THE IRISH AFFILIATIONS OF THE *CATECHESIS CELTICA*[1]

I. DESIGNATION

The *Catechesis Celtica* is the name given to the contents of Codex Reginensis Latinus 49 of the Vatican Library, and is but the Latinisation of the French title 'Catéchèses celtiques' given to the varied contents of the manuscript by Dom André Wilmart, when he published about one third of the work in 1933.[2]

Wilmart considered this title the most appropriate one for the contents of the collection. The genre of the collection, he notes, is hybrid and difficult to define. In it, one is in an intermediate and almost indistinct zone, half-way between direct preaching and didactic commentary. None the less, on rereading in succession the pieces chosen for inclusion by the compiler, one cannot fail to get the impression that his precise aim was to furnish priests involved in the ministry with varied expositions which would permit them to preach on the Gospel reading of the day. Thus, through these catecheses we are introduced to the ill-digested learning of a versatile exegete and also to the popular faith of a Christian community in the process of formation.[3] In the catalogue of the Vatican Reginensis collection of manuscripts, published in 1937, Wilmart avoids use of his earlier designation and describes the contents of Codex Reginensis 49 as: 'Commentaries and Homilies, principally of parts of the Gospels, and some excerpts'.[4] The title, however, remained and has been extended by Fr Robert McNally and later writers to such other presumed Hiberno-Latin collections of homilies as those of Cracow and Verona.

II. CONTENTS OF VATICAN CODEX REGINENSIS LATINUS 49

A colophon gives the scribe's name as Guilhelm: *Finit. Amen. Guilhelm scripsit hunc librum. Deo gratias* (f. 53). The Codex is numbered as (folios) 1–54, but there is no f. 5. The order of the folios in the present manuscript is disturbed and the text must be read in the sequence: ff. 1–2, 4, 3, 7, 6, 8–23, 32–47, 24–31, 48–54. There have also been some mistakes in transcription along the history of transmission, with portions of some texts copied erroneously as parts of other ones.

In the manuscript itself there is no clear division between the individual pieces. For this reason the division is left to the editors, who can differ on their separation of the material into individual items. Thus,

---

[1] I am very happy to have the honour of contributing to an edition of *Celtica* dedicated to Professor Brian Ó Cuív. This paper is the text of the Statutory Public Lecture delivered in Trinity College, Dublin, 8 September 1989.

[2] A. Wilmart, OSB, *Analecta Reginensia: extraits des manuscrits latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican* (Studi e Testi 50, Città del Vaticano 1933).

[3] ibid., 33.

[4] *Codices Reginenses latini* tomus I: codices 1–250 recensuit et digessit Andreas Wilmart (Città del Vaticano 1937) 112–17 for Cod. Reg. 49: 'Commentarii et homiliae, maxime de partibus Evangeliorum, excerptaque nonnulla' (p. 112).

whereas Wilmart divides the contents into forty-six items, McNally in
his unpublished edition of the text finds fifty-seven. The editor is helped
on occasion in his efforts by the presence of headings to some items, e.g.
Incipit umelia de oratione dominica (f. 9 v); *Omelia in Dominica Pal-
marum* (13 r); *Omelia in Cena Domini* (16 v); *De Cena Domini id est
de capitulo VI* (17 r); *Hoc ad solemnitatem Paschae conuenit* (18 v);
In nomine Dei Summi (20 v, 30 r), and the final item headed *De die
domi⟨ni⟩co* (f. 53). Together with these headings there is occasionally
other introductory material which seems to indicate the beginning of a
new item, such as the place in the Eusebian Canons of the Scripture peri-
cope to be commented on. This information is occasionally accompanied
by the number of the chapter in question, thus: 14 r (Palm Sunday);
24 r (Luke 11:27–8); 25 v (Matt. 13:45–6); 27 v (Matt. 21:10–11); 29 r
(Matt. 12:42); 30 r (Matt. 21:1–11); 30 v (Luke 2:1–20; Christmas Day);
37 r (Matt. 10:16); 39 r (Matt. 6:33); 40 v (Luke 13:6–9); 42 v (Matt.
9:10–13); 43 v (John 14:1–2); 47 r (Luke 2:21).

Sometimes we have, without indication of Canon or chapter, a Scrip-
ture passage to be commented on, apparently indicating the beginning
of a new item, thus: 35 v (Matt. 16:34), 40 v (Luke 13:6–9). Together
with these headings and openings, we are aided in our separation of the
pieces by certain formal and formulaic endings, e.g. *Finit* (10 v, first
exposition of the *Pater noster*); *Finit. Amen* (11 v, second exposition
of the *Pater noster*); . . . *per infinita secula seculorum. Amen* (16 r);
ipsi gloria et imperium in secula seculorum. Amen (16 v); . . . *qui cum
Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen* (17 r);
a similar prayer for eternal union with God *in secula seculorum. Amen*
(47 r, two distinct items; 47 v; 51 r).

The argument for distinct items is strengthened when a given piece
has both a heading, introduction and an ending. However, even with
these aids we are at times left in doubt with regard to the exact division
or the original intention of the compiler in this matter. Thus in 16 r
we have one exposition of the narrative of Jesus's entry into Jerusalem
rounded off with the ending: *Semperque laetamur et conregnemus cum
illo in perpetua uita per infinita secula seculorum. Amen*, which is fol-
lowed immediately (without heading) by another exposition of the same
text: *Moraliter. 'Duo discipuli', id est doctores cum fide et opere.* This
moral exposition is, in the tradition to which I believe the *Catechesis
Celtica* belongs, but the normal continuation of treatment of the text in
accord with the different senses of Scripture.[5] This, in turn, is followed
by an ending: *ipsi gloria et imperium in secula seculorum. Amen*, after
which comes (16 v) a homily headed *Omelia in cena Domini.* Sometimes
when an item is not marked off by either heading or ending it can be
identified as a unit by means of the subject matter, as in the case of 9 r
(comment on Ps. 1); 11 v (order of reading of the canonical Scriptures

---

[5]See further below, p. 313.

in St Peter's Church, Rome); 18 v, section of a Penitential; to which we may add two collections on various subjects (both preceded by sections with formulaic ending), i.e. 20 r and 49 v.

III. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

According to slips preserved in the Vatican Library, Codex Reginensis Latinus 49 has been consulted between 1913 and 1973 by twenty-eight different scholars, including: W. M. Lindsay (10 April 1915), K. W. Hughes (5 April 1951), B. Bischoff (17 April 1958; 3 March 1962), R. E. McNally (16 September 1960; 17, 21 October 1968). It was consulted too late by W. M. Lindsay for inclusion in his major works *Early Irish minuscule script* (Oxford 1910), *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915).[6] There is a marginal gloss *guor/cher* (written in two parts, one above the other) in f. 21 r to the word *summitas* (*fracta est summitas inferni cum resurgerent mortui*). Attention had been drawn to this gloss by H. M. Bannister, in the work *Paleografia musicale Vaticana*, who read it as *quor cher* and regarded it as Irish. Lindsay communicated his new reading (*guor cher*) of the gloss to J. Loth, who published a study of it, together with a facsimile of the page carrying it. He regarded the gloss as Cornish rather than Breton.[7]

In May 1932, in preparation for his work on the cataloguing of the Reginensis Collection, Wilmart wrote to Loth, informing him of the existence of two further glosses in the manuscript, i.e. *trapen* over the Latin word *capite* in f. 32 v and another of uncertain reading in f. 50, i.e. *he be* (with a stroke over the final *e*) above the Latin word *elimosina*, which Wilmart expanded as *he ben* (less likely *he ber*). In the same letter he remarked that the Celtic origin of the collection is evident, and remarks that the copyist of the present text (writing in the tenth century, or at earliest towards the end of the ninth) reproduced unaltered an earlier collection, one probably put together in the eighth. With regard to the provenance of MS 49 Wilmart remained uncertain. In his own view there were three possible points of origin from the palaeographical point of view: Cornwall or Wales; Brittany (*Bretagne Armoricaine*, his preference); or Fleury-sur-Loire. In the same letter Wilmart also remarked that the text of Luke 2:1–20 in the manuscript was entirely in the Celtic tradition as known to us through the manuscripts DELO(read: Q)R, except for 2:11, where for (*quia natus est uobis hodie*) *saluator* (*qui est Christus Dominus*) Reginensis 49 has: (. . .) *conseruator* (. . .) and adds *saluasti*. Wilmart asks whether *saluasti* here might not be another gloss. Loth published this correspondence in 1933.[8]

[6] Nor is it mentioned in his other study: W. M. Lindsay, 'Breton scriptoria: their Latin abbreviation-symbols', *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* 29 (1912) 264–72.

[7] J. Loth, 'Une glose britonnique du Xᵉ siècle', *Revue Celtique* 36 (1915–16) 411–12.

[8] J. Loth, 'Une glose brittone inédite du IXᵉ–Xᵉ siècle: une autre origine douteuse', *Revue Celtique* 50 (1933) 357–62.

The codex next attracted attention in 1933 when Wilmart published
about one-third of it (in XIV 'Catéchèses') together with an introduction
of five pages.[9] He took our present copy to be from the tenth century,
most likely from the first half. However, behind this tenth-century col-
lection he saw an original which he believed was very similar – apart
from the vernacular glosses and errors of transcription – to an original
to be situated approximately towards the end of the eighth century and
located in the British Isles, either in Cornwall or Wales. In his introduc-
tion Wilmart does not seriously consider the possibility, much less the
likelihood, of Irish origin. He sees a clear 'Celtic' link in the biblical text
of the Gospels used in the 'Catéchèses'. It is that of the 'Celtic' family,
represented by the manuscripts DELQR, L being the Lichfield Gospels,
probably written in a Welsh centre. He notes that the Gospel text used
in the 'Catéchèses' is not particularly close to L, which he takes as a
possible indication of Cornish rather than Welsh origin. He makes no
mention of the fact that D (the Book of Armagh) and R (the Rushworth
or Mac Regol Gospels) and presumably Q (the Book of Kells) are Irish.
Another link 'with the Celtic race and Insular bias'[10] he sees in the indis-
criminate use of the Apocrypha. He instances the Gospel according to
the Hebrews, certain *profetica verba*, the Signs before Doomsday, the
colourful description of the three Magi, the wonders worked on Sunday.

The first of the 'Catéchèses' published by Wilmart was one headed
'*De cena Domini*'. Dom J. Huyben soon pointed out to Wilmart that the
sources of this were to be found in the writings of Paschasius Radbertus.
That same year Wilmart published an essay on the matter. This cate-
chesis is but a résumé of Paschasius's large commentary on Matthew's
Gospel and of his treatise *De corpore et sanguine*.[11] It would indicate a
date in the later ninth century for this particular text of the catechesis,
and for the entire corpus if all the material is of the same date.

In 1936 the Bollandist Paul Grosjean made a very thorough study
of the section of the 'Catéchèses celtiques' published by Wilmart and
advanced very strong reasons for concluding that they are not without
Irish connections.[12] In this remarkable study Grosjean modestly tells
us that he wishes to draw attention to certain details in the catecheses
which appeared to him, in their cumulative force, to indicate at least
certain relationships with Ireland.[13] What he presents us with, in fact,
is a thorough examination of the portion of the *Catechesis* published by
Wilmart, indicating the relationship with the Irish language, and with
Irish tradition, both vernacular and Latin. In his introductory section he
notes the three glosses discussed by Joseph Loth: *guorcher, tra pen, he*

[9]Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 29–34.

[10]'. . . la race celtique et les partis pris insulaire. . .', ibid., 32.

[11]A. Wilmart, 'Une source carolingienne des catéchèses celtiques', *Revue Bénédic-
tine* 45 (1933) 350–51.

[12]P. Grosjean. 'A propos du manuscrit 49 de la Reine Christine', *Analecta Bolland-
iana* 54 (1936) 113–36.

[13]ibid., 118.

ben, the first of these indicating Cornwall rather than Wales or Armorica. He disagrees with Loth's understanding of the second gloss, which makes little sense in the context, and prefers another with the meaning 'in favour of'. The third expression *he ben* (after which he puts a question mark), he notes, could be Breton or Cornish; the matter is not as yet clear. Grosjean compares peculiarities of the Catecheses Latinity with Irish tradition: *pascha modicum, haeres Christi, aliena non immolanda sunt Deo, filius vitae, veteris legis, creator omnium elementorum, familia caeli et terrae, gradus angelorum, initium* (in an absolute sense of 'beginning of Lent'); the use in verbs with infinitive in *-are* of the subjunctive in *-a-* instead of in *-e-* (e.g. *negamus* for *negemus*).

He goes on to note the resemblance in ideas and literary expression between the Catecheses and Irish literature of the Middle Ages. In this section he stresses in particular the close relationship between the Catecheses and the homilies in the *Leabhar Breac* and the material in the glosses of the Gospels of Máel Brigte. He mentions especially the use of the stereotyped *peroratio*, rigorously adhered to in Irish homilies. He instances a very close connection between one text of the *Catechesis Celtica* (ed. Wilmart, p. 111 lines 55–61), and the *Leabhar Breac*. The *Catechesis* text reads: (*Beati qui habitant cum Abel et Enoc et Noe*) *cum Abraham et Isac et Iacob, cum Moise et Aaron et Iesu filio Nun, cum XII profae(tis) cum XII apostolis, cum omnibus sanctis ab initio mundi usque ad finem, cum IX ordinibus angelorum, cum patre et filio et spiritu sancto, in pace et laetitia, in puritate et in iuuentute, sine fame et nuditate, cum abun(dantia) omnis boni sine ullo malo, circa regem iuuenem, largum, pulcrum, aeternum. Rogamus deum omnipotentem ut mereamur possidere illam beatitudinem in saecula saeculorum. Amen.* Grosjean notes that the beginning of this passage is cited in almost the exact same way by the glossator of the Gospels of Máel Brigte. This glossator, be he Máel Brigte or someone else, appears to have had before him different collections of homilies. According to Grosjean, the citation he has from the *Catechesis Celtica* leads one to believe that Reginensis 49 itself, or a similar collection, was in the library of the glossator of the Máel Brigte Gospels (in Armagh itself if Máel Brigte was the glossator).

Grosjean also notes the relationship of the Apocryphal elements of the sections published by Wilmart and Irish tradition (i.e. the Magi, miracles at Christ's birth, Longinus, the *octo pondera de quibus factus est Adam*, the *IIII familiae quae ascribentur in iudicio*, the signs before Doomsday, the text *De die dominico*).

Grosjean concludes his essay by noting that the 'Catécheses celtiques' are not without relationship with Ireland, but prudently remarks that we know only one third of the work and that the sections remaining unpublished might well destroy hastily construed hypotheses. He follows this remark by recalling the role played by the *Céli Dé* reform (eighth and ninth centuries) in the Irish Church. One can suppose, he notes, that this, like all reforms, would have been accompanied by a renewal

in preaching. The date of the *Céli Dé* also fits in well with the aim
assigned by Wilmart to the compilation of the *Catechesis Celtica*, a
collection designed to aid preachers in their task.

We hope to show later than the unpublished sections admirably bear
out Grosjean's surmises regarding the Catecheses' relationship to Irish
tradition, and in particular to the *Leabhar Breac* and the glosses of the
Gospels of Máel Brigte.

