
Timofey V. Guimon

SHAW R. THE GREGORIAN MISSION
TO KENT IN BEDE'S
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY:
METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES.
L.; N.Y.: ROUTLEDGE, 2018.

This is a review of Richard Shaw's book dedicated to a systematic attempt to find out which were Venerable Bede's sources of information on the late 6th- and 7th-century events in Kent, and which were his methods of building the narrative. The author of the review expresses some minor objections (concerning Bede's usage of epigraphic sources, his probable source akin to the *Tribal Hidage*, etc.) but points out that Shaw's book is an elegant and very careful study of Bede's sources and methods which has several important implications for the studies of early Anglo-Saxon period.

Key words: England, Anglo-Saxons, Kent, Northumbria, Venerable Bede, church, source studies, historical writing, writing, epitaphs, the *Tribal Hidage*

Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, *HE*, finished in 731) is so an important source for the early history of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, and so a skilful and influential piece of historical writing that numerous studies have been dedicated to its analysis. It may seem strange, however, that not so many scholarly efforts have been undertaken to find out which were Bede's sources of information. I mean not foreign sources (Biblical, classical, patristic, papal letters, etc.), and not easily identifiable insular written sources (such as some saints' lives), but the sources, written or oral, from which Bede obtained the main core of his information about the late 6th- and 7th-century history of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms and church. Some scholars have tried to find out the origin of *HE*'s chronological information as well as the methods of Bede as chronologist¹. An important attempt to identify oral traditions of particular religious houses which Bede made use of

¹ See references: Гимон 2016. С. 387, примеч. 82.

has been undertaken by David Kirby (1966)². However, we still do not fully understand the origin of much of Bede's material as well as his methods of building a narrative and, therefore, the level of credibility of what Bede tells us.

Richard Shaw's book is the first systematic attempt to define the origin of each piece of information provided by Bede. Shaw limits his task to only those sections of *HE* which cover the early history of Christian Kent: from the Augustinian mission of the late 6th century to the beginning of Theodore's archiepiscopate in 669. Sporadically, Shaw analyzes fragments concerned with other kingdoms (such as East Anglia or Northumbria) but his main focus is on Kent. Such a study has been undertaken for the first time, and it would be difficult to underestimate its significance.

Chapter by chapter, passage by passage, Shaw analyzes *HE*'s text trying to understand what was taken by Bede from identifiable sources, what was his own deduction (and so does not need a hypothesis of a lost source), what reflects a common knowledge of Bede's time, and what, finally, goes back to non-extant written sources. When doing this job, Shaw uses a variety of methods: he analyzes the structure of Bede's narrative, his language (for example, his usage of wordings characteristic to certain kinds of texts, such as inscriptions or hagiography, or of caveats which express his reservations about the reliability of what he took from his sources), he tries to reveal rows of similar fragments or pieces of information which can be supposed to go back to a same source, he interprets Bede's own acknowledgements about his sources made in the preface to *HE*, and so on — it is impossible to list here all scholarly techniques of Shaw's study. The analysis of each of Bede's chapters is followed by a preliminary list of materials Bede used when composing it.

Most of Shaw's hypotheses about Bede's non-extant sources are already put forth in the course of this part of the book. However, in the second part, Shaw sums up the results of the study: which sources of Bede's information can be identified. Shaw speaks, firstly, of documentary (in a broad sense) sources such as lists of rulers, inscriptions, papal letters, etc. A separate chapter is dedicated to a series of hagiographical narratives which, as Shaw elegantly demonstrates, provided Bede with a good deal of his narrative dedicated to early Canterbury fathers (Shaw calls it the 'Canterbury tales'). In the conclusion Shaw

² See also historiographical references: Shaw 2018. P. 3–5.

summarizes some points concerning Bede's sources, methods of his work, and the possibilities of further study of early Kent.

