

Gregory the Great as ‘Apostle of the English’ in Post-Conquest Canterbury

by PAUL HAYWARD

Offering a new interpretation of the sermon ‘De ordinatione beati Gregorii anglorum apostoli’, a text preserved in Eadmer’s ‘personal manuscript’ (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 371), this article argues that the cult of St Gregory the Great was promoted by Archbishop Lanfranc (1070–89) and Archbishop Anselm (1093–1109) in order to undermine the pretensions to apostolic rank of St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury. It draws attention to the existence of a hitherto unrecognised but major conflict over apostolic authority that took place in England after the Norman Conquest; a conflict that involved the king as well as Canterbury’s most important churchmen. In so doing, this essay contributes, more generally, to our understanding of the roles that the cult of saints and its rhetorical structures played in battles over status and rank order.

For anyone familiar with the once traditional characterisation of Archbishop Lanfranc (1070–89) as the arch-critic of English saints’ cults,¹ one of the most intriguing features of his monastic statutes is the

AASS=*Acta sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland and others, Antwerp 1643–; Bodl. Lib.=Bodleian Library, Oxford; BHL=*Bibliotheca hagiographica latina, antiquae et mediae aetatis*, ed. Socii Bollandiani (Subsidia Hagiographica vi, 1898–9) with *Novum supplementum*, ed. H. Fros (Subsidia Hagiographica lxx, 1986); BN=Bibliothèque nationale, Paris; HBS=Henry Bradshaw Society; CCCC=Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; MGH=Monumenta germaniae historiae; OMT=Oxford Medieval Texts; RRAN=*Regesta regum anglo-normannorum, 1066–1154*, ed. H. W. C. Davis and others, Oxford 1913–69; RS=Rolls Series

The author wishes to thank Christopher Brooke for reading and commenting on the present paper.

¹ The primary basis of this characterisation is, of course, Eadmer’s account of Lanfranc’s investigation of St Ælfheah’s claims to sanctity: *Vita S. Anselmi, episcopi cantuariensis* (BHL 526a), i. 30, ed. R. W. Southern, in *The Life of St Anselm by Eadmer*, 2nd edn (OMT, 1972), 50–4. Note also Gervase of Canterbury, *Actus pontificum cantuariensis ecclesiae*, ed. W. Stubbs, in *Gervasi monachi cantuariensis opera historica* (RS lxxiii, 1879–80), ii. 325–414 at p. 372, where Lanfranc is said to have suppressed the liturgical commemorations associated with those of his predecessors, including Adelard, Ælfric and Bregwine, for whom ‘authentic writings’ could not be found. The traditional view has been contested by S. J. Ridyard, ‘*Condigna veneratio*: post-Conquest attitudes to the saints of the Anglo-Saxons’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* ix (1986), 179–206, and R. W. Pfaff, ‘Lanfranc’s supposed purge of the Anglo-Saxon calendar’, in T. Reuter (ed.), *Warriors and churchmen in the high Middle Ages: essays presented to Karl Leyser*, London–Rio Grande, Ohio

role played by the natal feast of St Gregory the Great – the anniversary of his death and rebirth in heaven on 12 March 604. Lanfranc singles out for special treatment thirty-five feasts of the temporal and sanctoral cycles and divides them into three ranks: five, including Easter and Christmas, to be celebrated with the utmost grandeur, fifteen to be kept with almost as much magnificence and another fifteen to be observed with somewhat less splendour. Gregory's natal feast is placed in the second group, together with that of Augustine, here designated the 'archbishop of the English'. Thus far the treatment given to Gregory's cult is in keeping with that of Lanfranc's Cluniac models,² but the text then goes on to state that Gregory's feast is to be accorded this distinguished rank because he is 'our – that is, the English people's – apostle'.³ With these words this authoritarian and sometimes oppressive⁴ Norman prelate would appear to have embraced a saint's cult that was dear to his English subjects. There is the possibility, of course, that they were interpolated into the text soon after the archbishop's death, for all of the surviving manuscripts were produced after his pontificate.⁵ But even if we allow for this relatively unlikely scenario, this gloss will still have originated at Christ Church and has still to be seen as a reflection of the archbishopric's intentions that demands explanation.