Grosjean's study appeared too late to have influenced Wilmart in
his treatment of Codex Reginensis 49 in his catalogue of the Reginensis
Collection published in 1937.[14] This does not go considerably beyond
his earlier 1933 work in *Analecta Reginensia* apart from noting that the
homily *De cena Domini* (ff. 17–18 v) depends on Paschasius Radbertus.
He notes that in Matt. 6:33 (ff. 39–40 v) the Codex has the Book of
Armagh reading *prestabuntur*,[15] and that there is an infinite number of
abbreviations according to the custom of the Irish.[16] The glosses show,
however, that the book belonged to the British (Breton), not the Irish
(Scottic).[17]

McNally worked on the manuscript in the Vatican Library in the
early and late 1960s and was preparing an edition of it for publication.
He edited one text from it, *De die dominico*, in 1973.[18] In the preface
he speaks of Vat. Reg. 49 and its contents:[19]

> The Vatican Codex, Reg. lat. 49 . . . can be dated to the late
> ninth or early tenth century and is . . . Breton, perhaps Welsh.
> The script, a remarkable combination of Carolingian minuscule and
> insular abbreviations, seems to confirm the probability of Breton
> origin. The manuscript contains the only extant copy of the *Cat-
> echesis Celtica*, a collection of homilies, intended for liturgical use
> in a Celtic setting. Since its contents are composite in nature, it
> is impossible to date the work as a whole, though beyond doubt
> some of the component pieces of this collection are authentic speci-
> mens of early Celtic piety and representative of its oldest and purest
> traditions.

In a note to this he adds:

> With respect to Wilmart's scholarship, his edition of the *Catechesis
> Celtica* should be reworked with proper care for the source-analysis
> and the reproduction of the complete text. A careful study of the
> whole work will yield remarkable conclusions on the spirituality of

[14] Wilmart, *Codices Reginenses latini*.

[15] ibid., 115.

[16] ibid., 117: 'Compendiorum infinitus est numerus, ex hibernorum consuetitudine
adhibitorum et quae nunc lectorem multum docent'.

[17] ibid.: 'Quapropter Brittonum liber erat, non Scottorum'.

[18] R. E. McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* I (Corpus Christianorum Series
Latina CVIIIB, Turnhout 1973).

[19] ibid., 178–9.

the Old Celts (Irish?). My edition of this work is nearing comple-
tion.

McNally died in 1978, but before his death he had completed the tran-
scription of the entire manuscript and provided it with a source-analysis.

McNally's rather thorough source-analysis has relatively few
Hiberno-Latin or Irish references: Pseudo-Isidore, *Liber de numeris*;
Pseudo-Bede, *Collectanea*; Pseudo-Jerome, *Expositio IV evangeliorum*,
In Matthaeum, *In Lucam*, *In Ioannem*; Scotus Anonymus, *In Lucam*
(the Vienna Commentary on Luke); Scotus Anonymus, *In epistolas
Catholicas*; for specific texts the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* (on the
Pater noster); the *Leabhar Breac* and the Cracow Homily Collection
(being prepared for publication by himself).

Frederic Mac Donncha has made an intensive study of a set of Middle
Irish homilies, found in the *Leabhar Breac* and elsewhere. In 1972 he
successfully completed a Ph.D dissertation (National University of Ire-
land) on the subject.[20] In a study of these homilies, published in 1976,
he noted the relationship between the *exordia* and the *perorationes* in
them and elements in the *Catechesis Celtica* (which he believed to be
most likely of Irish origin).[21] He also noted that many questions about
these homilies must remain unanswered until the various Hiberno-Latin
scriptural commentaries are all published (to which he could have added
the Hiberno-Latin homiletic material).[22]

In the early 1980s Giovanni Maria Vian published an interesting
and informative survey of the contents of Codex Reginensis latinus 49,
accompanied by a history of research on the *Catechesis Celtica*.[23] A
concluding English summary to the essay in Italian seems to favour
Irish, rather than Cornish, origin.

A decisive turn in the direction of research in this general area came
about a little later through the studies of Jean Rittmueller, both in
her doctoral dissertation on the *Leabhar Breac* homily *In cena Domini*
and on the sources of the correponding glosses in the Gospels of Máel
Brigte.[24] Her doctoral dissertation concentrated on the study of the
homily *In cena Domini* in the *Leabhar Breac*. This is in the form of a

---

[20] F. Mac Donnchadha, 'Na hoimilí sa Leabhar Breac (LB), Lebor na hUidre (LU),
Leabhar Mhic Carthaigh Riabhaigh (LMC) agus i Vita Tripartita Sancti Patricii
(VTP) (nó Bethu Phátraic): a mbunús, a n-údar agus a ndáta' (Ph.D dissertation,
National University of Ireland 1972).

[21] F. Mac Donncha, 'Medieval Irish homilies', in *Biblical studies: the medieval Irish
contribution* (ed. M. McNamara, Dublin 1976) 59–71, pp. 64–5.

[22] ibid., 71.

[23] G. M. Vian, 'Le catechesi celtiche pubblicate da André Wilmart', *Romanobar-
barica* 6 (1980–81) 145–59.

[24] J. Rittmueller, 'The Leabhar Breac Latin and Middle-Irish homily "In Cena
Domini": an edition and source analysis' (Ph.D dissertation, Harvard University
1984), available from University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor; eadem, 'The
Gospel commentary of Máel Brigte Ua Máeluanaig and its Hiberno-Latin back-
ground', *Peritia* 2 (1983) 185–214; eadem, 'Postscript to the Gospels of Máel Brigte',
Peritia 3 (1984) 215–18.

commentary on Matt. 26:17–30. She studies the commentaries on this passage in Irish tradition in writings from the seventh century down to the twelfth – from the Manchanus Gospel glosses of the mid-seventh century to the glosses of the Gospels of Máel Brigte (AD 1138; MS British Library Harley 1802). In all there are seven distinct Irish texts. Behind the central Irish tradition she finds Jerome's commentary on Matthew and the Manchanus glosses, jointly giving rise to the basic outline of exegesis for Matt. 26:17–30. Within this tradition she situates the *Catechesis Celtica* homily *De cena Domini*, which she tentatively assigns to the eighth–ninth century. She shows that the assumed dependence of the *Catechesis Celtica* homily and the Máel Brigte Gospel glosses on Paschasius Radbertus is not the explanation of their similarity. Among the Máel Brigte Gospel glosses there are a number marked as '*Man*', obviously considered as deriving from a writer thus abbreviated. The natural expansion of the abbreviation in an Irish context would be 'Manchianus' or 'Manchanus', and there was a noted Irish exegete of this name in the mid-sixth century. Bischoff could not accept the identification because of the presumed dependence of the *Man* glosses on the Eucharist on Paschasius Radbertus.[25] Ritmueller has now shown that the Irish tradition in question is quite independent of Paschasius. They both depend on common sources (Jerome's commentary on Matthew and the *Verba seniorum* on a Eucharistic miracle). On occasion also Paschasius has been proved to depend on Irish sources and, in fact, on one of the sources carrying the Irish exegetical synthesis on Matt. 26:17–30.

I have dwelt on Rittmueller's contribution at some length as I believe what she has established with regard to the homily *De cena Domini* and its exegesis of Matt. 26:17–30 may well hold good for the use of Matthew's Gospel in other homilies of the *Catechesis Celtica* and other Irish sources, e.g. the *Leabhar Breac*. Matthew's Gospel, in fact, was the chief text used in Irish homilies and we are fortunate in having various Hiberno-Latin commentaries on it from the seventh to the twelfth centuries. This exegetical tradition may help us in locating the exposition of the *Catechesis Celtica* collection in place and time.

The final contribution to the study of the *Catechesis Celtica* to be noted here is that of An tAthair Diarmuid Ó Laoghaire, in a conference given in 1984 and published in 1987.[26] He notes further points of contact between the contents of the collection and a variety of Irish texts: the Irish *Liber de numeris*, the Cracow Conferences, the

---

[25] B. Bischoff, 'The "Man" glosses (Manchianus?) of the Gospel Book of London B.M. Harley 1802', appendix to his essay 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter', *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954) 274–9 = *Mittelalterliche Studien* I, 270–73; English translation by Colm O'Grady, in *Biblical studies*, 145–9. On this question see J. Ritmueller, *Peritia* 2 (1983) 200–214; eadem, Ph.D dissertation, 277–94, with notes.

[26] D. Ó Laoghaire, 'Irish elements in the *Catechesis Celtica*', in *Ireland and Christendom: the Bible and the missions* (ed. P. Ní Chatháin and M. Richter, Stuttgart 1987) 146–64.

Lambeth Commentary, the Old-Irish Treatise on the Psalter, the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* and others besides. One notable contribution is Ó Laoghaire's treatment of one of the presumed Breton or Welsh glosses, namely the gloss on *Elimosina*. The text (f. 50 r a 21) in the manuscript reads: *elimosina dei mei opus la* (with stroke over *a*) and *.i. he be* interlineated above *elimosina*. As transcribed by Wilmart, this reads:[27] *Elimosina dei mei opus la(udat)*, with gloss on *elimosina* given (as the reading appeared to him) as: *i(dest) he be(n)*. He also admits that the expansion of *la* to *laudat* is but a conjecture. Ó Laoghaire has brought to our attention what appears to be the real reading for this passage, i.e. that found in the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* XIII.2: *Elimosina hebraice, Dei mei opus latine intellegitur*. The separation of *b* from *e* in the *Catechesis* text seems due to the need to avoid the upper extension of the letter *s* of *elimosina*. The extra (final) *e* (clear in the manuscript) may be due to a copyist's error or misunderstanding of the original. That the text of Codex Reginensis latinus 49 should be read in accord with the *Hibernensis* text is rendered all the more probable in that we have here an 'etymology' in the Hiberno-Latin tradition. That the basically Greek word *elimosina* should be taken as Hebrew is not surprising. *Eli* in Hebrew means 'My God' (cf. Matt. 27:46); *mosina* could easily be connected with the Hebrew *ma'aseh* 'work'. The Bretonic glosses are thus reduced to a maximum of two.

In what follows I shall examine the Irish affiliations of the *Catechesis* from different points of view: biblical text used, exegetical tradition involved, homiletic material, apocryphal material.

IV. CATECHESIS CELTICA AND IRISH BIBLICAL TEXT

Our examination of this topic is necessarily limited by the Irish (Latin) biblical text known to us in the present state of investigations.[28] For the Old Testament we have only the Psalter. With regard to the New Testament we have ample evidence for the Four Gospels, while for the remainder we are confined for the greater part to the text of the Book of Armagh, with an additional text from the Pauline Epistles and some evidence from the commentaries for the Catholic Epistles.

1. *The Psalter text*[29]

From the time of Jerome onwards the Western Latin Church used three texts of the Psalter: the Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*; sometimes referred to simply as the *Romanum* [abbrev. *Ro.*]), the Latin text revised by Jerome against the Greek and Hebrew, known as the *Gallicanum* [abbrev. *Ga.*], and Jerome's translation direct from the Hebrew, known

---

[27] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 108 line 32.

[28] On this see M. McNamara, 'The text of the Latin Bible in the early Irish church: some data and desiderata', in *Ireland and Christendom: the Bible and the missions*, 7–55.

[29] On this see M. McNamara, 'Psalter text and psalter study in the early Irish church (A.D. 600–1200)', *Royal Ir. Academy Proc.* 73 C (1973) 201–276.

as the *Hebraicum* or *Iuxta Hebraeos*. Both the *Gallicanum* and the *Hebraicum* were known and used in Ireland and, as the Benedictine editors of the critical editions of both have shown, Ireland had a distinct family both of *Gallicanum* and *Iuxta Hebraeos* texts. The specifically Irish family of the *Gallicanum* is found in the manuscripts given the sigla *C* and *I*, i.e. the Cathach of St Columba (MS in the Royal Irish Academy) and the Double Psalter of Rouen (MS, Rouen Bibliothèque publique 24 [A 41]).

I have counted some ninety-nine Psalter texts in the *Catechesis Celtica*. In fifty-four of these the text employed is identical with both that of the Old Latin (*Romanum*) and the critical edition of the *Gallicanum*, and they are consequently without significance for our purpose. Likewise with thirty-one others in which the text used is identical with the critical edition of the *Gallicanum*, even though this does not coincide with the Old Latin. It seems obvious that the compilers' Psalter text was the *Gallicanum*, not the Old Latin.

What is significant are the texts which agree with none of these. In the *Catechesis Celtica* we have thirteen such texts, disagreeing with the critical edition of the *Gallicanum* but agreeing with the readings of the specific Irish family of the *Gallicanum*. It is of little significance that the specific *CI* reading may also be an Old Latin text. This is evidence of contamination of the *Gallicanum*, not direct use of the Old Latin (or *Romanum*). The texts are as follows:

18:5 (*exiit* [two occurrences], for exiuit);
26:4 (*petiui*, for *petii*);
26:4 (*omnibus diebus*, for *omnes dies* of Gallicanum);
27:5 (*distrue* [*illos et non edificabis eos*] for *destrues i. et non aed. eos*
     of *Ga.*; *Ro.* has: *destrue il. nec aed. eos*);
32:2–4 (*conlaudatio*; *psallite ei*);
32:7 (*in utrem*);
43:23 (*obdormis*);
43:26 (*adiuua nos Domine*; two occurrences);
49:3 (*ardebit*; *CI* only with *Ro.*);
83:11b (*quam habitarem*, *CI* only);
91:14 ([*in atriis*] *domus* [*Dei*]; *I* with *Ro.*);
145:7 (*soluet*);
146:6 (*humiliat*, only *I*, with *Ro.*).

2. *The Gospel text*

We know of some thirty Irish Gospel manuscripts, and some other texts not written in Ireland related to these. One of these texts, *Usserianus primus* (with symbol r[1]) has the Old Latin Gospel text. Another, the Book of Durrow, has the Vulgate text. A number of the manuscripts have not as yet been fully examined from the point of view of textual character. The majority of those which have, however, present a mixed

text of both Vulgate and Old Latin readings. During the latter part of
the last century and the opening years of this one, scholars have identi-
fied a group of manuscripts which carry such a mixed text, manuscripts
known by their symbols as DELQR, i.e. the Book of Armagh (Codex
Dublinensis), British Library Egerton 609 (probably written in Brit-
tany), the Lichfield Gospels (probably written in a centre at the Welsh
border), the Book of Kells (Codex Cennanensis), and the Rushworth
or Mac Regol Gospels (most probably written at Birr). These texts do
not constitute a family, as they do not descend from a common original.
Since the group cannot be assigned to any particular country, but have
representatives from Ireland, Wales and Brittany, they are often (if not
generally) referred to as 'the Celtic Gospels'. It should be noted that
a number of other Irish works have the same characteristic readings as
this group but have not as yet been adequately examined.

The *Catechesis Celtica* has an abundance of Gospel texts, especially
from Matthew, the Gospel most frequently commented on in the homi-
lies. For the most part, these are longer passages, first cited in full and
then commented on with repetition of the key texts. Together with this
there are many brief Gospel texts cited throughout the homilies and the
other different items.