The results of Shaw's work have several very important implications. The first and the most important implication is a better understanding of *HE* as a historical source. After Shaw's work we have some sense of the materials which were, and which were not, available to Bede. His narrative no longer should be regarded as a primary source for the events in late 6th- and 7th-century Kent (Shaw 2018. P. 6, 247–250, etc.). Bede, as Shaw points out, is a secondary source, an 8th-century historian, who did the same job that modern historians do, trying to build a comprehensive narrative basing upon limited material, and in some respects he was even in a worse position than we are. Any study of early Kent must now be based on Bede's sources (as far as they can be reconstructed) and on independent materials (such as papal letters, archaeological data, etc.).

The second implication is a better understanding of Bede as historian, of his methods, techniques, and habits. As Shaw points out many times, Bede, as a rule, was not an inventor, he always tried to draw a picture he himself believed to be trustworthy. However, he had his own agendas, he could make reasonable reconstructions (for example, much in Bede's chronology can be explained as his deductions based upon the data of his sources: incarnational dates based upon the knowledge of regnal years, etc.), he could ascribe to persons of whom he did not know much features which made them examples for posterity, and so on (Ibid. P. 10–11, 242–243, and many more).

The third implication is a new knowledge on early written texts produced in 7th-century Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, that is, on the history of writing (including the gems of historical writing) in those newly Christianized societies. For example, very convincing are Shaw's conclusions concerning Bede's usage of inscriptions which no longer exist: dedication inscriptions in churches and epitaphs. Firstly, there is no doubt that inscriptions of those kinds existed in early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms: there are numerous continental examples as well as (later) Anglo-Saxon ones. Those inscriptions contained the kinds of information Shaw attributes to Bede's usage of them. Secondly, Bede is known to have used epigraphic sources, as he explicitly cites and extensively quotes some of them. Shaw argues that Albinus prepared for Bede a collection of transcripts of such inscriptions, a *sylloge* which became one of Bede's key sources on early Kent (Ibid. P. 42–43, 48–54, 107–110, 193–204, etc.). Shaw's deductions concerning

Bede's epigraphic sources can be regarded as a valuable contribution into the Anglo-Saxon epigraphy.

Shaw's argument concerning tomb inscriptions as a plausible source of Bede's information can be strengthened even more if to take into account Joanna Story's study of early Anglo-Saxon historical notes in Easter-tables extant in a number of Frankish manuscripts (Story 2005). Some of those manuscripts contain a series of Kentish 7th-century obits: those of kings (from Æthelberht to Eadric, that is, from *c.* 616³ to 686), and of Archbishop Theodore (690), indicating precise dates (calends and days of the week). Bede is unlikely to have used those annals, as he, for example, made a slight mistake in converting calends into month-and-day format when speaking of Æthelberht's death: Bede did not take into account that 616 was a leap year — a mistake unlikely when using the paschal annals in which leap years are specially indicated (Ibid. P. 81–82); Bede also does not provide precise dates of the deaths of kings Eadbald, Ecgberht, and Eadric, although they are present in the paschal annals (Ibid. P. 83; compare: Shaw 2018. P. 160). In any case one must explain the origin of the precise dates provided by both, Bede and the paschal annals. Story says that the records could exist in 'more than one format' (Ibid. P. 93), and discusses three options: 1) obits started to be recorded in an Easter-table as early as in the 640s (and she shows that the usage of Dionisian Easter-tables at that time was not impossible); 2) the information was taken from a liturgical calendar (examples of such notes in calendars are well known — however, they normally provide a calendar date of the death, but not a year-date); 3) the information was taken from tomb inscriptions (Ibid. P. 84–97). The latter option seems to Story the most plausible, and she presents some considerations in favour of the existence of royal epitaphs in 7th-century Kent, including 11th-century Goscelin's references to tombs of particular 7th-century kings as well as two 11th-century inscriptions on lead plates (Ibid. P. 93–97). The latter could be based upon Bede, but the former speak in favour of 'a strong local memory of the places at which individual members of the early Kentish dynasty had been buried'. Such a memory 'may have been sustained by inscriptions' (Ibid. P. 96). Cumulatively, Shaw's and

³ This is Bede's date. However, the uncertainty with the date of Æthelberht's death discussed by Shaw (2018. P. 118–121) is mirrored in the paschal annals where this note is placed alongside more than one year (620–622 in one manuscript, and 617–624 in the other: Story 2005. P. 82).

