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This essay is not about sources: I will neither try to establish a source relationship between Bede's martyrology (Bede) and the Old English Martyrology (OEM), nor will I try to identify sources for sub-sections of the two works. Instead, I intend to demonstrate how the two martyrologists, one of them known and deservedly celebrated, the other anonymous and unjustifiably forgotten, in compiling 'narrative' (or 'historical') martyrologies, used different techniques for presenting their information in a textual genre which, due to its genesis as well as its general characteristics, has a tendency towards a high degree of formalism. I would also like to show the effect of the methods of compilation on the prose style (especially the syntax) in both works, and to draw conclusions from a comparative analysis of a number of selected entries on martyrs, paying particular attention to the similarities between the two works, and the distinctive qualities present in each.

In Bede as well as in OEM (and in other martyrologies of the 'narrative' type also, for that matter), we find the influence of a traditional pattern of basic detail beside the individual selection of more specific information from various sources by the martyrologist concerned. First of all I shall attempt to demonstrate the tradition of the basic pattern of information contained in martyrology entries, in its genesis, form and transformational possibilities, before turning to the second, and more important, aspect of the individual modification of the traditional pattern by Bede and the compiler of OEM.

(a) Calendars and 'enumerative' martyrologies:

The earliest martyrologies belong to the type of 'enumerative' martyrology and, when we look at the history of the form, we find that hagiologists have considerable difficulty distinguishing this early type from saints' calendars. Hippolyte Delehaye states the terminological problem as follows:

Bien que l'usage ne soit pas absolument fixé sur ce point, on donne souvent le nom de calendrier aux martyrologes locaux et l'on réserve plus volontiers la dénomination de martyrôle à ceux qui ont un caractère moins exclusif. Il n'y a pas lieu d'adopter cette distinction et de donner aux termes une précision qu'ils n'ont pas.
The important fact to be noted in our context is that later martyrologies, as well as liturgical calendars, have a common source, i.e. lists of saints' and martyrs' festivals arranged in the order of the calendar. A look at the entry on St James the Great (Iacobus Zebedaei, July 25) in two early Anglo-Saxon calendars will show the amount of information on specific saints customarily found in liturgical calendars:

(1) MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10837, f.37v (Willibrord's Calendar; s. vii inc.): 7

... viii [kalendas agusti] iacobi apostoli fratris iohannis

(2) MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 63, f.43r (s. ix ex.): 8

viii kl [AUGUSTI] Sancti Iacobi apostoli.

These quotations, as well as our knowledge of the textual genre, can help us formalize the pattern of textual information found in calendars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME(S)</th>
<th>DESIGNATION(S)</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If we move on to martyrologies of a predominantly enumerative character, most impressively represented in the various forms of the Martyrologium (Pseudo-)Hieronymianum, the basic calendar pattern is modified in two ways: firstly, PLACE (which occasionally occurs as ADDITIONAL INFORMATION in calendar entries) becomes a regular feature of the martyrology pattern (after DATE), and secondly, the pattern is repeated many times to include a great number of saints for a specific date. To demonstrate this, I shall again use the entry for July 25 (including St James the Great):

DATE: VIII KAL. AUG.

PLACE: Romae Portu.....natale Canti et Nonni.

NAMES: Hierosolimis..........Iacobi........apostoli fratris Iohannis

DESIGNATION AND/OR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: evangeliostae

Iacobi Agathonis..........de nativitate sua.

et alibi............Stercori Clementis
Iuliani Caritonis Emeriti
Severi Suticiani.

et in Licia
civitate Samon..natale sancti Cristofori.

(b) Bede's martyrology and OEM:

The information pattern of 'enumerative' martyrologies (or even that of calendar entries) remains recognizable in the type of prose martyrology generally believed to have been created by Bede, the
'narrative' or 'historical' martyrology. In martyrologies of this type, to which OEM also belongs as a very early vernacular example, biographical and other details are frequently added to the basic information of calendars and 'enumerative' martyrologies. In both our martyrologies, however, a number of short entries remain which do not contain more than the amount of information customarily found in the enumerative type. The following quotations may serve as examples:

Bede I

DATE: X KL.IUL. - NAME: Iacobi Alfei - DESIGNATION: apostoli
DATE: VI NON.IUL. - PLACE: Romae - NAMES: Processi et Martiniani

OEM (September 3)


The characteristic difference, however, between the 'enumerative' and the 'narrative' types of martyrology lies in the various textual additions to the basic information pattern in a large number of entries. The following quotation from the Historia Ecclesiastica shows how Bede intended to expand the traditional pattern:

Martyrologium de natalityis sanctorum martyrum diebus, in quo omnes, quos inuenire potui, non solum qua die uerum etiam quo genere certaminis uel sub quo iudice mundum uicerint, diligenter adnotare studui.  

This quotation seems to suggest the following structural pattern for Bede's 'narrative' entries on martyrs:

DATE - NAME - TORMENTS - MARTYRDOM - PERSECUTOR (i.e. judge)

If, on the other hand, we take into account that the traditional pattern of 'enumerative' martyrologies is still present in Bede, as well as in other 'narrative' martyrologies, we can modify the basic information pattern for Bede's extended entries on martyrs as follows:

DATE - [PLACE] - NAME(S) - [DESIGNATION(S)] - PERSECUTOR(S) - TORMENTS - MARTYRDOM - [ADDITIONAL INFORMATION]

We can now move on to examine the way in which Bede's intention is realized in selected entries of his own work, and the way in which the method of compilation used by the Old English martyrologist can be shown to be similar to, or different from, that of Bede. This will also include a discussion of stylistic features in the entries concerned. For this purpose I have chosen the following 'narrative' entries of the two martyrologies:
(1) St Phocas (Focas, July 14):
This entry is reproduced in its entirety from both martyrlogies, to serve as an example of the detailed presentation of information.

