis, non solum Abel, sed et omnium interfectorum pro Domino.

Alcuin, *Interrogationes Sigewulfi*, PL 100, col. 525: *Int.* 87. Quomodo vox sanguinis Abel clamat ad Dominum?—*Resp.* [Id est] homicidii illius reatus in conspectu [justi] apparebat.

Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii Oratio*, PL 16, para. 21, col. 1393.

71-2, the meaning of Genesis is complex, but the language simple:

Jerome, *Epistulae*, Ad Paulinum Presbyterum (no. 53), CSEL 54, para. 8, pp. 455-7.

73-5, Joseph prefigures Christ:

Bede, *In Pentateuchum*, PL 91, chap. 41, col. 269: Post haec Joseph a penuria frumenti salvat Ægyptum, et Christus a fame verbi Dei liberavit mundum.

Haymo, *Homiliae de Tempore*, PL 118, Homilia LXXII, col. 462: Similiter venditio Joseph venditionem praefiguravit Christi.

75-86, the tabernacle of Moses and the gifts of the Israelites:

Bede, *De Tabernaculo*, CCSL 119A, Book II, chap. 1, p. 42: Tabernaculum quod fecit domino Moyses in solitudine...statum sanctae uniuersalis ecclesiae designat.⁵⁵

Jerome, *Praefatio in Libros Samuel et Malachim*, PL 28, col. 557: In tabernaculum Dei offert unusquisque quod potest; alii aurum et argentum et lapides pretiosus, alii byssum et purpuram et coccum offerunt et hyacinthum, nobiscum bene agetur si obtulerimus pelles et caprarum pilos. Et tamen Apostolus contemptibilia nostra magis necessaria iudicat. Unde et tota illa tabernaculi pulchritudo, et per singulas species (Ecclesiae praesentis futuræque distinctio) pellibus tegitur et ciliciis, ardoremque solis et injuriam imbrium ea quæ viliora sunt prohibent.⁵⁶

Bede, *De Tabernaculo*, CCSL 119A, Book I, chap. 3, p. 11: Cui uidelicet aurum offerimus cum claritate uerae sapientiae quae est in fide recta resplendemus, argentum cum et oris nostri confessio fit in salutem...pilos caprarum cum habitum paenitentiae ac luctus induimus...lapides onichinos et gemmas ad ornandum ephod ac rationale cum miracula sanctorum quibus cogitationes Deo deuotas et opera uirtutem ornauere digna laude praedicamus.⁵⁷

86-90, the sacrifice of the tail and the end of good works:

Gregory, *XL Homiliarum in Evangelia*, PL 76, Book II, homily 25, chap. 1, col. 1189.

Bede, *In Librum Beati Patris Tobiae*, CCSL 119B, chap. 11, p. 15.

92-9, Ælfric's theory of Scriptural translation:

Jerome, *Epistulae*, Ad Pammachium (no. 57), CSEL 54, paras. 5-7, pp. 508-12.

104-6, the structure of the Bible and the body:

pseudo- Jerome, *Breviarum in Psalmos*, CCSL 78, psalm 95, verse 2 (*Annuntiate de die in diem salutare ejus*), pp. 151-2: Nolite eum tantum laudare in ueteri testamento, ne sitis Iudaei; nolite eum tantum laudare in nouo testamento, ne sitis Manichaei. Laudate illum diem de die, hoc est, in ueteri et in nouo testamento...Quia scriptum est: *Adnuntiate diem de die salutare eius*. Propterea et apostoli bini mittuntur, propterea non habemus unum oculum sed duos, propterea duas habemus aures, propterea duas nares, propterea duo labia, propterea duas manus, duos pedes...et corporis nostri membra duorum testamentorum sacramenta testantur.

108-10, the subordination of the will to God:

Benedict, *Regula*, Sources Chrétiennes 181, chap. 7, De humilitate, pp. 476-8.

New College, Oxford

Notes

1 A version of this paper was delivered at the fifteenth open meeting of *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici* at King's College, London on 30 March 1999. For discussion of some of the sources not covered in this piece, see my article "Ælfric's Preface to Genesis: Genre, Rhetoric and the Origins of the *Ars Dictaminis*" in *Anglo-Saxon England* 29 (forthcoming), especially on the tabernacle.

