

Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral in the Central Middle Ages

HELEN GITTOS

Recent research suggests there is a large quantity of surviving evidence for the liturgical texts written at Canterbury cathedral in the central middle ages. A provisional list of manuscripts containing material for occasional rites, such as Candlemas, Palm Sunday and the dedication of churches is given, and the reasons for thinking they contain evidence for Canterbury's liturgy are presented. Some examples are given to illustrate their potential as sources of evidence for architectural historians, including for the policies of individual bishops, the fabric of the cathedral, and changes in the performance of the liturgy.

IT has been said that 'no detailed history' of the medieval liturgy of Canterbury cathedral 'can be written, since very little relevant documentation has survived'.¹ This is simply not true. Recent research suggests that there is a large quantity of surviving evidence for the liturgical texts written at the cathedral in the central middle ages, from c. 900 to c. 1150. In this article I shall give a preliminary review of that evidence, focusing on the material of greatest interest to architectural historians.

The most useful sources for understanding how rituals were performed are those containing directions for how to perform them; even if these are only ideals and bear little relation to what actually happened, they are still informative about what those ideals were. Such texts tend to be found in books written for priests (manuals), bishops (pontificals), and as guidance for how an ecclesiastical community should be run (customaries). During the last fifteen years or so there has been a considerable revival of interest in liturgical sources for this period. One of the results of this has been clarification about when and where some manuscripts were produced; and it has become clear that there are many surviving sources relating to Canterbury. Essentially, these are of two types:

- Manuscripts produced to be used in the cathedral;
- Texts written in Canterbury but preserved in manuscripts produced to be used elsewhere.

In the first group there are a number of manuscripts that can be reasonably confidently associated with Canterbury, and some of them with particular archbishops. It is likely that we have the pontificals of Archbishops Plegmund (890–923), Dunstan (959–88) and Anselm (1093–1109).² The second group requires more explanation.

Liturgical manuscripts such as pontificals and manuals contain collections of texts for different rituals. Almost every text is different: liturgical diversity was the norm throughout the period. When a new book came to be written, whoever was in charge of the process tended not just to copy another book wholesale: instead, he or she

selected the texts they wanted to use from a variety of manuscripts, ritual by ritual, often revising them as well. So, in order to make sense of these manuscripts as a historian, one has to examine each manuscript as a whole, and also investigate each individual ritual. As Christopher A. Jones says:

A fast rule in the study of liturgical manuscripts generally, and of pontificals especially, is that relations between books as wholes cannot be argued merely on the evidence of this or that single component. And yet the working out of such larger relationships has few options but to proceed ritual by ritual.³

When one starts trying to work out the history of rituals text by text, it becomes clear that liturgies were repeatedly being revised in Canterbury during the 10th, 11th, and 12th centuries. Enough material survives that the relationships between some of them can be worked out. Here is an example, a very short extract from the beginning of the rite for dedicating a church. The sources involved are Ordo Romanus 41, probably a Carolingian church dedication rite that survives in several manuscripts from the early 9th century onwards, and the rituals in Claudius Pontifical 1 (London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A.iii), written in England c. 1000, but probably containing material composed in Canterbury in the 950s, and the Dunstan Pontifical (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 943), almost certainly made for Archbishop Dunstan in the 960s.⁴

Ordo Romanus 41	Claudius Pontifical I	Dunstan Pontifical
<p><i>Primitus enim</i> antequam pontifex introeat in ecclesia</p> <p><i>inluminantur XII candelae per circuitum ecclesiae</i></p>	<p><i>Primitus enim</i> decet ut episcopus et ceteri ministri ecclesiae induant se uestimentis sacris cum quibus ministerium adimplere debent. et uenientes ante hostium ecclesiae quae dedicanda est.</p> <p><i>inluminentur duodecim candelae.</i> et ponant eas deforis <i>per circuitum ecclesiae.</i></p>	<p><i>Primitus enim</i> decet ut aepiscopus et ceteri ministri ecclesiae induant se uestimentis sacris cum quibus diuinum ministerium adimplere debent et ueniant ante ostium aecclesiae quae dedicanda est cantando antiphonam hanc. <i>Zacheae festinans</i> [...] Sequitur oratio. <i>Actiones nostras</i> [...] Deinde <i>inluminentur xii candelae et ponantur per circuitum aecessiae.</i> cum antiphona. <i>Ab oriente portae tres ab occidente</i> [...]</p>

In this case it is clear that one of the sources for the ritual in Claudius Pontifical I was a rite like Ordo Romanus 41; and that the text in the Dunstan Pontifical was a revision of a rite like the one in Claudius Pontifical I. That does not necessarily mean that the compiler of Dunstan's pontifical had access to Claudius I itself, but it does indicate that a rite like the one found in it was available to him. Doing this, line by line, for particular rituals in the surviving manuscripts from England in this period, one finds that some are closely related to one another and can be sorted into a chronological sequence.⁵ This does not work for all texts because some belong to other traditions, but in many cases it does.

There is good evidence that many of the manuscripts that recur in these chronological sequences were produced in Canterbury. Other manuscripts provide evidence

for liturgies that were available at Canterbury but only survive in books produced elsewhere. The Dunstan Pontifical is an example of a manuscript that we can be as certain as it is possible to be was written at and for Canterbury; Claudius Pontifical I is an example of one produced elsewhere but which appears to preserve material written at Canterbury. The former is much more useful evidence for the cathedral's liturgy than the latter, which needs to be treated with caution, yet I contend that it would be foolish to discount the evidence of the latter. It is clearly textually related to Canterbury manuscripts and is therefore useful, if imperfect, evidence, rather like a later copy of an Anglo-Saxon charter. Table 1 is a provisional list of manuscripts containing *ordines* (directions for how to perform a ritual) written for Canterbury cathedral, or containing texts likely to have been written there, in the central middle ages; the Appendix contains a summary of the reasons for their inclusion and placement. This is a preliminary, inevitably controversial, attempt to compile such a list which will change as further research is carried out, especially on the post-Conquest manuscripts that have been less studied.⁶ What it clearly demonstrates, though, is that far from there being little evidence for the liturgy of Canterbury cathedral in the central middle ages there is a great deal.

At this point it would be as well to lower expectations. This material does not tell us the kind of things that architectural historians might hope for: it will not explain what a particular chapel or altar was used for. Nevertheless, these are valuable sources. What follows is an attempt to convey some sense of their potential.

MATERIAL RELATING TO PARTICULAR BISHOPS: DUNSTAN

ONE of the manuscripts most securely related to an individual is the pontifical created for Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury 959–88 (Paris, BnF, Lat. 943).⁷ This pontifical contains precious evidence for Dunstan's confidence as a liturgist, his policies and, I suspect, his own compositions.⁸ And it contains some surprises, one of which is his attitude to relics. It is traditionally thought that in the middle ages it was normal for altars to have relics placed in them when they were dedicated. However, there are indications that this was not always the case in Anglo-Saxon England and that Dunstan did not think they were essential. He appears to have kept much of the church dedication service of his predecessor, Oda, but revised the rubrics concerning the deposition of relics into the altar.⁹ He shortened that part of the service, and in three places made it clear that it was not necessary for there to be relics. Whilst this view was unusual in the Church as a whole, there are precedents for it in the pontifical of Dunstan's early-10th-century predecessor Plegmund, and in one of the canons of the 816 Council of Chelsea. This may have influenced Dunstan, or he could have been reacting to the relic-raiding habits of his predecessor Oda and other contemporaries; Oda had taken St Wilfrid's relics from Ripon (Yorkshire) and placed them in a new altar at the east end of the cathedral. Modern historians talk about Oda building an altar in which to put Wilfrid's relics, but might the rhetoric at the time have been about getting relics to put in the new altar?¹⁰ If so, Dunstan's re-writing of the church dedication ceremony may have been a condemnation of relic-raiding. Whether or not this was the case, it suggests that current understanding of the cult of relics in Anglo-Saxon England needs some revision. It also provides an example of how such sources can reveal evidence for the attitudes of individuals that may have had an impact on church fabric.