1992, 95–108, but to no great effect. The older view has been vindicated and amplified by T. A. Heslop, 'The Canterbury calendars and the Norman Conquest', in R. Eales and R. Sharpe (eds), *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, saints and scholars, 1066–1109*, London–Rio Grande, Ohio 1995, 53–85; P. A. Hayward, 'Translation-narratives in post-Conquest hagiography and English resistance to the Norman Conquest', *Anglo-Norman Studies* xxi (1999), 67–93, esp. pp. 70–3; and with contrasting arguments by J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against history: the competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum* lxxiv (1999), 279–309. The fundamental discussion remains R. W. Southern's *Saint Anselm and his biographer*, Cambridge 1963, 277–87, now revised as *Saint Anselm: a portrait in a landscape*, Cambridge 1990, 312–20.

² Compare *Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis abbatis*, ed. P. Dinter, CCM x, Siegburg 1980, 62–3, and M. Gibson, 'Normans and Angevins, 1070–1220', in P. Collinson, N. Ramsay and M. Sparks (eds), *A history of Canterbury Cathedral*, Oxford 1995, 38–68 at pp. 41–3.

³ 'quia nostre, id est Anglorum gentis, apostolus est': Lanfranc, *Decreta monachis cantuariensibus transmissa*, ed. D. Knowles, rev. C. N. L. Brooke, in *The monastic constitutions of Lanfranc* (OMT, 2002), 92. Knowles thought this clause 'one of the few recognisable touches of Lanfranc's own hand', but Christopher Brooke, in the revised edition, detects an echo of Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum* ii. 1, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (OMT, 1969), 122–3: '[Gregorius] nostram, id est Anglorum, gentem ... conuertit'.

⁴ Even the author of the *Acta Lanfranci*, ed. J. M. Bately, in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS A* (*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* iii), Cambridge 1986, 84–9, admits as much: 'while he lived he crushed the murmuring of the others with his terror' ('inquietudinem ceterorum donec uixit, sua formidine quassauit').

⁵ Cf. Gibson, 'Normans and Angevins', 41. The earliest known copy (Durham Cathedral Library, MS B.iv. 24, fos 47–73) was produced between 1091 and 1096: M. Gullick, 'The scribal work of Eadmer of Canterbury to 1109', *Archaeologia Cantiana* cxviii (1998), 173–89 at p. 183. On the transmission of the *Decreta* see now *Monastic constitutions*, pp. xliii–xlix.

This essay will show, I hope, that Lanfranc and his successor, Anselm (1093–1109) had a carefully crafted policy of promoting the cult of Gregory the Great; and that this policy, far from being benign support of a worthy Anglo-Saxon observance, was an act of aggression targeted at their opponents. The argument is not, however, that the archbishopric of York was, as one might well assume,⁶ the primary target.

To be sure, the defence of Canterbury's position in the primacy dispute 'proper' required due respect for and much reference to Gregory's role in the foundation of the English Church, as, for example, in the tract which Archbishop Ralph d'Escures (1114–22) prepared for presentation to Pope Calixtus II (1119–24),⁷ and in the papal privileges which Canterbury forged as a last resort.⁸ But promoting Gregory's cult could do little to enhance Canterbury's position in this conflict. For, as the papal privilege which Calixtus issued in 1120 confirmed,⁹ York's insistence on equality was more in keeping with Gregory's plans than were Canterbury's pretensions to lordship over the northern province. Gregory had envisaged two archbishoprics of equal status, one based at London the other at York,¹⁰ and special pleading