For the purpose of our study here we can take the established Vul-
gate text as our point of reference. What must interest us is the total
number of deviations in reading from the Vulgate text and their textual
affiliations in so far as this is ascertainable.[30] I have counted three hun-
dred and thirty-three such deviations: one hundred and seventy-three
for Matthew, six for Mark, seventy-nine for Luke and seventy-five for
John. I have failed to trace the origin of quite a number of these read-
ings. They do not feature in the extensive apparatus of Wordsworth and
White's critical edition of the Vulgate. Some of them could be Old Latin
readings, others simply adaptations made by the homilist. (This latter
possibility, however, is something not lightly to be presumed.) My chief
interest here is the relation of the texts to Irish tradition, principally to
that of the mixed Irish or Celtic group DELQR, and related texts.

In this we must distinguish between the different Gospels. One
notable feature of the citations from Matthew's Gospel in the *Cate-
chesis Celtica* is the high proportion of the deviations from the Vulgate
which coincide with the DELQR group. In fact, of the one hundred and
seventy-three deviant readings in question, eighty-five (almost half of
them) are from this DELQR group. None of the deviations in the texts
from Mark's Gospel seems to belong to the DELQR group, while a few
(but not too many) of those from the Gospels of Luke and John do.

[30]M. McNamara, *Studies on texts of early Irish Latin Gospels (A.D. 600–1200)*
(Instrumenta Patristica XX, Steenbrugge and Dordrecht 1990) 215–43. I edit the
entire body of *Catechesis Celtica* Gospel texts which show disagreement with the
Vulgate, and where possible I note their affiliations.

It is clear that the form of Gospel text for Matthew, in particular,
used principally by the compiler or compilers of the collection, was of
the DELQR type. The longer passages could be pages from one of these
manuscripts, or of another similar to them. Wilmart rightly took this
text as one of the clearest guides for identifying the contents of Vat. Reg.
49 as 'Celtic'. He noted that the biblical text used was not particularly
close to L (presumably representing the Welsh text), and took this as
a further reason for favouring Cornwall (rather than Wales) as place of
origin.

At the present stage of research it is very difficult to speak of a Welsh
or a Breton form of Gospel text. To do so it is not sufficient to list the
Gospel manuscripts written in these regions. We must also try to trace
the use of a given text in the region's literature.[31] Egerton 609 (E) seems
to have been written in Brittany, but we do not have evidence that it
was a text form actually used there. In fact, we know relatively little,
as yet, of the Gospel text of Brittany.

An examination of the *Catechesis Celtica* Gospel texts reveals a pre-
ponderant correspondence with the readings of the Irish texts DRQ.
Much more analysis, however, is required before we can say whether the
Gospel text at the disposal of the writer or writers was nearer to any
one particular known Gospel manuscript.

All the texts of the *Catechesis Celtica* which differ from the stan-
dard Vulgate or Old Latin versions are not of the DELQR type. The
compiler(s) had certainly a very special text for Luke 2:11 which occurs
a number of times in the homily on the Gospel for Christmas day and
also outside of it. The text of Luke 2:11 reads: *quia natus est uobis
hodie conseruator salutis qui est Christus Dominus in ciuitate Dauid
quae dicitur Bethlehem.* The Vulgate and general Old Latin text has:
*quia natus est uobis hodie Saluator qui est Christus Dominus in ciuitate
Dauid.* This text (*conseruator salutis*) is found again in the (presumed
Hiberno-Latin) Vienna Commentary on Luke (in MS Vind. lat. 997).[32]
This is the reading of the Old Latin (Irish) text *Usserianus primus*,
found also in Sankt Paul, Carinthia,[33] fragment (MS 23.3.19 with siglum
β), the final words *quae dicitur Bethlem* being found only in the latter.

I have given here the evidence for Irish affiliations in the Gospel text
of the *Catechesis Celtica*. This does not prove categorically that these
homilies are of Irish origin. Before a final conclusion is reached other
aspects of these biblical citations will need to be examined. One is the
use of a liturgical *incipit* in pericope as if it were part of the biblical text,
treating it as a lemma for comment. Thus for John 2:1 we have: *In illis*

---

[31] We have one such study: L. H. Gray, 'Biblical citations in Latin Lives of Welsh
and Breton saints differing from the Vulgate', *Traditio* 8 (1952) 389–97.

[32] J. Kelly (ed.), *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108C, Turnhout 1974) 15, 84.

[33] D. De Bruyne (ed.), 'Deux feuillets d'un texte préhieronymien des Évangiles',
Revue Bénédictine 35 (1923) 62–80.

diebus die tertio,[34] with later comment on the opening words added only for liturgical purposes. Fr Bonifatius Fischer informs me that division of Gospel texts with words such as these inserted in the text itself is a feature of Gospel manuscripts written in Brittany.

A further point worthy of note regarding the Gospel text of the *Catechesis Celtica* is a presumed knowledge of the Greek text and the citation of part of Matt. 28:1 in Greek in the homily on the resurrection headed *In nomine Dei summi. Amen.* The Greek is actually cited in the course of a grammatical discussion on the gender of (the Latin) *uesper, uespere, uesperum, uespera*, the corresponding Greek word (to these Latin neutrals) being introduced as feminine.

> '*Vespere sabbati*'. *Id est, graeca nomina sunt uesper et uespere et uespera, et interpretantur finis uel defectio. Et femini⟨ini⟩ generis est in greca uespere, nam sic est in euangelio greco:* ΟΨΕ [above this: *id est uespere*] ΤΗ [above this: *id est, hac*] CΑΒΒΑΤΟΥ [above this: *id est, sabati*] ΤΗ [above this: *id est, qua*] ΕΠΙΦΟC [above this: *id est, lucescit*] ΕΙC [above this: *id est, in*] ΜΟΥΑΝ [above this: *primum*] CΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ [above this: *id est, sabatorum*]. *In quo apparet quod opse femininum nomen est, te uero femininum pronomen est. Quidem autem uolunt uespera, non uespere, hic dici debere. Quidem dicunt quod uespere commune est uel masculinum et femininum* (f. 20 v).

The significance of the evidence on a knowledge and use of the Greek text has yet to be evaluated. Its use in the *Catechesis Celtica* must be examined in conjunction with the presence of essentially the same Latin text, and two of the words of the Greek text, in the eighth-century Hiberno-Latin commentary on Matthew entitled *Liber questionum in euangeliis*. We shall return to this point below.[35]

3. *The text of the Pauline epistles*

For an evaluation of the affiliations of the text of the Pauline Epistles we have only the text of the Book of Armagh (with siglum D in Vulgate manuscripts; no. 61 for Beuron Old Latin) and of the Würzburg manuscript Universitätsbibliothek M. p. th., f. 12 (with siglum W).[36]

There are numerous citations from Paul in the *Catechesis Celtica*. Their textual affiliations, however, have not been studied in any depth. A number of the citations from Romans agree with the Book of Armagh readings against the Vulgate. Thus:

> 2:4 (*ignoras, bonitas*); 2:5 (+ *tu autem; cor impenitens*, for *im. cor*); 9:26 (*uocabitur*; Vg: *dictum est*); 9:25 (*dilectam dilectam*; Vg: *misericordiam consecutam*, twice); 11:20 (*sta*); 11:33 (*inscriptalia*, D:

---

[34] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 72.
[35] See below, p. 321.
[36] See M. McNamara, in *Ireland and Christendom*, 49–51.

inscrutabilia; Vg: *incomprehensibilia*); 13:2 (*appropinquauit*; Vg: *adpropiauit*).

There is an extensive citation from Romans in a comment on Matt. 7:12 ('The Golden Rule') which agrees verbatim with D as distinct from the Vulgate and other texts. In the course of the comment Rom. 12:9–10 is cited as follows:[37]

> *Exsecrantes malum adherentes bono caritatem fraternitatis inuicem benigni honore motuo praevenientes.*

The Vulgate has:

> *odientes malum adhaerentes bono caritatem fraternitatis inuicem diligentes honore inuicem praeuenientes.*

Only D has the variant *exsecrantes*, with no Old Latin support. It too, alone in Vulgate texts, has the variant *benigni* for *diligentes* (although some Old Latin texts do have it) and *mutuo* (*motuo*) for *inuicem* (with the Ambrosiaster, Augustine and Sedulius Scottus).

Beyond these texts from Romans there does not appear to be any close connection between the many *Catechesis* Pauline citations and the Book of Armagh. More detailed study is required to ascertain the exact textual affiliations of the Pauline text used by the compiler.

4. *The text of the Catholic epistles and Apocalypse*

For the Irish textual tradition for the Catholic Epistles we have again the Book of Armagh, and a small fragment of text for 2 Peter from Bobbio, now in Turin. The indirect transmission is found in the two early Hiberno-Latin commentaries on these Epistles.[38]

Walter Thiele[39] has examined the Irish tradition and notes that the biblical text of the section of the *Catechesis* published by Wilmart, together with that of the Hiberno-Latin commentaries, tends to agree with the text of D. There are relatively few citations from these seven Epistles in the entire compilation. I have counted eight from James; thirteen from 1 Peter, two from 2 Peter, six from 1 John, and find it hard to situate them within the Latin Bible.

There are about thirty-two citations from the Apocalypse in the *Catechesis*. These, once again, I have been unable to situate within the Latin tradition. They do not appear to agree either with the Vulgate text or that of the Book of Armagh.

5. *Conclusion on Biblical text of the* Catechesis Celtica

In the matter of citations from the Psalms and the Gospels the *Catechesis Celtica* has evident affiliations with Irish tradition. The same

---

[37] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 83.

[38] See McNamara, in *Ireland and Christendom*, 51–2.

[39] W. Thiele, *Epistolae Catholicae Vetus Latina: die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel* 26/1 (Freiburg 1956–69) 22.

is true with regard to some citations from Romans. Any view on the origins of the compilation must take this evidence into account.

On the other hand, no solution regarding origins will convince until it explains all the phenomena of the work's biblical text, the deviations from Irish traditions and its affiliations with other recognisable ones (if such is the case), as well as the Irish connections.

An indication of the importance of the biblical citations in the matter of determining origins can be seen in one of the texts from the *Catechesis* published by Wilmart.[40] This is text IX, a commentary on Matt. 7:11. It opens with a reference to an earlier writing of the author (*sicut prius scripsi*), which leads Wilmart to suspect the entire piece is from some (unidentified) source.[41] He tentatively mentions Gildas the Wise and *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*. No definite sources have thus far been identified. Any theory of origins, however, will have to reckon with Irish-type elements in the biblical text, e.g. the addition of *bona* in Matt. 7:12, Ps. 32:7 (*utrem*), and the extensive Book of Armagh-type text of Rom. 12:9.

V. CATECHESIS CELTICA AND IRISH EXEGETICAL TRADITION

1. *Comment on Psalm 1*[42]

One of the unexpected items in the *Catechesis Celtica* is its exposition of Psalm 1 in its entirety (f. 9 r–v). This is quite out of keeping with the other items in the collection. The greater part of the commentary on Psalm 1 is paralleled in other Irish sources. This is all the more significant in that early Irish Psalm exegesis had clearly defined characteristics of its own, which sets it off from the general Psalm exegesis of the Western Church, indeed from Psalm exegesis as generally known to us. This Irish exegesis of Psalm 1 is found in a number of sources: The *Old-Irish treatise on the psalter*[43] (from c. AD 800), the Irish Reference Bible (in Hiberno-Latin; from c.750–800), the *Eclogae tractatorum in Psalterio*, in Hiberno-Latin (from c. AD 750), in the Double Psalter of Rouen (Psalter of St Ouen or St Evreult), written in Ireland in the tenth century, with expositions on both the text of the *Gallicanum* and of the *Hebraicum*, the former being 'historical', literal, as distinct from the spiritual, found in glosses on the *Hebraicum*.[44] A peculiarity of this Irish exegesis was the finding of a twofold historical (literal) reference for the Psalms, the first referring it to David and his times, the second (at

---

[40] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 83–5.

[41] ibid., 83 nn. 2, 7.

[42] On the Psalms in Irish tradition, see M. McNamara, *RIA Proc.* 73 C (1973); also idem, 'Tradition and creativity in early Irish Psalter study', in *Ireland and Europe: the early Church* (ed. P. Ní Chatháin and M. Richter, Stuttgart 1984) 338–89, pp. 364–6 for the twofold historical sense and Ps. 1.

[43] K. Meyer (ed.), *Hibernica minora, being a fragment of an Old-Irish treatise on the psalter* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Oxford 1894) 32–7.

[44] Preliminary publication of the glosses on the *Hebraicum* by Lucas de Coninck, *Incerti auctoris expositio Psalmorum I:1-XVI:11A iuxta litteram* (Kortrijk 1989), Ps. 1 in pars II, pp. 4–5.

least in theory) to later Jewish history (Hezekiah, Assyrian, Babylonian or Maccabean times). It matters little that items of this Irish exegesis can be traced to earlier sources. If found in combination with other Irish elements the supposition is that the entire body of exposition is Irish.

i. The Psalm's title
Catechesis Celtica

> *Beatur uir.* Ubi est titulus? Non habet titulus quia ipse est titulus omnium psalmorum. Aliter: Ideo non habet titulum quia de Christo narrat

Old Irish Treatise[45]

> Question. Why has this psalm no title? Not difficult. *Ideo primus psalmus non habet titulum, quia titulus omnium psalmorum est. Primus psalmus,* says Bede, *titulum non habet quia capiti nostro Domino Salvatori de quo absolute loquitur non debuit proponi.*

ii. Division of the Psalm
Catechesis Celtica

> *Tria in hoc psalmo continentur: diffinitio, increpatio, laudatio. Primo currit diffinitio hominis iusti a loco ubi dicit: Beatus uir per II uersus usque Dauid dicit: Erit tamquam lignum* (i.e. vv. 1–2 incl.). *Currit enim laudatio hominis iusti per V uersus usque Dauid dicit: Non sic impii* (i.e. v. 3). *Postquam sequitur item uersus II de hac laudatione, ubi dicit: non sic usque dum dicit peribit* (vv. 4–6).

Old Irish Treatise[46]

> Some of the numbers of the commentators say that the three things which are found in the psalms are found in this psalm alone, to wit, *vox definitionis,* 'the speech of definition', *vox consolationis,* 'the speech of consolation', *vox increpationis,* 'the speech of rebuke'. *Primus psalmus titulus est omnium psalmorum, quod in eo continentur tres voces omnium psalmorum,* i.e. *vox definitionis, vox consolationis, vox increpationis.* This is *vox definitionis* in it, from *Beatus uir usque die ac nocte.* This is *vox consolationis* in it, from *die ac nocte usque prosperabuntur.* This is *vox increpationis* in it, from *prosperabuntur usque in finem.* Twelve verses in it.

The verses in question are to be understood in the older sense, not in the sixteenth-century and current meaning, in which the psalm has six verses.

The same tradition of the division of this psalm is found in the right-hand margins of the *Gallicanum* of the Double Psalter of Rouen. There

---

[45]Based on Meyer, *Hibernica minora,* 32–3.
[46]Based on ibid., 32–5.

in the right-hand margin to *Beatus uir* we have *diffi⟨initio⟩*; opposite *die ac nocte* we have *consul⟨atio⟩*; opposite *prosperabuntur* we have *increp⟨atio⟩*.

iii. First and second literal Exegesis.