TABLE I. Liturgical manuscripts containing *ordines* written for Canterbury cathedral

890	Plegmund	Leofric Missal: Bodl, 579
923x25	Athelm	
926	Wulfhelm	
941	Oda	Claudius I: BL, Cott. Claudius A.iii Sacramentary of Ratoldus: BnF, Lat. 12052
958	Ælfsige	
959	Byrthelm	
959	Dunstan	Dunstan Pontifical: BnF., Lat. 943
988	Æthelgar	Lanalet Pontifical: Rouen, BM, 368 Archbishop Robert: Rouen, BM, 369
990	Sigeric	
995?	Ælfric	Anderson Pontifical: BL, Add. 57337
1006	Ælfheah	
1013	Lyfing	
1020	Æthelnoth	
1038	Eadsige	Claudius II: BL, Cott. Claudius A. iii: ff. 9–18v, 87–105v Canterbury Benedictional: BL Harley, 2892
1042	Siward – auxiliary	
1051	Robert of Jumièges	Ramsey Pontifical: BL, Cott Vit A. vii London, BL, Add. 28188
1052	Stigand	Douai, BM 67 Corpus 44
1070	Lanfranc	Lanfranc’s Constitutions Cosin Gradual: Durham, UL, Cosin V.v.6
1093	Anselm	‘Dublin’ Pontifical: Trinity College 98
1114	Ralph d’Escures	
1123	William of Corbeil	Claudius III: BL, Cott. Claudius A.iii, ff. 19–29v Oxford, Magdalen College, 226 ‘Ely Pontifical’: Cambridge, Trinity College B.11.10 Cambridge, UL, LL.2.10 BnF, Lat. 14832 BL, Cott. Vespasian D.xv BL, Cott. Tiberius B.viii ‘Winchester’ Pontifical: Cambridge, UL, Ee.2.3
1139	Theobald of Bec	
1162	Thomas Becket	
1174	Richard of Dover	
1185	Baldwin	
1193	Hubert Walter	

Bold Manuscripts written for use at Canterbury cathedral

Others Manuscripts containing texts of rites written at Canterbury cathedral

(Some of the dates are for when texts within manuscripts are likely to have been written rather than when the manuscripts themselves were produced.)

MATERIAL RELATING TO THE FABRIC OF THE CATHEDRAL: RITE FOR BLESSING
A PAVEMENT MOVED FROM ELSEWHERE

MY second example cannot yet be tied to a particular bishop, but is almost certainly associated with a specific event in the history of the cathedral. Sometime in the early 11th century a ritual was drawn up at Canterbury for the blessing of a pavement that had been moved from somewhere else: 'The consecration of the pavement of a church which has been moved from its first location into another position'.¹¹ What happened was intended to be similar to the way floors were blessed in church dedication rites: the bishop was to draw alphabets diagonally across the floor, sprinkle it with holy water, process around the whole church with water, and with incense. This is such an unusual rite (I know no other examples of rituals for this eventuality) that I suspect it must have been drawn up for some specific purpose, perhaps associated with a remodelling of the cathedral in the 1040s or 1050s. It fits well with the widespread evidence for the use of polychrome relief tiles in high-status churches, including Canterbury cathedral, from the 950s onwards, and it is also further evidence for church floors being treated as especially sacred at this time.¹² Christopher Norton has suggested this happened later on in the life of the cathedral when in the 1180s, or perhaps a little later, materials from the pavement that had lain in front of the high altar or in the Trinity chapel were relaid at Becket's shrine.¹³ This is an example of how these sources have the potential to add to our knowledge about aspects of the cathedral's fabric.

HOW LITURGY CHANGED OVER TIME: THE IMPACT OF THE NORMAN CONQUEST

IN addition to the considerable evidence for the liturgies being compiled at Christ Church in the pre-Conquest period, there also exists some for the liturgy intended to be celebrated during Lanfranc's archiepiscopacy (1070–89). Of particular value are his customary, drawn up *c.* 1077, and a chant-book written for Canterbury and sent to Durham *c.* 1083.¹⁴ T. A. Heslop, Michael Gullick and Richard Pfaff have argued that Anselm's own pontifical also survives as Dublin, Trinity College MS 98. Gullick and Pfaff have made a case for it having been produced hurriedly for Anselm in *c.* 1093.¹⁵ Less well studied are a group of 12th-century pontificals, some of which were written at the Cathedral, which are listed in Table 1 and the Appendix. This wealth of material makes it possible to assess changes in the cathedral's liturgy over a long period of time.

So far this has only been attempted to a limited degree. Arnold Klukas has considered the architectural implications of Lanfranc's *Constitutions*, and there has been discussion about changes to the liturgical calendar in this period, especially in relation to Lanfranc's attitudes towards Anglo-Saxon saints' cults.¹⁶ Heslop has argued that during the 1070s or so, Lanfranc simplified the calendar 'by removing from it English saints who were not either of major national importance or of local significance', and introduced a few new feasts of which 'none could really be construed as partisan on the part of the Norman element in the community'.¹⁷ Lanfranc's letters indicate that he was 'a careful student of pontifical rites', and more evidence for his liturgical activities is emerging.¹⁸ D. H. Turner argued that Lanfranc was responsible for drawing up the so-called 'Third English Coronation Order'; Thomas Kozachek thought Lanfranc was responsible for a revision of the rite for dedicating churches, and went so far as to suggest that 'a general revision of pontifical services was executed at Christ

Church under the direct supervision of Lanfranc'.¹⁹ John Cowdrey argued that Lanfranc was responsible for an *ordo* for an episcopal synod, and Christopher A. Jones thinks revisions to the Chrism Mass rite may also be attributed to him.²⁰ Lanfranc's reputation as a liturgical reformer is growing. As yet, there is less evidence for Anselm's activities as a liturgist, though he did have an interest in Anglo-Saxon liturgy because he wrote to Lanfranc asking for a copy of the rule that St Dunstan instituted.²¹ Additionally, Thomas Bestul has argued that Anselm's private prayers continue a tradition that flourished in the pre-Conquest period.²² These conclusions have come either from investigation of the policies of particular individuals, or tangentially from studying the history of certain rituals. There have been few attempts to use the sources gathered in Appendix 1 to explore how the liturgies being written at Canterbury Christ Church changed over time.

As soon as one begins to make comparisons, it becomes apparent that the liturgists who put together Anselm's and Lanfranc's own pontificals based them on late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. I am not aware that this has been said before, but it is implied in the observations made by Thomas Kozachek in relation to the church dedication rite, where he characterizes the early Anglo-Norman texts as a revision of the late Anglo-Saxon ones.²³ It is also supported by Christopher A. Jones's work on the Chrism Mass, where he shows that the ritual in the early Anglo-Norman pontificals is a 'revised version' of the late Anglo-Saxon ones.²⁴ The relationship between Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman liturgy is a topic that deserves detailed investigation; here there is only space for some case studies.

The church dedication rite is a useful example for two reasons: it is one of the longest and most complex of all Christian rituals, and it is one of the few for which there is evidence in Canterbury manuscripts from the 1050s, *c.* 1083 and *c.* 1093, in other words probably from the archiepiscopates of Stigand, Lanfranc and Anselm. This is because, whilst no pontifical of Lanfranc's is known to survive, the Cosin Gradual, which was sent to Durham from Canterbury between 1083 and 1096, preserves chant for some *ordines*.²⁵ This includes the antiphons for the dedication rite in their proper order, though without rubrics (Durham, UL, Cosin V.v.6, fols 95r–98v).²⁶ So the Cosin Gradual provides clues to the Lanfranc-period ritual and some parts of it but not the complete rite. The antiphons in the Cosin Gradual are almost identical to those in the Anselm Pontifical.²⁷ The Anselm rite, which survives complete, was a redraft of a text very like that in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 44, pp. 9–81, the latest of the surviving Anglo-Saxon pontificals from Canterbury: they are frequently word-for-word identical.²⁸ As the chant in the Cosin Gradual is so similar to that in the Anselm Pontifical, it is highly likely that Anselm gives a good indication of the Lanfranc-period rite. It therefore appears that the compilers of the Lanfranc-period rite rewrote something like the one in Corpus 44, making minor changes to wording but only a few substantive alterations. These were principally that:

- The litanies were abbreviated and reordered.
- The whole rite was pruned, with about nine prayers and eleven antiphons omitted.
- The section concerning the deposition of relics in the altar was completely rewritten, giving it more prominence within the rite.