Bede

DATE: II IDUS JULII
DESIGNATION 1: ----
NAME: Sancti Focatis
DESIGN. 2: episcopi
PLACE: Ponti,
PERSECUTOR(S): qui sub Trajan
imperatore, praefecto
Africano,
TORMENTS & carcerem, vincula,
MARTYRDOM: ferrum, ignem etiam
pro Christo super-
avit.
ADD.INFO.1: ----
PUNISHMENT
OF PERSECUTOR

OEM

On ðone feowerteqðan deg þes monðes
bið þes miclan martyres gemynd
se is neumed Sanctus Focas.
He wæs bishcop
on ðære mægðe ðe Pontus is neumed;
ac Traianus se casere
hine ðreðe mid unaseggendlicum
wítum for Cristes geleafan; ond
atnehestan he het hine sendan on
byrnendne ofn, ond on ðæm he
onsende his gast.
Ond ðrym dagum æfter ðæm he
ateawde beforan þæs caseres dura
ond cleopade to þæm casere ond him
sæde þæt him were hell ontyned ond
hire wite gegeard, ond hine het
efstan to þæm; ond ða sona æfter
þæm swealt se casere
Peosses biscopes reliquias syndon
þæsosse biscose reliquias syndon
basilica Apostolorum,
on Galwala mægðe on Mennia [sic]
ðære ceastre, ond þa reliquias
syndon swiðe mere geond middan-
geard.

ADD.INFO.2: Cujus reliquiae in
RELICS
basilica Apostolorum,
in Gallia, civitate
Vienna, habentur.

If we examine the categorized Bede entry, we find that it corresponds closely to the structural pattern suggested above. The additional information here only concerns the location of the bishop's relics. If on the other hand we look at the OEM entry, we see that the basic Bede pattern is clearly noticeable there as well. But there are two general differences which need stating. First, Bede is more specific in a number of details, although his entry is much more concise than that in OEM. This applies to Bede's list of torments compared with the unspecific persecution formula followed by the description of the saint's death in OEM, to the more precise location of the martyr's relics in Bede, as well as to the more
detailed information about the persecutors. Secondly, OEM adds narrative material which is not in Bede, especially the passage on the punishment of the emperor Traianus.

A comparison of the prose style of the two entries yields the following conclusions: Bede's style is marked by conciseness and brevity. Syntactically, the whole of the entry, except for the date, can be interpreted as one complex syntactic unit with an elliptical genitival construction as syntactic head (the missing nominative is the natale of many other Bede entries), on which two relative clauses depend. Apart from its syntactic structure, the stylistic effect of the Bede entry is also due to the complete lack of qualifying adjectives, and the asyndetic string of nouns summarizing the torments leading to the martyr's death. A characteristic of the style in OEM, on the other hand, is its tendency towards over-explicitness in its presentation of detail, together with an overall syntactic simplicity. This tendency to be over-explicit is reflected in expressions such as "on ēre magōs 6e Pontus is nemned" (vs. Bede's "Ponti"), or "se is nemned Sanctus Focas" (vs. Bede's "Sancti Focatis"). The syntactic simplicity of OEM manifests itself in the predominance of conjunctive parataxis, i.e. apart from the beginning of the entry, and in the indirect speech referring to the persecutor's punishment, we only find simple main clauses, most frequently connected by the conjunction ond.

(2) St Romanus (August 9): The entries on St Romanus, as well as the rest of the entries discussed in this essay, will not be included in their entirety but will be reduced to their basic informational categories, with a discussion of their salient features and the way they modify the basic information pattern.

Bede

```
| DATE | PLACE | DESIGN. | ADD.INFO.: CONVERSION |
```

OEM

```
| DESIGNATION | NAME |
```

(by Laurentius, with indirect inclusion of PERSECUTOR in OEM)

Bede

```
| PERSECUTOR | MARTYRDOM |
```

OEM

```
| (RESTING) PLACE |
```

The additional information in Bede's entry, one of twelve narrative entries from the so-called Gesta Laurentii, refers to Laurentius' influence in the conversion of Romanus in fairly general terms only: "qui in confessione sancti Laurentii compunctus, petiit ab eo baptizari". OEM, on the other hand, has a much more detailed presentation of the situation leading to Romanus' conversion:
"se gelifde forpon ðe he geseah Godes engel stondan ond drygan mid sceatan Sancti Laurentius limu, þa Decius se casere hine het stingan mid irenum gyrdum tyndehtum. Ond he ða onfeng fulwihte ...".

As in the Phocas entry, Bede includes specific detail as regards the martyr's torments and death ("cum fustibus exhibitus ac decollatus est"), for which OEM only gives the frequently used formulaic expression "ond geþrowode martyrdom for Criste". OEM, however, also includes information which is not in Bede, i.e. the detailed reference to the saint's resting place ("at Rome on ðam londe Ùeranum") and, more significantly, the miraculous narrative detail of the angel drying St Lawrence's limbs quoted above.