The text of the *Catechesis Celtica* proceeds to give what, in effect, is the first literal interpretation of verse 1, according to the Irish fourfold sense pattern. The text runs:

> *Beatus uir. id est Usai, filius Arachi. Impiorum. id est Achitophel et familia Abisolon. Impius, qui nihil pie agit. . . . Aliter. Beatus uir. id est Dauid. Impiorum. id est filiorum Zarabiae, qui uoluerunt occidere Saulem, id est Ioab et Usai et Assael, qui impii dicuntur, quia contradicebant semper consilio eius . . . Diei. id est quando Saul fuit in spelonca. Nocte. quando salutauit Dauid Saul post motatam lanceam, dormitante Saul.*
> *Item. Beatus uir. De Ionatha dici potest. Secunda intentio semper historialiter de Iosa dicitur, id est quod pertinet ad Dauid. Quod autem pertinet persecutoribus Dauid, Assiriis et Babilonis, maxime ad Nabacodonosor, intentione secundae historiae et ad Sincharib deductum inuenies.*

The entire passage is anything but clear with regard to its exact meaning. It speaks of a *secunda intentio*, of an *intentione secundae historiae* without any prior reference to a *prima intentio*. The lack of clarity may be due to later use of an exegetical tradition, only imperfectly understood. The text and historical references become clearer when situated within the early Irish framework of intepretation and of this Psalm 1 in particular.

We have, first, the theory of the fourfold sense of the Psalms (in particular Ps. 1) as given in the *Old-Irish treatise on the psalter*:[47]

> There are four things that are necessary in the psalms, to wit, the first story, and the second story, the sense and the morality. The first story refers to David and to Solomon and to the above-mentioned persons, to Saul, to Absalom, to the persecutors besides. The second story to Hezekiah, to the people, to the Maccabees. The meaning (*sians* = spiritual or mystical sense) (refers) to Christ, to the earthly and heavenly church. The morality (*morolus*) (refers) to every saint.

A little further on, this theory is applied to the interpretation of the Psalms, in particular Ps. 1, as follows:[48]

> The first story (*cétna stoir*) of the Psalms refers to the time of David; the second (*in tánaise*) to Chusai Arachitis (*iesu irechitis*;

---

[47]ibid., 30–31.
[48]ibid., 36–7.

variant reading: *hissu ireichidis*). It was he who did not abandon him at the time of persecution, though every one (else) abandoned him.

The same exposition is found in the section on the Psalter in the 'Reference Bible', a work closely related to the *Old-Irish treatise*. In words attributed to a certain Hilar(ius), most probably an early Irish expositor on the Psalms, the twofold historical sense is thus applied to Ps. 1:1:[49]

> *Hilar. Beatus uir qui non abiit. Prima historia ad Dauid pertinet, qui non abiit in consilio sociorum, qui uoluerunt occidere Saul in spelunca, quando Dauid dixit: Non contingat mihi ut mittam manum meam in Christum Domini* (cf. 1 Sam. 26:11, 23). *Beatus reliqua. Secunda historia ad Chusai Arachitam pertinet, qui non exiit in consilium Abisolon et Achitophel, qui uoluerunt exire post Dauid quando fugit et occidere eum, usque Chusai dissipauit consilium eorum* (cf. 2 Sam. 15:34; 17:14).

The text of the *Catechesis Celtica* obviously belongs to this Irish tradition of exegesis. For some reason as yet unknown, however, it uses the term *intentio* (in the meaning of 'sense') instead of 'story' (*stoir*) and *historia* (i.e. 'historical meaning') of the *Old Irish treatise* and the 'Reference Bible'.

iv. Psalm 1 interpreted of Joseph (of Arimathea).

The *Catechesis* text goes on to interpret Ps. 1 (in the historical sense presumably) of Joseph of Arimathea who buried the body of Jesus. This interpretation, too, is found in almost all Irish texts.[50]

v. Psalm 1 interpreted spiritually of Christ.

The *Catechesis* text continues:

> *Aliter. De Christo semet ipso psalmus iste cantatus est secundum ueritatem.*

By *ueritas* in this text 'the mystical sense' or 'spiritually' is most probably to be understood. It corresponds to the *sians* of the *Old-Irish treatise*, and *sensus* of Hiberno-Latin texts.[51]

vi. Psalm 1 interpreted morally of every saint

The *Old-Irish treatise* in its fourfold sense says that the morality (*morolus*) of the psalms (Ps. 1 is principally if not solely intended) refers to every saint. The *Catechesis* text goes on without special introduction to say:

---

[49] See text in M. McNamara, in *Ireland and Europe*, 365.

[50] e.g. the Columba Series of Psalm Headings; the *Tituli Psalmorum* of Pseudo-Bede (PL 93, 483B), the Irish Reference Bible.

[51] On this see M. McNamara, in *Ireland and Europe*, 364.

Beatus uir. id est unusquisque sanctus.

As part of this moral exposition it comments on verse 3 as follows:[52]

> *Et erit tamquam lignum quod est in paradiso Adae. Quomodo est*
> *istud lignum non Hieronimus dicit. Lignum, quod inter aquas bene*
> *crescit, ⟨est⟩ in quo IIII fiunt: formositas, fructuositas, uiriditas et*
> *semper frondosum. Item de ligno Hieronimus dicit. Lingua ebreica*
> *lignum illud mochal [sic] dicitur. Nihil ueterescit in eo, sed cotidie*
> *innouatur fructus eius; siue non defluit folium ab eo et non defecit*
> *fructus eius.*

A text corresponding to the greater part of the above is found in a gloss to this verse in the *Hebraicum* section of the Rouen Psalter (written in Ireland in the tenth century). Theodore of Mopsuestia and Jerome interpreted this entire psalm as containing moral teaching rather than history or prophecy, and the glosses in the Rouen Psalter are in this same line of exegesis. The gloss on verse 3 reads:

> *Et erit tanquam lignum transplatatum. Hoc lignum nochul [sic]*
> *uocatur quod inter aquas bene crescit; huic ligno III sunt: uiriditas*
> *fructuositas et semper frondosum est; sic huic uiro conuenit uiridi-*
> *tas uirtutum, fructuositas in filiis, et senium in hereditate florida.*

There are a few other brief interpretations of the Psalms in the *Catechesis* corresponding with Irish Psalm interpretation, but none in so sustained a fashion as we find for Ps. 1.

2. *Interpretation of Genesis chapter 1* [53]

In Codex Reginensis 49, ff. 18 v – 20 r we have an item headed 'Hoc ad solemnitatem paschae conuenit'.[54] It comes after a homily and an exposition on the narrative on the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. 26:20–30). The item is actually a homiletic exposition on the creation narrative of Gen. 1:1–26 read at the Easter Vigil. It is thus introduced in the *Catechesis*:

> *Haec autem lectio quam sancta eclesia ad sanctificationem huius*
> *noctis constituit, conuenientiam in se et magnum profectum con-*
> *tinet nobis. Conueniens autem erat ut principium in principio, et*
> *natiuitas in natiuitate ac babtismum in babtismo legeretur. Sicut*
> *namque in hac lectione principium mundi monstratur, ita in hac*
> *sollemnitate resurrectionis Christi initium noui testamenti aeclesia*
> *ostendit.*

[52] ed. L. de Coninck, *Incerti auctoris expositio*, pars altera 4 lines 30–34.

[53] For Gen. 1 in Irish tradition see M. McNamara, 'Celtic Christianity, Creation and Apocalypse, Christ and Antichrist', *Milltown Studies* XXIII (1989) 5–39, esp. 5–16.

[54] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 39–44.

The text is actually an exposition of this creation narrative according
to a threefold sense, historical, spiritual and moral, although it is not
formally laid out as such. It has an ending of the kind frequently found
in Irish homiletic and semi-homiletic compositions:

> . . . *Et postea in montem sublimem regni caelestis subleuabuntur,*
> *ubi erit uita sine fine, letitia sine tristitia, iuuentus sine senec-*
> *tute, sanitas sine dolore, lux sine tenebris; ubi non uidebitur inim-*
> *icus et non audietur nisi spirituale carmen laudis Domini nostri*
> *Iesu Christi; ubi non odorabitur nisi suauissimus ⟨odor⟩; ubi non*
> *gustabitur nisi dulcedo; ubi dabuntur praemia sempiterna sanctis*
> *eternis cum eterno Deo in secula seculorum. Amen.*

The exposition itself seems very closely related to the exegesis of this
section which we find in such works as the Reference Bible, the *Com-
memoratio Geneseos*, the commentary on Gen. 1–3 in MS Sankt Gallen,
Stiftsbibliothek 908,[55] and in some other sources besides. The homiletic
exposition of the *Catechesis* seems to follow the commentary material
very closely indeed: the *lux* of Gen. 1:2 is *lux pallida* or the angels;
the firmament of Gen. 1:3 is *caelum aereum uel glaciale et iacinthimum
uel celum igneum*. In both, the exposition is according to the three-
fold sense. The moral interpretation of *duo luminaria* in both is *fides
et opus*. These are but a few, almost random, examples of sustained
correspondence between the catechetical homily and the commentary
material.

Only detailed analysis will reveal how close the connection really is
and whether other influences are present in the *Catechesis* beyond that
of the commentaries on the Hexameron. That this exegetical synthesis
on the six days of creation was very much at home in early and later
medieval Ireland is proved by a comparison of the strictly exegetical
Latin material with works in Irish, and with Latin works of demonstrably
Irish origin.

3. *Exegetical glosses on the Canticle of Solomon*[56]

In the *Catechesis Celtica* there is neither exegetical or homiletic com-
mentary on the Canticle of Canticles. There are, however, in the col-
lection, a number of citations from this book, principally in a homiletic
treatment of Luke 11:27–8 ('Blessed is the womb that bore you . . .'). I
have counted thirty texts of Canticles in the various homilies and half of

---

[55] On this text, see now C. Wright, 'Apocryphal lore and insular tradition in St.
Gall, Stiftsbibliothek MS 908', in *Ireland and Christendon*, 124–45.

[56] Apponius's commentary, and the later abbreviation of this, have been critically
edited by B. de Vregille and L. Neyrand, *Apponii in Canticum Canticorum exposi-
tionem* (CCL 19, Turnhout 1986). For Apponius's commentary in Irish tradition see
M. McNamara, 'Early Irish exegesis: some facts and tendencies', *Proceedings of the
Irish Biblical Association* 8 (1984) 71–3; and idem, 'New critical edition of Appo-
nius and Hiberno-Latin studies', ibid. 11 (1987) 93–6; also de Vregille and Neyrand,
Apponii in Canticum, xxxviii–xliii (xxxix–xl for the *Catechesis Celtica*).

these (fifteen) carry exegetical material from the commentary of Apponius on this work, more precisely from the abbreviation of Apponius's commentary on Canticles. This abbreviated commentary on Canticles was used in Ireland; in fact it was the only commentary on Apponius known to have been used there. It is the sole source for the commentary on this biblical work in the Reference Bible and in the Hiberno-Latin Marburg (Marburg, Staatsarchiv Hr. 2, II) fragmentary commentary on Canticles as well. We know from their Rule that this book of the Canon was held in high regard by the *Céli Dé*.

In this instance, as elsewhere, the *Catechesis Celtica* is using exegetical material current in the early Irish Church.

VI. THE CATECHESIS CELTICA AND IRISH HOMILETIC TRADITION

In this section I shall consider homiletic material in the *Catechesis Celtica* which I consider related to corresponding vernacular Irish and Latin material in the *Leabhar Breac*. Where possible this material will also be compared with Hiberno-Latin exegetical material. In this section I concentrate on material having to do with the liturgical celebrations of Holy Week and Easter.

In the Codex Reginensis 49 this is found together in ff. 13 r b – 23 v b, 32 r (ff. 24–31 are displaced in the binding). The collection opens with a text entitled *Omelia in dominica die palmarum* (f. 13 r), in which priests are presented as being directed to preach Christ's great deeds and miracles to some undefined audience which is exhorted to listen and put the message into practice:

> *Et idcirco, fratres karissimi, sicut necesse est sacerdotibus uirtutes et mirabilia quae fecit Iesus narrare uobis, ita et uos debitis humiliter audire et in corde firmiter tenere, in actus et in opere uoluntarie perficere.*

This text is on the curing of the blind men at Jericho (Matt. 20:29–34). It has what appears to be a formulaic ending (. . . *caelestia dona quae semper manent in caelo*, f. 14 r). This is followed by the continuation of the biblical passage (Matt. 21:1–17), its place in the Eusebian Canons being indicated in the left margin. This text begins with a small capital. The biblical text is rich in DELQR readings. The comment begins in Irish fashion through *heret*. (*Cum appropinquassent heret egredientibus illis ab Iericho*.) This text gives what appears to be the 'historical' interpretation of the pericope, even though no explicit mention is made of this. Another exposition of the same pericope follows immediately on this (15 r) and without heading. This section ends with a *peroratio* (*Illud autem scire et intellegere debetis, fratres carissimi*. . .), ending in formulaic fashion: *Semperque laetemur et coregnemus cum illo in perpetua uita per infinita secula seculorum. Amen* (f. 16 r). Immediately, in the same line, as heading, there follows: *mora*(*liter*), formally introducing the next section, beginning a new line and with small capital, as

the moral exposition of the same pericope. This, too, has a formulaic ending (16 v . . . *ipsi gloria et imperium in secula seculorum. Amen*).

Immediately on this there follows (16 v) another piece entitled *Omelia in cena Domini* (addressed to *fratres karissimi*). This is on the Gospel for the washing of the feet (John 13:1–14), in which only the lemmata commented on are cited. It has a formulaic ending (. . . *qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat in secula seculorum. Amen*). There follows another section (f. 17 r), headed in the right-hand margin as *De cena Domini, id est de capitulo VI°* (written *de capitulo/uio*). It contains the pericope Matt. 26:20–30, on the institution of the Eucharist. This has a formulaic ending (f. 18 v).

