Æthelthryth of Ely in a lost calendar from Munich

MECHTHILD GRETSCH

ABSTRACT

A fragment of a calendar, written s. viii$^{2/4}$, either in England or in an Anglo-Saxon centre on the Continent was preserved in Munich until 1939, but was subsequently lost. While still extant, the fragment had been printed, and from this edition it can be seen that, in addition to universally culted saints, the entries included the obits of five Anglo-Saxons, Æthelthryth among them. After a brief review of how the commemorations of the universal saints relate to the earliest manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and to Bede's Martyrology, the article focuses on the English obits, in particular on the question of what light may be shed on the origin and first ambience of the calendar by its commemoration of Æthelthryth and by the form in which her obit there appears.

The fragment Munich, Hauptstaatsarchiv, Raritäten-Selekt 108 was a mutilated folio, containing a calendar for most of the months of May and June. According to an entry in the typescript catalogue of the Hauptstaatsarchiv, the fragment was lost in connection with an exhibition in 1939. It is described in volume IX of Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores*.[1] This volume appeared in 1959, and the loss of the fragment is duly recorded there, but there can be no doubt that Lowe (or Bernhard Bischoff who collaborated with him) had inspected the folio before 1939: its vellum is said to be of 'insular type', the initial K's are described as 'coloured in green and red', and a plate, showing the entries from 3 to 13 May, accompanies the description. Lowe and Bischoff date the fragment to the eighth century, describe the script as 'a compressed Anglo-Saxon majuscule verging on minuscule', and assume the manuscript to have been written 'in England or in a Continental centre under Anglo-Saxon influence'. A number of additions were made 'in Anglo-Saxon and Caroline minuscule by different hands, saec. viii and ix'.[2] The ninth- and early-tenth- century provenance of the manuscript is (on grounds of these additions) either Tegernsee or Ilmmünster (both monasteries belonged to the diocese of Freising in Bavaria). At one time

---

[1] See E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols. and supplement (Oxford, 1934–71) IX.1236.

[2] *Ibid*. Bischoff also describes the fragment briefly in his *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit* I. *Die bayrischen Diözesen*, 3rd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1974), p. 167, where he gives 721 × 755 as the date for the original entries and records insular influence for the first entries made by the later hands (the entries for 7 May, 5 and 14 June). The dating 721 × 755 is given on grounds of obits in the fragment, on which see below.

159

the fragment seems to have served as a binding leaf for a printed book,[3] but it is not known when the manuscript to which the folio originally belonged was dismembered, what printed book it was bound up with, and how the fragment eventually fetched up in the Hauptstaatsarchiv in Munich. A number of the original entries in the calendar point to Northumbria; the most recent of these entries being the death of King Osric of Northumbria (729) which is recorded on 9 May.[4] The earliest datable addition by a later hand refers to the martyrdom of St Boniface on 5 June 754. This leaves us with 729 × 754 as the outer limits for the origin of the calendar (at least for the two months that had been preserved until 1939).

The folio has been edited integrally and according to its manuscript layout by Dom Romuald Bauerreiss and (after Bauerreiss's edition) by Klaus Gamber,[5] who both associate the calendar with Boniface and the Anglo-Saxon mission to Germany.[6] The Anglo-Saxon obits are printed and discussed by Jan Gerchow,[7] and all the original entries are printed (again after Bauerreiss's edition) and discussed in an important article by Paul Grosjean, who also associates the fragment with the Anglo-Saxon mission (see below, pp. 164–5).[8]

In what follows, I shall explore what light may be shed on the origin and first ambience of the calendar by its commemoration of Æthelthryth and by the form in which her obit there appears. For this it will be necessary to form some

---

[3] See R. Bauerreiss, 'Ein angelsächsisches Kalendarfragment des bayrischen Hauptstaatsarchivs in München', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktiner-Ordens und seiner Zweige* 51 (1933), 177–82, at 177. Note that neither Lowe nor Bischoff make mention of such a stage in the history of the fragment.

[4] The date 721 given by Bischoff as the *terminus post quem* (above, n. 2), is due to an erroneous identification of the Osric commemorated on 9 May, made by Bauerreiss, 'Kalendarfragment' and others: see below, p. 165 and n. 22.

[5] See Bauerreiss, 'Kalendarfragment', pp. 178–9, and K. Gamber, *Das Bonifatius-Sakramentar* (Regensburg, 1975), pp. 50–2.

[6] See Bauerreiss, 'Kalendarfragment', pp. 180–1; Gamber links the Munich fragment to the so-called 'Regensburger Bonifatius-Sakramentar': see *Bonifatius-Sakramentar*, p. 49; see also his *Codices liturgici Latini antiquiores*, 2nd ed. (Fribourg, 1968), no. 413, and his article 'Liturgiebücher der Regensburger Kirche aus der Agilolfinger- und Karolingerzeit', *Scriptorium* 30 (1976), 3–25, at 6–7. There is, however, no certainty that the calendar fragment indeed formed part of a sacramentary. The fact that entries continued to be made in the calendar at a time when the type of sacramentary to which the calendar would have belonged had long been superseded, might be taken to speak against such assumption: see Gamber, *Bonifatius-Sakramentar*, p. 50, n. 28.

[7] J. Gerchow, *Die Gedenküberlieferung der Angelsachsen, mit einem Katalog der libri uitae und Nekrologien* (Berlin, 1988), pp. 213–15 (commentary) and 329, no. 2 (list of obits). For an earlier ed. of the Anglo-Saxon obits, see F. L. Baumann, *Dioeceses Brixinensis, Frisigensis, Ratisbonensis*, MGH, Necrologia Germaniae III (Berlin, 1905), pp. 103–4.

[8] See P. Grosjean, 'Un fragment d'obituaire Anglo-Saxon du VIIIe siècle naguère conservé à Munich', *AB* 79 (1961), 320–45.

estimate of the company she keeps in the Munich calendar. I begin therefore with a synopsis of the feasts that were entered by the original scribe and which span the period from 3 to 24 May and from 4 to 24 June, which is all that had survived.