2 Bodleian Library Laud Miscellany MS 509, Cambridge University Library MS II.1.33, and Cotton MS Claudius B IV. The first contains Ælfric's Genesis, the other two have the OE *Hexateuch*. Cotton Claudius B IV has lost its first leaf, but part of the missing first half of the preface is preserved in a transcript, CCC MS 379.

3 These prefaces are conveniently brought together by D. De Bruyne, ed., *Préfaces de la Bible latine* (Namur, 1920), but may also be found in their proper contexts in R. Weber, ed., *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart, 1975).

4 See R. Marsden, *The Text of the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 15 (Cambridge, 1995), p. 36: "Jerome

wrote prefaces to most of the books he translated from the Hebrew and these are rarely absent from Vulgate manuscripts.”

5 PL 28, col. 147.

6 “Ælfric as Translator: the Old English Prose Genesis,” *Anglia* 109 (1991): 319-58, at pp. 322-8.

7 Quotations from the text and references to its lineation are taken from J. Wilcox, ed., *Ælfric's Prefaces*, Durham Medieval Texts 9 (Durham, 1994), pp. 116-19.

8 Quoted from *St Jerome, Letters and Select Works*, trans. W.H. Fremantle, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. 6, pp. 113-15. The text may be found in CSEL 54, paras. 6-7, pp. 508-12. Similar remarks on the absurdity of word-for-word translation are made by Jerome in the preface to the translation of Eusebius.

9 I pursue the issue of Ælfric's debt to Jerome further in the *ASE* article mentioned above.

10 Pseudo-Jerome, *Breviarum in Psalmos*, CCSL 78, psalm 95, verse 2 (*Annuntiate de die in diem salutare ejus*), pp. 151-2.

11 See, principally, J.H. Ott, *Über die Quellen der Heiligenleben in Ælfrics Lives of Saints I* (Halle, 1892), M. Förster, “Über die Quellen von Ælfrics exegetischen Homiliae Catholicae,” *Anglia* 16 (1894), pp. 1-61, E.M. Raynes, “Ms Boulogne-sur-Mer 63 and Ælfric,” *Medium Aevum* 26 (1957), pp. 65-73, C.L. Smetana, “Ælfric and the Early Medieval Homiliary,” *Traditio* 15 (1959), pp. 163-204 and “Ælfric and the Homiliary of Haymo of Halberstadt,” *Traditio* 17 (1961), pp. 457-69, J. Hill, “Ælfric and Smaragdus,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 21 (1992), pp. 203-37.

12 *Books Known to the English, 597-1066* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), p. 183.

13 Pembroke, Cambridge 91, Gneuss no. 136; see his “A Preliminary List of Manuscripts written or owned in England up to 1100,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 9 (1981), pp. 1-60, at p. 12.

14 “Nu cwædon þa Mannichei, þa manfullan gedwolan, þæt Gode wære unwurð on his mægenþrymnyse þæt he wurde acenned of wifmannes gecynde,” *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, ed. J.C. Pope, EETS os 259 (London, 1967), homily I, pp 213-14, ll. 410-12. See also Pope IV, p. 279, ll. 276-7, where Ælfric speaks of the same heresy.

15 Note L. Grundy, *Books and Grace: Ælfric's Theology*, King's College London Medieval Studies 6 (London, 1991), pp. 26-7: "Ælfric was worried by error, as his prefaces indicate, but it is not likely that he had to deal with actual heresy." B. Raw points out, however, that the early eleventh century saw the appearance in the West of new Trinitarian heresy: *Trinity and Incarnation in Anglo-Saxon Art and Thought*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 21 (Cambridge, 1997), p. 24.

16 His phrasing earlier in the preface with regards to those who *wish* to live now according to the law of Moses shows a similar predisposition to locate human sinfulness in the will, if this is the correct translation. Perhaps, however, the auxiliary indicates a hypothetical future (ll. 19-20, Gif hwa wyle nu swa lybban = "If someone is going to live in this fashion in the modern age"). On Ælfric's Augustinian emphasis on the role of free will in the origin of sin, see Grundy, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-94.

17 Grundy, *Books and Grace*, p. 26. She also helpfully lists references in his works to the trinitarian heretics Arius, Sabellius and Olympius and the non-trinitarian Manichees and the man who maintained that Christ never ate.