This is followed immediately by a brief section from a Penitential. Then comes another section headed *Hoc ad solemnitatem paschae conuenit* (18 v), which opens by noting that Holy Church has arranged this reading for the sanctification of this holy night. The reading is Gen. 1, here provided with a commentary, of which we have already treated. It has a formulaic ending (20 r: . . . *cum eterno Deo in secula seculorum. Amen*). A rather brief section, with some unrelated items follows. Then come a number of sections on the Gospel resurrection narratives. The first (20 v) is headed: *In nomine Dei summi*, opening: *Vespere autem sabbati usque in hodiernum diem*, i.e. the resurrection narrative of Matt. 28:1–15. It is a long section without any apparent structure, one which we shall consider in greater detail below (VI, 3). Following on it (22 v, last line) we have a new piece beginning with a small capital: *Vespere sabbati*. Although not formally introduced as such, the nature of this new exposition indicates that it is the spiritual interpretation of the same pericope. The next small capital, and apparently the next division, is in f. 23 v: *Duo sepelierunt Christum, id est Ioseph et Necodimus*. . . . The true beginning of this section, however, is to be found a few lines earlier: *Moraliter: sepulchrum Domini sanctam aeclesiam significat*. We thus have a threefold exposition of the resurrection narrative of Matthew, in accord with the historical, spiritual and moral senses of Scripture. In 23 v another section follows (23 v, 32 r), on the praises of Easter Sunday, ending: *Ipse est dies specialiter in quo erit pasca magnum in fine mundi, quando Dominus sedebit in sede maiestatis sue, iudicaturus humanum genus reddens unicuique iuxta opera sua.*

In the *Leabhar Breac* the Passion and Resurrection material is all together, but separated from the homilies on Palm Sunday (*Domnach na hImrime*, p. 40 a 26), Spy Wednesday (Judas's betrayal, p. 44 a), the homily *In cena Domini* (p. 48 b 18). The section on the Passion of the Lord is in pages 160–72. The treatment is principally on the Passion (Good Friday), to which is subjoined, with separate heading, a homily on the resurrection of Christ (Easter Sunday) and another untitled homily on the incredulity of Thomas (Low Sunday). The entire body is preceded (pp. 157 b 31 – 159 b 51) by a piece on the corresponding holy places in Jerusalem, from Bede's summary of Adomnán's *De locis sanctis* (taken

down from the description of Arculf). It is headed: 'Here commences an account of the holy places which are in the Eastern world around Jerusalem, and around the holy places also, as related by Bede, the illustrious chief historian'. Next comes a section entitled *Pasio Domini nostri Iesu Christi incipit* (pp. 160 a – 163 b). This is an Irish version of the Gospel of Nicodemus. Next (pp. 163 b 21 – 169 b 42) comes another item headed: 'The second version of the passion of the Lord here according to Matthew'. This is a paraphrase of Matt. 26:36–27:10, with some apocryphal and foreign elements, from Gethsemane to the death of Judas, called 'the incidents of the even and the morning of the next day' (Good Friday). At p. 166 a 4 there is a break and a new part begins with the heading: 'The third account here' (*In tres gné inso*). This is really a continuation of the preceding paraphrase of Matthew (with some apocryphal additions). This continues the narrative of Matthew until the death of Christ and has a formal ending, with a prayer to God to protect Matthew (p. 167 a 52).

There immediately follows, with special capital but without heading, another section in Irish, being an abbreviated paraphrase of the Gospel narratives (but mainly of Matthew 28) of the resurrection and post-resurrection appearances of Christ. There then follows a fourfold exposition of this according to the plain (historical), spiritual, moral and anagogical senses, these presented explicity as such (*etargna staraide, etargna fhollus; etargna siansaide, .i. runda ⁊ infhoilsigi, mad iar sians; etargna bésta; iar n-anagóig*).[57]

After the anagogical exposition there follows an exhortation to celebrate the Easter festival, followed by a text on the day of judgement (p. 169 b 41).

A section of a bilingual homily for Good Friday follows (pp. 169 b 43 – 170 a 20), left incompleted, two and a quarter inches of blank space being left for its completion. After this there follows an Irish translation of the apocryphal *Descensus ad Inferos*, being the second part of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*.

Here it is worth noting that exposition according to the multiple sense of Scripture is a feature in common between the homiletic material in the *Leabhar Breac* and Codex Reginensis latinus 49. There is this difference, however, that while the *Leabhar Breac* homilies are clearly structured according to the multiple sense exposition, with an indication of where one type of interpretation ends and the other begins, only occasionally is mention made in the *Catechesis Celtica* of a multiple exposition. This is all the more noteworthy in that the exegetical exposition of the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, on which the *Catechesis Celtica* texts very often depend, is predominantly in accord with the historical, spiritual and moral senses of Scripture.

---

[57]R. Atkinson (ed.), *The passions and the homilies from Leabhar Breac* (Todd Lecture Series II, Dublin 1887) 137–41.

1. *The homily on the Lord's supper*

Jean Rittmueller has made a detailed study of the sources of the homily *In cena Domini* of the *Leabhar Breac*[58] and has shown conclusively that it stands in an Irish tradition that can be traced from Manchianus in the seventh century, down through the Hiberno-Latin commentary on Matthew entitled *Liber questionum in euangeliis* of the eighth century to the glosses of the Máel Brigte Gospels of 1138. The *Catechesis Celtica* homily and the commentary of the Reference Bible on the institution narrative of Matthew belong to this same tradition, as do some other texts.

2. *Homiletic material for Palm Sunday*

The *Catechesis Celtica* introductory material on the cure of the blind men of Jericho (Matt. 20:29–34) need not detain us here, since there is no text corresponding to it in the *Leabhar Breac*.[59] It is, however, worth noting that the Gospel reading (Matt. 27:1–17) on which the *Leabhar Breac* homily for 'Riding Sunday' (i.e. Palm Sunday) is based is the continuation of the text on the blind men of Jericho.

The *Catechesis Celtica* homiletic material that follows (on Matt. 21:1–17) is related to Irish tradition and to the bilingual homily of the *Leabhar Breac* in a number of ways. To begin with, together with the indication of the Eusebian Canons it has as heading *In nomine Dei summi*. These dedicatory words, as McNally notes, while not in themselves a conclusive proof of Hiberno-Latin presence, are symptomatic of its influence.[60] Then again, the homily has the DELQR biblical text. Its exposition, too, in accord with a multiple sense of Scripture, is like that of the *Leabhar Breac* homily – in both cases the historical, spiritual, moral senses are treated. The relationship is closer than this, since right through all three sections, but through the first two in particular, there is a correspondence in the actual exposition of the text. Likewise, both have a relationship to other Irish exegetical texts (e.g. the glosses of the Máel Brigte Gospels), even when not related to one another. A detailed study of the kind performed by Rittmueller would be required to do justice to the relationship. Here I can only cite a few examples:

Statim inuenietis asinam

CatCelt: *id est prescientia Spiritus sancti quod inuenitur asina, quod II equi, quod alligata esset, quod dimmetetur.*

LB: *Iesus per praescientiam spiritus sancti intellexit quod inueniretur asina, et quod alligata esset, et quod duum animalium numerus inueniretur, quodque dimitt[er]entur.*

---

[58] Rittmueller, Ph.D dissertation (1984): see note 24, above

[59] See Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 168–71, 419–25.

[60] See below, note 66.

In the spiritual exposition:

Betfage:
CatCelt: *id est domus maxillae interpretatur, quod significat eclesiam in qua ruminant sacerdotes misteria legis. . . .*
LB: *quod interpretatur domus maxillarum, signat ecclesiam in qua ruminantur sacra mysteria scripturarum.*
Duo discipuli:
CatCelt: *. . . siue chorum apostolorum cum duobus legibus;*
LB: *signant duas leges, i.e. Uetus et Nouum (Testamentum).*

In the moral exposition:

Intrauit Iesum in templum:
CatCelt: *id est ipsum hominem qui templum Dei est;*
LB: *exprimit homini* (!) *cum sit templum Dei.*

The relationship between the *CatCelt* and the *LB* could best be illustrated by printing both in parallel columns. It runs right through, especially in the spiritual exposition.

When we turn from a comparison of the *Catechesis Celtica* with the *Leabhar Breac* text to a comparison with the Hiberno-Latin commentary *Liber questionum in euangeliis* we find a continuous correspondence between the two. So close, in fact, is this in the historical and spiritual exposition that one may legitimately ask if the compiler of the *Catechesis Celtica* had the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* as a direct source. That he had seems clear from the very opening of the exposition, which in both texts is as follows: *Cum appropinquassent* (Matt. 21:1) *heret egredientibus illis ab Iericho* (Matt. 20:29), i.e. the Irish technique of linking contextual texts through the word *heret*.

The introductory *Catechesis* material on the cure of the blind men at Jericho also follows the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* exegesis. Thus, in this homiletic material on Palm Sunday we have a tradition stretching from the seventh century to the twelfth, from the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* to the Máel Brigte Gospel glosses through the *Catechesis Celtica* and the *Leabhar Breac* homilies.

3. *Catechesis Celtica homiletic material on Christ's resurrection*

The first item in this section is the homiletic treatment of Genesis 1, the reading for the first part of the Easter Vigil. This, as we have seen, is closely related to Irish exegetical tradition. After this comes the homiletic treatment of the Gospel for the Easter Mass, i.e. Matt. 28:1–15: '*Vespere autem sabbati*' *usque* '*in hodiernum diem*' as the opening words put it. For grammatical purposes 28:1a is also given in Greek capitals, as follows: ΟΠΕ ΤΗ CABBATOY [Greek text has: $\sigma\alpha\beta\beta\alpha\tau\omega\nu$] ΤΗ ΕΠΙΦΟC [*sic*! Greek has: $\epsilon\pi\iota\varphi\omega\sigma\kappa\text{o}\nu\sigma\eta$] ΕΙC MOYAN [= $\mu\iota\alpha\nu$] CABBATON. Next there is a homily of rather unusual kind, headed

In nomine Dei summi. Amen. It has no obvious unifying principle of
exposition, taking a variety of approaches to the text and apparently
introducing items foreign to the central theme. In this it differs from
the first exposition of the text in these homilies. It is obviously intended
by the complier as the historical interpretation of the biblical pericope
but has little in common with the *Leabhar Breac*'s historical exposition
of the same passage. We shall consider this first exposition in greater
detail below because of its very special Irish affiliations, albeit from other
points of view.

Matters are different with regard to the connection between the *Cat-
echesis Celtica* and the *Leabhar Breac* in the spiritual exposition of the
Gospel passage. To illustrate by some examples:

CatCelt: *Vespere sabbati. id est in fine ueteris testamenti;*
LB: 'The evening of the sabbath' . . . denotes the completion and ter-
mination that overtook the Law on the coming of the Gospel.
CatCelt: *Duo Mariae. IIae aeclesie;*
LB: 'The two Marys who were seeking Christ at the grave' denote the
two Churches that are seeking the Lord to-day in the New Testament
– the Church of the faithful Jews, and the Church of the chosen
Gentiles.
CatCelt: *Angelus. id est Christus, Dei Filius et hominis, ueniens in
carnem, consulans sanctas animas cum lenitate dicens: Venite ad
me omnes;*
LB: 'For an angel came from heaven': this denotes the Saviour Jesus,
whose name in the Scripture is 'the Angel of great counsel', coming
from heaven to earth at the pleasure of the heavenly Father, to help
and deliver men . . .
CatCelt: *Accedens reuoluit. id est in carnem ueniens litterae duritiam
ammouit;*
LB: '. . . he pushed the stone from the grave', means, mystically, when
Christ came into the body, He put away the hardness and severity
of the teaching of the Law, through the clemency and gentleness of
the teaching of the Gospel.
CatCelt: *Videte locum. id est, credite humanitatem sed incircumscrip-
tam assumite diuinitatem;*
LB: 'Come and see the place', i.e. the humanity, as being the place and
dwelling of the Son in his divinity.

In the *Leabhar Breac* text the moral exposition is followed by a pas-
sage on the praises of Easter Day, with an exhortation to honour it.

'Beloved brethren,' says the sage, 'let us today celebrate the festivity
of the Easter; this festival fully deserves its honour and celebration
at the hands of all the faithful'. This feast is directed to be hon-
oured in three ways. . . . And though all feasts fully deserve their

celebration and honour in these three ways, still more does this festival; for in it is the assembling together of the folk of heaven and earth; it is the festival alike of the Old and New Testament; it is the peculiar feast of the heavenly Father; the feast of the Lord's resurrection; the feast which surpasses all others; the honoured and venerable festival of the people of heaven and earth, is this festival of Easter. For many are its wonders and marvels: in it the angel passed over the houses of the children of Israel; . . . in it Christ arose from the dead, after binding the devil in hell; in it the souls of the righteous of the five ages of the world came out of hell into paradise; in it will be the famous day, the Day of Judgement.

(The text goes on to describe this great Day of Judgement at some length.)[61]

In the *Catechesis Celtica* the moral exposition is also followed by one, or perhaps two, pieces with an exhortation to celebrate Easter, singing its praises, and dwelling on the marvels done and yet to be done on that day.

> *Facta sunt in hac die multa beneficia, quia in hac die resurrexit Christus, Filius Dei uiui post uastationem inferni, et solutionem humani generis de ore diaboli et de peccato Adae. Et in hac die debemus laetari, quia dies mirabilis est, dies uenerabilis, dies solemnis, dies lucis et iustitiae, dies principalis, dies salutis humani generis, dies laudabilis, dies magnae gloriae, dies resurrectionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Resurrectio Christi in caelo et in terra ueneranda est, quia per illam nostra resurrectio facta est* (f. 32 r).

This is immediately followed by a further *praeconium paschale*:

> *Solemnitas ista uenerabilis est per totas aeclesias mundi, id est solemnitas resurrectionis Christi Filii Dei uiui altissimi a mortuis, quia omnes sollemnitates, quae sunt in anno, annumerantur Christo, sunt quasi fructus mirandi et pulchri inter flores . . . Ista tamen solemnitas paschae prae omnibus specialiter pertinet Christo, nam etsi ueneranda fuerit dies uaticinationis Christi quam profetae uaticinauerunt . . ., uenerabilior et altior est haec solemnitas resurrectionis Christi quae ueneratur in caelo et in terra. . . .Hic est dies in quo est maxima laetitia et exultatio familiae caeli. Hic est dies in quo fecit Deus Pater caritatem et pacem inter homines terrae et familiam caeli. Ipse est dies specialiter in quo erit pasca magnum in fine mundi, quando Dominus sedebit in sede maiestatis sue, iudicaturus hamanum genus reddens unicuique iuxta opera sua.*

---

[61] Leabhar Breac, f. 169 a; Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 390 (Irish text, 141–2).

There are no glosses on this section of the Gospel of Máel Brigte. When we turn to the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, once again we find the same tradition as in the *Catechesis Celtica*. This is continuous in the spiritual exposition, but is also present in the literal interpretation, as we shall see in the next section. It is a fair assumption that here again the compiler of the *Catechesis* was using the LQE or a commentary almost identical with it.

4.   *The Easter homily 'In nomine Dei Summi. Amen' and its* Man. *glosses.*

We now return to the Easter homily, or homilies, in ff. 20 v – 23 v. I have earlier (VI above, introduction) described the *Catechesis Celtica* sections on the resurrection narratives as lacking any apparent structure. It seems clear, however, that the first section in the folios indicated above contains a triple exposition (historical, ff. 20 v – 22 v; spiritual, 22 v infra – 23 v; and moral, 23 v) on the resurrection narrative of Matt. 20:1–15, although this original plan has not been respected in the present lay-out of the manuscript.

The first of these homilies, which must have been intended as the historical exposition, is headed '*In nomine Dei summi. Amen*' (ff. 20 v – 22 v) and is of special interest to us for a variety of reasons. For one thing, we find in it the only sure Breton or Cornish gloss *guor cher* (f. 21 r). On the other hand it contains very strong indications of Irish affiliations, even of Irish origin, not least being the source indication *Man.* and the heading.

In this homily, by way of exception almost as far as Codex Reginensis 49 is concerned, we have the presumed sources indicated in the margins, and occasionally in the text. The marginal notations are (in order of occurrence): *hir*⟨unimus⟩, *Ag*⟨ustinus⟩, *Man*⟨chianus?⟩, *Sedo*⟨lius; *Carmen paschale*⟩, *Amb*⟨rosius⟩ (twice), *hir*⟨unimus⟩ (twice), *Man, Ag* (twice), *hir* (twice). In the text itself *Arcul.* (= Arculfus) is indicated as a source: '*De forma tegorii et aeclesiae rotondae Arcul. refert*' (= Adomnan, *De locis sanctis* I.2, 1–14). In this part there is also clear dependence on the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, a dependence that is more pronounced in the spiritual and moral expositions that follow on it.