Story's argument makes a strong case in favour of epitaphs as a source for both, Bede and the paschal annals.

Contrary to Shaw, however, I should stress the fact that Bede and the paschal annals provide the same incarnational dates of the deaths of kings Eadbald (640), Eorcenberht (664), Ecgberht (673), and Hlothere (685) (see: *Ibid.* P. 82–83). As neither Bede used the paschal annals nor the opposite, Shaw is not right when regarding the date of Eadbald's death as Bede's own deduction (Shaw 2016. P. 161), nor when assuming that the date of Eorcenberht's death was taken from the epitaph of Bishop Deusdedit who had died on the same day (*Ibid.* P. 173). If the epitaphs were the most probable source here, they, therefore, should have contained year-dates (maybe indictional, not necessarily incarnational). As for Æthelberht, the uncertainty with the year of his death in both the sources⁴ implies that it was absent in the epitaph (which, nevertheless, probably existed: *Ibid.* P. 119)⁵.

Epigraphic sources are just one example. Equally, Shaw's conclusions contribute into our understanding of early history of royal and episcopal lists, hagiography, as well as other kinds of texts. I have published (in Russian) an overview of early forms of historical writing in Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (Гимон 2016). The most intriguing question for me was that of the gems of historical writing which could have existed already before Bede in Northumbria as well in other kingdoms. For Kent, everything I could recall were the above-mentioned notes in Easter-tables, not to count traces of Kentish oral tradition reflected in several non-Kentish sources (see: Brooks 2000a. P. 37–46; 2000b). After Shaw's work the picture becomes absolutely different, and much more definite. Now one can speak of several (rather primitive) forms of recording (or forging) historical memory which appeared in Kent in the 7th (or, the latest, the early 8th) century:

– inscriptions (at least two kinds of them: dedication inscriptions in churches and epitaphs);

⁴ See the previous note.

⁵ In the cases of Eorcenberht and Hlothere, Bede's date is one day earlier than that of the paschal annals. As Story (2005. P. 82–83) observes, the paschal annals report the day of burial (*depositus*), and Bede reports the day of death (*defunctus, mortuus*). This does not contradict the hypothesis of the epitaphs as a common source of both: it would be natural to Bede to deduce that the day of death should have been one day earlier than the day of burial provided by the epitaphs. The above-mentioned difference concerning the day of Æthelberht's death has another nature as both the sources report the death, not the burial.

– lists of bishops⁶ and kings as well as, maybe, royal genealogies⁷;

– a collection of hagiographical stories on the founders of the church of Kent designed for liturgical commemoration.

Shaw convincingly argues that most (if not all) of those texts originated after 669, when Theodore became archbishop of Canterbury following a probable breakdown of the church life in Kent. The hypothesis about this breakdown (Shaw 2018. P. 210–216) and the understanding that there are no proofs of the existence of continuous Kentish tradition about the conversion of Kent, are one more important result of Shaw's study. At least, almost all in Bede's narrative about those events can be explained as going either back to sources which originated after 669, or to documents of the papal archives, or as Bede's own deductions. This negative conclusion is convincing. However, some general doubts remain. What about the laws of Æthelberht which were available to Bede⁸ and which still survive in a 12th-century manuscript? What about dynastic oral tradition which no doubt was continuous⁹? Was it at all possible that in Canterbury, both among the laity and the clergy, there was no common knowledge, no oral information about events of so principal importance and of not so distant past? If much of the memory about those events was forged in Theodore's time, from where did Theodore know what to forge (I mean, the most general information such as names of the principal actors of those events, etc.¹⁰)? Maybe, the tradition (oral, not necessarily written) did exist, but by Bede's time it was overshadowed by new materials which appeared under Theodore and later?