3 May	SS Alexander [Eventius and Theodolus][9]
5 May	Ascension of Christ
6 May	Bishop Eadberht of Lindisfarne
7 May	John of Beverley, archbishop of York
8 May	St Victor
9 May	Beginning of summer; King Osric of Northumbria
12 May	St Pancratius
13 May	Dedication of the Pantheon
14 May	SS Isidorus and Bonifatius
15 May	*primum pentecostes*[10] and St Marcorius
18 May	St Mark, the Evangelist
19 May	St Pudentiana
20 May	St Basilla; King Ecgfrith of Northumbria
6 June	Dedication of the Holy Cross and the Altar
7 June	St Columba of Iona
9 June	SS Primus and Felicianus
11 June	St Barnabas, the Apostle
12 June	St Basilides
14 June	St Elijah, the Prophet
15 June	St Vitus
17 June	SS Diogenes and Blastus and 262 other martyrs
18 June	SS Marcus and Marcellianus
19 June	SS Gervasius and Protasius
22 June	St James, 'the Less'
23 June	Æthelthryth
24 June	St John, the Baptist

THE UNIVERSAL SAINTS

The saints who are commemorated in the foregoing list are for the most part those contained in the early recensions of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*.[11]

---

[9] Only Alexander's name had been legible; that his usual companions were also commemorated is clear from the plural form used at the beginning of the entry: n*at*ale s*anct*orum.

[10] For this entry, see below, p. 174.

[11] For a brief analysis of the feasts in the Munich fragment with regard to their agreement with various manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, see Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 325–33. In Grosjean's view the entries commemorating universal saints or feasts were taken from a

161

The textual history of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* is immensely complex and need not be rehearsed here in any detail, except for some few points which are relevant to the present discussion. The *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* was originally compiled somewhere in Northern Italy, in the late fifth century (in spite of its name, it has no connection whatsoever with St Jerome). Its text was revised somewhere in Gaul, in the course of the sixth century (or perhaps very early in the seventh); one or several copies of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* reached England (Northumbria) in the course of the seventh century, where the text underwent some revision and attracted a number of accretions, the commemoration of specifically Northumbrian saints among them. The text was subsequently taken back to the Continent, where its three earliest surviving copies were written, almost three centuries after the original compilation had been made:

(1) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 10837, fols. 2–32, written at Echternach (now in Luxembourg), s. viii^{in} (E)
(2) Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 289, fols. 37–129, written at Metz, s. ix$^{1/3}$ (B)
(3) Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August-Bibliothek, Weissenburg 81, written at Weissenburg, where it was copied in 772 from an exemplar originating at Saint-Wandrille (W)

These three copies represent two distinct redactions, with E (written at Willibrord's monastery and containing the clearest indications of a Northumbrian stage of the text) representing the first, and B and W representing the second redaction.[12]

copy of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* or, possibly, from a sacramentary which commemorated identical saints and feasts for the days in question. The edition of the three earliest full manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (ptd diplomatically in three columns) is G. B. de Rossi and L. Duchesne, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum ad fidem codicum adiectis prolegomenis*, Acta Sanctorum Nov. II.1 (Brussels, 1894). There is a second edition, comprising a commentary and the collation of further manuscripts, by H. Quentin and H. Delehaye, Acta Sanctorum Nov. II.2 (Brussels, 1931).

[12] For two recent surveys of the reconstructed textual history of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, see P. Ó Riain, 'A Northumbrian Phase in the Formation of the Hieronymian Martyrology. The Evidence of the Martyrology of Tallaght', *AB* 120 (2002), 311–63, at 318–23, and M. Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham and the Origin of the *Old English Martyrology*', *AB* 123 (2005), 29–78, at 45–52; both with fresh insights concerning the early history of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, especially its English phase. Note that Ó Riain and Lapidge disagree, in that Ó Riain would derive all three early manuscripts from a Northumbrian hyparchetype, whereas Lapidge (in accordance with de Rossi and Duchesne, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, p. (xliv)) posits a Northumbrian hyparchetype only for E (see Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', p. 52, n. 77). For a detailed discussion of the various types of martyrologies in medieval and modern use, see H. Leclercq, 'Martyrologe', in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* X.2 (Paris, 1932), cols. 2523–619.

162

With regard to the Munich fragment, it will be seen that, excepting E, even the earliest surviving texts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* postdate its calendar. For a number of the Munich calendar entries the relationship with the three early manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* is not straightforward,[13] and there is no unequivocal affiliation with the Echternach recension, which one might have expected. To give a few examples: St Marcorius (15 May) has no parallel and cannot be identified; St Pudentiana (19 May) does not occur in the early manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, and the place given for her martyrdom in the Munich calendar, 'in aquilone', is attested nowhere else and may be an error. The place given for the martyrdom of SS Primus and Felicianus (9 June), 'in celio monte', is correct, but also occurs nowhere else; and the combination of saints commemorated on 17 June is found in no manuscript of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*.

There are a few interesting links with Bede's *Martyrologium*, which was composed between 725 and 731.[14] Unlike the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, which gives only the name of the saint, the date on which he or she was martyred or buried, and the place of his/her death, Bede usually includes a brief narrative of the circumstances which accompanied a saint's death. He thus created the type of the historical martyrology. Nevertheless, Bede drew for a substantial amount of his entries on the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*.[15] Concerning the links of the Munich fragment with Bede's *Martyrologium*, it is noteworthy that it commemorates the 'Dedicatio basilicae beatae Mariae' on 13 May. This refers to the dedication of the Pantheon at Rome as a Christian church, which took place probably in 609. The feast is not found in the early manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*; it occurs first in Bede's *Martyrologium*. The earliest manuscript of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* which commemorates the dedication of the Pantheon is a tenth-century manuscript, written at Sens, which has been shown to preserve Insular influence.[16] Furthermore, the Munich fragment and Bede commemorate the apostle Barnabas on 11 June (instead of 10

---

[13] See discussion by Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 325–33.

[14] For the date, see Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', p. 57 and n. 107, and H. Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du moyen age* (Paris, 1908), p. 106.

[15] For a comprehensive study of Bede's martyrology, see Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques*, pp. 17–119; and see, briefly, Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham' pp. 46–9, where it is estimated that Bede drew for about seventy percent of his entries on the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. There is an edition of Bede's *Martyrologium* by J. Dubois and G. Renaud, *Edition pratique des martyrologes de Bède, de l'anonyme lyonnais et de Florus* (Paris, 1976). Unfortunately, this edition is not very reliable: see Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', p. 46, n. 54.

[16] For the historical background of the feast, see briefly Grosjean, 'Obituaire', p. 326. The manuscript from Sens is now shelved in two parts as Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 1604 and Rome, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 567; for Insular influences in its text, see Ó Riain, 'Northumbrian Phase', p. 318 and n. 24, and p. 347.