The historical exposition begins by a treatment of the opening word *uespere* (Matt. 28:1), which presents an obvious problem if taken to mean 'evening', since Christ's resurrection was in the early morning. The exposition opens with a long text on this and related forms, taken from the grammarian Virgilius Maro, a text already cited by the seventh-century anonymous Irish writer from the circles of Cummian, in his work *Pauca de ratione conputandi secundum solem et lunam.*[62] It reads:

---

[62] Text of Virgilius Maro in *Virgilio Marone Grammatico, epitomi ed epistole,* edizione critica a cura di G. Polara, traduzione di L. Caruso e G. Polara (Nuovo Medievo 9, Naples 1979) 186, 188. Text of *De ratione conputandi* ed. D. Ó Cróinín

Est etiam uesper, uespere, uesperum, uespera. Hic casus nomi-
natiuus quadruplex est cuius differentia hoc erit, quod uesper quidem
dicitur quoties sol nubibus aut luna ferruginibus quacumque diei uel
noctis hora contegitur. Et hoc meritum est ut (sic!; Virgilius Maro:
hoc neutrum ut) *uesper, -is, -ri, -em, -er, -re declinetur. Nom-*
inatiuo uespere uocatur ab hora nona, sole discessum inchoante.
Sed hoc nomen non declinatur: Vesperum cum, sole occidente, dies
deficit, et sic declinatur: uesperum, -i, -o, -um, -um, -o. Vespera
est cum lucis oriente aurora nox finitur, et sic declinatur: uespera,
-ae, -ae, -am, reliqua. Cauendum est ne aut uesper aut uesperum
aut uespera pluralem numerum habeant (Virgilius Maro: habere
putentur).

This text is immediately followed by another in which the Greek text of
Matt. 28:1a is cited for the purpose of showing that *opse*, the presumed
Greek for *uespere*, is feminine.

In this first and historical exposition the homilist is concerned with
the harmonization (*concordantiae*) of the resurrection narratives of the
Gospels. The *Man.* texts tend to occur in contexts of Gospel harmony
(*concordantiae*).

The first of the *Man.* references comes soon after the initial gram-
matical considerations, and considers the different Marys mentioned in
Matt. 28 (f. 20 v b 21–2). The text has the marginal references *Ag* and
Man immediately under one another (line-ending noted by /):

'Venit Ma/ria Magdalena'. id est de Magdalo in Galilea de qua,/
ut Marcus dicit, iecit Dominus VII demonia. 'Et altera/ Maria'.
id est uirgo mater Domini. Cessantibus enim car/nis operibus in
Domino, mater non dicitur haec.

The next occurrence (f. 21 r b 6–14) has an explicit reference to harmo-
nization and is on the interval between the arrival of the different women
at the tomb:

Aliqua distantia de aduentu istarum mulierum uidetur inter euan-
gelistas. Mattheus dicit: uespere; Marcus, uero, Ortu sole.
Lucas, ualde deluculo. Iohannes, cum adhuc tenebrae essent.
Man⟨chianus?⟩ de hac concordatione dicit sapi⟨ens⟩: Consumma-
tio noctis uespera est, sicut consummatio diei uespera est. Quando
nox consummatur, diluculum est et adhuc tenebre et prima lucescit
et statim oritur sol, ut IIII euangelistae in una narratione congru-
ant. (The manuscript has, without marginal reference: . . . Man.
De hac concordatione dicit sapi., consummatio. . . .)

The text here ascribed to Man⟨chianus⟩ sapi⟨ens⟩, *Consummatio noctis uespera est, sicut consummatio diei uespera est*, would appear to depend on Virgilius Maro's understanding of *uespera* cited above: *Vespera est cum lucis oriente nox finitur.*

A little further on (f. 21 v a) we have a further text, ascribed in the margin to *Man.*, towards the end of which there is a further passage ascribed in the text itself to the same source:

> *Sciendum ob quam causam pauciores angeli in morte Christi quam in natiuitate uidentur. Nascente enim illo legitur: 'Et ecce exercitus caelestis', reliqua. In morte autem III tantum angelis amministrare intelliguntur, quia caelestis rex in terrestria rura ueniens debuerat cum exercitu caelesti uenire ad repugnandas aereas uirtutes. Ascendens autem in caelos iterum cum exercitu uadit sicut legitur: 'Attolite portas principes uestras', reliqua. Man. Spelunca sepulchri corporis Christi IIIbus custoditur ad spem resurrectionis confirmandam. id est angelis, IIIbus mulieribus, et apostolis.*

Given the evidence of Irish affiliations, it is natural to expand the abbreviation *Man.* as *Manchianus* and to identify the scholar in question with the seventh-century Irish scholar known now from a variety of sources. He is mentioned in the prologue of the Irish pseudo-Augustine's *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae* (composed 655; PL 35, 2175–6): *post patrem Manchianum*, as teacher of pseudo-Augustine. He is presumably the same person as the *Manichaeus* of the printed editions of *De mirabilibus* II, 4, who is mentioned as among the *Hiberniensium . . . ceteros sapientes* who are said to have died on a year identifiable as 652. Manchianus is cited in the Hiberno-Latin commentary on the Catholic Epistles (seventh century) as *Manchianus doctor noster* by reason of a comment of his on use of a text of Gen. 15 (*credidit Abraham Deo*) by both the Apostles Paul and James (James 2:23).[63] Manch(i)anus's commentary on the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist of Matthew has been excerpted from the glosses of the Máel Brigte Gospels as *Man.*, *Manchanus*.[64] P. Grosjean and others believe that he is very probably to be identified with Manchán of Liath Mancháin (Lemanaghan) (*ob.* 655), while J. F. Kenney and others identify him with Manchianus of Men Droichit (*ob.* 652).[65]

---

[63]McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B) 15: 'Manchianus, doctor noster, hanc rem duorum apostulorum uno exemplo utentium ⟨tractauit⟩, et ad utrasque causas de clasibus uoluit similitudinem ponere que uno eodemque uento mouentur, sed non uno itinere currunt'.

[64]See Rittmueller, *Peritia* 2 (1983) 200–214.

[65]See P. Grosjean, 'Sur quelques exégètes irlandais du VIIe siècle', *Sacris Erudiri* 7 (1955) 67–98, p. 89; McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B) ix. D. Ó Laoghaire, in *Ireland and Christendom*, 158, prefers to be more general, stating that the Manchianus in question 'was perhaps one of the two of that name, the first of Men Droichit († 652), the other of Liath Manchán († 655)'. The arguments in favour

Apart from the name of *Man.* (Manchianus), there are arguments for Irish connections, even origin, for this particular homily. To begin with, the very title '*In nomine Dei summi*' is symptomatic of Irish origins.[66] The interest in grammatical questions in evidence at the beginning of the homily is in keeping with what we know of early Irish commentaries. Some of the sources used in the text have Irish origins or associations. The most noteworthy is the long excerpt from Virgilius Maro Grammaticus, a text also used by Manchianus's Irish contemporary, the anonymous author of *De ratione conputandi*, from the circles of Cummian. Then there is the mention of Arcul(f)'s description of the holy places, i.e. Adomnan's *De locis sanctis*.[67] It is also to be noted that pseudo-Jerome's commentary on Mark (probably of Irish origin, and possibly from the pen of a certain Cummeanus) is cited at least twice under the name of Jerome. The clear use of the Hiberno–Latin work *Liber questionum in euangeliis* is a further argument for strong Irish connections, if not for Irish origin. The *Man.* glosses and influence of this same commentary on Matthew are also present in the section on the Eucharist in the Máel Brigte Gospels glosses.

There remains the difficulty of the use of the Greek text of Matt. 28:1a. However, the Greek Psalter text of Psalm 39:3 is used in the Hiberno-Latin (and probably sixth-century) pseudo-Hilary commentary on the Catholic Epistles (1 Peter 1:1).[68] With regard to the Greek text of Matt. 28:1a cited in the *Catechesis Celtica*, it must be noted that the text in question is found in substance, though not verbatim, already in the seventh-century Hiberno–Latin *Liber questionum in euangeliis* (p. 266). This reads:

> *De nomine uero quod et uespere multi opinantur diuersa. In euangelio uero greco ita habetur:* ΟΨΗ CABBA, *id est uespere sabbati quae in primam sabbatorum. In quo apparet quod* ΟΨΗ *femininum nomen est.* ΤΗ *enim femininum pronomen. Unde quidam uolunt quod uesper communis generis, id est feminini et masculi . . .*

of identification with Manchianus of Men Droichit is the identification of the *pater* of the prologue with *Manichaeus* of II, 4, said to have died in 652, the annalistic obit of Manchianus of Men Droichit: thus J. F. Kenney, *The sources for the early history of Ireland: ecclesiastical* (New York 1929, repr. Shannon 1968, etc.) 276–7; Walsh and Ó Cróinín, *Cummian's letter*, 88 n. 225.

[66] On this title, see R. McNally, '*In nomine Dei summi*: seven Hiberno-Latin sermons', *Traditio* 35 (1979) 121–43, pp. 123–4 for the formula: 'The appearance of the dedicatory words, "In nomine Dei summi" in early medieval manuscripts, while not in itself a conclusive proof of the Hiberno-Latin element, is symptomatic of its influence'. F. E. Warren had earlier commented on the significance of this formula: 'This short and pious motto which is written on the upper margin of the opening pages of the Bangor Antiphonary seems to have been especially, if not exclusively, used by Irish scribes' (*The Antiphonary of Bangor* II (HBS X, London 1895) 35).

[67] For the text referred to in the homily, see D. Meehan (ed.), *Adamnan's De locis sanctis* I (Scriptores Latini Hiberniae III, Dublin 1958) 42–7.

[68] McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B) 77.

In this particular homily, we may note, the *Catechesis Celtica* agrees with the LQE in a number of points with regard to questions concerning the death and resurrection of Christ (e.g. the length of time Christ was in the tomb, both citing Augustine as an authority). It is obvious that both belong to the same tradition, even though here the *Catechesis* is not dependent solely on the LQE, for one thing, because it cites more of the Greek text.

That early Irish scholars were interested in the harmonization of the Gospel passion and resurrection accounts is clear from the Reference Bible, where the greater part of the entry on Mark (twelve columns out of sixteen in the Paris MS, ff. 156 r – 159 v) is devoted to questions on the passion and the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection. Some of the same sources are used as in the *Catechesis Celtica* homily, and the contents of one section on the prophecies of the resurrection and the number of hours Christ was in the tomb (drawing on Augustine for this) are the same in both.

5. *Homily for Octave of Easter*

In ff. 32 v – 35 v we have a long homily for the Octave of Easter, on the text of John 20:26–31.[69] The *Leabhar Breac* also has a homily, in Irish and Latin, on this same passage.[70] There are certain similarities between the two (such as the number of the post-resurrection appearances, the one to Thomas being the sixth). There are also Irish 'symptoms' in the Latin of the *Catechesis Celtica*, e.g. Low Sunday called *pascha modicum* (Irish *Mion-Cháisc*). There is no clear relationship, however, between the *Leabhar Breac* text and the *Catechesis*, possibly because of the lack of a common exegetical source, as was the case in the homilies on pericopes from Matthew's Gospel.

6. *Homily on Christ's fast and temptation in the desert*

The very first item in the *Catechesis Celtica* (ff. 1 – 3 r) is a commentary on Matt. 4:1–11, i.e. Christ's fast in the desert and his temptation. This is separated by a short piece (f. 3 r–v) from the comment on Matt. 19:16–30 on the call of the rich young man. In the *Leabhar Breac*, after treatment of Palm Sunday (p. 40 a 26) and Judas's betrayal (Spy Wednesday *Cédain in braith*, p. 44 a 1), and immediately before the section *In cena Domini* (p. 48 b 18) comes a section entitled *De ieiunio Domini in deserto* (p. 45 a 7). This is a bilingual homily which originally belonged to the eleventh-century homiliarium.[71] One feature of this *Leabhar Breac* homily is the close manner in which part of it is related to the Latin tradition found in the *Catechesis Celtica*. This is evident in particular in the Latin text, in the *Leabhar Breac* first (i.e. the

[69] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 47–58.

[70] Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 227–34 (Irish text), 465–70 (Latin text, with English translation of small portion of Irish not represented in the Latin).

[71] ibid., 172–81 (Irish text), 425–30 (Latin text, with translation of small section of Irish not directly from Latin).

historical) interpretation of the pericope and also in the final section on the supremacy of almsgiving over mere fasting, and in the remark that the time devoted to fasting is a tithing, a tenth of the three hundred and sixty-five day year. Since the Latin texts coincide verbatim and in sequence as comments on the *lemmata* there can be no question of mere accident. The final text found in both works, and in the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*, strengthens the argument for direct links through some particular homiletic tradition. As examples we have:

> *Ductus est, non inuitus aut captiuus, sed ex uoluntate pugnandi . . .*
> *Postea esuriit: . . . ne a temptando pauens hostis aufugeret . . .*
> *in sanctam ciuitatem: ista assumptio non imbecillitate Dei . . . sed*
> *de inimici superbia, qui uoluntatem Saluatoris necessitatem putat*
> *. . . si cadens adoraueris me: arrogans et superbus etiam hoc de*
> *iactantia loquitur. . . .*

This particular exegetical text occurs almost verbatim in the Hiberno-Latin *Liber questionum in euangeliis*. Going on the evidence of other texts, the presumption is that the *Catechesis* depends (directly most probably) on the Hiberno-Latin commentary. The same is probably true with regard to the *Leabhar Breac* homily.

In both the *Catechesis Celtica* and the *Leabhar Breac* (in the Irish and Latin texts) we have an item on the seven-week fast, minus the six Sundays in which there is no fast, being one tenth of the year, the Lenten fast being consequently a tithing. In this section the *Catechesis Celtica* text is almost verbatim as that of the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*.

Next after this in the *Catechesis* comes a text to the effect that Christ fasted immediately after his baptism which occurred at the Epiphany (January 6). The present position of the Lenten season in the calendar is due to the Fathers. There is a similar text in the *Leabhar Breac*, although not immediately after the treatment of Lent as a tithing. As in other texts, here too, the *Catechesis Celtica* is almost verbatim like that found in the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*.