⁶ Cf. A. T. Thacker, 'Memorializing Gregory the Great: the origins and transmission of a papal cult', *Early Medieval Europe* vii (1998), 59–84, esp. pp. 76–7, who suggests that the cult was first promoted by Archbishop Theodore in his efforts to 'make good his claim to be archbishop of Britain'. See likewise idem, 'Peculiaris patronus noster: the saint as patron of the state in the early Middle Ages', in J. R. Maddicott and D. M. Palliser (eds), *The medieval state: essays presented to James Campbell*, London 2000, 1–24, esp. pp. 17–22. But given Gregory's plans for the organisation of the English Church it could be argued that the development of the cult owed more to northern resistance to such designs than to the pretensions of Canterbury. Certainly, Northumbrian centres, not least the monastery of Whitby where the earliest *Vita* of Gregory was written between 704 and 714, figure prominently in the cult's emergence in the late seventh and early eighth-century: *Liber beati et laudabilis viri Gregorii pape urbis Rome de vita atque eius virtutibus* (BHL 3637), ed. B. Colgrave, in *The earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an anonymous monk of Whitby*, Cambridge 1985, 72–138.

⁷ *Epistola ... querentis de injuria sibi et ecclesie cantuariensi illata in consecratione archiepiscopi, et causis ecclesie eboracensis*, ed. J. Raine, in *Historians of the Church at York and its archbishops* (RS lxxi, 1879–94), ii. 228–51.

⁸ The texts are printed in H. Boehmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks von Canterbury*, Leipzig 1902, 145–61. Southern, *Portrait*, 342, 352–64, argues persuasively that these charters were first deployed between 1120 and 1123 in the midst of the crisis which accompanied Thurstan's return to England, immediately after they had been concocted. See also idem, 'The Canterbury forgeries', *EHR* lxxiii (1958), 193–226; cf. M. T. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, Oxford 1978, 169–70, 213–17.

⁹ 'neque, quod penitus a beato Gregorio prohibitum est, ullo modo Eboracensis Cantuariensis dicioni subiaceat': Hugh the Chanter, *The history of the Church of York, 1066–1127*, ed. C. Johnson, rev. M. Brett, C. N. L. Brooke and M. Winterbottom (OMT, 1990), esp. pp. 168. See, more generally, *ibid.* 156–7, 168–75, 222–3. See also B. Schilling, *Guido von Vienne – Paps Calixt II.*, MGH Schriften xlv, Hanover 1998, 433–45; M. Cheney, 'Some observations on a papal privilege of 1120 for the archbishops of York', this *JOURNAL* xxxi (1980), 429–39.

¹⁰ *Registrum epistolarum*, xi. 39, ed. D. Norberg, CCL cxl, 1982, ii. 934–5; Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* i. 29, pp. 104–7.

was required to explain away his letter to this effect. Lanfranc attempted to deny its relevance by arguing that it pertained only to the status of the bishoprics of York and London, not to that of Canterbury.¹¹ Eadmer, developing Lanfranc's explanation, made Richard de Belmeis, bishop of London (1108–27), attempt to assert seniority over Thomas II, archbishop of York (1108–14), at Henry I's Christmas court in 1109 on the basis of this 'institutio beati Gregorii Anglorum apostoli'.¹² But the strength of Canterbury's case always lay, however much its proponents may have attempted to flesh out the argument with the pope's teachings, not in Gregory's intentions for the English Church but in historical realities, not least the lordship that the pre-Conquest archbishops, most notably Theodore (668–90) and Oda (941–8), could be shown, on the authority of Bede and of other pre-Conquest historical texts, to have achieved over York.¹³ When it came to fighting York's attempts to escape Canterbury's jurisdiction there was little to be gained by promoting the cult of St Gregory.

It is the argument of this essay that the primary targets of Lanfranc and Anselm's interest in the cult were the abbot and monks of St Augustine's Abbey. Located just outside the walls of Canterbury, this monastery was attempting to win greater status and an exemption from the jurisdiction of its bishop on the grounds that such privileges were due to the resting place of the apostle of the English. Promoting Gregory's cult provided Lanfranc and Anselm with powerful means of contesting the abbey's claims, for it had been a long-established tradition of the Anglo-Saxon Church that Gregory, not Augustine, was the nation's apostle. It was in the context of this struggle over episcopal and apostolic authority that the cult had much to offer these Norman prelates. It will be useful to begin by examining the role that apostolic saints' cults played in the articulation of claims to status and authority in the medieval Church.