June) and the prophet Elijah on 14 June (instead of 20 July). Both are not found in the early manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, and for both this is the day on which they were commemorated in the Greek liturgy. It is probable that for these and a number of other feasts which are dated according to Greek (as opposed to western) liturgy in Bede's *Martyrologium*, Bede drew on a Greek menological or liturgical source, now lost.[17] This Greek source was also laid under contribution by the compiler of the Latin *Vorlage* of the *Old English Martyrology*, who may have been in close contact with Bede.[18] The compiler of the Munich calendar may have taken the commemorations of Barnabas and Elijah on their Greek feast days directly from Bede, or he may have had independent access to the Greek source (perhaps in a Latin translation). The second explanation is suggested specifically by a third commemoration in the calendar which has a Greek background (at least in part), but is not found in Bede's *Martyrologium*: the martyrdom of SS Isidore and Boniface (14 May). The partial Greek background and the unusual character of this commemoration was noted by Grosjean, who observed that in the Latin West neither Isidore nor Boniface occurred in a calendar earlier than the Munich fragment.[19] In the manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* both saints occur together only in B (s. ix$^{1/3}$), but the correct localization given for St Boniface's burial place ('in auentino') occurs uniquely in the Munich fragment. This interest in Boniface of Tarsus revealed in the entry for 14 May prompted

---

[17] For the feasts in question and Bede's hypothetical source, see Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', p. 58, n. 113 and pp. 70–2 (with further references). For the Greek background of the commemoration of Barnabas and Elijah, see also Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 331–2.

[18] On this Latin *Vorlage* for the *Old English Martyrology* and its presumed compiler, see Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham'; on the Greek source drawn on by the *Vorlage*, see *ibid*. pp. 71–2.

[19] See Grosjean, 'Obituaire', p. 327. Note that SS Isidore and Boniface did not suffer martyrdom conjointly. Isidore was a third-century soldier from Alexandria, who was martyred at Chios; he is commemorated on 14 May in Greek sources, 15 May (or 5 February) in the Latin West. Boniface was a fourth-century Roman, martyred at Tarsus. His earliest Greek *passio* (*Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca*, ed. F. Halkin, 3rd ed. I (Brussels, 1957), no. 279–80) does not give the date and place of his martyrdom. Later Greek menological sources commemorate him on 19 (17, 18, 20) December: see (the late-ninth-century) *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. H. Delehaye, Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum, *Nouembris* (Brussels, 1902), p. 325. May 14 (as in the Munich fragment) is his feast day in the western church: he is entered at this date in the (ninth-century) Marble Calendar of Naples, which records the saints that were commemorated in this city: see H. Delehaye, 'Hagiographie napolitaine', *AB* 57 (1939), 5–64, at 22. Also note that in Anglo-Saxon menological sources St Boniface of Tarsus occurs scarcely at all: he is absent from Bede's *Martyrologium* and the *Old English Martyrology*, and, with the possible exception of the calendar in Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 150 (prob. 969 × 987, South-West England), no Anglo-Saxon calendar has this Boniface. (The entry in Salisbury 150 is mutilated: only *Sancti Bone* is legible. As two saints of that name were commemorated on 14 May it is not clear which Boniface is in question: Boniface, the sixth-century bishop of Ferrento (whose miracles are related in Gregory's *Dialogi* I.9), or Boniface of Tarsus, the martyr (as is assumed by F. Wormald, *English Kalendars before 1100*, HBS 72 (London, 1934), p. 20, n. 2)).

Grosjean to surmise that the entry lets us glimpse 'la dévotion personelle' which St Boniface, the missionary, may have felt for a saint whose name was given to him by Pope Gregory II in 718.[20]

In sum, therefore, the entries for universal saints in the Munich fragment present an uneven picture in terms of their relationship with the early manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. This may teach us that, already in the incipient stages of its documented transmission, the relation between the various witnesses of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (including breviate versions and calendars) was more complex than can be captured by a stemma – notwithstanding the probability that a stemma may adequately represent the basic links between individual manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and the ultimate derivation of these manuscripts. Bede's remark that many copies of all the texts necessary for the celebrations of feast days were now extant in churches and monasteries,[21] may be reflected in the intricate relationships of the surviving early copies of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, calendars and liturgical books, such as the Munich fragment with its, partly elusive, affiliations with the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, Bede's *Martyrologium* and, perhaps, a Greek menological source.

<div align="center">THE ANGLO-SAXON OBITS</div>

The commemoration of English saints has always played an important role in establishing textual relationships and confirming the Insular derivations of continental manuscripts. It is to these entries in the Munich calendar that we may now turn. In the brief span covered by our calendar no less than five English ecclesiastics or kings are commemorated. The kings are: Ecgfrith of Northumbria (d. 685), on 20 May, and Osric of Northumbria (d. 729), on 6 May.[22] There is no evidence that either of them was culted at any time. Osric

---

[20] See Grosjean, 'Obituaire', p. 327.

[21] Cf. *Historia ecclesiastica* IV.18 [16] (ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Oxford, 1969), p. 388).

[22] The obits for both kings are given by Bede: cf. *Historia ecclesiastica* [*HE*] IV.26 [24] (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 426) for Ecgfrith, and *HE* V.23 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 556) for Osric. Bauerreis ('Angelsächsisches Kalendarfragment', p. 179), followed by Grosjean ('Obituaire', p. 336) and Gamber (*Bonifatius-Sakramentar*, p. 40), identified this Osric as King Osric of Deira (d. 634), but the error was already noted and corrected by W. Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 146–7 and n. 5. A more thorough look at Bede could have revealed at a glance that the obit could scarcely refer to Osric of Deira – a king who had reverted to paganism and whose name, according to Bede, had been erased from all regnal lists on grounds of his apostasy: cf. *HE* III.1 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 212–14). Nevertheless, the erroneous identification is repeated in an article by W. A. Chaney ('Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England', *Harvard Theol. Rev.* 59 (1960), 197–217, at 212–13, n. 88) who, in spite of Osric's apostasy assumes a posthumous cult of this king, since he was killed by the heathen Cadwallon.

<div align="center">165</div>

does not occur in any other liturgical source, while obits for Ecgfrith are entered in the calendar of Archbishop Willibrord[23] and in the late-twelfth-century Irish manuscript of the 'Martyrology of Tallaght', which preserves a considerable number of entries pointing to an early-eighth-century Northumbrian exemplar in its line of transmission.[24]

Likewise, obits for two bishops are entered in the Munich fragment: on 6 May, Eadberht (d. 689), St Cuthbert's successor as bishop of Lindisfarne, and on 7 May, John of Beverley (d. 721), bishop of Hexham (687–706), subsequently bishop of York (706–21). Bede gives the precise date for Eadberht's death,[25] but has the year only for John of Beverley's death.[26] Eadberht and John of Beverley also occur in the *Old English Martyrology*,[27] where John is commemorated on the same day (7 May) as in the Munich calendar; and it is almost certain that he had a feast day in May (although no precise date can be given) in the lost Northumbrian archetype of the 'Metrical Calendar of York', composed 754 × 766.[28] With regard to the *Old English Martyrology* (itself being a ninth-century text), a strong case has been made recently that it was translated