The abbreviation of the litanies and the shortening of the rite fits with Heslop's conclusion, made on the basis of changes to the calendar, that 'the Normans wished

to shorten and to simplify what they found on their arrival': to prune to improve, rather than to replace the unfamiliar with what they knew.²⁹ However, the changes to the deposition of the relics are of an entirely different character. One of the unusual aspects of Anglo-Saxon dedication services was the lack of prominence given to this part of the ceremony. Whilst there is no evidence that Dunstan's attitude to relics was widely shared, nevertheless, the Anglo-Saxon rituals associated with their deposition were perfunctory in comparison with other contemporary European rites: they were short, and not integrated with the rest of the ceremony.³⁰ What is found in the Anselm Pontifical by contrast is much more in line with continental traditions and includes some material from, or akin to, the rite in the Romano-Germanic Pontifical.³¹ Some conclusions can be drawn from this. During the 1070s, Lanfranc had a church dedication rite drawn up; it is worth noting that he needed one for the service for the rebuilt cathedral on 9 April 1077.³² We know that he was interested in how such services should be conducted from a letter written between 1070–77 to John, archbishop of Rouen, in which he debates a detail with him and says:

I have often watched various bishops of different provinces dedicating churches, and I have observed most scrupulously all that they did. In some respects their practice differed [...]³³

It seems very likely that Lanfranc chose to use a late Anglo-Saxon text, very like Corpus 44, and had the rite edited, abbreviated, and those parts he considered wrong altered. So far as one can tell, no substantive changes were made by, or for, Anselm. This indicates a respect for and sensitivity towards Anglo-Saxon customs which tempers the impression that Lanfranc profoundly changed the Christ Church liturgy which some have gained from Lanfranc's Customary, and the probable changes to the calendar.³⁴

Some rites were, however, radically altered, such as my final examples, the major processional feasts of Candlemas and Palm Sunday. In late Anglo-Saxon England, it was normal on Candlemas (2 February) to process to an outlying church, the laity bringing with them candles to be blessed there, and then to process back to the main church with them shimmering in the pre-dawn gloom. There the lay people were supposed to hand over the candles as offerings at the end of mass. The focus of the ceremony was at the doorway of the main church where the crowd gathered to bring their candles inside. Several late Anglo-Saxon bishops, including Dunstan and Wulfstan, were keen to encourage lay participation.³⁵ This is the form of what is found in the Canterbury Benedictional, made for use at the cathedral, perhaps in the second quarter of the 11th century.³⁶ The antiphons in the Lanfranc-period Cosin Gradual (Durham, UL, Cosin V.v.6, fol. 115r) are compatible with such a rite.³⁷ However, the Candlemas ritual in Lanfranc's *Constitutions* and the Anselm Pontifical, which correspond with one another, is totally different.³⁸ No reference is made to the participation of the laity, or to the offering of candles. Instead, the candles were simply to be laid on a carpet in front of an altar, where they were blessed; then there was a procession around the exterior of the church, and a station in front of the crucifix at the entrance to the choir. The emphasis of this ritual is on the monastic community within the cathedral, rather than a public procession from a church somewhere in the city that culminated in the entrance into the cathedral.

In late Anglo-Saxon England, Palm Sunday processions were like the Candlemas ones. The Canterbury Benedictional again provides good evidence for how it was intended to be celebrated at the cathedral.³⁹ The community:

- Gathered for the start of the ceremony.
- Processed to a church where the ‘palms’ had been set out where they were blessed and distributed — probably in St Augustine’s abbey.
- Processed from there up to St Martin’s where there was a prayer and gospel reading, probably with the monks from St Augustine’s.
- Went back to the cathedral, where the ‘Gloria Laus’ hymn was sung in front of the doors.

This is a reminder of how peripatetic early medieval liturgy was, and of how outlying churches sometimes hosted the liturgies of cathedrals and minster communities. The need to host the occasional celebration of grand events may have had an impact on these buildings. Again, though, in the post-Conquest period something very different was intended. The Cosin Gradual, Lanfranc’s *Constitutions*, and the Anselm Pontifical agree that:

- The branches should be blessed on a carpet in front of the high altar in the cathedral.
- The community should process out of the city to an unspecified place where there was a station around a shrine containing the consecrated host.
- They then processed with it back into the city holding stations at the city gate, the entrance to the cathedral, and the entrance to the choir.⁴⁰

Although this procession was to venture beyond the precinct walls, the emphasis was again on the monastic community. The importance of the palms was displaced by the host; the centre of attention was not the crowd of people united by the blessed branches they held aloft, but Christ himself. This makes good sense, given Lanfranc’s beliefs about the real presence of Christ in the consecrated host.⁴¹ It also helps explain why so much attention was paid to the Palm Sunday procession in Lanfranc’s *Constitutions*: because so much was being changed.

In some cases it is clear that Lanfranc did desire to change the liturgy of the cathedral radically, in others, alterations were only made later, perhaps under Anselm’s guidance.

CONCLUSIONS

SEVERAL conclusions can be drawn. Lanfranc and his liturgists made a very careful assessment of the cathedral’s liturgy. He did not simply impose new customs; he did rifle through the book chests. At least as far as *ordines* were concerned, some rites seemed to him good, and so he had them tidied and slightly pruned, balancing the tendency towards ever greater elaboration that is clear in the pre-Conquest pontificals of the mid-11th century, especially Corpus 44. Some practices, though, seemed to him odd and misguided. These included the way that relics were placed in altars and the forms of the Candlemas and Palm Sunday processions. Here he changed the emphasis, placing it on Christ and on the monastic community who served Him, rather than on the crowds formed of the whole local Christian community. The processions became more monastic ceremonies than civic and archiepiscopal ones. Just as the architectural emphasis was changing from the groups of several churches common in the early middle ages, to larger, more complex single buildings, so liturgies were becoming more confined within cathedral and monastic walls. This may be part of the desire associated with the Gregorian reforms to separate the roles of clergy and laity.⁴² Some

of these changes were enduring. The Anselm Pontifical provides evidence that Lanfranc's customary was being followed at Canterbury cathedral two decades after it had been introduced and that Anselm, or at least his liturgists, wanted it to be.

David Knowles was not right to say of post-Conquest Canterbury Christ Church that 'at no house was the break with the past so complete', nor was Richard Southern that 'Lanfranc had been dissatisfied with almost everything in the cathedral monastery that he found on his arrival. [...] He [...] drew up a new rule, and introduced a new liturgy [...]'.⁴³ Rather, these sources support the assessment by Hugh Thomas that the Normans 'did not hesitate to sweep aside what they did not approve of, or thought they could improve on. [...] Yet there was no wholesale rejection of Anglo-Saxon culture. [...] The Normans were perfectly willing to treasure and admire those aspects of English culture that impressed them'.⁴⁴ I wonder, though, whether the emphasis should be reversed: that, at least in this case, there was a tendency to keep what they found, changing only what they felt they must.

If these reforms were enacted, those changes to the liturgy that were made following the Norman Conquest would not only have had an impact on Canterbury's monks; their consequences would also have been widely apparent in the local community. Open-air processions such as those at Candlemas and Palm Sunday were amongst the most popular events of the ecclesiastical year in late Anglo-Saxon England and involved the participation of large numbers of people: changes to them would have been noticed by the townspeople.⁴⁵ Were the curtailment of popular involvement in them to have been replicated elsewhere, might it have been an element in the investment being made into local churches at this time, as a reaction to a sense of disenfranchisement? And might it mean that the inhabitants of different cities had different experiences of the liturgy at this time? Did Wulfstan at Worcester maintain the Anglo-Saxon tradition of large processional, participatory events?