The text on the supremacy of almsgiving over mere fasting comes almost immediately after that on tithing in the *Leabhar Breac*, whereas in the *Catechesis* it is separated by a number of texts not drawn from the *Liber questionum*. The text reads as follows in the *Catechesis*:

> *Debet quoque unusquisque nostrum ieiunare in istis diebus; etsi non*
> *ualuerit, manducet cum gemitu et suspirio et dolore animi. Pro eo*
> *quod, aliis abstinentibus, ille abstinere non potest, et conieuiunare*
> *non potest, amplius ⟨debet⟩ erogare pauperibus, ut peccata, quae non*
> *potest ieiunando curare, possit elimosinas dando redimere. Bonum*
> *est ieiunare, fratres; sed melius est elimosinam dare. Si aliquis*
> *utrumque potest, duo sunt bona. Si uero non potest, melius est*
> *elimosinam dare. Si possibilitas ieiunandi non fuerit, elimosina*
> *sufficit sine ieiunio. Ieiunium uero sine elimosina omnino non*

sufficit. Elimosina sine ieiunio bonum est. Ieiunium uero sine elimosina nullum bonum est nisi forte ita sit aliquis pauper, ut non habeat omnino quod tribuat. Illi, qui non habuerit, sufficit uoluntas bona. Tale ergo ieiunium sine elimosina sicut lucerna, quae sine oleo accenditur, fum⟨ig⟩are potest, lumen habere non potest. Ita ieiunium sine elimosina carnem quidem cruciat, sed caritatis lumine minimum illustret.

In the margin of Codex Reginensis 49 this text is ascribed to *Ag*, i.e. Agustinus. It is, in fact, from Sermon 199 (nos. 2–3 and 6) of St Caesarius of Arles,[72] which with many other sermons of this saint became falsely attributed to Augustine (as Sermon 142, 3, 1–2; in PL 39, 2022–3) in the course of transmission. The *Catechesis* text is composed from two distinct sections (2–3 and 6) of Caesarius's homily. The central section of it (*Bonum est ieiunium . . . sufficit uoluntas bona*) is also in the *Leabhar Breac* text,[73] which, however, we should recall, has more from Caesarius's homily than that found in the *Catechesis*. The *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* (XIII, 8),[74] in the section on fasting, has an almost identical text, with, however, some differences. In one branch of the *Hibernensis* tradition the excerpt is attributed to Jerome, in another, to Augustine.

The similarities and differences between these Irish texts may be due to dependence of all on some common homiletic tradition or patristic florilegium.

7. *Homilies on the Lord's Prayer*

We have seen that the *Catechesis Celtica* has more than one item on the Lord's Prayer, or more exactly a collection of material headed by the title *Incipit umelia de oratione dominica*. It does not appear that the compiler has imposed any great order on this material. Matters are somewhat different with the material on the *Pater noster* in the *Leabhar Breac* (pp. 248 a 45 – 250 b z). This is a bilingual text, the sentences or phrases occurring alternately in Latin and Irish.[75] The text opens with an introduction, followed by a single exposition of the petitions of the *Pater*, after which come comments of various kinds.

Opinion is divided with regard to the date to be assigned to the *Leabhar Breac* text. Frederic Mac Donncha regarded it as part of a homiliarium of the eleventh century. Brian Ó Cuív would date it, from its language, to the end of the Middle Irish period, probably the twelfth

---

[72] G. Morin, (ed.), *Sanctus Caesarius Arelatensis: sermones* II (CCL 104, Turnhout 1953) 803–7.

[73] ibid., 420.

[74] H. Wasserschleben (ed.), *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* (Leipzig 1885) 40.

[75] Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 259–66 (Irish text), 495–503 (English translation of Irish), 503–6 (Latin text).

century.[76] The piece has been transcribed in later Irish in MS BL Egerton 91 (f. 20; of the fifteenth century). Robin Flower noted that some points in the commentary in the Egerton manuscript are also to be found in the comment on the *Pater* in Matt. 6:5–13 in Harley 1802 (i.e. the Gospels of Máel Brigte). Thus far, scholars have failed to identify the sources of the *Leabhar Breac* text on the *Pater noster*.

It appears that the solution to the quest will come through the newly identified Hiberno-Latin exegetical and homiletical texts. Already, before the material brought to the attention of students by Bischoff, the Latin text of *Leabhar Breac* invited comparison with the commentary on the *Pater* in Pseudo-Jerome, *Expositio IV evangeliorum*, available in Migne's *Patrologia latina* (vol. 30). Keeping with the aim of this paper, I here begin by comparing the Latin text of the *Leabhar Breac* with that of the *Catechesis Celtica* and then with other related texts.

The relationship of the Latin text with the *Catechesis* is verbatim and manifold, not merely in the exposition of the petitions. In the comment on the opening words we read in both: *Quid autem filiis carius esse debet quam pater? Quid enim petentibus filiis non dabit pater . . . ut filii essent, et dicant: 'Pater noster . . .'.* The *Leabhar Breac* text (Latin and Irish) gives six reasons why this Prayer is said (sung) silently. *Sex autem causis haec oratio silenter canitur.* The *Catechesis Celtica* is interested in the point, but gives no list: *Interrogatur hic. Cur silenter hii uersiculi canuntur? ⟨Hoc⟩ multis causis ostenditur.* Obviously, the *Catechesis* compiler has cut short his source. The *Leabhar Breac* text speaks of the Old Testament prefigurations of the *Pater*: *Haec autem oratio figurata est in scala uisa ab Iacop in Bethel, cum septem gradibus attingente a caelo usque ad terram . . . Prophetata est per Isaiam prophetam, dicentem, 'faciet Dominus uerbum breuissimum super terram . . .',* to which the *Leabhar Breac* Latin text (and corresponding Irish translation) adds: *uerbum consummans et breuians iniquitates hominum.* The same text is found verbatim in the *Catechesis Celtica*. The passage of Isaiah intended is not quite clear (possibly Isa. 38:7), and the Irish translation interprets somewhat.[77]

This text of the *Leabhar Breac* is followed by a very interesting one: *Hic est malleus ferreus, quo contritus est diabolus, sicut dicitur, 'malleo ferreo conteram soliditatem tuam'.* The Irish text, and

[76]See F. Mac Donncha, in *Biblical studies*, 61; idem, 'Seanmóireacht in Éirinn ó 1000 go 1200', in *An léann eaglasta in Éirinn 1000–1200*' (eag. M. Mac Conmara, Baile Átha Cliath 1982) 77–95, p. 79; B. Ó Cuív, 'Some versions of the sixth petition in the *Pater noster*', *Studia Celtica* 14–15 (1979–80) 212–22, p. 212.

[77]The text is not Vulgate, which has: . . . *quia faciet Dominus uerbum hoc quod locutus est*, i.e. making the shadow on Ahaz' sundial turn backwards. The Septuagint translation does not differ significantly. The Irish Leabhar Breac translation renders *uerbum* of the Latin as 'prayer': 'The Lord will make a short prayer, by which all their sins and vices shall be forgiven to men' (Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 501). The other text which follows, attributed to Job in the Irish translation, cannot be traced. Both 'quotations' may be from a non-biblical source.

apparently translated, of this passage presumes to identify the source
of the citation: 'This is the iron hammer by which the power of the
devil is broken, as saith Job in the person of the Lord: "I will break
your power, O devil, saith the Lord, with an iron hammer" '. The text
is also in the *Catechesis Celtica* as the immediate continuation of that
just quoted: *Hic est malleus de quo contritus est diabulus, sicut est
malleo ferreo ut concutiam soliditatem tuam.*

The *Leabhar Breac* text connects the seven petitions of the *Pater*
with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, and with the seven deadly sins.
This is also true of the *Catechesis Celtica*. Comparison of the *Cate-
chesis Celtica* with the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* shows that here
again the former is indebted to the latter, in some sections more heav-
ily than in others. The exposition of the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9–13)
in the *Liber questionum* is extremely rich (covering pages 88 to 94 of
the Orléans manuscript). There are no less than four different expla-
nations of the passage and various other points of Christian teaching
are connected with its seven petitions: the teaching on the paradise of
Adam, Adam's person, the seven principal vices, the manner in which
the Lord himself fulfilled the seven petitions, the seven days of creation,
the six ages of the world (*Sex aetates*), and the seventh age after the
judgement. A number of the headings, and the substance of the teach-
ing on them, have passed over into the *Catechesis*. What must also be
noted is that the *Leabhar Breac* text has material from the *Liber ques-
tionum in euangeliis* not in the *Catechesis Celtica*, such as a number of
interpretations of the text of Matthew, which at times agree verbatim
with the Latin *Leabhar Breac* text, e.g. the interpretation of *regnum* (of
Adueniat regnum tuum) as *iudicium*, likewise the following: *Cum ergo
dicimus in oratione Domenica, 'et ne nos inducas in temptationum',
nonne hic petimus, non temptari sed ut non feramur in temptationes
quas sustinere non ualemus* (LB 249 b 32–4).[78] The text of LQE (MS
Orléans, p. 90, 3–2 from end) has: *Non hic petimus ut non temptemur
sed ut non feramur in temptationes quas sustinere non ualeamus.*

The explanation of these phenomena seems to be that both the *Cat-
echesis Celtica* and the *Leabhar Breac* texts depend on the *Liber ques-
tionum in euangeliis*, or a text almost identical with it. Direct depen-
dence of the *Leabhar Breac* on the *Catechesis* does not appear indicated
by the evidence. The commentary of the kind found in the *Liber ques-
tionum in euangeliis* must have been known in Ireland, and have contin-
ued to be used there, since it seems to have been employed as a source

---

[78] Atkinson, *Passions and homilies*, 504; in manuscript followed immediately by
Irish text: *In tan din atberum is-in ernaigthi choimdetta Et ne .n.ī.d.ī.t. 'a Dé nach-
ar-léic i n-amus', ni hed chuinchemit andsin, na ro-tartaither aimse foraind, acht
is ed, na tartaither oirn aimse dofhulachta no-n-scarut fri forpthecht ⁊ fri fírinde*
(ibid., 263, English translation p. 499: 'When we say in the Lord's prayer:- "O God,
leave us not in temptation," we do not thereby ask that no temptations should be
put on us, but what we ask is, that there should not be given us temptations beyond
our power, which may sever us from spirituality and truth').

for the glosses of the Gospels of Máel Brigte, roughly contemporary with the *Leabhar Breac* homily or catechetical text on the Lord's Prayer.

Many more questions remain to be answered with regard to the *Leabhar Breac* text on the Lord's Prayer, for instance, the exact relationship of the Irish version to the Latin. The new Hiberno-Latin material will scarcely bring an answer to all of these, as for instance, the background to the Irish form of the sixth petition: *ni r-lecea sind i n-amus ndofulachtai; ocus nach-ar-léic i n-amus.*[79] However, the newly identified corpus of material of apparently Irish origin or affiliations should help immensely.

VII. CATECHESIS HOMILIES ON MATTHEW AND THE *Liber questionum in euangeliis*

In examining the relationship between the *Catechesis Celtica* homiletic tradition and the homiletic tradition of the *Leabhar Breac* I have used the relevant material from the seventh-century Hiberno-Latin commentary on Matthew entitled *Liber questionum in euangeliis*. The use of this commentary established for these sections can be extended to practically all the pericopes from Matthew commented on in the *Catechesis Celtica*, with the exception of the homily on Matt. 20:1–16 (f. 7 v – 8 v) which is entirely from Gregory the Great's homily I and II on the Gospels. The historical and spiritual exposition on Matt. 19:16–30 (ff. 3 v and 7 r) draws on it throughout. So also the homily that follows on Matt. 21:33–46. Here, once again, direct use of the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* [LQE] seems indicated by the opening section verbatim identical in both: '*Aliam parabolam audite*' (Matt. 21:33) *a loco ubi ait:* '*Accesserunt ad eum principes sacerdotum*' (Matt. 21:23), *reliqua a Matheo sine ulla cuiusque rei uel personae interpositione sermo contexitur. Potest enim putari* (LQE: *aestimare*) *omnia principibus locutum fuisse* (LQE: *esse*) *a quibus fuerat de potestate interrogatus, siue hic tacuit breuitatis causa, quod Lucas dixit:* '*coepit*', inquit, '*dicere ad plebem parabolam*', reliqua. '*Homo erat*': Dominus noster. . . . It has been already noted that this same source (LQE) is used for the homily for Palm Sunday (Matt. 21:1–17) and for that on the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. 26:20–30) as well as for the homilies on the Resurrection narrative (Matt. 28:1–15). We find the same source used for another homily on Matt. 20:29–34 (ff. 47 v, 24 r), and in the homiletic treatment of Matt. 19:16–30 (ff. 50–51).

We may thus say that practically the sole source for the compiler's understanding and exposition of the Gospel of Matthew was the treatment of this Gospel in the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*.

---

[79] On these *Leabhar Breac* forms, see Ó Cuív, *Studia Celtica* 14–15 (1979–80) 214, 216.

VIII. USE IN THE *Catechesis Celtica* OF APOCRYPHA AND RARE LATIN
TEXTS

Wilmart, in his edition of sections of the *Catechesis Celtica*, noted the
indiscriminate use made in them of Apocrypha, *prophetica verba*, texts
on Doomsday and signs before Doomsday, and suchlike. The use of these
he saw as further indication of the Celtic origin of the homilies. We may
go further and use this evidence as a strong indication of specifically
Irish affiliations.

1. *The Magi and the Gospel according to the Hebrews*[80]

In the homily for Low Sunday (f. 35 v), towards the end of the homily,
we have a citation from the Gospel of the Hebrews:

> *Item, isti VIII dies paschae in quo resurrexit Christus Filius Dei*
> *significant VIII dies post remissionem paschae in quo iudicabitur*
> *totum semen Adae, ut nuntiatur in euangelio Ebreorum; et ideo*
> *putant sapientes diem iudicii in tempore pascae, eo quod in illo die*
> *resurrexit Christus ut in illo iterum resurgant sancti.*

Different texts from the work entitled 'The Gospel according to the
Hebrews' are encountered in Irish sources. One of these is the description
of the Magi. A text on these is found, without indication of source, in
the *Catechesis Celtica* in a commentary on the Gospel for the miracle
of Cana (Epiphany) (John 2:1–11):

> *Hodie III magi ab oriente uenientes cum IIIbus muneribus Ihesum*
> *Christum dominum nostrum inuenerunt. Haec autem est tractatio*
> *nom(inum) de his tribus magis. Primus eorum senior(um) Melchus*
> *nomine, qui erat canus cum barba prolixa et cum coma, tonicam*
> *habens iacinthinam et sagum milleum, et indutus erat calciamentis*
> *iachi⟨n⟩tino et albo commixtis, opere polimatario uarie compositis.*
> *Secundus Caspar nomine, iuuenis imberbis, rubicundus, tonicam*
> *millenicam et sagum rubeum habens, calciamenta iacinthina uest-*
> *itus, tus secum afferens quasi deo digne deum adhorauit. Tertius*
> *Patizara nomine, fuscus, niger, intig(er) barbatus, tonicam rubeam*
> *et sagum album habens, et calciamentis millenicis indutus, per mirr-*
> *am filium hominis moriturum confessus est. Omnia autem uestim-*
> *enta eorum sirica erant.*

A slightly different form of this tradition is found in the *Collectanea* of
Pseudo-Bede (PL 94, 541C-D), probably of Irish origin, and in other
Irish sources.

[80]On this subject see R. McNally, 'The Three Magi in earliest Latin writing',
Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten II (Münster 1970) 667–90; M. McNamara,
The Apocrypha in the Irish Church (Dublin 1973, corrected reprint 1984) 54–6 § 48.
The text is in Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 73–4.