---

[23] The calendar is ed. H. A. Wilson, *The Calendar of St Willibrord*, HBS 55 (London, 1918); for bibliography on the manuscript (Paris, BNF, lat. 10837, which also contains the E-version of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*), see B. Ebersperger, *Die angelsächsischen Handschriften in den Pariser Bibliotheken* (Heidelberg, 1999), pp. 185–6. The calendar was written at Echternach for Willibrord's personal use, and was compiled in its original form before 709; the obit for Ecgfrith was added by the 'second', almost contemporary, hand: see Wilson, *Calendar*, pp. x–xi, and, for the dating of the various later hands, p. xiii. King Ecgfrith also occurs, together with a substantial number of Anglo-Saxon entries, in a calendar, now Berlin, Staatsbibliothek preussischer Kulturbesitz, Phillipps 1869, written at Prüm, s. ix²/³, the Carolingian 'Reichskalender', as it has been called by its most recent editor (see below, p. 173, n. 58). On the date and origin, see B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* I (Wiesbaden, 1998), p. 92, no. 438. On entries (not only of English names) in this calendar which were evidently taken over from Anglo-Saxon sources, see W. Böhne, 'Das älteste Lorscher Kalendar und seine Vorlagen', *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch. Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764,* ed. F. Knöpp, 2 vols. (Darmstadt, 1977) II, 171–220. On these entries, see also P. Meyvaert (as n. 58, below, p. 173), pp. 12–16 and 62–3.

[24] The 'Martyrology of Tallaght' is ed. R. I. Best and H. J. Lawlor, *The Martyrology of Tallaght from the Book of Leinster and MS. 5100–4 in the Royal Library Brussels*, HBS 68 (London, 1931). For the Northumbrian exemplar of the 'Martyrology of Tallaght', see Ó Riain, 'Northumbrian Phase', esp pp. 323–7, 329–30 and 338–44; and cf. his stemma at 360–1. The Northumbrian entries are conveniently extracted (in the form in which they occur in the text) by Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', p. 50.

[25] See *HE* IV.28 [30] (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 444).

[26] See *HE* V.6 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 468).

[27] See *Das altenglische Martyrologium*, ed. G. Kotzor, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Abhandlungen 88, 2 vols. (Munich, 1981) II, chs. 80 and 81 (pp. 90–6).

[28] See discussion by M. Lapidge, 'A Tenth-Century Metrical Calendar from Ramsey', in his *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900–1066* (London, 1993), pp. 343–86, at 348 (orig. publ. *RB* 94 (1984), 326–69).

integrally from a Latin *Vorlage*, a martyrology compiled 731 × 740.[29] Arguably therefore, the date of the obit given in the *Old English Martyrology* and in the Munich calendar are the earliest references to a commemoration of John of Beverley on 7 May.[30]

Ecgfrith and Osric of Northumbria are styled 'rex', and Eadberht of Lindisfarne and John of Beverley are styled 'episcopus', but the style that presumably followed the fifth English entry, 'depositio aethildrudis', had been illegible when Bauerreiss edited the Munich fragment: he recorded a space of about four letters of which nothing could be made out. Was this style 'uirginis' or 'reginae'? I shall return to this question in a moment.

The date of the obit for Æthelthryth (23 June) is that on which she is commemorated invariably in later Anglo-Saxon calendars and mass books. But no date is given by Bede in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, although he devotes two entire chapters[31] to St Æthelthryth, for whom he felt a deep and long-standing veneration, as can be seen from the elaborate, abecedarian, epanaleptic hymn in her honour, which fills most of the second chapter, and which, Bede says, he composed 'many years ago'.[32] Bede gives, however, 23 June as the date for Æthelthryth's deposition in his *Martyrologium*, composed 725 × 731,[33] where she is one of four English saints whom he includes (the others being St Cuthbert (20 March), the two brothers Hewald (3 October) and Paulinus (11 October), bishop of York and latterly bishop of Rochester). On 23 June Æthelthryth is also commemorated in the *Old English Martyrology*,[34] and hence, arguably, in its Latin *Vorlage*, dated to the 730s (see above). The account of her given there is, however, based unequivocally on Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* (which provides no date), not on his *Martyrologium*. The *Vorlage* for the *Old English Martyrology* (henceforth *OEM Vorlage*), Bede's *Martyrologium* and the Munich calendar are the only eighth-century liturgical sources in which Æthelthryth is commemorated.[35] In sum, then, within two months, which have not even been preserved integrally,[36] the Munich calendar assembled the obits for two Northumbrian kings, two Northumbrian saintly bishops, and an East Anglian saint and Northumbrian queen. This cannot be paralleled by the English entries in any other liturgical source, not

---

[29] See Lapidge, 'Acca of Hexham', esp p. 69.

[30] John of Beverley is also commemorated, on 5 May, in the Martyrology of Tallaght.

[31] *HE* IV.19 [17] and 20 [18].   [32] See *HE* IV.20 [18] (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 396).

[33] See Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques*, p. 106; for the date of Bede's text, see above, p. 163.

[34] See *Martyrologium*, ed. Kotzor II, ch. 110 (pp. 127–9).

[35] She is not recorded in the Martyrology of Tallaght with its eighth-century Northumbrian connections.

[36] It would have been interesting to know whether the Munich fragment commemorated St Augustine of Canterbury on 26 May, as do manuscripts E and B of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, but any May entries after the 24th had apparently been cut off.

even by the Latin *Vorlage* for the *Old English Martyrology*, with its keen interest in Northumbrian saints, or by the Martyrology of Tallaght, with its substantial residue of Northumbrian entries. It may be a reasonable hypothesis that English entries were included in similar numbers in the Munich calendar for the months that had not survived.

Where did the compiler of the calendar find these English entries? We have seen that for three of the surviving entries (kings Ecgfrith and Osric, and Bishop Eadberht) he could have drawn on Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*.[37] For one (John of Beverley) he could have drawn on *OEM Vorlage*; alternatively both *OEM Vorlage* and the calendar could have drawn independently on a third source. Equally for one entry (Æthelthryth), the compiler of the calendar could have drawn on Bede's *Martyrologium* (which would provide a further link with that text), or on *OEM Vorlage*, or independently on a source that may also have been laid under contribution by the two other texts. The various possibilities which open themselves up in the case of Æthelthryth and John of Beverley (for which recourse to the *Historia ecclesiastica* is excluded) may permit us to think that the obits for Ecgfrith, Osric and Eadberht, too, may not have been drawn from the *Historia ecclesiastica*, the (for us) obvious source: the latest datable entry in the fragment is the obit for Osric (d. 729), the calendar must have been on the Continent by 754 (St Boniface's martyrdom) at the latest,[38] and the *Historia ecclesiastica* was completed only in 731. Furthermore, if the calendar is to be associated with the Anglo-Saxon mission,[39] we should bear in mind that, as late as 746/7, Boniface wrote to Northumbria, asking for copies of Bede's works.[40] In other words, it is possible that all the English obits were derived from a common source, a source which was different from the one drawn on for the universal saints and feasts, and which (on grounds of the obits for kings Ecgfrith and Osric) may also have been different from the source(s) that were drawn on by Bede's *Martyrologium* and the *OEM Vorlage*. This source for the English entries could have been an obit list: a hypothesis which was first propounded by Paul Grosjean.[41] Among the arguments adduced by Grosjean in support of his hypothesis is the observation that the English obits were entered towards the right-hand margin of a line, and that this indentation was observed even when there was no other entry for the day