As regards syntactic structure, Bede's entry on Romanus is similar to the entry on Phocas, although it is slightly more complex. The whole entry consists of one sentence with an elliptical syntactic head after DATE and PLACE, on which two relative clauses with embedded participial constructions depend. In OEM the martyrologist's predilection for parataxis (with three instances of the conjunction ond) can again be seen, but here we also have greater variation in the use of subordinate clauses than in the Phocas entry: a relative clause ("se gelifde ..."), a causal clause ("forpon ðe he geseah ..."), and a temporal clause ("þa Decius se casere hine het stingan ..."). Nevertheless, the difference in stylistic effect between the two martyrologies is similar to that of the Phocas entry, i.e. complexity and brevity in Bede due to the syntax and the lack of qualifying epithets vs. greater simplicity with a tendency to elaborate on detail in OEM (e.g. "sancti Romani" Bede/"se is nemned Sanctus Romanus" OEM). In general terms we might say that Bede's technique is that of producing a mere summary, while the Old English martyrologist, by including selected narrative detail (in this case, the miraculous conversion of Romanus), tends more towards telling a story.

(3) Sts John and Paul (June 26):

The entry on John and Paul is our first example of an entry commemorating two martyrs, which necessitates modification of the basic structural pattern.

Bede

OEM

(3) Sts John and Paul (June 26):
In addition to the necessary duplication of information, in the case of John and Paul we have a greater number of extensions to the basic pattern in both martyrologies than in the entries discussed before. Bede adds detail concerning the historical setting ("Constantiae virginis, filiae Constantini"), and refers to the executioner’s conversion ("per Terentianum campi doctorem, qui deinde christianus factus est"), while OEM has a larger number of additions: the pseudo-historical information "Hig wæron acennede of Constantines sidan þæs miclan caseres, þæt ys of gestreonde", a short characterization of the martyrs ("and hig wæron swyðe Crystene weras"), and especially details concerning the direct punishment of the persecutor Julianus ("... com an stræl of heofenum and hyne gewundode on hys oðer gewenge, and he þa swealt sona"), and the indirect punishment of the executioner Terrentianus in the form of his son’s madness.¹⁴ OEM also describes the saints’ martyrdom in greater detail than Bede, but omits the fact of the executioner’s conversion.

Syntactically the beginning of this entry in Bede exactly corresponds to that of the entry on Romanus. Again, the Bede entry can be regarded as one complex sentence without epithets, compressing most of the information into relative clauses. The manner of presentation in OEM is equally familiar. The information, including narrative, descriptive and miraculous detail ("stræl of heofenum"), is presented in a more explicit, less condensed form than in Bede, e.g. "þær lychoma restæ on Romebyrig" OEM/"Romæ" Bede. Although OEM has relative, temporal and complement subordinate clauses in this entry, the overall syntactic structure remains simple, with the conjunction and as the predominant linking device.²⁵

(4) Sts Iustina and Cyprianus (September 26).²⁶

This is a different type of entry commemorating two martyrs: while in the John and Paul entry there is parallel treatment of both martyrs, the situation in the entry on Iustina and Cyprian bears a certain similarity with the Romanus entry where Romanus was a heathen converted by the example of Laurentius.²⁷ Here, too, the conversion (of Cyprian by Iustina) is presented in the course of the entry in both martyrologies.
The looser handling of the basic pattern in Bede's martyrology, as well as in OEM, is due to the fact that a chronological development is given in the detail on the conversion and further career of the erstwhile sorcerer Cyprian, which is subordinated to, and at the same time linked with, the persecution and martyrdom of Iustina. Comparing Bede with OEM, there are instances in both of detail not contained in the other (e.g. "sub Claudio principe" Bede / "ond heora lichona rested in ðære ceastre pe is nemned Antiochia" OEM), but this entry is also a good example of the different handling of narrative detail by the two martyrologists in the description of Cyprian's conversion; cp. "cum esset magus" Bede / "Se Cyprianus waes ærst ealra dry se wyrsta" OEM (i.e. a bare statement in Bede vs. a qualified statement in OEM), "eam dementare conaretur" Bede / "ond he wolde þære fæmnan mod on his sicnæftum onwendan to haefendome ond to unclaenum hæmede" OEM, and especially the inclusion of the poetical simile in OEM which has no correspondence in Bede: "Ac ða gedwino his drycraeftas for hyre halignesse swa swa þe þone þe toglideæ, ðe weax þonne hit for fyre gemelteð". To sum up, OEM adds descriptive and narrative material where Bede contents himself with giving the bare outline of the story.

The syntactic framework of the Bede entry is similar to that of the entries discussed before, although there is a greater number of embedded constructions in this entry, which adds to the effect of syntactic complexity. In the noun phrases of Bede's entry, we find one qualifying adjective ("nobili"), but this can hardly be interpreted as modifying the terseness of Bede's style. OEM, again, gives the general stylistic impression of greater, sometimes possibly exaggerated, explicitness, as in "Sancta Iustinan . . . þære fæmnan" or "in ðære ceastre pe is nemned . . .". Syntactically, the OEM entry consists of a series of main clauses, with only a few subordinate clauses, as in the case of the two coordinated clauses in the twofold simile quoted above. The stylistic effect, predominantly created by the syntax of the passage, is that of a simple narrative.

(5) Sts Marcellinus and Petrus (June 2).