My intentions in this article have been twofold. First, I hope that I have drawn attention to the quantity of surviving liturgical sources for Canterbury cathedral in the central middle ages. Taken together, recent research on individual rituals, and on manuscripts, has considerable implications for understanding how Canterbury's cathedral churches were used, and for changes in the ritual life of the city. There is a great deal more surviving material than has often been appreciated. Although it rarely reveals the kind of detail that architectural historians want, nevertheless, if read in conjunction with one another, these sources have great potential for understanding how buildings were used. My second intention has been to convey something of their value as sources for the policies of individual archbishops, for the history of the fabric, and for change over time. Work on this material has only just begun; there is much yet to be discovered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Linda Monckton for inviting me to give the BAA lecture on which this paper is based, and Alixe Bovey for encouraging me to accept the invitation and making space for it in this volume. Richard Gameson, Sandy Heslop, Andy Hudson, Christopher A. Jones, Simon Keynes and Tessa Webber all very kindly read a draft and gave me extremely helpful comments. I bear responsibility for not having incorporated all their suggestions and for any errors.

APPENDIX

DATES AND CANTERBURY ASSOCIATIONS OF MANUSCRIPTS LISTED IN
TABLE 1*Leofric Missal: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579*

A 'combined sacramentary, pontifical and ritual'.⁴⁶ Nicholas Orchard has argued that the manuscript was written for Plegmund, archbishop of Canterbury 890–923.⁴⁷ It was designed for an archbishop because it contains an episcopal ordination ceremony and a coronation ordo.⁴⁸ It was written for use in England because it contains an English coronation ordo; St Mark's day is given as being on 18 May rather than 25 April; the litany contains English saints not usually found in continental manuscripts, notably St Guthlac; and it contains many texts only or mostly found otherwise in English manuscripts.⁴⁹ It has been dated on palaeographical grounds to c. 860–920.⁵⁰ Orchard thinks it remained at Canterbury because of the addition to it of a calendar akin to the one in the Bosworth Psalter, which was probably made for St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury.⁵¹

Claudius I: London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A.iii, fols 31r–86v, 106r–150v

A combined pontifical and benedictional. David Dumville suggests on the basis of the script that it was produced c. 1000.⁵² In the first quarter of the 11th century, a law code was added and it was rebound. The lawcode was annotated by Wulfstan, bishop of London (996–1002), Worcester (1002–16) and archbishop of York (1002–23).⁵³ However, it is not likely to have been his main pontifical because the texts are frequently archaic and incomplete; Jones argues that it 'almost appears as much an archive as a service book'.⁵⁴ Orchard suggests it was copied for Wulfstan whilst bishop of Worcester 'from a model prepared in Bishop Oswald's time' (bishop of Worcester 961–92, archbishop of York (971–92) and that it 'gives us some idea of the type of pontifical adopted by Oda (archbishop of Canterbury 941–58), in the 950s'.⁵⁵ This is because it is textually akin to Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College MS 100, 'associable on palaeographical grounds with Oswald'.⁵⁶ Additionally, the rite for dedicating a church in the Dunstan Pontifical, likely to have been written c. 960, is a rewriting of a rite like that in Claudius I.⁵⁷ This would make sense if Claudius I were a copy of the pontifical of Oda, who was Dunstan's predecessor and Oswald's uncle.

Sacramentary of Ratoldus: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 12052

A sacramentary combined with pontifical *ordines* and episcopal blessings commissioned by Ratoldus, whilst abbot of Corbie c. 972–86, or perhaps earlier — c. 957. It was created by 'working together' at least two separate texts, a sacramentary from Saint-Denis and an Anglo-Saxon pontifical.⁵⁸ The texts in the latter must, therefore, predate c. 972. Textually, the pontifical elements are most like those in Claudius I, Lanalet and other early Anglo-Saxon pontificals, especially those with Canterbury associations.⁵⁹ Nicholas Orchard suggests the underlying pontifical was a Canterbury book of the 950s.⁶⁰

Dunstan Pontifical: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 943

A pontifical and benedictional probably made for Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury 959–88. A *terminus post quem* is provided by the inclusion of a copy of the papal privilege granting him the pallium which he personally collected from Rome on 21 September 960. Given the controversy surrounding his election as archbishop, the copy of the papal privilege may have been included as an assertion of his right to the post.⁶¹ It may therefore have been produced in the early 960s.

Lanalet Pontifical: Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, A. 27 (368)

A pontifical and benedictional with West Country associations. An early-11th-century excommunication order was added from the monastery of 'Lanalet' (St German's, Cornwall).⁶² An Old

English note on fol. 196r says it was once owned by Bishop Lyfing, perhaps the bishop of Wells 998/9–1013 and archbishop of Canterbury 1013–20, or Lyfing, bishop of Crediton and Cornwall (c. 1027–46).⁶³ Neil Ker and David Dumville date its Style-I Anglo-Caroline script to the early 11th century.⁶⁴ Jane Toswell argues it was probably produced after c. 1020 because St Martial of Limoges is classed as an apostle in one of the litanies.⁶⁵ Textually, it is closely related to mid- to late-10th-century Canterbury pontificals. For example, the church dedication rite is a light revision of the one in the Dunstan Pontifical and it has the same Candlemas rite as the ones in the late-10th-century Canterbury books Dunstan and Anderson.⁶⁶

Benedictional of Archbishop Robert: Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, Y.7 (369)

The most likely context for the production of this combined pontifical and benedictional is that it was made at the New Minster, Winchester for Æthelgar, its abbot, who was appointed bishop of Selsey in 980 (or that it is a later copy of such a book).⁶⁷ Textually, the manuscript shares affinities with other early Anglo-Saxon pontificals, including ones certainly associated with Canterbury such as the Dunstan Pontifical.⁶⁸

Anderson Pontifical: London, British Library, MS Add. 57337

A pontifical and benedictional, which Dumville argues was ‘written in a monumental version of Style-II Anglo-Caroline minuscule. It is datable c. 1000: the script would be quite consistent with an origin at Christ Church, Canterbury’.⁶⁹ Heslop prefers a slightly later date, suggesting that the presence of St Bartholomew in one of the litanies is connected with the arrival of the arm of that saint, said to have been given by Queen Emma, perhaps in 1022 or 1023.⁷⁰ In support of Christ Church being its place of production, it contains an ordo for consecrating an archbishop, so it was probably produced for an archiepiscopal see. Textually, it is close to late-10th- and early-11th-century pontificals, including those made at Canterbury, such as Dunstan’s.⁷¹ It is sometimes very close to the Dunstan Pontifical in wording, though there are notable divergences. Kozachek, observing that it contains chant that is distinctively from the Old Minster, Winchester, suggests it was owned by Ælfheah (bishop of Winchester 984–1006, archbishop of Canterbury 1006–12).⁷²

Claudius II: London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols 9–18v, 87–105v

Part of a pontifical. Its contents suggest that it was written at Christ Church, Canterbury because it includes the archiepiscopal rite for blessing a new archbishop found in other Canterbury pontificals. It is written in Style-IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule and Dumville dates it to the mid-11th century.⁷³

Canterbury Benedictional: London, British Library, Harley, 2892

A benedictional that incorporates much pontifical material.⁷⁴ A *terminus post quem* of 1023 is provided by a blessing for the feast of the Translation of St Ælfheah, and it probably dates to the second quarter of the 10th century.⁷⁵ It was intended for Canterbury because it refers to the presence of an archbishop, and a procession to St Martin’s church.⁷⁶ Its Palm Sunday and Candlemas *ordines* were revised a little later for BL Add. 28188.⁷⁷ Its rite for dedicating a cross is very similar to the one in Corpus 44.⁷⁸