Apostolic cults in the Middle Ages

The meaning of the concept 'apostle' has been contested throughout its history. In its broadest sense the term refers to missionaries who establish branches of the Church in areas previously untouched by the faith. Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés refers to apostles as 'forging sheepfolds of

¹¹ *The letters of Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson (OMT, 1979), no. 4, p. 54; cf. no. 3, p. 42.

¹² *Historia novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule (RS lxxxi, 1884), 212.

¹³ See, for example, Eadmer's *Vita et miracula S. Wilfridi eboracensis* (BHL 8893), ed. and trans. B. J. Muir and A. J. Turner, in *The Life of Saint Wilfrid by Eadmer*, Exeter 1998, 8–161, esp. §§ 35, 62, 88, 94–5, 97, 115, 117, where Wilfrid is presented as a 'bishop' of York rightly, though not always, obedient to Canterbury, the see that is 'totius Britannie mater', and where Oda is shown to have exercised authority in Northumbria.

Christianity',¹⁴ a phrase which conjures up the image of a pioneer clearing virgin forest, fencing out territory, sowing pastures and nurturing new flocks. In the New Testament the concept is used in this sense to refer to itinerant preachers sent out from established communities to preach the Gospel,¹⁵ but even here there is much evidence of diverse attempts to restrict its application. For Paul, the apostle was a missionary sent by Christ himself: only someone who had received a personal commission from the risen Christ could be his apostle.¹⁶ For Luke, there could only be twelve apostles. He describes how Jesus 'called his disciples, and chose from them twelve, whom he named apostles'.¹⁷ Later, he presents Judas Iscariot's betrayal of Jesus as a rejection of his apostolic office, and has St Matthew elected to take his place in the twelve.¹⁸ In the Middle Ages attempts both to extend and to restrict the application of the concept were many and various.¹⁹ Some founding fathers were held to be apostles commissioned, after the fashion of St Paul, through a vision of Jesus Christ himself. Others were held to be apostolic in as much as they were disciples chosen by the original twelve, as in the case of St Julian, supposed founder of the see of Le Mans. It was alleged that the Apostle Peter had called him 'into the number of the seventy disciples' and sent him forth to Gaul 'to preach and carry out the pontifical office'.²⁰ In his desperation to raise St Martial of Limoges to apostolic status, Adémar of Chabannes even attempted to define as apostles all the seventy-two disciples whom Luke says were sent forth by Christ.²¹ From the eighth century, moreover, the term was

¹⁴ 'Christianitatis ouilia cuderent': *Sermo de fundamento et incremento christianitatis*, §13, ed. Ute Önnertors, in *Abbo von Saint-Germain-des-Prés, 22 Predigten: Kritische Ausgabe und Kommentar*, Frankfurt-am-Main 1985, 136.

¹⁵ Acts xiv. 13; Philippian ii. 25; Romans xvi. 7; 1 Corinthians ix. 5. See further S. Brown, 'Apostleship in the New Testament as a historical and theological problem', *New Testament Studies* xxx (1984), 474–80.

¹⁶ Galatians i. 1, 15–17; Romans i. 1. See further J. H. Schütz, *Paul and the anatomy of apostolic authority*, London 1975.

¹⁷ Luke vi. 13; cf. Mark iii. 13–14.

¹⁸ Acts i. 15–26; cf. Revelations xii. 14.

¹⁹ For what follows see further A. Angenendt, *Heilige und Reliquien: die Geschichte ihres Kultes vom frühen Christentum bis zur Gegenwart*, Munich 1994, 38–40; H. Fichtenau, *Lebensordnungen des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart 1984, 23–9; H. U. Rudolf, *Apostoli gentium: Studien zum Apostelepitheton unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Winfried-Bonifatius und seiner Apostelbeinamen*, Göppingen 1971, passim.