⁶ Doubtful is Shaw's interpretation of Bede's words in in his preface saying that Albinus and Nothelm provided him with the information 'by which bishops and in the time of which kings they (kingdoms of the Anglo-Saxons. — *T.G.*) received the grace of Gospel' ('a quibus praesulibus uel quorum tempore regum gratiam euangelii perceperint'). According to Shaw, 'this notice is most naturally taken as a reference to episcopal lists for the kingdoms in question' (Shaw 2018. P. 192). I see here no reference to episcopal lists: these words imply no more than the knowledge of the names of one bishop and one king for each kingdom. However, all other Shaw's argument in favour of episcopal lists as a kind of material which pre-dated Bede and of which Bede made use is convincing.

⁷ Shaw lists Kentish and East Anglian royal pedigrees among Bede's sources but says that they 'may have been purely oral at one stage' (Shaw 2018. P. 182).

⁸ On Bede's usage of Kentish laws see: Shaw 2018. P. 123–125, 162, 188.

⁹ See the reference to Nicholas Brooks's studies above.

¹⁰ Should we, for example, look for a written source for Bede's reference on Priest Peter as the first abbot of St Peter and Paul's, Canterbury (Shaw 2018. P. 75–76)? It seems more than probable that Albinus, the abbot of that house and Bede's key informant, did not need any written source to name his first predecessor.

Shaw's book is important not only for the students of Kent. Generally, Shaw chooses not to discuss Northumbrian matters, but he makes, nevertheless, important observations concerning Northumbrian sources of Bede. The most intriguing, to my mind, is the one which Shaw labels as '*Hidage document*' of the '*tribute*' type. The author (in this book (Shaw 2018. P. 37–38) as well as, more in detail, in a separate article (Shaw 2016)) systematically analyzes Bede's assessments of certain territories in hides (*familiae* in Latin), and comes to the conclusion that they fall into two groups. The first group is concerned with royal grants of land and similar matters, and here, as Shaw convincingly argues, at least in some of the cases the probable source were non-extant charters (Shaw 2016. P. 413–435). The second group, which Shaw labels 'tribute type', consists of nine references (the list is taken from: Shaw 2018. P. 186):

- Thanet, 600 hides (*HE*, I: 25)
- Anglesey, 960 hides (*HE*, II: 9)
- Isle of Man, more than 300 hides (*HE*, II: 9)
- Iona, 5 hides (*HE*, III: 4)
- Southern Mercia, 5 000 hides (*HE*, III: 24)
- Northern Mercia, 7 000 hides (*HE*, III: 24)
- South Saxons, 7 000 hides (*HE*, IV: 13)
- Isle of Wight, 1 200 hides (*HE*, IV: 16)
- Ely, 600 hides (*HE*, IV: 19)

Here an obvious parallel arises with the document known as the *Tribal Hidage*, a list of more than thirty Anglo-Saxon entities estimating the size of each in hides (see references in: Blair 2014; ГИМОН 2015). Shaw rightly says that Bede did not use the *Tribal Hidage* as we have it (Shaw 2016. P. 431), nor is he likely to have obtained those figures each from separate source, nor to have invented them (*Ibid.* P. 425–429).

Shaw also dismisses a possibility that the dimensions of large territorial units could be a common knowledge at the time of Bede. Here the reasons are less obvious¹¹. Bede certainly was an expert in contemporary Anglo-Saxon politics and geography. Dimensions of

¹¹ Two points (that references to hidages often are scarcely connected to the context, and that it is difficult to envisage particular sources of information about some of those areas: Shaw 2016. P. 426–428) are convincing but they speak in favour of Bede's special interest to hidages, not necessarily of a written source.