---

[37] For Eadberht he could have also drawn on *OEM Vorlage*. [38] See above, p. 160.
[39] See above, p. 160, and below, p. 173.
[40] Cf. *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, ed. M. Tangl, MGH, Epist. select. I (Berlin, 1916), letters no. 75 (Boniface to Archbishop Ecgberht of York) and no. 76 (Boniface to Abbot Hwætberht of Wearmouth). However, the wording of these letters does not permit us to conclude that Boniface, in the mid-740s, had no previous knowledge of any of Bede's works.
[41] See Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 323 and 335–9. Grosjean's hypothesis was grossly misrepresented by Gerchow, *Gedenküberlieferung*, pp. 214–15.

in question to fill the left side of the line. For three of the five entries this can be controlled by the facsimile provided by Lowe.[42] Grosjean further pointed to a difference in the wording of the entries for the universal saints and in those for the English obits. Whereas for the universal saints the abbreviation for *natalis/natale* is employed invariably, *depositio* is the term that occurs in the English entries. Furthermore, the style 'saint', which is regularly used for the universal saints, is not employed in any of the English obits.

The Obit for Æthelthryth

In light of these observations, it is most unfortunate that the letters which presumably gave Æthelthryth's style, 'uirgo' or 'regina', could no longer be read while the fragment was still extant. Should this style have been 'queen' – after all, she had been King Ecgfrith's queen for twelve years – this would have been further confirmation of the hypothesis that the source for the English entries was an obit list of kings, queens, bishops, and perhaps other persons of secular and ecclesiastical rank. And it would have given us a unique glimpse of Æthelthryth being commemorated for her social standing in a, presumably, Northumbrian source. Should the style have been 'virgin', this would have provided a clue that the source from which the English entries were derived was no mere regnal and episcopal list of obits, but that it also contained English saints. An entry 'Æthelthryth, virgin' would also have been a testimony to her cult in Northumbria at a very early date and, presumably, independent of Bede's personal veneration for her.

The Bonifatian ambience, in which the Munich calendar arguably belonged, suggests yet a further possible explanation for Æthelthryth's presence there. Originally, her obit may not have been part of the same source that provided the other English commemorations; rather, it may have been added to the calendar because knowledge of her cult had reached Bonifatian circles at some point in the first quarter in the eighth century.[43] Æthelthryth's cult spread from East Anglia subsequent to her translation at Ely in 695, and although almost nothing is known of the early stages of her cult there and how rapidly it spread farther afield, it may not be unreasonable to assume that interested circles in Wessex, Boniface's homeland, could have heard about her veneration at Ely within a decade or so.[44]

---

[42] See *Codices Latini Antiquiores* IX, no. 1236.

[43] In this case, Æthelthryth's obit would have been adapted to the format of the other English entries; see above.

[44] There is an excellent survey of the early history of Ely abbey and the unfolding cult of St Æthelthryth by Simon Keynes, 'Ely Abbey 672–1109', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, ed. P. Meadows and N. Ramsay (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 3–58; for the eighth and ninth centuries and the incipient stages of her cult at Ely, see esp pp. 10–15. For a survey of Æthelthryth's cult in Anglo-Saxon England, see also M. Gretsch, *Ælfric and the Cult of Saints in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, CSASE 34 (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 162–72 and 195–210.

169

Whatever the explanation for Æthelthryth's commemoration in the Munich calendar may have been, it is clear that to know whether she was entered there as a queen or a saint would be decisively important for an appraisal of all the English entries in this calendar. As the result of the vagaries of manuscript transmission this question must forever remain unanswered.

The Form of Æthelthryth's Name

There is a second point which is crucial for an assessment of the Munich fragment, and this also turns on Æthelthryth's entry. This time, however, reasonable certainty is attainable. We have seen (above, p. 159) that the manuscript of which the fragment once formed part was judged on palaeographical grounds to have been written either in England or on the Continent in a centre under Anglo-Saxon influence. In the latter case, the manuscript could have been written either by an Anglo-Saxon scribe or by a continental scribe trained in an Anglo-Saxon centre. There are other eighth- and early-ninth-century manuscripts, now preserved in continental libraries, for which the question of their origin, England or an Anglo-Saxon centre on the Continent, can equally not be decided on palaeographical grounds.[45] For our calendar, however, the question can be settled with the help of philology. The name 'Æthelthryth' represents the Germanic dithematic type of personal names, and is compounded of the adjective *æþel(e)* 'noble' and the noun *þryþ* 'glory, splendour, strength, power'. As a female, personal name it is common in Old English, as is revealed by a glance at Searle's *Onomasticon*.[46] When 'Æthelthryth' is given a Latinized form, it is to be expected that the three *þ*'s <th> in this Germanic name will undergo some alteration, and this is precisely what happens in the early manuscripts of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, where the name occurs on seven occasions. Six of these occurrences are in bk IV of *HE* and refer to Æthelthryth of Ely. There is a useful study by van Els of the proper names in books IV and V of *HE*, as they occur in Kassel, Gesamthochschulbibliothek, 4° Ms. theol. 2 (s. viii², written in Northumbria); this includes a comparison of the Kassel manuscript with the four other early manuscripts of *HE*.[47]

[45] For this problem, see, for example, H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe, AZ, 2001), p. 6, and H. Gneuss and M. Lapidge, 'The Earliest Manuscript of Bede's Metrical *Vita S. Cudbercti*', *ASE* 32 (2003), 43–54, at 46–8.

[46] See W. G. Searle, *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum. A List of Anglo-Saxon Proper Names from the Time of Beda to that of King John* (Cambridge, 1897), pp. 53–4.