Ramsey Pontifical: London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. vii

A badly damaged pontifical, written after 1030 because of the presence of St Olave in the litanies.⁷⁹ It appears to have been written by two Exeter scribes.⁸⁰ At least part of it seems to have been the basis for BL Add. 28188.⁸¹ The Canterbury links are textual. In the case of the rites for dedicating

a church, and for a cemetery, *Ramsey* is clearly based on a text like *Anderson* and it was itself the basis for a further revision, which is found in *Corpus 44*, a demonstrably Canterbury book.⁸²

London, British Library, Add. 28188

A pontifical and benedictional produced at Exeter (Devon) in the third quarter of the 11th century, probably for Bishop Leofric (1046–72).⁸³ The pontifical section is closely related to, and perhaps largely copied from, the *Ramsey Pontifical*.⁸⁴ Like *Ramsey*, there are textual affiliations with Canterbury manuscripts, such as with the church dedication rite discussed above under *Ramsey*, and with the cemetery consecration ceremony.⁸⁵ It also shares a number of links with the *Canterbury Benedictional* and in some cases appears to be just slightly later than it, such as with its *Candlemas* and *Palm Sunday ordines*.⁸⁶

'Pontifical of Thomas Becket': Douai, Bibliothèque municipale, 67

A pontifical.⁸⁷ The nickname comes from an 18th-century inscription that says it was donated to the church of Marchiennes (Nord) by Thomas Becket. It was made in Canterbury and has the rite for the reception of a pallium by an archbishop of Canterbury.⁸⁸ On the basis of its script, it has been dated to the early to mid-12th century, though its *ordines* for dedicating a church and for blessing the oils are textually close to ones in late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.⁸⁹ I have therefore placed it early in the sequence in Table 1, but only tentatively, given how little-studied this manuscript is.

Corpus 44: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 44

A pontifical.⁹⁰ The presence of St Ælfheah in the litanies provides a *terminus post quem* of 1012.⁹¹ Dumville describes its gorgeous script as 'a massive round' Style IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule best dated 'broadly to the middle quarters of the 11th century'.⁹² It includes a rite for enthroning a new archbishop which refers specifically to the western chapel at Canterbury Cathedral (pp. 261–78). Textually, it is the latest of the surviving pre-Conquest pontificals: its rites for consecrating churches and cemeteries appear, for example, to be a revision of those in *Ramsey* and BL, MS Add. 28188.⁹³ It has been suggested that it was made for Archbishop Stigand (1052–70), or in preparation for the arrival of Lanfranc.⁹⁴

Lanfranc's Constitutions

The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc, ed. D. Knowles and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford 2002)

A customary written by Lanfranc for the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury which was more widely disseminated.⁹⁵ It was probably written in the 1070s or early 1080s, perhaps *c.* 1077.⁹⁶ Two early copies written in the 1090s survive.⁹⁷

Cosin Gradual: Durham, University Library, Cosin V.v.6

A gradual written at Canterbury and given to Durham cathedral between 1083 when it was re-established as a monastery and 1096 (the death of William of St Calais, on the list of whose donations to the cathedral priory it seems to appear).⁹⁸ It contains the chant for several *ordines*, hence its inclusion here and in Table 1.

'Dublin' Pontifical: Dublin, Trinity College 98 (B.36)

A pontifical and benedictional. Michael Gullick and Richard Pfaff argue that the main part of it was written at Christ Church, Canterbury in the 1090s because the hands of several scribes also

Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral

wrote other books there then. It also contains a rite for the reception of a pallium by a new archbishop of Canterbury. On the basis of this and its contents, Gullick and Pfaff think that the book was made specifically for Anselm in the 1090s, with additions in *c.* 1097 and *c.* 1120.⁹⁹

Claudius III: London, British Library, Cotton, Claudius A.iii, fols 19r–29v

A coronation ordo, perhaps from a full pontifical, written at Canterbury cathedral on the basis of the hand used. Turner dated the script to *c.* 1090–1150 and probably mid-12th century; others prefer an early-12th-century date, including Webber who suggests the 1120s or 1130s.¹⁰⁰

Oxford, Magdalen College, 226; ‘Ely Pontifical’, Cambridge, Trinity College B.11.10; Cambridge, University Library, Ll.2.10

A group of pontificals whose contents are all very similar to one another and to the Anselm Pontifical.¹⁰¹ Wilson thought they were ‘derived from a recension proceeding from Canterbury, and possibly intended for general use throughout the southern province’.¹⁰² He also suggested that Cambridge, UL, Ll.2.10 was substantially a copy of Trinity B.11.10.¹⁰³ Hartzell suggests a date in the second quarter of the 12th century for the first two, and a little later for CUL Ll.2.10.¹⁰⁴ Little work has been done on these books in recent years, though Pfaff intends to discuss their relationship to one another in a forthcoming study.¹⁰⁵

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 14832

A pontifical whose contents are closely related to the Magdalen Pontifical. It appears to be a copy of a Canterbury cathedral manuscript produced in the mid-12th century for Avranches cathedral.¹⁰⁶

London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian D.xv

A collection of pontifical rites designed for use in the province of Canterbury, written during the 12th century. According to Wilson, its texts are like those in the Magdalen Pontifical.¹⁰⁷

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.viii, fols 1–34, 81–197

A pontifical written by the scribe Eadwine in the mid-11th century, perhaps *c.* 1160.¹⁰⁸ Heslop argues that it was made for an archbishop of Canterbury on textual grounds and that it may have been made for Thomas Becket.¹⁰⁹ Its contents are akin to those in Cambridge, UL, Ee.2.3.¹¹⁰

‘Winchester’ Pontifical: Cambridge, University Library, Ee.2.3

A pontifical and benedictional. Its contents are related to the Magdalen Pontifical group, but more distantly than the other manuscripts mentioned above.¹¹¹ It has broadly the same Chrism Mass rite as in the Magdalen group, though is perhaps a later version.¹¹² Similarly, its Candlemas rite (fols 8r–11r) differs from the ones in the Magdalen Pontifical (and related manuscripts such as CUL Ll.2.10), with changes to the rubrics and the inclusion of more texts. Various dates in the 12th century have been suggested; Webber suggests a date ‘no earlier than the mid-12th century’.¹¹³ It was produced for somewhere in the province of Canterbury. This may well be one of the latest in the group.

Omitted from Table 1: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 146

It has been suggested that this pontifical was made at Winchester cathedral because it contains blessings for Winchester saints and a reference to the saints of Winchester.¹¹⁴ However, Dumville

argues for Canterbury because it is written in Style II Anglo-Caroline minuscule which he thinks was not used at Winchester; and it contains a coronation ordo and provision for one archbishop to ordain another.¹¹⁵ Textually, it is close to Canterbury books but often diverges from them and those differences were not then copied into later Canterbury manuscripts. Its rite for dedicating a cross, for example, are different from those in earlier and later Canterbury texts, such as Dunstan, Anderson and the Canterbury Benedictional.¹¹⁶

NOTES

1. R. Bowers, 'The Liturgy of the Cathedral and its Music, c.1075–1642', in *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, ed. P. Collinson, N. Ramsay and M. Sparks (Oxford 1995), 408–50, at 413. M.-P. Gelin, *Lumen ad revelationem gentium: iconographie et liturgie à Christ Church, Canterbury, 1175–1220* (Turnhout 2006), especially in ch. 1.2 'Traditions: la construction d'une identité liturgique', focuses only on the *Regularis concordia*, and evidence for the Canterbury calendar.

2. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579: *The Leofric Missal*, ed. N. Orchard, Henry Bradshaw Society 113–14, 2 vols (London 2002); Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 943; Dublin, Trinity College, 98. For these manuscripts, see the Appendix.

3. C. A. Jones, 'The Chrism Mass in Later Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. H. Gittos and M. B. Bedingfield, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia 5 (London 2005), 105–42, at 128.