kingdoms, or large administrative units, or (previously) autonomous entities expressed in very round quantities of hides (such as 600, 1 200, 7 000, etc., which meant the amount of tribute and/or soldiers each entity could gather) could be an essential part of the political reality of the time. Shaw points at the islands of Anglesey and Man (960 and more than 300 hides, respectively) as at places situated far outside the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, the dimensions of which probably were not commonly known by educated people in Northumbria (Ibid. P. 428). This is, perhaps, right but those two Bede's references are not typical in one important respect: the figures find no analogies in the *Tribal Hidage* where entities are estimated in round figures: 300, 600, 900, 1 200, etc., nothing like 960, and never as 'more than'. Thus, Bede's references to the dimensions of Anglesey and Man should be excluded from the list, as probably being purely geographical, not concerned with tribute, army, or political weight. Of the remaining seven references three more refer to islands (Thanet, 600 hides, Iona, 5 hides, and Wight, 1 200 hides). One more feature unites all the five references to the dimensions of islands (Thanet, Anglesey, Man, Iona, and Wight): the usage of the wording *iuxta aestimationem Anglorum*. Shaw treats this wording as a proof of the existence of a single written source of all the second group of Bede's references to hides (Ibid. P. 429). This is probably true, but, as this wording is used in relation to islands only, the source in question should rather have been a kind of geographical tract than a document similar to the *Tribal Hidage*¹².

Thus, only four references to hides remain in the 'tribute' group: Southern Mercia (5 000 hides), Northern Mercia (7 000 hides), the South Saxons (7 000 hides), and Ely (600 hides). Those are obviously akin to the *Tribal Hidage*, but are four references (in fact three, as the first two occur in the same passage) a sufficient material to reconstruct a special written document? Won't Bede's usage of common knowledge be a better explanation?

One consideration, nevertheless, may speak in favour of a 'hidage document' used by Bede. Of the four references listed, two perfectly fit the information of the *Tribal Hidage*. Both sources estimate the South Saxons as 7 000 hides¹³. 600 hides for Ely are in accord with

¹² Bede's note on the hidage of Thanet is immediately followed by a note on the width of River Wantsum which divides it from the mainland, and on two places where it can be crossed. Shaw ascribes this information to 'Bede's own knowledge' (Shaw 2018. P. 38), but why not can all these geographical details go back to the same source?

¹³ As Shaw (2016. P. 431) acknowledges.

600 hides for the South Gyrwe in the *Tribal Hidage*.¹⁴ However, 5 000 and 7 000 hides for the Southern and the Northern parts of Mercia in Bede do not make 30 000 for the Mercians in the *Tribal Hidage*. It seems that Bede's reference reflects a more archaic situation than that of the *Tribal Hidage*: Mercia of Bede's account is smaller, and still has a dual division¹⁵. Most of scholars date the composition of the *Tribal Hidage* to the 660s–680s¹⁶. Bede in III: 24 speaks of an event of 655. When speaking of the dimensions of the two parts of Mercia, he uses the caveat *ut dicunt*. This can point either at an oral source (but could an oral tradition about so a remote event be responsible for this sort of figures?), or at a written source, the information of which contradicted Bede's own knowledge and thus seemed doubtful to him¹⁷. If the latter, the plausible source would be a 'hidage document' which, as Shaw assumes, could have originated during the reign of Oswiu (642–670) (Shaw 2016. P. 432–433; 2018. P. 38, 186–187).

This logic is similar to that of Shaw when he speaks of the 'hegemon list' document, Bede's source for his list of overlords of Britain up to Oswiu in I: 25, which comprises details probably contradicting Bede's own knowledge and going back to Oswiu's time (Shaw 2018. P. 121–122, 185–186). I would agree with Shaw that both hypothetical texts (if indeed they existed) constituted a pair, parts 'of the same text, or at least a manuscript' kept in Jarrow (Ibid. P. 123, see also p. 187–188).

Shaw (2016. P. 431) adopts Nicholas Brooks's (2000c. P. 62) and Nicholas Higham's (1995. P. 74–111) view that the *Tribal Hidage* is a 7th-century Northumbrian document. Those scholars believe that kings did not impose tribute upon the core areas of their 'empires',

¹⁴ Bede's account in *HE*. IV: 19 seems to imply that those two names refer to the same area (e.g.: Yorke 1990. P. 70; see, however: Davies, Vierck 1974. P. 231).