[47] See T. J. M. van Els, *The Kassel Manuscript of Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum' and its Old English Material* (Assen, 1972). Bks IV and V are the sole content of the Kassel manuscript. The four other manuscripts whose proper names in bks IV and V are compared to the forms in the Kassel manuscript are:

According to this survey, the forms *Aedilthryd(e)* and *Aedilthryda* occur most frequently, with *Aeðelðryda* as a third notable variant.[48] From these variants in the early English manuscripts it is clear that the form in which any of the three *þ*'s occurs cannot be used in establishing an English or continental origin of *Aethildrudis* in the Munich calendar (though we may note that the sequence *th-d-d* does not occur in any of these English manuscripts).[49]

The spelling (and, accordingly, the phoneme) which is decisive here, and which points to the Continent, is the <u>. This does not occur in any of the early English manuscripts, which preserve <y> in all seven occurrences of the name in *HE*; and its representation as <e> in later texts, such as the twelfth-century *Liber Eliensis* (for example, *Æthelðreda*, *Æðeldreðe*) reveals the normal Late Old English sound change from *y* to *e* in the South East.[50] For an explanation of the *u* in the form *Aethildrudis* we have to resort to etymology: *y* in the noun OE *þryþ* results from *i*-mutation of *u*. By the time the early manuscripts of *HE* were written, this sound shift had been completed in all dialects of Old English for about a century. The sound shift occurs also in German, but is not regularly attested there before the early Middle High German

---

St Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q. v. I. 18 (731 3 746, Wearmouth–Jarrow), Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (*c.* or after 737, Northumbria, Wearmouth–Jarrow?), London, BL, Cotton Tiberius A. xiv (s. viii^med, Wearmouth–Jarrow), London, BL, Cotton Tiberius C. ii (s. ix2/4, S England, prob. Canterbury (St Augustine's?)). Date and origin of the manuscripts are according to Gneuss, *Handlist*. For a recent, slightly different dating of the first three manuscripts, see M. Lapidge, in *Bède le Venerable, Histoire ecclésiastique du peuple anglais*, ed. A. Crépin, M. Lapidge *et al.*, 3 vols., Sources Chrétiennes 489–91 (Paris, 2005) I, 56–60.

[48] See van Els, *The Kassel Manuscript*, p. 72. This picture is not altered by the one occurrence of the name outside bk IV, and hence not covered by van Els's study. The name here refers to Æthelthryth, daughter of King Edwin (II.14): for this occurrence, the variants in the early manuscripts may be controlled by the apparatus criticus in the edition by C. Plummer, *Venerabilis Baedae Opera Historica*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1896) I, 114. Plummer aims at recording in his apparatus all the variants for all the proper names from the early manuscripts of *HE*: cf. *ibid.* p. lxxxiv.

[49] Note that I use 'þ' to simplify reference to the two allophones of the dental fricative occurring in 'Aethelthryth': [θ] and [ð]. The letters <þ> and <ð> are beginning to occur in manuscripts from the eighth century onwards: see N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), pp. xxxi–xxxii. According to van Els's list of attestations of the name 'Aethelthryth' (*The Kassel Manuscript*, p. 72), the spellings <d>, <th> and <ð> are employed; <þ> is never used. For a philological analysis of these various representations of the dental fricative in the three positions in which it occurs in the name, see van Els, *The Kassel Manuscript*, pp. 217–20. Also irrelevant to the purpose of establishing an English or continental origin of the calendar are the variants concerning the vowels in the first element, *æþel*: for a philological analysis of their representations, see *ibid.*, pp. 72 and 119.

[50] For the forms, see *Liber Eliensis*, ed. E. O. Blake, Camden 3rd series 92 (London, 1962), e.g. pp. 47–50 (chs. 28, 29, 32, 33 and 34). For the sound change, see A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (Oxford, 1959), §§ 288–91, and K. Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik*, 3rd ed. (Tübingen, 1965), § 31, n. 1.

171

period.[51] Previously, the phoneme /y(:)/ did not exist in German. Therefore, someone with a knowledge of Old High German *and* Old English, either a native speaker of German or an Anglo-Saxon who had learned German as a 'second language', would have recognized without much difficulty that Old English words with *y* (long and short vowels) corresponded to Old High German words with *u*, such as OE *wyrm* – OHG *wurm* 'reptile, serpent', *wyrt* – *wurz* 'plant, vegetable', *cyning* – *kuning* 'king', *cȳðan* – *kunden* 'to make known', *ȳð* – *unda* 'wave', *brȳd* – *brūd* 'bride, young woman', and *mȳs* – *mūsi* 'mice'. Moreover, the second element in the name *Æthelthryth*, though (unlike Old English) not attested as an independent noun in Old High German, does occur (as *drūd*) in Old High German personal names such as *Adaldrud* (the exact equivalent to *Æthelthryth*), *Sigidrud*, *Drudbald*, *Drudlind*.[52] In light of this occurrence of *þrȳþ* and *drūd* as elements of personal names in Old English and Old High German respectively, there is perhaps no need to assume an intimate knowledge of both languages for the alteration to *Aethildrudis* to be made: a native speaker of either language with a minimal knowledge of the other could have done it.

There is an interesting parallel to the substitution of *–drud* for *–thryth* in the only occurrence of the name *Æthelthryth* in Alcuin's poem on *The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York*.[53] For this poem, only two textual witnesses have survived, both from the Continent: Rheims, Bibliothèque municipale, 426, an early-twelfth-century manuscript from Saint-Thierry, and Cambridge, Trinity College 1130 (0. 2. 26); a late-seventeenth-century transcript, made by Dom Thierry Ruinart (of Saint-Germain des Près) from a manuscript (now lost) from Saint-Remi, which he dated to the tenth century.[54] Both witnesses present the form *Adiltruda*.[55]

---

[51] For *i*-mutation in Old English, see Campbell, *Grammar*, §§ 190–204, and 246–55; and Brunner, *Grammatik*, §§ 94–107. For *i*-mutation of *u* in German, see W. Braune and I. Reiffenstein, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik I*, 15th ed. (Tübingen, 2004), § 42. The earliest attestations of *u* > *y*, spelled <iu> occur in the writings of Notker of St Gallen (*c.* 950–1022).

[52] See van Els, *The Kassel Manuscript*, p. 170, and esp E. Förstemann, *Altdeutsches Namenbuch I. Personennamen*, 2nd ed. (Bonn, 1901), cols. 421–3. Note that OHG *drūd* as an element in personal names is often mixed up with OHG *trūt* 'dear', which also occurs as a theme in personal names, e. g. *Walantrud(is)*, *Hilditrud*: see H. Ström, *Old English Personal Names in Bede's History* (Lund, 1939), p. 36, G. Schramm, *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache. Studien zu den zweigliedrigen Personennamen der Germanen* (Göttingen, 1957), p. 167, H. Kaufmann, *Ernst Förstemann, Altdeutsche Personennamen. Ergänzungsband* (Munich, 1968), pp. 98–9, and A. Bach, *Die deutschen Personennamen* I.1, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg, 1952), pp. 208 and 226.