4. M. Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen âge*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 11, 23, 24, 28, 29, 5 vols (Louvain 1931–61), IV, 339 (no. 41); *The Claudius Pontificals (from Cotton MS. Claudius A. iii in the British Museum)*, ed. D. H. Turner, Henry Bradshaw Society 97 (n. pl. 1971), 41; BnF, Lat. 943, fol. 10r, ed. in M. A. Conn, 'The Dunstan and Brodie (Anderson) pontificals: An edition and study' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Notre, 1993), 25–26; H. Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford 2013), 221–23.

5. For examples, *ibid.*, ch. 2, 4, 6 (consecration of churches, and of cemeteries, ordines for Palm Sunday and Candemas). Other detailed, manuscript-based, studies of particular rites from medieval England include T. D. Kozachek, 'The repertory of chant for dedicating churches in the middle ages: music, liturgy, and ritual' (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Harvard University, 1995); S. Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *Liturgy* (as n. 3), 65–103; Jones, 'Chrism Mass' (as n. 3) and C. A. Jones, 'The Origins of the "Sarum" Chrism Mass at Eleventh-Century Christ Church, Canterbury', *Mediaeval Studies*, 67 (2005), 219–315; H. Gittos, 'Hallowing the Rood: Anglo-Saxon Rites for Consecrating Crosses', in *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies in Honor of George Hardin Brown*, ed. K. L. Jolly, C. E. Karkov and S. L. Keefer (Morgantown 2008), 242–75.

6. A related attempt on a smaller scale was made by D. N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England: Four Studies* (Woodbridge 1992), 93, which tries to associate some pontificals produced at Canterbury in the late Anglo-Saxon period with particular archbishops. He includes Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 146, for which see the Appendix. Also relevant is Emma Hornby's recent 'summary list of pre-Conquest manuscripts including notation': E. Hornby, 'Interactions between Brittany and Christ Church, Canterbury in the Tenth Century: The Linenthal Leaf', in *Essays on the History of English Music in Honour of John A. Caldwell: Sources, Style, Performance, Historiography*, ed. E. Hornby and D. Maw (Woodbridge 2010), 47–65, at 58–60. I disagree with her inclusion of two manuscripts: Cambridge, Corpus 146, discussed in the Appendix, and the Sacramentary of Robert of Jumièges (Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 274), on which see *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 61.

7. See Appendix 1.

8. J. Rosenthal, 'The Pontifical of St Dunstan', in *St Dunstan: His Life, Times and Cult*, ed. N. Ramsay, M. Sparks and T. Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge 1992), 143–63; Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 113–15, 223–28.

9. For a fuller discussion of the reasons for thinking this see *ibid.*, ch. 6.

10. N. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (London and New York 1984), 227.

11. 'Consecratio pavementi quae fuerit de primo loco suo in alium statum translata': London, British Library, Add. 28188, fols 39r–40r; London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. vii, fols 36v–37r; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 44, pp. 103–05; for further discussion and justification for why I think the rite was produced in Canterbury, see Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 235–36. A blessing for a pavement also appears in

Durham, University Library, Cosin V.v.6, fol. 99r, though it is very much simpler and includes only two antiphons: K. D. Hartzell, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Written or Owned in England up to 1200 Containing Music* (Woodbridge 2006), 176.

12. B. Kjøbye-Biddle, 'Two Anglo-Saxon Relief-Decorated Floor Tiles', in *Canterbury Cathedral Nave: Archaeology, History and Architecture*, ed. K. Blockley, M. Sparks and T. Tatton-Brown, The Archaeology of Canterbury, New Series 1 (Canterbury 1997), 196–200; W. Rodwell, 'New Glimpses of Edward the Confessor's Abbey at Westminster', in *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*, ed. R. Mortimer (Woodbridge 2009), 151–67, at 153, 159–63; M. Biddle and B. Kjøbye-Biddle, *The Anglo-Saxon Minsters of Winchester*, Winchester Studies 4.I (Oxford forthcoming); L. Donkin, 'Making an Impression: Consecration Ritual and the Creation of Architectural Memory', in *Romanesque and the Past: Retrospection in the Art and Architecture of Romanesque Europe*, ed. J. McNeill and R. Plant (Leeds 2013), 37–48.

13. C. Norton, 'The Luxury Pavement in England before Westminster', in *Westminster Abbey: The Cosmati Pavements*, ed. L. Grant and R. Mortimer (Aldershot 2002), 7–27, at 15–16.

14. *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, ed. D. Knowles and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford 2002), xxviii; Durham, UL, Cosin V.v.6, for which see Appendix. On Lanfrancian liturgy more generally, R. W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge and New York 2009), 118–22.

15. See Appendix.

16. A. W. Klukas, 'The Architectural Implications of the *Decreta Lanfranci*', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 6: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 1983*, ed. R. Allen Brown (Woodbridge and Dover, New Hampshire 1984), 136–71; R. W. Pfaff, 'Lanfranc's Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar', in *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. T. Reuter (London and Rio Grande 1992), 95–108; T. A. Heslop, 'The Canterbury Calendars and the Norman Conquest', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars 1066–1109*, ed. R. Eales and R. Sharpe (London and Rio Grande 1995), 53–85; J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum*, 74.2 (1999), 279–309; H. M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation, and Identity 1066–c.1220* (Oxford and New York 2003), 290–96; H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford and New York 2003), 175–84; Pfaff, *Liturgy* (as n. 14), 104–05.

17. Heslop, 'Canterbury Calendars' (as n. 16), 59.

18. Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 285; *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson (Oxford 1979), no. 14 (pp. 82–89).

19. *Claudius Pontificals* (as n. 4), xli–xlii; Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 285 and n. 185 and references; Kozachek, 'Repertory of Chant' (as n. 5), 334.

20. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (as n. 16), 130–31; Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 285. Gilbert Crispin, writing in the early 12th century, claims Lanfranc forbid the 'barbarous rites' of the people: G. Crispin, 'Vita Herluini', in *The works of Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster*, ed. A. S. Abulafia and G. R. Evans, *Auctores Britannici Medii Aevi* 8 (Oxford 1986), 183–212, at 201 (c. 83); Thomas, *English and the Normans* (as n. 16), 368.

21. *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi: opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, 6 vols (Edinburgh 1946–61), iii.151 (letter 39).

22. T. H. Bestul, 'St. Anselm and the Continuity of Anglo-Saxon Devotional Traditions', *Annuaire mediaevale*, 18 (1977), 20–41; T. H. Bestul, 'The Collection of Anselm's Prayers in British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D.xxvi', *Medium Aevum*, 47.1 (1978), 1–5, esp. 3–4; T. H. Bestul, 'St Anselm, the Monastic Community at Canterbury, and Devotional Writing in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Anselm Studies: An Occasional Journal*, 1 (1983), 185–98.

23. Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 331–34.

24. Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), esp. 243–44.

25. See Appendix.

26. Listed in Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 175–76.

27. Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 333. The Cosin Gradual has all but three of the thirty-one antiphons in the Anselm Pontifical.

28. Though the wording is very similar, the Anselm one may have been a revision of an earlier text than Cambridge, Corpus 44 — sometimes it omits texts that are in Corpus 44 but not in earlier rites, such as Cambridge, Corpus 146. The 12th-century coronation *ordines* are also thought to have been copied from an earlier Anglo-Saxon manuscript rather than from Corpus 44: G. Garnett, 'The Third Recension of the English Coronation *ordo*: The Manuscripts', *Haskins Society Journal*, 11 (2003), 43–71, at 63–64.

29. Heslop, 'Canterbury Calendars' (as n. 16), 67 (64–66 esp. 64 n. 32 for discussion of some later Canterbury litanies and comparisons with those in Cambridge, Corpus 44).

30. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 220–21, 225–26, 228–29, 243–44.

31. Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 332. The account he gives on p. 331 is not right because the changes to this part of the rite that he ascribes to later Anglo-Norman manuscripts are already present in the Anselm Pontifical.

32. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (as n. 16), 104.