¹⁵ This is one of possible interpretations, see: Yorke 1990. P. 106. Shaw adopts another view: Southern Mercia was an artificial, temporary political unit of the 650s (Shaw 2016. P. 432). The implication, however, is the same: Bede refers here to the situation of the 650s, not of his time. This can, perhaps, be paralleled to the case of the Isle of Wight: in Bede it is estimated as 1 200 hides (*HE*, IV: 16) which is two times bigger than *Wihthara* of the *Tribal Hidage*. This difference has been interpreted in both directions: either Bede reflects a bigger tribute imposed on the island after its annexation by Wessex in 686 (Yorke 1990. P. 180, note 70), or the *Tribal Hidage* reflects the decline of the island after its devastation in the course of the same event (Shaw 2016. P. 432, note 132). This case is too ambiguous, and hidages of islands can go back to another source, as it has been said above.

¹⁶ Datings slightly vary, see, e.g.: Davies, Vierck 1974. S. 226–227; Yorke 1990. P. 10; Dumville 1989. P. 132–133.

¹⁷ See Shaw's comments on Bede's usage of such caveats (Shaw 2018. P. 40, 227, etc.).

and thus the *Tribal Hidage* must have originated in Northumbria, as it lists Anglo-Saxon entities only outside this kingdom. However, I am sure they did. As all the structure of the *Tribal Hidage* is Mercia-centered, I would agree with those scholars who consider it a Mercian document¹⁸. As for the hypothetical ‘hidage document’ used by Bede, Shaw considers it Northumbrian on the same grounds: none of the nine Bede’s references to hides of the ‘tribute’ type is concerned with any part of Northumbria (Shaw 2016. P. 431). I would disagree with the logic, but agree with the conclusion. Nine (or, rather, four) references are too few to conclude whether there were Northumbrian entities in the list or not. However, it is natural to suppose that a Northumbrian list was available in Jarrow.

If so, we can assume that similar lists were composed in the 7th century in two kingdoms: Mercia and Northumbria. In the case of Northumbria this list (if it indeed existed) was, as Shaw supposes, a part of a group of documentary texts stored by King Ecgrith in the monastery of Jarrow after its foundation in the 670s (Shaw 2016. P. 431–432; 2018. P. 38)¹⁹. This parallelism of texts composed for two 7th-century kings of powerful Anglo-Saxon polities is itself significant.

Generally speaking, another important implication of Shaw’s study concerns the interaction of ‘secular’ and ‘ecclesiastical’ in Anglo-Saxon England. The conclusions of the book speak in favour of the role of at least some important religious houses (such as St Peter and Paul’s, Canterbury, or Wearmouth-Jarrow) as places where texts with ‘secular’ content and importance (such as king-lists or the ‘hidage document’) were maintained and preserved, and also as institutions responsible for education, not only of those whose career was purely ecclesiastical (see especially: Shaw 2018. P. 183–185, 188, 246). Bede, one would add, himself was an example of such an interaction as his *HE* was dedicated to a king, and by its content it was a history of the kingdoms no much less than of the church²⁰.

In spite of some minor objections expressed above, I must strongly recommend Shaw’s book not only to the students of Bede and early

¹⁸ See e.g. references in note 16.

¹⁹ Shaw refers here to the case made by Ian Wood ‘for the role of Jarrow as a house designed by Ecgrith for his own benefit, including a treasury and archive’ (Shaw 2018. P. 81, note 58).

²⁰ One could recall here the case of the monastery of Iona and the kings of Dalriada. The monks of the former composed for the latter three kinds of texts: the annals, genealogies, and a ‘census’ document (the second part of *Senchus Fer nAlban*) somewhat similar to the *Tribal Hidage* (see: Nieke 1988. P. 243–247).

Anglo-Saxon kingdoms (for whom it is of principal importance) but also to those interested in any early medieval narrative as a historical source. This book is an elegant example of a kind of systematic study after which we learn about the text studied much more than it had been obvious before this study was undertaken. Texts like that of Bede strongly resist such an analysis but it is badly needed and, as Shaw has demonstrated, is possible.