18 *The Church History of Eusebius*, trans. A.C. McGiffert, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (Oxford, 1905), I:159 (and n. 8 on the probability that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" differed from the canonical Gospel of Matthew). On Ælfric's use of Eusebius (known to him in the Latin translation by Rufinus) in *The Catholic Homilies*, see M. Förster, *op. cit.*

19 McGiffert, *op. cit.*, p. 161. Licentiousness was commonly attributed to those who rejected the law, and, conversely, those who were held to be sexually incontinent were often charged with antinomianism.

20 See *A Dictionary of the Bible, dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents, including the Biblical Theology*, ed. J. Hastings (Edinburgh, 1900), III:547, n. 3 and McGiffert, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-2.

21 PL 118, col. 836.

22 See Wilcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-5, *A Guide to Old English*, ed. B. Mitchell and F.C. Robinson, 5th ed. (Oxford, 1992), pp. 191-5 and *Bright's Old English Grammar and Reader*, ed. F.G. Cassidy and R.N. Ringler, 3rd ed. (New York, 1971), pp.251-4.

23 *The Old English Version of the Heptateuch, Ælfric's Treatise on the Old and New Testament and his Preface to Genesis*, ed. S.J. Crawford, EETS o.s. 160 (London, 1922), p. 289.

24 *Poems and Prose from the Old English*, trans. B. Raffel, ed. B. Raffel and A.H. Olsen (New Haven, 1998), p. 176.

25 See *OLD*, *cauda*, sense 3.

26 Note that Ælfric deploys a number of terms in the preface with more than one sense—*æ* (law/ Testament), *boc* (book/ Book of the Bible), *gecynd* (origin/ species), *gelaðung* (the Church as building and congregation), *awendan* (change/ turn/ translate), *ful soð/soðlice* (truly/literally)—perhaps reflecting in his style the complexity of meaning that is his theme.

27 *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

28 *The Cambridge History of the Bible from the Beginnings to Jerome*, ed. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 415-16.

29 *The Treatise De Spiritu Sancto, The Nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron and the Letters of St Basil the Great*, trans. B. Jackson, A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 2nd Series, 8 (Oxford, 1895), pp. 106-7. Eustathius, however, does not directly translate the first section of this passage.

30 For full references to the relevant passages see *Conspectus*, section B, lines 63-7. In addition to these analogues, it should also be noted that “Genesis was specially near to [Alcuin’s] heart, he often cites Genesis 1:26...and it becomes a key passage in the dispute about images”: see J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), p. 215.

31 See, respectively, Mitchell and Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-5, and Wilcox, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-19.

32 *Sermo LXXI*, PL 38, chap. 12, sections 19-20, col. 455: “Sed perfecta charitas perfectum donum est Spiritus sancti. Prius est autem illud quod ad remissionem pertinet peccatorum...Contra hoc donum gratuitum, contra istam Dei gratiam loquitur cor impœnitens. Ipsa ergo impœnitentia est Spiritus blasphemia, quæ non remittetur neque in hoc sæculo, neque in futuro.”

33 *De Civitate Dei*, CCSL 48, Book XVI, chap. 29, pp. 533-5: “Item Deus apparuit Abrahae ad quercum Mambre in tribus uiris, quos dubitandum non est angelos fuisse... Unde multo est credibilius, quod et Abraham in tribus et Loth in duobus viris Dominum agnoscebant, cui per singularem numerum loquebantur, etiam cum eos homines esse arbitrarentur...sed erat profecto aliquid, quo ita excellabant, licet tamquam homines, ut in eis esse Dominum, sicut adsolet in prophetis, hi,

qui hospitalitatem illis exhibebant, dubitare non possent; atque ideo et ipsos aliquando pluraliter et in eis Dominum aliquando singulariter appellabant. Angelos autem fuisse scriptura testatur, non solum in hoc Genesis libro, ubi haec gesta narrantur, uerum etiam in epistula ad Hebraeos, ubi, cum hospitalitas laudaretur: *Per hanc, inquit, etiam quidam nescientes hospitio receperunt angelos.*”

34 These are listed in *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron*, II Genesis, ed. B. Fischer (Freiburg, 1951-4), pp. 194-5.