²⁰ *Vita Juliani episcopi cenomannensi* (BHL 4545), §12, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru, in *Actus pontificum cenomannis in urbe degentium*, Le Mans 1901, 28–39, quoted in W. Goffart, *The Le Mans forgeries*, Cambridge, Mass. 1966, 354, 359. On this approach and its relationship to the controversy about *chorepiscopi* see *ibid.* 194–207.

²¹ *Epistola de apostolatu s. Martialis*, PL cxli. 98–9, after Luke x. 1. The number is specified as 72 in the Vulgate but as 70 in some other versions of the Bible. See further D. F. Callahan, 'Sermons of Adémar of Chabannes and the cult of St Martial in Limoges', *Revue bénédictine* lxxxvi (1976), 251–95, and 'Adémar of Chabannes and his insertions into Bede's *Expositio actuum apostolorum*', *Analecta Bollandiana* cxi (1993), 385–400; R. Landes, *Relics, apocalypse and the deceipts of history: Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034*, Cambridge, Mass. 1995.

extended, without much opposition, to cover the leaders of large-scale missions that brought about the conversion of entire peoples. In this way, the missionaries Patrick and Boniface came to be recognised as the apostles of the Irish and Germans respectively.

Behind these struggles over definition lay conflicts over status and authority. In the primitive period claims to apostolic authority conferred great power over the direction of the Church since, after Christ's ascent to heaven, there were no higher authority figures. 'God has appointed in the church', writes Paul, 'first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues'.²² In Paul's conception, the apostles stood above the Christian community, subject only to Christ's judgement, and empowered to demand obedience from all Christians.²³ Moreover, debates over who had been an apostle continued to resound down through the history of the Church, because questions about the position of churches within the elaborate structure of dioceses, provinces, vicariates and patriarchates that evolved from the second century were often decided by reference to the rank of their founding fathers in the hagiological hierarchy. Churches founded by apostles – especially those that possessed their relics and in which they were, therefore, still 'present' in their shrines – were entitled to the deference of those founded by martyrs or confessors, or so those who stood to benefit from this approach to ecclesiology argued. Since there was no higher kind of saint, there was no better trump card than an apostolic cult. All the important bishoprics had an apostolic founder or forged historical narratives to this effect where they were lacking. Most notoriously, the see of Constantinople fabricated the legend that it had been founded by the Apostle Andrew, the first disciple, so that its claim to patriarchal status could be made stronger than that of Rome.²⁴

Claims to apostolic status figure strongly, if with less frequency and finality, among the arguments used to justify primacy within the monastic order. In France and Italy possession of the relics of St Benedict of Nursia, the author of the rule that had become the basis of western monasticism, formed the basis of the two most successful arguments. In France, Fleury claimed from the ninth century to have acquired Benedict's body from Montecassino by *furta sacra*, and in 997, because Benedict was the *dux* of monasticism, Pope Gregory V issued a privilege that declared the abbot of Fleury 'primus inter abbates Gallie'.²⁵ In Italy, Montecassino maintained that it was still in

²² 1 Cor. xii. 28; cf. Ephesians ii. 20; Jude i. 17; 2 Peter iii. 2.

²³ 1 Cor. iv. 3, 9; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. x. 8; xiii. 1–3.

²⁴ See further F. Dvornik, *The idea of apostolicity in Byzantium and the legend of the Apostle Andrew*, Cambridge, Mass. 1958.