This is the third example of a double entry included in this discussion, for which the following is the 'narrative' pattern:
One of the striking features of this entry is the detailed inclusion of extensive additional information in both martyrologies, especially with reference to the executioner Dorotheus' conversion. Although both texts describe the miracle seen by Dorotheus, and his subsequent conversion, the narrative detail included is very different, and shows the divergent approaches of the two martyrologists. While in Bede the miraculous element is presented only briefly ("vidit animas eorum splendide ornatas, ab Angelis ferri ad caelos") before Bede moves on to historical and biographical detail ("sub Julio papa, baptizatus est in senectute sua"), the Old English martyrologist does not include the latter information, and instead presents the miraculous element in much greater detail: "ond pa saegde se mon eallum folce, se pe hi beheafdade, pat he gesego heora sawle 6a hi uteodon of þem lichoman swelce [hig] were 'n' mid gimmum gefretwade ond mid golde [ond] beorhtum hreglum gegerede, ond englas mid heora hondum heo gefeonde baren to heofonum". The over-explicitness already observed in other OEM entries is again present here, e.g. in the expression "6e Serenus waes nemned" instead of the mere name in Bede, and this entry again includes examples of another characteristic of the Old English martyrologist's technique: the use of unspecific formulaic expressions as a shorthand for repetitive descriptive contexts ("6a dydon manego wundor", "ond ðrowedon monigfealdne martyrdom").

The syntax in Bede is necessarily more varied in this case than in the entries previously discussed because of the addition of the Dorotheus story. Nevertheless, Bede's basic syntactic pattern is still to be seen (ELLIPtical HEAD, "qui ... decollati sunt ... "). The syntactic structure of the OEM entry is very similar to that of the other entries discussed, with the exception of the sentence describing the miracle seen by Dorotheus (cf. the quotation above), which is among the most complex syntactic units in OEM. Apart from this, we only find four short subordinate clauses in this entry: one complement clause ("pat hi mon þar beheafdade") and three relative clauses, two of these with the function of naming (e.g. "se was genemmed Silua Nigra, se swearta wudu") and one with the function of clarification ("se pe hi beheafdade OEM 116, 2").

(6) St Mark the Evangelist (April 25):

The entry on Mark the Evangelist is, in the context of our previously presented material, an exceptional case:
In accordance with the importance of Mark the Evangelist, the entries in both martyrologies are unusually long, and include many details by which the basic structural pattern, which is still recognizable in both texts, is modified and extended. The story of the genesis of Mark's gospel (the *furtum laudabile* story) occurs in OEM only. Both texts name the geographical areas in which Mark carried out his missionary work (with more detail in Bede, cf. "per Lybiam, Marmaricam, Ammoniacam, Pentapolim, Alexandriam atque Aegyptum universam" Bede / "Egypta maegpe, ond Libia maeg6e, ond Armarice, ond Pentapalim" OEM), but the Old English martyrlogist, as a consequence of his fondness for the miraculous and unsavoury, includes details which are not to be found in Bede: "On pissum meg6um waron sr swa unclane men þet hi . . . astorfen aton. Bes Sanctus Marcus halde untrume men ond hreofe, ond deade men of deade awehte". The most substantial part of the text in both martyrologies, however, consists of the treatment of Mark's torments and martyrdom at the hands of his anonymous Alexandrian persecutors. In this case both Bede and the Old English martyrlogist have detailed information including the miraculous element (an angelic visitation and an appearance of Christ himself). Both texts also contain (different) direct speech taken from the source: "In manus tuas commendō spiritum meum" Bede / "Sibb sy þe, ure godspellere Marcus" OEM. In the presentation of the events after Mark's death, Bede concentrates on historical detail by referring to the future history of the see of Alexandria ("Ordinaverat autem pro se Alexandriæ..."
episcopum Annianum"), while OEM concentrates on the more sensational aspect of the punishment of the persecutors by thunderstorm ("Ba com punor ond regn, ofslogan monige þara þæpenra, ond þa ofre flugon onweg").

As far as syntax is concerned, this entry - although constructed in a much more complex way than the entries discussed previously - again includes Bede's basic syntactic pattern (HEAD . . . qui . . . qui . . .). But, although Bede has other long entries, this is the only one included in this essay which has something like a real narrative structure, indicative of the way in which later Latin martyrologists (especially Ado of Vienne) were to extend many of Bede's briefer entries. Here, too, the difference in syntactic structure reflects the basic stylistic difference between the two martyrologies: Bede has a complex syntax alternating subordination and coordination in a skilful way which makes the time structure of the entry transparent (cf. "qui videntes eum die sancto Paschae, VII Kl. Maii . . .", "Vespere autem facto . . .", "ubi circa medium noctem . . ."), "Et mane, dum traheretur . . ."). OEM, on the other hand, has 28 main clauses (as opposed to 7 short subordinate clauses, and 13 instances of the conjunction ond as syntactic link), which - taking into account the simple structure of most of the main clauses (e.g. "He was Sancte Petres godsunu on fulwithe, ond he leornode set him") - confirms the basic simplicity of OEM's prose syntax. In order to demonstrate the different stylistic effect generated by the two martyrologists, I shall use the episode of the miraculous visitations which is included in both texts:

Bede

...ubi circa medium noctem
   primo angelica visitatione
   confortatus est,
   deinde ipso Domino sibi
   apparente, ad caelestia
   regna vocatus.