35 See Conspectus section B, lines 68-9.

36 *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies, The Second Series: Text*, ed. M Godden, EETS ss 5 (London, 1979), Dominica Quinta in Quadragesima, p. 133, ll. 185-7. For the relevant quotation from Gregory, see Conspectus, section B, lines 68-9.

37 Mitchell and Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 192 and Wilcox, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

38 See Conspectus, section B, lines 47-52.

39 *Ælfric's Anglo-Saxon Version of Alcuini Interrogationes Sigeuulfi Presbyteri in Genesin*, ed. G.E. MacLean (Halle, 1883), p. 72.

40 *Exameron Anglice, or the Old English Hexameron*, ed. S.J. Crawford, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 10 (Hamburg, 1921), pp. 35-7.

41 Pope, *op. cit.*, pp. 199-200.

42 MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

43 Crawford, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-6.

44 Pope, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

45 See Conspectus, section B, lines 47-52.

46 Sancti Augustini Sermones, post Maurinos Reperti, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, ed. G. Morin, vol. I (Rome, 1930), pp. 12-13: *In principio*, inquit, *fecit Deus caelum et terram*. Fecit in principio caelum et terram. Per quid fecit? Per Verbum... Ipsum enim Verbum est et Sapientia Dei, cui dicitur: *Omnia in Sapientia fecisti*. Si in sapientia Deus fecit omnia, et unigenitus eius Filius procul dubio est Dei Sapientia, non dubitemus in Filio facta esse, quae per Filium facta esse didicimus. Nam ipse Filius est profecto principium. Interrogantibus quippe Iudaeis et dicentibus, *Tu quis est?* respondit, *Principium*. Ecce *In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram... Spiritus Dei super-*

ferebatur super aquas, et ipse opifex, nec a Patre et unigenito Verbo seiunctus. Nam ecce, si diligenter attendamus, Trinitas nobis insinuat. Ubi enim dicitur, *In principio fecit*, usia intellegitur Patris et Filii: in principio Filio, Deus Pater. Restat Spiritus, ut Trinitas impleatur: *Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquas*.

47 *Commentaria in S. Joannis Evangelium*, PL 100, chap. 21, col. 864: Respondit dicentibus *Tu quis es?* et ait: *Principium, quod et loquor vobis*. Quare se dicit Dominus Jesus principium? Quia omnia per ipsum facta sunt, sicut Psalmus dicit: *Omnia in sapientia fecisti*. Si igitur omnia in sapientia fecit Deus, id est, in Filio suo coæterno sibi et consubstantiali, Filius utique omnium principium est.

48 *In S. Joannis Evangelium Expositio*, PL 92, col. 745: Respondit dicentibus *Tu quis es?* et ait: *Principium, qui et loquor vobis*. Quare se dicit Dominus Jesus principium? Principium, quia omnia per ipsum facta sunt, sicut Psalmista dicit: *Omnia in sapientia fecisti*. Si igitur omnia in sapientia fecit Deus, id est, Filio suo coæterno sibi et substantiali, Filius utique omnium principium est.

49 On this form and its history, see A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship and the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford, 1993), pp. 82-96.

50 MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

51 P. Clemons, "The Chronology of Ælfric's Works," in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in some Aspects of their History and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. Clemons (London, 1959), pp. 212-47, at p. 225.

52 See *Conspectus B*, lines 69-70.

53 MacLean, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

54 Johnson's *A Collection of the Laws and Canons of the Church of England*, ed. and trans. J. Baron, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1850), I: 217. J.E. Cross and A. Hamer, in their "Ælfric's Letters and the *Excerptiones Eggerhti*," in *Alfred the Wise: Studies in Honour of Janet Bately on the Occasion of her Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. J. Roberts, J.L. Nelson and M. Godden (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 5-13 argue, however, that Ælfric is the source for the similar passages in the *Excerptiones*, rather than vice versa. If so, this influence extends beyond his *Letters* to this preface.

55 *Bede: On the Tabernacle*, trans. A.G. Holder, *Translated Texts for Historians*, 18 (Liverpool, 1994), p. 45.

56 Fremantle, *op. cit.*, p. 490.

57 Holder, *op. cit.*, p. 9.