33. 'Diuersos enim diuersarum prouinciarum praesules ecclesias dedicare sepe conspexi, omnibusque quae ab eis acta sunt quantum potui curam adhibui. Qui etsi in nonnullis dissimilia egerunt', *Letters of Lanfranc* (as n. 18), no. 14 (pp. 84–85).

34. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (as n. 16), 176–77 considers the evidence from the calendars 'points to a break with the past which was major and radical'. A similar attitude to Anglo-Saxon rites as that which I suggest for the dedication ceremony was taken with other rites I have compared in detail. The form for consecrating a cemetery in the Anselm Pontifical is clearly based on the one in Cambridge, Corpus 44, but the mass and episcopal blessings have been omitted. The blessing of a cross is akin to the Corpus 44 version and has also been abbreviated. On the pre-Conquest rites for the first of these ceremonies see Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 39–54 and for the latter Gittos, 'Hallowing' (as n. 5). For some evidence for Lanfranc's borrowings of pre-Conquest Canterbury liturgy in his Constitutions: *The Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 12052, ed. N. Orchard, Henry Bradshaw Society 116 (London 2005), clxv.

35. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 110–22, 262–64.

36. *The Canterbury Benedictinal* (British Museum, Harl. MS. 2892), ed. R. M. Woolley, Henry Bradshaw Society 51 (n. pl. 1917), 80–85 and see the Appendix.

37. It gives one antiphon to accompany the distribution of candles, three for the procession but lacks rubrics specifying where the procession was intended to go: Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 179. All are found in late Anglo-Saxon sources. The Canterbury Benedictinal, however, provides more chant than this: the Cosin Gradual is closest to what is given in Cambridge, Corpus 146, pp. 243–47 and *The Missal of the New Minster, Winchester: (Le Haure, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 330)*, ed. D. H. Turner, Henry Bradshaw Society 93 (n. pl. 1962), 69–72.

38. *Monastic Constitutions* (as n. 14), c. 17 (pp. 24–27); Dublin, Trin. Coll., 98, fols 51r–52v.

39. *Canterbury Benedictinal* (as n. 36), 22–28; Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 124–34.

40. *Monastic Constitutions* (as n. 14), c. 25 (pp. 34–41). The Cosin Gradual (fol. 117r) only gives the processional antiphons; they agree reasonably well with the Constitutions and are listed in Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 179. The Anselm Pontifical (fols 55r–56v) only provides for the blessing and distribution of the palms.

41. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (as n. 16), 59–74.

42. 'A typical example is the statement by Humbert, a Burgundian cardinal in Rome around 1060, that just as clergy and laity are recognized as separated in place and function within the walls of basilicas, so they should also be outside': J. Onians, *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance* (Cambridge 1988), 97.

43. D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of its Development from the Times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940–1216*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge 1963), 122; R. W. Southern, 'Anselm [St Anselm] (c.1033–1109)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004; online edn, October 2009).

44. Thomas, *English and the Normans* (as n. 16), 370.

45. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 13–14, 112–22, 124–34.

46. *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 1.

47. *Ibid.*, I, 1, 131.

48. *Ibid.*, I, 73–80, 83, 99–105.

49. C. E. Hohler, 'Some Service-Books of the Later Saxon Church', in *Tenth-Century Studies: Essays in Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia*, ed. D. Parsons (London and Chichester, 1975), 60–83, 217–27, at 78; *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 29, 53–56, 66–68, 74–80, 99–105.

50. *Ibid.*, I, 10–13, 16–20.

51. *Ibid.*, I, 8–9, 132, 177–79.

52. Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 78.

53. N. Ker, 'The handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in primary sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge 1971), 315–31, at 321.

54. C. A. Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. M. Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10 (Turnhout 2004), 325–52, at 346.

55. *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), xxxii, xcvi.

56. *Ibid.*, cii.
57. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 222–29.
58. *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), xiv, cxcii–cxciii.
59. *Ibid.*, xxxii, ciii–civ, cix–cxxxviii, cxxvvi–clii, clxxx; Jones, ‘Origins’ (as n. 5), 234–35.
60. *Ibid.*, cxcii–cxciii.
61. On the controversy: D. Whitelock, ‘The Appointment of Dunstan as Archbishop of Canterbury’ in *Otium et Negotium: Studies in Onomatology and Library Science Presented to Olof von Feilitzen*, ed. F. Sandgren (Stockholm 1973), repr. in her *History, Law and Literature in 10th–11th-Century England* (London 1981), 232–47; Brooks, *Early History* (as n. 10), 239–40, 243–44. On the papal privilege: Rosenthal, ‘Pontifical’ (as n. 8), 154 n. 59.
62. Edition: *Pontificale Lanaletense: (Bibliothèque de la ville de Rouen A. 27. cat. 368.): A Pontifical formerly in use at St. Germans, Cornwall*, ed. G. H. Doble, Henry Bradshaw Society 74 (London 1937); Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 538–49 (no. 318).
63. D. N. Dumville, ‘On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts’, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*, 10.1 (1991), 40–57, at 51–52; *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), ciii.
64. Dumville, ‘On the Dating’ (as n. 63), 52; Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 87.
65. M. J. Toswell, ‘St Martial and the Dating of Late Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts’, *Scriptorium*, 51 (1997), 3–14.
66. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 113–15, 228–29.
67. *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society 24 (London 1903), xi–xii, endorsed by *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 70–71 and *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), c–ci.
68. A. Prescott, ‘The Structure of English Pre-Conquest Benedictionals’, *The British Library Journal*, 13.2 (1987), 118–58, at 124–26; Hamilton, ‘Rites’ (as n. 5), esp. 79–80; Jones, ‘Chrisam Mass’ (as n. 3), 112–13; Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 228–30.
69. Dumville, ‘On the Dating’ (as n. 63), 46; D. N. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 6 (Woodbridge 1993), 106–07. Conn, ‘Dunstan’ (as n. 4), 172–338 edits the pontifical; its contents are listed in N. K. Rasmussen, *Les Pontificaux du Haut Moyen Âge: genèse du livre de l’évêque*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense: Études et documents 49 (Leuven 1998), 167–257; Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 225–32 (no. 125).
70. T. A. Heslop, ‘The production of *de luxe* manuscripts and the patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma’, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 19 (1990), 151–95, at 169–70, 183 but the evidence for this event is not secure: Brooks, *Early History* (as n. 10), 292.
71. R. E. Reynolds, *The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Berlin 1978), 84; J. L. Nelson, ‘The Second English Ordo’, in *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London and Ronceverte 1986), 361–74; Hamilton, ‘Rites’ (as n. 5), esp. 79–80; Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 46–48, 113–15.
72. Kozachek, ‘Repertory’ (as n. 5), 323 n. 54.
73. Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 77–78. Edition: *Claudius Pontificals* (as n. 4), 89–113.
74. Edition: *Canterbury Benedictional* (as n. 36).
75. *Ibid.*, p. xxv; Jones, ‘Origins’ (as n. 5), 239–40 summarizes recent discussion about dating; Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 289–93 (no. 158) inventories its music.
76. *Canterbury Benedictional* (as n. 36), xiv.
77. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 116–21, 124–29; its penitential order for Ash Wednesday is also close to BL, MS Add. 28188: *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), cxxxix.
78. Gittos, ‘Hallowing’ (as n. 5), 252, 261, 269–73.
79. Contents: N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford 1957), 278–79 (no. 213) –1130 should read 1030; J. Brückmann, ‘Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals in England and Wales’, *Traditio*, 29 (1973), 391–458, at 437; Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 265–71 (no. 147).
80. *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 140–41 and references.
81. *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 140–41; Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 79 n. 70.
82. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 46–48, 228–30.
83. Contents: *The Leofric Collectar (Harl. MS. 2961) with an appendix containing a litany and prayers from Harl. MS. 863*, ed. E. S. Dewick, Henry Bradshaw Society 45, 46, 2 vols (London 1914–1921), II, 614–18; Brückmann, ‘Latin’ (as n. 79), 426.
84. E. M. Drage, ‘Bishop Leofric and Exeter Cathedral Chapter (1050–1072): a reassessment of the manuscript evidence’ (unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Oxford 1978 [1979]), 149–54, 364–65; J. L. Nelson and R. W. Pfaff, ‘Pontificals and Benedictionals’, in *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. W. Pfaff (Kalamazoo, Mich 1995), 87–98, at 93; Hamilton, ‘Rites’, 82–83.
85. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 46–48, 228–30.