REFERENCES

- Гимон Т.В.* «Роспись племен» («Tribal Hidage») и территориальная структура англо-саксонских королевств // ВЕДС-XXVII: Государственная территория как фактор политогенеза. М., 2015. С. 65–71.
- Гимон Т.В.* Зарождение историописания в Англо-Саксонской Англии // ДГ, 2013 год: Зарождение историописания в обществах Древности и Средневековья. М., 2016. С. 365–438.
- Blair J.* The Tribal Hidage // The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England. 2nd ed. Chichester, 2014. P. 473–475.
- Brooks N.* The Creation and Early Structure of the Kingdom of Kent // *Brooks N.* Anglo-Saxon Myths: State and Church, 400–1066. L.; Rio Grande, 2000 (first published in 1989). P. 33–60. (a)
- Brooks N.* The English Origin Myth // *Brooks N.* Anglo-Saxon Myths: State and Church, 400–1066. L.; Rio Grande, 2000. P. 79–89. (b)
- Brooks N.* The Formation of the Mercian Kingdom // *Brooks N.* Anglo-Saxon Myths: State and Church, 400–1066. L.; Rio Grande, 2000. P. 61–77 (first published in 1989). (c)
- Davies W., Vierck H.* The Contexts of Tribal Hidage: Social Aggregates and Settlement Patterns // Frühmittelalterliche Studien. B.; N.Y., 1974. Bd. 8. S. 223–293.
- Dumville D.* Essex, Middle Anglia, and the expansion of Mercia in the South-East Midlands // The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms. L.; N.Y., 1989. P. 123–140.
- Higham N.J.* An English Empire: Bede and the Early Anglo-Saxon Kings. Manchester; N.Y., 1995.
- Kirby D.R.* Bede's Native Sources for the *Historia Ecclesiastica* // Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. 1966. Vol. 48, №. 2. P. 341–371.
- Nieke M.R.* Literacy and power: the introduction and use of writing in Early Historic Scotland // State and society: The emergence and development of social hierarchy and political centralization. L. etc., 1988. P. 237–251.
- Shaw R.* Bede's sources for his references to 'hides' in the *Ecclesiastical History* and the *History of the Abbots* // Historical Research. 2016. Vol. 8. P. 412–434.

Shaw R. The Gregorian Mission to Kent in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*: Methodology and Sources. L.; N.Y., 2018.

Story J. The Frankish Annals of Lindisfarne and Kent // Anglo-Saxon England. Cambridge, 2005. Vol. 34. P. 59–109.

Yorke B. Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England. L.; N.Y., 1990.

Т. В. Гимон

ШО Р. МИССИЯ, НАПРАВЛЕННАЯ ГРИГОРИЕМ ВЕЛИКИМ В КЕНТ, В «ЦЕРКОВНОЙ ИСТОРИИ» БЕДЫ: МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ И ИСТОЧНИКИ. ЛОНДОН; НЬЮ-ЙОРК, 2018

Книга Ричарда Шо посвящена выявлению источников, которыми пользовался Беда Достопочтенный, описывая в своей «Церковной истории народа англосаксов» события, происходившие в Кенте с конца VI в. и до 669 г.: христианизацию Кента, деятельность его первых епископов, а также политическую историю. Как это ни странно, несмотря на огромную значимость труда Беды как исторического источника, до сих пор не предпринималось попыток систематически определить его источники информации, будь то устные или письменные, по собственно англо-саксонской истории. Книга Шо представляет собой очень удачный опыт в этом направлении и одновременно блестящий образец тонкого источниковедческого исследования. В рецензии подчеркивается значение труда Шо не только для характеристики «Церковной истории» Беды как исторического источника и как памятника историописания, но и для нашего понимания ранних этапов становления письменной культуры (в том числе зачатков историописания) в Кенте и других англо-саксонских королевствах. В то же время автор рецензии полемизирует с Р. Шо по ряду частных моментов (касающихся использования Бедой королевских надгробных надписей, источника, схожего с мерсийской «Росписью племен», и др.).

Ключевые слова: Англия, англо-саксы, Кент, Нортумбрия, Беда Достопочтенный, церковь, источниковедение, историописание, письменная культура, надгробные надписи, «Роспись племен» («Tribal Hidage»)

DOI: 10.32608/1560-1382-2020-41-398-409