2. *The* Liber de gradibus caeli, *attributed to Gregory the Great*[81]

In the homiletic exposition on Gen. 1 for the Easter Vigil, on Gen. 1:26 the *Catechesis* has:

> *Et nouissime factus est homo ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei. Imago autem in sanctitate et aeternitate anime consistit, ut Gregorius in libro de gradibus caeli dixit; similitudo uero in persecutione et dominatione ostenditur.*

What must be the same work, but attributed to Augustine, is cited in the Hiberno-Latin commentary on Gen. 1–3 preserved in the St Gall manuscript, Stiftsbibliothek MS 609 (*Augustinus in libro de gradibus caeli*).

3. *The signs of seven days before Doomsday*[82]

In f. 52 v of Codex Reginensis 49 there is an item entitled *De diebus VII ante diem iudicii*, with a description of the events to occur on the seven days preceding Doomsday. The greater part of this depends on the apocryphal *Apocalypse of Thomas*. There are citations from this same work in some homilies in a Reichenau manuscript, now at Karlsruhe, homilies which may be of Irish origin. It is clear from the extensive use made of it that the apocryphal work was known to the author of the concluding Cantos (153–62) of *Saltair na Rann*. There was an early interest in the Signs before Doomsday in Ireland, coupled with a rich development on this particular tradition. While the signs as given in the *Catechesis* are not of the developed kind we find in later texts, the presence of a text dependent on the *Apocalypse of Thomas* can be taken as a further indication of Irish affiliations of the collection of homilies.

4. *De Die Dominico*[83]

The *Catechesis Celtica* text (f. 53 r) entitled *De die dominico* was published by Wilmart. It was republished, together with two other texts, by McNally, one of Breton origin (Orléans 221[193]; Paris BN lat. 3182), the other (Vatican, Pal. lat. 220) in an Anglo-Saxon hand of the Middle or Upper Rhine. The texts are closely related to the Irish *Epistil Ísu* and the *Cáin Domhnaigh*. If not of Irish origin, the piece entitled *De die dominico* at least has strong Irish affiliations.

---

[81] See P. Grosjean, 'Le "Liber de gradibus caeli" attribué à S. Grégoire le Grand', *Analecta Bollandiana* 61 (1943) 99–103. On the St Gall text 609, see also C. D. Wright, in *Ireland and Christendom*, 124, 132–3. The text is in Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 41.

[82] On the question in general see McNamara, *Apocrypha*, 128–44 §§ 104–8; also idem, 'Airdena Brátha', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* I (New York 1982) 111–12.

[83] Wilmart, *Analecta Reginensia*, 111–12; McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B) 185–6, with discussion of texts etc., 175–9.

5. *The seven seals: the seven things prophesied of Christ*[84]

In the *Catechesis Celtica* (f. 23 v), in a text in praise of Easter, it is stated that on this day effect is given to the destruction of the seven walls of the sin of Adam and Eve. This destruction had already been going on through history, in Abel, in Enoc etc. and finally, as no. 11: *in Christo, per VII quae profetata sunt de illo, id est natiuitas, babtismum, crux, sepultura, resurrectio, ⟨ascensio et iudicium⟩.*

The seven things prophesied of Christ are given in greater detail in a separate item in the *Catechesis* (f. 40 v), this time in a comment on Apoc. 5:1: *Vidi . . . librum scriptum . . . ., signatum sigillis VII.* The comment reads:

> *Signatum, id est conclusum sigillis VII. Hoc est, conceptione Christi et natiuitate et passione et sepultura et resurrectione et ascensione et de aduentu eius. Sigilla in profetis pronuntiata sunt, claues in nouo quibus aperiuntur sigilla. De conceptione sigillo Esaias dicit: Ecce uirgo in utero concipiet et pariet filium, et uocabitur nomen eius Emmanuel. Clauis est, cum dicitur: Aue Maria, gratia plena, et reliqua usque tui. Sigillum de natiuitate ut: Nascetur homo de semine Iuda et dominabitur omnibus gentibus. Clauis est: Natus est uobis hodie conseruator salutis, qui est Christus. . . .*

The tradition behind them is well attested in Latin literature. It has been traced by E. A. Matter from four manuscripts, with two families: Family A, Karlsruhe Aug CXI, Munich Clm 14423; Family B, Munich Clm 6407 and Vatican lat. 5096. The piece is connected in these manuscripts with the exegesis of Apocalypse 5:1–5. The tradition may have originated in Visigothic Spain in the sixth or seventh century. The tradition of the seven things prophesied of Christ is found in a number of Irish texts without direct connection with the Apocalypse. They are already listed by Hilary in his *Instructio psalmorum* (the introduction to his commentary on the Psalms), no. 6 (CSEL 27, 7), on which much of the Latin and Irish tradition probably depends.

The Latin tradition studied by Matter is really quite different from the developed one we find in the *Catechesis Celtica*. After an introduc-

---

[84] On the larger question of the origin of the Seven Seals tradition see E. A. Matter, 'The Pseudo-Alcuinian "De septem sigillis": an early Latin Apocalypse exegesis', *Traditio* 36 (1980) 111–37. Some Irish texts listed, McNamara, in *Ireland and Europe*, 363–4 n. 99. With regard to Irish texts we have, apart from the *Catechesis Celtica*, an Old-Irish gloss on Col. 1:25 in the Würzburg Codex which speaks of the seven things that were prophesied of Christ (Wb. 26 d 9); *Thesaurus palaeohibernicus* I (ed. W. Stokes and J. Strachan, Cambridge 1901, repr. Dublin 1975) 670. These are itemised in the *Scuab Chrábhuid*, ed. K. Meyer, *Otia Merseiana* 2 (1900–1901) 29; C. Plummer, *Irish litanies* (London 1925) 42–3; see also R. McNally (ed.), *Der irische Liber de numeris* (München 1957) 117 no. VII.21; Sermon VII of the series, *In nomine Dei summi* (ed. McNally, in *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B) 143). Also in the Hiberno-Latin work *Ex dictis S. Hieronimi* no. 10, ed. R. McNally, *Scriptores Hiberniae minores* (CCL 108B, Turnhout 1973) 226.

tory paragraph, found in Family A only, citing Apoc. 5:1–5, the seven
seals are identified in the traditional manner (*natiuitas, baptismum, cru-
cificatio, sepultura, resurrectio, ascensio, iudicium*). The text then goes
on to link the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit with these seven seals, and
in the third and final section to link the same seven gifts with the Patri-
archs. The *Catechesis Celtica* form of the tradition, which cites both
the prophecy and its New Testament fulfilment, is found again in almost
identical form in the Hiberno-Latin Reference Bible, in the comment on
Apoc. 5:1–5. It begins:

> *Librum intus et foris signatum. Librum Uetus Testamentum sig-
> nificat. Intus et foris. Id est in historia et sensu. . . .sigillis VII
> qui de Christo principaliter leguntur, id est natiuitas reliqua. Ideo
> sigillati in ueteri quia nemo potuit scire Ecce uirgo in utero con-
> cipiet reliqua usque Christus natus fuit de uirgine. Haec sunt VII
> sigilli in ueteri testamento de natiuitate Christi. Ut est Ecce uirgo
> in utero reliqua, Christus soluit quando natus est, ut dicitur: Natus
> est nobis hodie conseruatur salutis nostrae reliqua. Secundus sigillus
> de baptismo. . .* (MS Paris BN 11561, f. 207 r–v)

The form of both is extremely close right through all seven seals. The
wording is likewise. With regard to the first, we may note the presence
in both texts of the rare and peculiar reading *conseruator* (Reference
Bible, *conseruatur*) *salutis* for Luke 2:11. The ending of the best-known
form of the tradition on the Seven Seals, with the connection of the
seven gifts of the Holy Spirit with the patriarchs is found separately in
the *Catechesis Celtica* (f. 3 r–v) and also in the Irish *Liber de numeris*
(as VII, 1).

IX. CONCEPTS AND PHRASES COMMON TO *Catechesis* AND IRISH TEXTS
    In this study I have, for the greater part, concentrated on areas
which have not been hitherto fully explored. To the evidence for Irish
affiliations of the homily collection in Codex Reginensis latinus 49 which
I have given above, we must add that already brought forward by others.
This I have given in summary as part of the history of research, namely
terms and phrases in the Latin text which are unusual in Latin but
which correspond to the vocabulary of Irish vernacular texts, especially
religious documents. I repeat these here:

> *pascha modicum, haeres Christi, aliena non immolanda sunt Deo,
> filius vitae, veteris legis, creator omnium elementorum, familia caeli
> et terrae, gradus angelorum, initium* (in the specialized sense of
> 'beginning of Lent').

To these others could be added, for example, *sensus* with the mean-
ing of the Irish *sians*, i.e. spiritual sense (on Matt. 21:7 and John
12:14): *Hic notandum est quod . . . super utrumque animal sedere non*

possit. . . . Tamen sensui (=the spiritual sense) *magis conuenit quod super utrumque animal sedit, quia Dominus II populos supersedit, id est Israelem et gentilem* (f. 14 r); *tres XL*, i.e. *tres quadragesimae*, the 'three Lents'.

This list could well be expanded. Such a study, however, is best left to a full examination of the peculiarities of the vocabulary of the *Catechesis Celtica*.

X. CONCLUSION

At the end of this investigation we return to the title of this paper and ask: How Irish is the *Catechesis Celtica*? How Irish are its affiliations?

Let us review the evidence. Although the script is Carolingian and not Irish or Insular, it does have certain Irish or Insular abbreviations, possible pointers to an Insular or Irish original.

In its biblical text there is a fairly strong Irish element in the Psalter text used, and in the Gospel of Matthew, in particular, there is clear evidence of use of the DELQR group of texts, which was at home in Ireland, if not restricted in use to that country. There is also evidence for the use of a text of Romans and of the Catholic Epistles of the kind used in Ireland.

Passing from Bible text to exegesis we find clear evidence of a close relationship between the *Catechesis Celtica* and the Irish tradition of Psalm exegesis, with relation to the understanding of Ps. 1, at any rate. The compiler's understanding of Gen. 1 is also that of the Hiberno-Latin commentaries on the Hexameron, and in so far as one can judge, also that of vernacular Irish literature. What little comment on the Canticle of Canticles the collection has is also that of the commentary of Apponius, a work very much at home in Irish circles.

We have seen that a major source for the compiler, and almost the sole source for the interpretation of Matthew, was the *Liber questionum in euangeliis*. As Bischoff has noted, this was quite an influential work. Much of it has passed over into the Hiberno-Latin one-volume commentary, the Reference Bible (composed towards the end of the eighth century), and into the commentary of Paschasius Radbertus on Matthew. The date of the work's origin is uncertain, but probably the eighth century.

The author whose name was abbreviated by the compiler as *Man.* should, we believe, be taken as the mid-seventh-century Irish scholar Manchianus *sapiens* of Men Droichit, who died in 652, or possibly as Manchán of Liath Mancháin (Lemanaghan), who died in 655. Another author cited by him, namely Pseudo-Jerome on Mark, may also have been Irish. Together with this there are Irish affiliations in other texts he cites by name or uses anonymously: Gregory's *Liber de gradibus caeli*, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, traditions on the Magi, and in points of doctrine in the *Catechesis* known to have been of interest to the early Irish, e.g. the seven things prophesied of Christ. Then there

is the Latin phraseology, rare, if not unknown, outside of Irish sources but current in Irish texts and at times possibly representing translation from the Irish.

These are all Irish affiliations, to say the least. They may not prove that the *Catechesis Celtica* had an Irish origin, but they must at least be taken very seriously in the consideration of origins. An authoritative, if not final, verdict on provenance can only be given after the arguments in favour and against any particular origin have been duly weighed.

Should one opt for an Irish origin – and in Ireland itself rather than in Irish circles on the Continent – an attempt at a date and place must be made. In the Irish homiletic tradition, the *Catechesis Celtica* would fit well into the development between the compositions of Manchianus of the mid-seventh century and the *Liber questionum in euangeliis* (eighth century), on the one hand, and the glosses on the Gospels of Máel Brigte (AD 1138), on the other. Grosjean mentioned *Céli Dé* circles as a suitable milieu for composition, by reason of this monastic movement's interest in preaching. The use of Apponius's commentary on Canticles by the compiler would further favour this position. We know of the regard in which this book of the Canon was held by the Reform monks. *The teaching of Mael Ruain* tells us that 'when a person was at the point of death, or immediately after the soul had left him, the *Canticum Salomonis* was sung over him. The reason for this practice was that in that canticle is signified 'the union of the Church and every Christian soul' (*ceangal na heaglaise agus gacha hanma Criostuidhe*).[85] I cannot say that the composers of the Rule of Mael Ruain got this theory of interpretation from the commentary of Apponius. We may possibly infer as much, though, from a comment on Matt. 21:11: *Hic est Iesus profeta a Nazareth Galilaee* occurring in one of the homilies on Matt. 21:11. Nazareth is first interpreted as *flos munditiae*. The homilist then links it with Cant. 7:12 as follows (f. 28 v):

> Ciuitas autem in qua Christus nutritur nobiscum cor nostrum est in quo *flores munditiae* bonae cogitationes fiunt quas Deus quaeritur, sicut in Cantico Canticorum dixit: *Videamus, si floruit uinia* (Cant. 7:12). Viniam animam uniuscuiusque dicit in qua flores diuersorum colorum cogitationes diuersarum uirtutum, misericordiae, patientiae, oboedientiae castitatisque et ceterarum uirtutum quas Deus requirit; et sicut coram oculis hominum concupiscibile et pulchrum est in aestatis tempore pomarium cum uariis floribus aut ager cum diuersis holeribus coloribus conspicere, ita et anima coram Deo cum multarum uirtutum ⟨et⟩ cogitationum ⟨floribus⟩ pulchra est. Igitur in corde nostro per bonas cogitationes ⟨Iesus⟩ nutritur, sicut in Nazareth nutritus est.

[85] E. Gwynn (ed.), *The Rule of Tallaght* (Dublin 1927) 18–19 § 29.

The possibility, or even the likelihood, of a non-Irish origin for the *Cat-echesis Celtica* also needs to be explored further. The arguments put forward to date have to do with the manuscript Codex Reginensis latinus 49 rather than with the nature of its contents: the Carolingian script, indicating Continental, not Insular origin, and the three glosses which have been seen to connect it with Cornwall. The value of the first argument still holds good and indicates a Continental origin for the present manuscript. With regard to the three 'Celtic' – presumed Cornish – glosses, one (*he ben*) seems in reality to be no more than a Latin abbreviation (*heb*) for *hebraice*. The most important of the three, i.e. *guor cher*, occurs as a marginal gloss in a homily which contains strong indications of Irish origin: the heading *In nomine Dei summi*, citations ascribed to *Man*, who is most probably the seventh-century Irishman Manchianus *sapiens* of Men Droichit or Manchán of Liath Mancháin, clear dependence on the Hiberno-Latin *Liber questionum in euangeliis*, and contact with other Irish sources.

It may well be that more detailed research will indicate the presence in these catecheses of non-Irish affiliations (in the Bible text, source employment, and other ways), and in so doing give us new insights into the manifold relationships that existed between monks and scholars in Ireland, Britain and on the Continent. Evidence for non-Irish affiliations, however, will need to be concrete, as concrete as that now before us for the Irish affiliations.

MARTIN MCNAMARA, MSC
Milltown Institute of Theology and Philosophy