86. *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), cxxxix (links with Canterbury Benedictinal), cxlv (links with Corpus 44); Hamilton, 'Rites' (as n. 5), 82–83 (Canterbury Benedictinal); Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 116–21, 124–29 (Candlemas, Palm Sunday).

87. Contents: V. Leroquais, *Les pontificaux manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols (Paris 1937), I, 148–55 (no. 49).

88. *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 77, 106.

89. Leroquais, *Pontificaux* (as n. 87), I, 154–55; Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 298, 311, 318; Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 241–42. For further discussion of *ordines* in it: *Liber pontificalis Chr. Bainbridge, archiepiscopi Eboracensis*, ed. W. G. Henderson, Surtees Society 61 (Durham, London and Edinburgh 1875), xx–xxi; *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 106–08; *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), cxlv n. 241. I am grateful to Richard Gameson for his comments on this manuscript.

90. Contents: M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols (Cambridge 1909–12), I, 88–90; Brückmann, 'Latin' (as n. 79), 403–04; Ker, *Catalogue* (as n. 79), no. 33; M. Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue*, 2 vols (Kalamazoo, Mich. 1997), I, 675–85; Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 23–28 (no. 22).

91. Ker, *Catalogue* (as n. 79), 46 (no. 33).

92. Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 71.

93. Gittos, *Liturgy* (as n. 4), 46–48, 228–30. For other textual links with Ramsey and BL, MS Add. 28188: *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), cxlv; *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 76–77; Nelson, 'Second' (as n. 71), 363 n. 12; J. L. Nelson, 'The Rites of the Conqueror', in *Anglo-Norman Studies* 4 (Woodbridge 1982), 117–32, 210–21, repr. in her *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London and Ronceverte 1986), 375–401, at 382.

94. Budny, *Insular* (as n. 90), I, 676–79.

95. Edition: *Monastic Constitutions* (as n. 14). Discussion: Pfaff, *Liturgy* (as n. 14), 106–10.

96. *Monastic Constitutions* (as n. 14), xxviii, xxx; Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (as n. 16), 155.

97. *Monastic Constitutions* (as n. 14), xxxi; Pfaff, *Liturgy* (as n. 14), 109 and references.

98. Contents: Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), no. 95. Discussion: K. D. Hartzell, 'An unknown English Benedictine gradual of the eleventh century', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4 (1975), 131–44; Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 331; R. Gameson, 'English Manuscript Art in the late Eleventh Century: Canterbury and its Context', in *Canterbury* (as n. 16), 95–141, at 117 n. 77, 120 n. 86; R. Gameson, 'The Divine Service in the Aftermath of the Norman Conquest', in *Treasures of Durham University Library*, ed. R. Gameson (London 2007), 34–5; Pfaff, *Liturgy* (as n. 14), 180–83. I am grateful to Richard Gameson for comments about this manuscript.

99. M. Gullick and R. W. Pfaff, 'The Dublin Pontifical (TCD 98[B.3.6]): St Anselm's?', *Scriptorium*, 55 (2001), 284–94, pls 58–60. This follows the statement made by Heslop, 'Canterbury Calendars' (as n. 16), 60 n. 17 that it 'must be from Anselm's time', comments about its likely Christ Church origin by Gameson, 'English' (as n. 98), 120 n. 86; T. Webber, 'Script and Manuscript Production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest', in *Canterbury* (as n. 16), 145–58, at 155, 158 and reported in Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), 54 n. 60, 61, and pertinent observations by T. Kozachek, 'Tonal Neumes in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Pontificals', *Plainsong and Medieval Music*, 6.2 (1997), 119–41, at 134–35. Contents listed in: M. L. Colker, *Trinity College Library Dublin: Descriptive Catalogue of the Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Manuscripts*, 2 vols (Aldershot 1991), I, 195–98, II, pl. X; Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 147–53 (no. 82).

100. Edition: *Claudius Pontificals* (as n. 4), 115–22 (pp. xxxix–xlii for date); J. Brückmann, 'The Ordines of the Third Recension of the Medieval English Coronation Order', in *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson*, ed. T. A. Sandquist and M. R. Powicke (Toronto 1969), 99–115, at 103; Gullick and Pfaff, 'Dublin Pontifical' (as n. 99), 290; Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), 54 and n. 63.

101. Edition: *The Pontifical of Magdalen College: with an Appendix of Extracts from other English Mss. of the Twelfth Century*, ed. H. A. Wilson, Henry Bradshaw Society 39 (London 1910), with description of the other manuscripts on pp. xiii–xvi. The contents of the other two are listed in: M. R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: A Descriptive Catalogue*, 4 vols (Cambridge, 1900–04), I, 348–50 (no. 249); Brückmann, 'Latin' (as n. 79), 411–12, 414.

102. *Pontifical of Magdalen College* (as n. 101), xxxi (p. viii for Canterbury associations of the Magdalen Pontifical).

103. *Ibid.*, xiv–xv; *Liber pontificalis* (as n. 89), xxxi–xxxii.

104. Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 12–16, 120–27, 507–14 (nos 16, 61, 302).

105. Gullick and Pfaff, 'Dublin Pontifical' (as n. 99), 290 n.16. Work on individual rites that discuss these manuscripts includes: Brückmann, 'Ordines' (as n. 100); Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 331–34; Jones,

Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral

'Origins' (as n. 5), 242-44; *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), cxlv n. 241; Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28).

106. Contents listed in: Leroquais, *Pontificaux* (as n. 87), II, 185-93 (no. 154). Brief discussion of particular rites: Kozachek, 'Repertory' (as n. 5), 331-34; Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 242-44.

107. *Pontifical of Magdalen College* (as n. 101), xxvii-xxix.

108. T. Webber, 'The Script', in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, ed. M. Gibson, T. A. Heslop and R. W. Pfaff (London and University Park, PA 1992), 13-24, at 23 n. 35; T. A. Heslop, 'The Illuminated Initials', in *ibid.*, 53-59, at 58; but note Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), 55 n.68. Contents: Brückmann, 'Latin' (as n. 79), 435. Discussion: Brückmann, 'Ordines' (as n. 100), esp. 106; *Liber pontificalis* (as n. 89), xxxiv; *Pontifical of Magdalen College* (as n. 101), xxvi-xxvii, xxix-xxx1.

109. T. A. Heslop, 'Eadwine and his Portrait', in *Eadwine Psalter* (as n. 108), 178-85, at 184 n. 33.

110. *Pontifical of Magdalen College* (as n. 101), xxix-xxx1. Discussion of its coronation ordo: Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), esp. 56, and 58, 62, 65 where he suggests their rites were corrected against a copy of the Romano-Germanic Pontifical.

111. *Pontifical of Magdalen College* (as n. 101), xxiii-xxvi, xxix-xxx1; Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), esp. 56.

112. Jones, 'Origins' (as n. 5), 243-44.

113. Garnett, 'Third Recension' (as n. 28), 54-55; Brückmann, 'Ordines' (as n. 100), 103; Brückmann, 'Latin' (as n. 79), 412-13 (earlier 12th); Hartzell, *Catalogue* (as n. 11), 7 (no. 10: third quarter). Other discussion: *Liber pontificalis* (as n. 89), xxx1.

114. *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints*, ed. M. Lapidge, Henry Bradshaw Society 106 (London 1991), 63; *Leofric Missal* (as n. 2), I, 75; *Sacramentary of Ratoldus* (as n. 34), ci.

115. Dumville, *Liturgy* (as n. 6), 72.

116. Gittos, 'Hallowing' (as n. 5), esp. 251, 270-73.