[53] See *Alcuin, The Bishops, Kings, and Saints of York*, ed. P. Godman (Oxford, 1982), p. 64, line 753.

[54] For the manuscripts, see Godman, *Alcuin*, pp. cxx–cxxii (Rheims) and cxv–cxix (Trinity).

[55] See Godman, *Alcuin*, p. 64, line 753, app crit.; for Godman's emendation of the name form as it appears in the edited text of the poem: *Aedilthrydam*, see *ibid.* p. cxiii, n. 1. The forms *-drud/-trud* were also common on Westfrankish territory, where the exemplars of the surviving witnesses were presumably written: see Förstemann, *Namenbuch*, cols. 421–3, and Schramm, *Namenschatz*, p. 167.

Moreover, *Æthelthryth* is not the only Anglo-Saxon name that was adapted to the phoneme system of Old High German. Some further examples from the circles of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries would be: *Hygeburg* transformed into *Hugeburc*, *Burgheard* into *Burkhard* and *Friðugils* into *Fridugis*.[56] In short, therefore, *Depositio Aethildrudis* in the Munich obit points unmistakably to a continental origin of the calendar and to its production with a view to German-speaking users. The obit does not, however, permit a conclusion as to whether the scribe was of Anglo-Saxon or German extraction.

If an origin of the calendar on German territory is accepted, this may have an implication for another entry, which, in conclusion, we must briefly consider. The entry for 6 June reads 'dedicatio sanctae crucis et altaris'. This has been taken to be a tantalizing reference to the dedication of a cross and an altar in the monastery in Northumbria where the calendar was written, but which can no longer be identified.[57] This is of course possible, and if so, the dedication would have been copied, together with the other entries, into our fragment from its Northumbrian exemplar. However, on the assumption that the calendar was copied somewhere in Germany, and is a product of St Boniface's mission, this entry may, perhaps, more plausibly refer to the dedication of the cross and altar at the foundation for which the calendar was destined. In this case, the entry would be no less tantalizing, inasmuch as its wording might take us back to the very beginnings of this foundation (of which, alas, no name is given), to a time prior to the construction of a proper church. The lost Munich fragment might thus provide a unique and fascinating glimpse of books being produced for a new church, while the missionaries and their followers were still clearing the woods for building this church. But this must remain conjecture.

CONCLUSION

As a result of its extremely fragmentary state, the Munich calendar does not allow us to pronounce with confidence on what its full contents might have been, and on its place among the other continental calendars that bear traces of Anglo-Saxon missionary activities. It is clear that the calendar was intended for liturgical, not computistical purposes.[58] Only one entry is unequivocally

---

[56] On such transformations of Old English personal names into Old High German (and vice versa), see the brief note by M. Förster, 'Frühags. Doppelformen von Eigennamen', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 136 (1917), 289–90.

[57] See Bauerreiss, 'Kalendarfragment', p. 179, and Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 336–7.

[58] On the computistical contents of calendars (pertaining to the reckoning of time), see the important article by P. Meyvaert, 'Discovering the Calendar (*Annalis Libellus*) Attached to Bede's Own Copy of *De Temporum Ratione*', *AB* 120 (2002), 5–64. Meyvaert here brilliantly demonstrates that the calendar which originally accompanied Bede's *De temporum ratione* (and which did not contain any hagiographical entries when it left Bede's study) was decisively influential on the formation of later Carolingian calendars. He thus refutes convincingly the

173

computistical: the beginning of summer is recorded on 9 May.[59] However, the dates for the beginning of the four seasons are recorded in practically all liturgical calendars from Anglo-Saxon England which are printed by Francis Wormald.[60] Two further entries might pass as computistical: on 15 May 'primum pentecostes' (for 'pentecosten') signals the beginning of the period in which Pentecost can fall, and on 4 May 'Ascensio domini ad caelos' is recorded. But again, both entries occur regularly in later liturgical calendars and, as noted by Grosjean, they also occur in manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and in sacramentaries.[61]

With regard to the hagiographical entries – the shibboleth by which liturgical calendars are identified – we have noted above (p. 165) the close, if not straightforward, relationships with early (and later) manuscripts of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*. Had the calendar been preserved in its full form, the picture might perhaps have become clearer, especially in respect of possible links with Bede's *Martyrologium* and a lost Greek menological source.

It is, however, with regard to the Anglo-Saxon entries that the fragmentary state of the calendar is most to be regretted. It seems clear that, at one stage in the textual history of the calendar, these entries were taken over from a source which was not identical with the source for the bulk of the entries. This much can still be seen from the distinct layout they had in the Munich fragment (see above, pp. 168–9). Judging by the number of English obits that had been preserved, we may suspect that the calendar, when still complete, contained a very substantial number of such obits, perhaps more than any surviving calendar with Anglo-Saxon commemorations. The calendars which would lend themselves to a comparison are Willibrord's calendar, the Walderdorff calendar, written in Northumbria, s. viii[med],[62] and the

---

hypothesis advanced by A. Borst, *Die karolingische Kalenderreform*, MGH, Schriften 46 (Hanover, 1998) that Carolingian calendars and their derivatives were compiled exclusively in the wake of the intellectual reforms instigated by Charlemagne's *admonitio generalis*, issued in 789. There is a recent three-volume edition of the so-called Carolingian 'Reichskalender', which provides ample collations of a huge number of related calendars: A. Borst, *Der karolingische Reichskalender und seine Überlieferung bis ins 12. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols., MGH, Libri memoriales 2 (Hanover, 2001). The Carolingian 'Reichskalender' is now Berlin, Staatsbibliothek preussischer Kulturbesitz, Phillipps 1869, 1–11v; s. ix[2/3], copied at Prüm from a Lorsch exemplar, see above, p. 166, n. 23.

[59] Note that this is the Roman date, which was advocated by Bede in his *De temporum ratione*: cf. discussion by Meyvaert, 'Discovering the Calendar', pp. 16–24.

[60] See *English Kalendars*, ed. Wormald, *passim*.

[61] See Grosjean, 'Obituaire', pp. 325 and 327.

[62] Now Hauzenstein near Regensburg, Gräflich Walderdorffsche Bibliothek, s.n. (*Handlist*, no. 791); ed. P. Siffrin, 'Das Walderdorffer Fragment saec. viii und die Berliner Blätter eines Sakramentars aus Regensburg', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 47 (1933), 201–24, and Gamber, *Bonifatius-Sakramentar*, pp. 53–9.