²⁵ *Papsturkunden, 896–1046*, ed. H. Zimmermann, Vienna 1984–9, no. 335. The charter is genuine, but depends on various forgeries concocted by Abbo of Fleury: M. Mostert, 'Die

possession of Benedict's body, and in 1059 Pope Nicholas II confirmed the abbey's right to a primacy over all monasteries.²⁶ During the eleventh century, however, custody of relics of alleged apostles became the basis of several new claims to primacy among the monastic order in southern France, such as that developed by the abbey of St Martial of Limoges.²⁷

Much was at stake in these struggles. Primacy of rank brought concrete advantages, many of which are illustrated by the contents of the papal privilege that Fulda obtained from Leo IX in 1049.²⁸ This bull represents the culmination of a long campaign to secure primatial status among the monasteries of Germany, pursued in large part through forgery and manipulation, successive popes having been persuaded to endorse grants that their predecessors had not made.²⁹ It confers on the abbot of Fulda 'a primacy of seating' before the other abbots of Germany and Gaul in all places and at all meetings. This was far from being an insignificant privilege. Synods were chaired by the bishop with *primatus sedendi*. He could direct and control the course of their deliberations; he had the right to announce his opinion first and could thus provide a lead for the lesser prelates who had to speak after him.³⁰ The abbot of the first monastery exercised an analogous role, being seated in close proximity to the presiding bishop at meetings of both abbots and bishops and taking charge when the abbots met separately to consider their opinion.³¹ The bull also confers on the abbot of Fulda the right to wear the pontifical mitre and sandals while celebrating mass – to claim the rank if not the powers of a bishop.³² It grants the monastery an exceptionally thorough exemption from the jurisdiction of its diocesan: no priest, certainly not the bishop, is to have *ditio* or authority in the abbey; the bishop is not to perform consecrations or to say mass in the monastery except

Urkundenfälschungen Abbos von Fleury', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, MGH Schriften xxxiii, Hanover 1988, iv. 287–318.

²⁶ PL cxliii. 1306, no. 3.

²⁷ The challenge to the status of other churches was clear to the abbey's critics: Adémar, *Epistola de apostolatu s. Martialis*, PL cxli. 91. For the wider context see A. G. Remensnyder, *Remembering kings past: monastic foundation legends in medieval southern France*, Ithaca, NY 1995, esp. pp. 95–9.

²⁸ M. Rathsack (ed.), *Die Fuldaer Fälschungen: eine rechtshistorische Analyse der päpstlichen Privilegien des Klosters Fulda von 751 bis ca. 1158*, Stuttgart 1989, ii. 415–20. There are no doubts as to this bull's authenticity: the original, copied in the hand of the papal chancellor, still survives.

²⁹ Cf. *Papsturkunden*, nos 16, 42, 43, 71, 99, 112, 113, 122, 150, 199, 201, 321, 339, 379, 380, 526, 546, 589, 590, 616, 626.

³⁰ Fichtenau, *Lebensordnungen*, 21, 30–2.

³¹ In a privilege attributed to Pope Silvester II (*Papsturkunden*, no. 380), the abbot of Fulda is granted the honour of being first among all the monasteries of Germany 'in sessione sive in iudiciali sententia seu in omnibus conciliis atque ordinibus'. See also *Papsturkunden*, nos 526, 590.

³² In a forgery attributed to Gregory V (*ibid.* no. 339), the *pontificalia* are defined as 'tokens' ('pignora') that signify the abbey's direct subjection to the Roman Church, and in another attributed to John XIX (*ibid.* no. 590), the *pontificalia* are granted that the abbot 'might appear especially marked out (*insignitus*) above others with the privilege of our love'.

when invited by the abbot; the abbot is to be blessed by the pope; he is to be judged by the pope if accused of a crime; and he has the right to preach by the authority of St Peter – that is, without first seeking the bishop’s permission.³³ There was, in short, much that monasteries as well as bishoprics might gain by establishing a primacy within a major national Church, and this could be achieved by, among other means, wining recognition for the apostolic status of one’s founder or patron. In England, however, there does not appear to have been any serious interest in realising the potential of such cults until the eleventh century.