OEM

...þær him on niht æþynde Godes engel
   ond him sæde þæt he sceolde þæs on
   mergen leoran on ða ecean reste.
   Ond þa ætnehestan Crist seolfa him
   æþynde ond him cwæd to: 'Sibb sy
   þe, ure godspellere Marcus.'

Again we can observe greater precision and conciseness in Bede's style, as opposed to the presentation of a simple narrative structure in OEM.

(7) St Hippolytus (Ypolitus, August 13):

This is the second entry on a martyr from the Gesta Laurentii to be included in this essay, although Bede's text makes no mention of Laurentius who is, however, referred to in the OEM entry. Instead, Bede includes a second martyr (Concordia), as well as nineteen anonymous martyrs, who are not mentioned in OEM. The information pattern of the two entries is as follows:
In this case the information content and patterns are very different in the two texts. While Bede has no more than a reduced basic pattern (without TORMENTS) which is applied three times for Hippolytus himself, for his nurse Concordia and for the nineteen anonymous martyrs, OEM has the basic pattern (for Hippolytus only), with two major additions: it includes Hippolytus' conversion by Laurentius ("ac he gelyf'd'e Gode 'burh' pa w[u]ndor pe he geseah at Sancti Laurentie pam deacone, ond he onfeng fulwhite . . . "), and a detailed reference to the punishment of the persecutors Valerianus and Decius, in both cases including direct speech. There is also other detail only found in OEM, e.g. in connection with Hippolytus' martyrdom: "ond da hors forleton done lichoman" (i.e. 'and the horses left the body'). This is typical of the method of the Old English martyrologist who is often more concerned with giving a few selected, often miraculous, narrative details from the longer hagiographical texts used as sources, while Bede, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with giving a very brief summary following his basic pattern, with modifications to suit the specific case.°

Due to the threefold nature of the Bede entry, the syntactic pattern which we generally find in Bede is repeated three times, with the second and third genitival heads introduced by Et. In all three cases we have relative clauses containing the information not included in the NAME (& DESIGNATION) parts of the syntactic heads, in the first and second cases with additional embedded participial constructions. The OEM entry also has the syntactic features already observed in the other entries, although here the initial part of the entry has a certain similarity with Bede's NAME/qui pattern (Sancti Ypoliti; se was . . . ").°°

(8) St Procopius (OEM July 7 / Bede July 8):°°

The last entry to be looked at in this context was selected as a final example in which Bede adheres fairly closely to his basic information pattern as indicated in the quotation from the Historia Ecclesiastica given in the initial part of this essay, while in OEM - as might be expected - the basic pattern is extended to include
various additions by which it is turned into a simple narrative:

Bede

DATE \rightarrow NAME \rightarrow PLACE(S) \rightarrow ADD.INFO. 1: TRIAL

OEM

DATE \rightarrow DESIGNATION \rightarrow PLACE(S) \rightarrow ADD.INFO. 1: CHILDHOOD

Bede

PERSECUTOR \rightarrow MARTYRDOM (judge) \rightarrow ADD.INFO. 2: TRIAL (incl. HEAVENLY BLISS PLACE)

OEM

PERSECUTOR \rightarrow MARTYRDOM \rightarrow ADD.INFO. 3: HEAVENLY BLISS

While Bede has a more precise geographical setting than OEM ("in Palestina, qui ab Scythopoli ductus Caesaream" Bede/"se was on Palestina ðere ðægbe", and later "on Cessaria ðere ceastre" OEM), the Old English text (whose wrong name form "Proconi" is easily explained as a scribal error) extends the basic pattern by including an account of Procopius' self-castigation by living on bread and water in his childhood (OEM 140,14-141,5). OEM also includes a detailed narrative account (with direct speech) referring to Procopius' trial and his martyrdom by beheading on the order of the judge Flavianus (OEM 141,5-12).

In the syntax of Bede's entry there is only slight variation of the familiar pattern: the syntactic head (with name and place, on which a relative clause with further embedded constructions depends) includes the nominative "Natale" which is only present by implication in most of the other entries discussed. The conciseness of Bede's style is again clearly noticeable if we compare Bede's entry with the entry in OEM, but also if we compare Bede with his longer narrative source. The narrative technique of the Old English martyrrologist, as opposed to the hypotactic summary technique most frequently found in Bede, is marked by the use of straightforward syntactic linking devices in order to present a consecutive story ("on sona", "Ond þa þætnehston", "Ond þa for ðeossum").

I shall now attempt to draw general conclusions from the above investigation:

(a) In the case of both martyrologies, we are dealing with a highly formalized presentation of information which makes use of a basic information pattern appropriate to the textual genre as set out by Bede in his Historia Ecclesiastica, with additional elements which can be explained by examining the genesis and the development of the genre.

(b) The most striking difference between Bede and OEM in the structure of comparable entries lies in the individual methods of selecting and including additional information used by the two martyrrologists. Although there are variations in accordance with the demands of the entry concerned, general principles can be
observed. While Bede's aim is normally stylistic brevity with a marked preference for summary form including multiple detail at the cost of descriptiveness and explicit narrative, the Old English martyrologist often concentrates on the presentation of a few selected episodes from his sources, with a tendency towards including the sensational or miraculous. In general, Bede's technique is more deserving of the label 'historical', while that of the Old English martyrologist can, with more justification, be called 'narrative'.