174

'Reichskalender' (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1869, s. ix$^{2/3}$) and the large number of continental calendars related to it.[63] While the relationships of these last-mentioned calendars are immensely complex and while it may be impossible to extract from them an original common core of Anglo-Saxon commemorations,[64] the near-contemporary Walderdorff calendar is, regrettably, also a fragment, preserved only for the months from July to October. A direct comparison between the two fragments is therefore not possible. The Walderdorff calendar commemorates two English bishops: Paulinus (d. 14 October 644), bishop of York, then of Rochester (who occurs in the Echternach manuscript of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* and in Bede's *Martyrologium* and may therefore have already been in the Northumbrian recension of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*) and, interestingly, Archbishop Honorius of Canterbury (d. 30 September 653), who occurs in no other early menological source. No English king is commemorated in the Walderdorff calendar, not even Oswald, king and martyr (d. 5 August 642), who may also have been in the Northumbrian recension of the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, and is in the Echternach manuscript of this text.

A special case is the calendar of Boniface's colleague and erstwhile mentor Willibrord. This calendar was written at Echternach before 709, for Willibrord's personal use,[65] and contains obits for a large number of ecclesiastics, Anglo-Saxon and continental, many of whom had been Willibrord's friends. Most of the Anglo-Saxon entries were, however, not part of the original design of the calendar, but were added by later, if (near-)contemporary hands. When we compare the obits for Anglo-Saxon kings and bishops in Willibrord's calendar and in the Munich fragment, we find that Willibrord's calendar commemorates four Northumbrian kings: Ecgfrith (20 May), in accordance with the Munich fragment; and further, Oswald, king and martyr (5 August), Oswin (19 August), and Edwin (13 October). For these three, we cannot compare the Munich fragment. Unlike Munich, there is no obit for King Osric (9 May) in Willibrord's calendar: he died (729) after the calendar had been compiled, at least in its original form.

It is interesting to note that Willibrord's calendar provides an almost uninterrupted list of the Christian kings of Northumbria from Edwin (d. 653, the first Northumbrian king to receive baptism) to Ecgfrith (d. 685). Absentees from this list are Osric and Eanfrith, Edwin's successors in Deira and Bernicia respectively, who had reverted to paganism and whose names were therefore

---

[63] For this calendar, see above, p. 166, n. 23 and p. 173, n. 58.
[64] For the Anglo-Saxon commemorations, see above, p. 166, n. 23, esp the remarks by Böhne and Meyvaert with regard to extracting such a common core.
[65] See above, p. 166, n. 23.

excised from all regnal lists, as Bede remarked.[66] Also absent from Willibrord's calendar is Oswiu (d. 670), Oswald's successor as king in Bernicia, who had Oswin (Oswald's successor as king in Deira) killed, and subsequently took on the kingship of all Northumbria.[67] Note that Oswin, Oswiu's victim, *is* commemorated in Willibrord's calendar. The Munich obit for King Osric (d. 9 May 729) raises the suspicion that Willibrord's regnal list could also have been contained in the Munich calendar, and that the 'Munich continuation' of Willibrord's obits, in its complete form, may have had also an obit for King Aldfrith (d. 14 December 705), Ecgfrith's successor and Osric's most eminent predecessor.[68] But this is of course conjecture.

The Anglo-Saxon bishops entered in Willibrord's calendar are Chad, bishop of Lichfield (d. 2 March 676), Cuthbert, bishop of Lindisfarne (d. 20 March 687), Aidan, bishop of Lindisfarne (d. 31 August 651),[69] Archbishop Theodore (d. 19 September 690) and, as in the Walderdorff fragment, Paulinus, bishop of York and Rochester (d. 14 October 644). So again, none of these entries can be compared with the Munich fragment. Unlike Munich, Eadberht, bishop of Lindisfarne is not found in Willibrord's calendar, and Munich's John of Beverley (d. 721) is too late for this calendar.

Due to the fragmentary state of the Munich and Walderdorff calendars, a systematic comparison of the early menological sources is not possible. Nevertheless, what has survived in these sources may permit us to think that the Anglo-Saxon missionaries had a keen interest in preserving the memory of the kings, bishops and saints of their homelands – perhaps for reasons of nostalgia, shared by expatriates of all ages, perhaps for reasons of establishing a memorial culture for their young churches. There is a strong Northumbrian bias in the kings, bishops and saints chosen for commemoration. If this is natural in the case of Willibrord, himself of Northumbrian extraction, it may appear striking in the case of Wessex-born Boniface and the Southumbrians in his circle. Here, however, we have to bear in mind that, in the early eighth century, Northumbria was the only Anglo-Saxon kingdom where a memorial culture, transmitted in writing, seems to have been established, as is attested

---

[66] See *HE* III.1 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 212–14); for Osric of Deira, see also above, p. 165, n. 22.   [67] See *HE* III.14 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, p. 256).

[68] On Aldfrith, who was renowned for his learning, see *HE* IV.26 [24] and V.15 (ed. Colgrave and Mynors, pp. 430 and 504–10); and see M. Lapidge, in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes and D. Scragg (Oxford, 1999), p. 25. For the undistinguished interim reigns (between Aldfrith and Osric) of Eadwulf, Osred I and Coenred, 705 × 718, see S. Keynes, in *Blackwell Encyclopaedia*, p. 504, and *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. E. B. Fryde, D. E. Greenway, S. Porter and I. Roy, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, 1986), pp. 6–7. The day of their death is not known for any of the three, and Eadwulf is not even included in the Northumbrian regnal list.

[69] Aidan seems to be a later addition: see Wilson, *Calendar of St Willibrord*, p. 38.

not least by the important redaction which the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* underwent there, before it returned to the Continent.[70] Therefore, for Boniface and his colleagues, the obits for Ecgfrith and Osric, or Eadberht and John of Beverley, were probably not so much commemorations of Northumbrian kings and saintly bishops of Lindisfarne and York; rather, they will have regarded these commemorations as part of their Anglo-Saxon heritage, a part for which written records existed, and which they could thus transmit to the Continent, together with Christianity, the religion of the book. The numerous later and local entries in the Munich calendar, which continued to be made in Bavaria until the early tenth century, attest to the Anglo-Saxon heritage indeed having become part of the collective memory of early medieval churches on German territory. May we even assume that the tenth-century monks at Ilmmünster or Tegernsee, with a copy of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* in their libraries, had a clearer notion than their eighth-century brethren and sisters of why they should commemorate St Æthelthryth on 23 June?[71]

---

[70] For the most recent discussion of some remnants of Kentish annalistic writing preserved in continental manuscripts, see J. Story, 'The Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne and Kent', *ASE* 34 (2004), 59–110.

[71] I am very grateful to Helmut Gneuss and Michael Lapidge for commenting on this article.