The apostles of the English

Until the eleventh century there was a broad consensus that Pope Gregory the Great, a saint whose bodily relics were not claimed by any English church, was the ‘apostle of the English’. Gregory had played a guiding role in the conversion of the English.³⁴ In 596, driven by the belief that it was his duty to ensure that all peoples had received the Gospel before the impending apocalypse, he chose Augustine, then a monk at the monastery of St Andrew in Rome, to head a mission to convert the Anglo-Saxons. After some prevarication and delay, Augustine arrived in England in 597, having been consecrated a bishop at Arles. Within four years, he had secured the conversion of Æthelberht, the king of Kent, and set about creating a structure for the new English Church, establishing his cathedral at Canterbury, the leading city in Æthelberht’s kingdom. This cathedral later became a metropolitan see when the Roman mission to England was unable to realise Gregory the Great’s plan of making London the seat of the southern of England’s two provinces. Augustine also began building the monastery outside the walls of the city which would later come to be known as St Augustine’s. It was here that he was buried when he died in about 604.

Given that Gregory never visited Britain, Augustine, the actual leader of the mission, might seem to be the most obvious candidate for recognition as the English apostle, yet from the start and without apparent dispute this title was accorded to Gregory among Anglo-Saxons north and south of the Humber. For the Southumbrian poet Aldhelm he was ‘our teacher, *ours* I say, who removed the error of filthy heathenism from our parents and

³³ On the scope and implications of claims to exemption in this period see now B. H. Rosenwein, *Negotiating space: power, restraint and privileges of immunity in early medieval Europe*, Manchester 1999, esp. pp. 106–9, 171–2. See also H. H. Anton, *Studien zu den Klosterprivilegien der Päpste im frühen Mittelalter*, Berlin 1975, 49–92; B. Szabó-Bechstein, *Libertas ecclesiae: ein Schlüsselbegriff des Investiturstreits und seine Vorgeschichte, 4.–11. Jahrhundert*, Rome 1985.

³⁴ On the context and course of the mission to England see I. N. Wood, ‘The mission of Augustine of Canterbury to the English’, *Speculum* xlix (1994), 1–17, and R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his world*, Cambridge 1997, 177–87.

handed over the rule of regenerating grace'.³⁵ The Northumbrian author of the *Whitby Life* describes him, likewise, as 'our St Gregory', as 'our blessed master' and as 'our blessed apostolic Gregory'.³⁶ Bede, another Northumbrian, describes Gregory as the vigilant apostle of our people,³⁷ and in the *Historia ecclesiastica* the case for recognising him as such is made with real passion:

We [the English] can and should by rights call him [Gregory] our apostle, for though he held the most important see in the whole world and was head of Churches which had long been converted to the true faith, yet he made our nation, till then enslaved to idols, into a Church of Christ, so that we may use the apostle's words about him, 'If he is not an apostle to others yet at least he is to us, for we are the seal of his apostleship in the Lord'.³⁸

In the eighth and ninth centuries, likewise, Gregory was seen as the English apostle by Frankish writers such as Paul the Deacon († 799), the author of the earliest *vita* of Gregory composed outside England,³⁹ and Fulk, the archbishop of Rheims (883–900) who corresponded with Alfred the Great.⁴⁰ In the late tenth century the monastic reformer Æthelwold referred to Gregory as 'our holy patron',⁴¹ and Ælfric of Eynsham, following Bede as transmitted through Paul the Deacon, declared that Gregory is 'rightly the apostle of the English nation, for through his wisdom and his mission he rescued us from worship of the devil and inclined us to God's faith'.⁴²

Augustine's cult was relatively weak before the eleventh century. The calendar associated with the English missionary Willibrord († 739) includes

³⁵ 'Pedagogus noster, noster inquam, qui nostris parentibus errorem tetrae gentilitatis abstulit et regenerantis gratiae normam tradidit': *De virginitate prosa*, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH Auctores antiquissimi xv, Berlin 1919, 211–323 at p. 314.

³⁶ *Liber Gregorii pape Rome*, §§5, 6, 30, pp. 80, 82, 134.

³⁷ *In Lucam Evangelium expositio*, ed. D. Hurst, CCL cxx, Turnhout 1960, 7.

³⁸ *Historia ecclesiastica* ii. 1, pp. 122–3, citing 1 Cor. ix. 2.