(c) The different methods of the two martyrologists are particularly discernible in their prose style, especially their syntax. Bede's tendency towards a brief and concise presentation can be seen in the comparative lack of epithet. The decisive stylistic feature of his work, however, is the compressed syntax of an entry type very frequently used, where most of the information is found in a single complex sentence. OEM, on the other hand, normally has a predominantly paratactic structure with short syntactic units and simple narrative linking devices. The Old English martyrologist also makes use of a number of descriptive formulae when he does not want to include narrative detail, or when such detail may not have been accessible to him. Another striking feature of the Old English martyrologist's style is his tendency to be over-explicit in his inclusion of explanatory detail which may often seem redundant to the modern reader.

In trying to draw further conclusions from these observations, it might be tempting to transfer the comparative stylistic simplicity of OEM to a simplicity of mind in the public for which OEM was intended. But this stylistic simplicity may also be a consequence of the high degree of formalism intrinsic in the textual genre, which is expressed by different means in the Latin and the Old English texts. It is certainly dangerous to use the syntactic structure of OEM as a means for dating the text in the way Georg Herzfeld attempts to: "We may feel certain that he [i.e. the Old English martyrologist] had not King Alfred's work as an example before him, and, although we cannot arrive at a definite result with the material before us, the earlier date (850) is perhaps more probable". There is a significant difference between the free prose of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica and the repetitive formalized prose in Bede's martyrology due at least partly to the different functions of the texts; and functional differences may also provide an explanation for stylistic and syntactic variation in other early extant texts written in a new medium for literary expression, English prose. There is one certain conclusion to be reached, namely that Bede as a martyrologist, and the Old English martyrologist, building on similar basic structural patterns, used different techniques for different aims, which gives each of their works a distinctive original character.

There is a final question to be asked: is it likely that the Old English martyrologist used Bede's text as a model? In view of the differences in the overall structure of the two works, of the different textual detail in individual entries, and of the different stylistic techniques used by the two martyrologists, this does not
at first sight seem very likely. On the other hand, if we consider that a similar basic information pattern was used by Bede as well as the Old English martyrologist for the new type of 'narrative' or 'historical' martyrology, it does not seem improbable that Bede's work was used by the compiler of OEM to provide a framework for his entries which he very often filled with additional textual material more suited to his taste or his intentions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Information</th>
<th>Basic Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUNISHMENT OF</strong> PERSEC./EXEC.</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIONER (of others)</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVERSION</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTYRDOM</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSECUTOR(S)</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATION(S)</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE(S)</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bede</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEM Bede</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (1) Pocus
- (2) Romanus
- (3) John etc.
- (4) Justin, etc.
- (5) Marcellinus etc.
- (6) Mark
- (7) Zippolus
- (8) July
Bede's prose martyrology, extant in interpolated form only, is edited in
H. Quentin, Les martyrologes historiques du moyen âge (Paris, 1908; repr.
des martyrologes de Bede, de l'anonyme lyonnais et de Florus (Paris, 1976);
Quentin's date for Bede is "peu avant 735" (p. 683). On the problems con­
cerning the establishment of Bede's original text, cf. Jacques Dubois, Les
refer to my edition: Das altenglische Martyrologium, ed. Günter Kotzor,
Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen,
N.F. 89/1, 2, 2 vols. (München, 1981); for the date of OEM, cf. below, n.56.
On general differences in the entry structure between Bede and OEM, cf.
ologies and the Old English Martyrology", to be published in Studies in

On the terms 'narrative' and 'historical' martyrology, cf. Kotzor,
Martyrology, vol. I, p. 177 and n. 6. I am aware that I am over-simplifying
by referring to the 'Old English martyrologist' in the course of this essay.
It has not yet been established whether the original compilation was a
Latin text subsequently translated into Old English (in which case some of
the stylistic features discussed below would be attributable to the trans­
lator), or whether the compilation was an original Old English text using
Latin sources; cf. J.E. Cross, "The Latinity of the Ninth-Century Old English
Martyrologist", to be published in Szarmach, Studies. The possibility of
multiple authorship is also not to be excluded.

In addition to entries on martyrs, Bede, as well as OEM, also includes
entries on confessors, church festivals, and computistical material; cf.
Kotzor I, p. 175, n. 2.

Bede's sources are presented and discussed in Quentin, pp. 56-112. In this
context I need hardly refer to the comprehensive and exemplary investigation
into the sources of OEM which is being carried out by J.E. Cross. On other
Latin prose martyrologies (such as the 9th century compilations of Florus
of Lyons, Ado of Vienne, Usuard of St Germain, and Rhabanus Maurus), cf.
Dubois, Les martyrologes.

H. Delehaye, "Le témoignage des martyrologes", Analecta Bollandiana 26
(1907) pp. 79-80. On the terminological problem and the early history of
calendars and martyrologies, cf. also Dubois, Les martyrologes, pp. 16-17,
and René Aigrain, L'hagiographie. Ses sources, ses méthodes, son histoire

One fact to be noted here is that earlier liturgical calendars often con­
tain more textual information than later texts, cf. also Kotzor I, p. 261-2.
In the context of this essay I have excluded non-verbal information also
contained in calendars, e.g. indications of the liturgical rank of saints'
festivals.


English Kalendars before A.D. 1100, ed. Francis Wormald, HBS 72 (London,
1934) p. 8.

Square brackets are used to indicate textual elements which may not be
included in specific entries. The label DESIGNATION is used for expressions
characterizing the saints concerned, such as "episcopi", "apostoli", "exorcistae",
as well as (in the case of OEM) "pes miclan martyres", "pes
"cerapan", "bare famman". The informational categories do not necessarily occur in individual texts in the order suggested by the formalized pattern.

The quotation is from the textual type found in the Echternach MS of the Martyrologium (Pseudo)Hieronymianum (MS Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, lat. 10837), i.e. "Willibrord's martyrology", ed. H. Quentin, Acta Sanctorum, Nov. II, ii (1931) p.395. The Hieronymian martyrology very rarely includes narrative information, e.g. in the entry on St Stephen "... qui lapidatus est a Judaeis" (p.10). The expression 'natale' (for 'festival') is treated as part of the NAME category in the course of this essay.

On the possibility of an earlier 'historical' martyrrology used by Bede, cf. Quentin, Martyrologes historiques, pp.683-4.

The examples from Bede I are taken from Quentin, p.52. According to Quentin (p.684) Bede I, the earlier of the two extant interpolated versions of Bede's martyrrology, was composed after 755. The best MS containing Bede I is the fragmentary MS St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 451, s.ix inc. The OEM example is taken from my edition, p.198.

HE V.24: "A martyrology of the festivals of the holy martyrs, in which I have diligently tried to note down all that I could find about them, not only on what day, but also by what sort of combat and under what judge they overcame the world", quotation and translation from Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, ed. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969) pp.570, 571.

I have changed the order suggested in the quotation by putting PERSECUTOR before TORMENTS & MARTYRDOM to suit the logical order, but also to conform to the order found in the majority of Bede's entries. The category TORMENTS is the one most frequently omitted by Bede in his realization of the basic pattern.

Dubois/Renaud, p.127 (Quentin, p.88). Kotzor II, pp.147-8. A translation of Bede's text runs: 'July 14. (The festival) of Phocas, bishop of Pontus, who overcame (torments by) fetters, iron (?) and fire for (the love of) Christ under the emperor Trajanus (and) the prefect Africanus; whose relics are (to be found) in the church of the Apostles, in Gaul, in the town of Vienne'. For the OEM entry, I shall use an unpublished translation by J.E. Cross: 'On the fourteenth day of the month is the memoria of the great martyr who is called Saint Phocas. He was bishop in the province which is called Pontus; but the emperor Trajanus threatened him with unspeakable punishments for (his) belief in Christ; and, finally, he ordered him to be sent into a burning oven, and, in it, he sent forth his spirit. And three days after this he showed (himself) before the emperor's door, and called the emperor, and told him that hell was opened and its torments prepared for him and ordered him to hasten to it. And then, the emperor died immediately after this. The relics of this bishop are in the province of Gaul in the city of Vienne and the relics are very famous throughout the world .


In comparing the prose style of a Latin text with that of an Old English text we have to take into account that some of the stylistic features may be due to structural differences between the two languages, and will not necessarily reflect differences attributable to the individuality of the authors.
Cf. below, n.38.

Dubois/Renaud, p.147 (Quentin, p.79). Kotzor II, p.175.

Cf. Quentin, pp.77-81, Kotzor I, p.274 n.406 and J.E. Cross, "The Passio S. Laurentii et aliorum: Latin Manuscripts and the Old English Martyrology", Medieval Studies (45) 1983, pp.200-13. Another martyr from the Gesta Laurentii discussed in this essay is Hippolytus, cf. below, pp.162-3. The quotation from Bede may be translated as 'who, compelled by the confession of St Lawrence, asked to be baptized by him'.

"He believed because he saw an angel of God stand and dry St Lawrence's limbs with a cloth, when the emperor Decius ordered him to be pierced with spiked iron clubs; and then he received baptism . . ." (translation by J.E. Cross, "The Passio S. Laurentii . . .", n.32).

Cf. Kotzor I, p.416 and above, n.16.


On the pseudo-historical detail in OEM, cf. Kotzor II, p.324, and J.E. Cross, "Latinity". The OEM quotation on the emperor's punishment reads in translation: "... an arrow came from heaven and wounded him in one of his cheeks, and he died at once" (Herzfeld, p.107); Herzfeld attributes this part of the story to the punishment of the executioner, but the context in OEM suggests that the person referred to is the emperor Julianus.

The text of the John and Paul entry is extant in MS C (CCCC 196) of OEM only, which expands the tironic note 7 as and, as opposed to ond in MS B (BL Cotton Julius A.x), the base MS of my edition.


Cf. above, pp.156-7.

"But then his magic arts vanished before her holiness like smoke when it glides away, or wax when it melts from the fire" (Herzfeld, p.181). The origin of the double image is discussed in an unpublished article by J.E. Cross (it occurs, for example, in Aldhelm's prose De Virginitate, which was used as a source by the Old English martyrologist, cf. Kotzor I, pp.256-7).

Dubois/Renaud, p.100 (Quentin, p.82). Kotzor II, pp.114-16.

Translation by J.E. Cross, "A Virgo in the Old English Martyrology", Notes and Queries 29 (1982) p.104 (the emendation ond is suggested by Cross, n.14): "And the man who beheaded them told all the people that he saw their souls when they went out of the body, as if they were adorned with gems and clothed in gold and in shining garments and angels, rejoicing, bore them in their hands to heaven".

Cf. above, n.16.

Bede's entry also includes one qualifying adjective ("dira vincula"), and one adverb qualifying a participial adjective ("splendide ornatas").


"Among these nations were men so unclean that they worshipped idols and ate dead bodies. This St. Mark healed sick men and lepers and awakened dead people from death" (Herzfeld, pp.63, 65). For examples of the miraculous element in OEM, cf. Kotzor I, pp.408-9. For unsavoury detail cf. e.g. the entry on Lawrence, Kotzor II, p.176 (the detailed description of the roasting of the martyr).

Cf. below, p.162 and n.41.

The Passio Marci (Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina 5276), cf. J.E. Cross, "Irish Texts", p.188 and n.78.

In this case, the syntactic head includes Natale, cf. below, p.164.

For a detailed analysis of Ado's method, cf. Quentin, pp.465-649. In the later Latin prose martyrologies up to Ado, Bede's text is normally retained (with slight modifications), and expanded by including additional detail from the longer hagiographical texts (passiones etc.), or from other sources. This method is used by Ado to such an extent that his work sometimes reads more like a short legendary than a martyrology.

The time structure is also recognizable in the OEM entry, but it is presented with less precision than in Bede; cf. the beginning of the quotations given below, p.162 (with a translation in n.41). There are rare examples of complex syntax to be found in OEM, cf. above, p.157, and Herzfeld, p.xxxii.

Bede: 'where around midnight he was at first comforted by an angelic visitation, and then by an appearance of the Lord himself he was called to the heavenly kingdom' Dubois/Renaud, p.71 (Quentin, p.86). OEM: "There (Herzfeld: "where") God's angel appeared to him at night and told him that in the morning he would enter into eternal rest. At last Christ himself appeared to him at night and said to him: Peace be with thee, Mark, our evangelist (Herzfeld: "apostle")"; translation from Herzfeld, p.65 (my modifications).


Cf. above, p.156 and n.20.

"... but he believed in God through the miracles which he saw from the deacon, St. Lawrence, and he received baptism ..." (translation by J.E. Cross, "The Passio S. Laurentii ...", n.36).

This is especially noticeable in the case of the entry on Mark. It has to be pointed out, however, that there is a greater number of lengthy entries in Bede than is suggested by the random selection discussed in this essay, e.g. the entries on St Sebastian (Quentin, p.91), Sts Victor and Corona (Quentin, pp.94-5).
This is also true for the entry on Procopius. The essential syntactic difference is that the relative clauses in OEM are short and followed by predominantly paratactic structures, while in Bede they frequently contain additional embedded constructions.


Cf. also above, n.38 and n.10.

For a comparison of Bede's entry with its source (BHL 6949), cf. Quentin, p.89.

We also find the Old English martyrologist's fondness for adding explanatory detail in this entry, i.e. "se waes on Palestina ðære mægðe" OEM / "in Palestina" Bede.


This is a general tendency in Bede, although there are counter-examples, cf. the discussion of the entry on Mark the Evangelist, and n.45.

E.g. in the entries on Romanus and Procopius.

Cf. above, n.16.

This may be caused partly by the difficulties involved in turning Latin constructions into Old English syntax, and partly by the martyrologist's (or his expected audience's) unfamiliarity with the material presented (e.g. in the Phocas entry, "He wes bispoc" OEM compared with "episcopi" Bede, and "on ðære mægðe ðæ Pontus is nemmed" OEM "Ponti" Bede).


For the different presentation of textual material by Bede in the Historia Ecclesiastica (HE) and in his martyrology (in entries where he may have used HE as a source), cf. Quentin's comparison of the Bede entry on St Alban with its source (p.105); for the difference between OEM and Werferth's translation of Gregory's Dialogues (where Gregory's Latin text is the source of the OEM entry), compare, e.g., the OEM entry on Benedict of Nursia (Kotzor II, p.40) with Werferth's text (ed. Hans Hecht, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa 5 (Leipzig, 1900; repr. Darmstadt, 1965) pp.175-6): OEM "... his broðra twegen gesægon ðonne wege fram his mynstre rihte east on ðone heofon; se wes bebrasded mid hwitum ryftum, ond þær was on unrim scinendra leochtare, ond þær stod an beorht wer ond cwæp to him: 'Dis is
se weg midby þe Dríhtnes se leofa Benedictus astag on heofon'." / GD "hi gesawon beþen, þæt an scinende wæg 7 lyxende wæs asteæht mid ȝodwebbenum þællum 7 unarinendum leochtatum ymbseted 7 mid rihtre stige eastweardes wæs aþpened to heofonum fram Benedictes cytan. 7 ofer þam wæge wæs standende swiþe beorht wæs mid æwarðlicum þæþyrelan, se acsode þa broðora, hwæs wæg þæt wære, þe hi sceawedon, hi andetton, þæt hi nyston, se beorhta wæs cæl to þan: 'bis is se wæg, on þam dríhtnes deorling Benedictus ðestah to heofonum'". Hecht's text is from MS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 322 (s.xii²). On syntactic and stylistic variation in the transmission of GD, cf. David Yerkes, Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of the Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues (Binghamton, 1982).

On structural differences between OEM and Bede, cf. the references at the end of n.1. On similarities between Bede and OEM in the initial part of some entries, cf. p.163 and n.46, but cf. also the 'narrative' entry of the Hieronymian martyrology referred to in n.10 which has a similar syntactic pattern.