³⁹ *Vita beatissimi Gregorii papae urbis Romae* (BHL 3639), ed. H. Grisar, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* xi (1887), 162–73.

⁴⁰ *Councils and synods with other documents relating to the English Church, I: 871–1204*, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke, Oxford 1981, pt 1, no. 4. On the diffusion of Gregory's cult within Frankish territory see B. Judic, 'Le Culte de saint Grégoire le Grand et les origines de l'abbaye de Munster en Alsace', in M. Heinzelmann (ed.), *L'Hagiographie du haut moyen âge en Gaule du nord: manuscrits, textes et centres de production*, Stuttgart 2001, 263–95; P. Jounel, 'Le Culte de saint Grégoire le Grand', in J. Fontaine, R. Gillet and S. Pellistrandi (eds), *Grégoire le Grand*, Paris 1986, 671–80.

⁴¹ *Regularis concordia angliae nationis monachorum sanctimonialiumque*, ed. T. Symons, London 1953, 3. For the attribution of the work see M. Lapidge, 'Æthelwold as scholar and teacher', in B. Yorke (ed.), *Bishop Æthelwold: his career and influence*, Woodbridge 1988, 89–117 at pp. 98–100.

⁴² 'He is rihtlice engliscere ðeode Apostol. for ðan ðe he þurh his ræd. and sande us fram deofles biggengum ætbræd. and to godes geleafan gebigde': *Catholic homilies: the second series: text*, ed. M. Godden, Oxford 1979, ix. 4–6, p. 72; cf. Paul the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii papa*, §16 (173). On the sources of Ælfric's homily see now M. Godden, *Ælfric's Catholic homilies: introduction, commentary and glossary*, Oxford 2000, 403–12.

two feasts for St Gregory,⁴³ but it has none for St Augustine. The records of the 747 Council of Clovesho suggest, indeed, that Augustine's cult first emerged on the coat-tails of Gregory's cult. Canon 17 calls for his *depositio* (26 May) to be celebrated everywhere along with Gregory's *natalis* (12 March) and for Augustine's name to be recited in litanies after that of Gregory. Gregory is designated 'papa et pater ad populus anglorum', Augustine as 'beatus pater et doctor noster'.⁴⁴ This canon was not widely obeyed – litanies in pre-Conquest liturgical books rarely have Augustine immediately after Gregory⁴⁵ – but that only helps to show how much further behind was the former's cult. That Gregory's name was already being widely invoked in English litanies is clear – the Whitby *Life* states as much.⁴⁶ 'St Augustine's' did not, finally, gain currency as a name for the abbey until the ninth century: its usual name was 'St Peter's' after the original dedication to SS Peter and Paul, and this designation continued to be used until the early twelfth century.⁴⁷ The earliest evidence, none of it particularly solid, that St Augustine's Abbey was attempting to present its founder and patron as the *anglorum apostolus* dates from the mid-eleventh century.⁴⁸ The earliest arguably authentic charter in the abbey's archives to describe him as such is a grant attributed to Archbishop Eadsige (1042–50).⁴⁹ Augustine is designated,

⁴³ See n. 141 below.

⁴⁴ *Councils and ecclesiastical documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, ed. A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, Oxford 1869–71, iii. 368. The only surviving manuscript is now badly damaged, but is an authentic product of a late eighth-century 'Southumbrian' scriptorium: see further S. D. Keynes, 'The reconstruction of a burnt Cottonian manuscript: the case of Cotton MS Otho A.I', *British Library Journal* xxii (1996), 113–60. It is worth asking whether this book belonged to St Augustine's, for William Thorne, *Chronica de rebus gestis abbatum S. Augustini Cantuarie* iii. 17, ed. R. Twysden, in *Scriptores X*, London 1652, cols 1753–2226 at col. 1772, shows knowledge of this canon, though his version of the text denotes Gregory as 'pope' and Augustine as *anglorum apostolus*. On the council of 747 and its liturgical reforms see C. Cubitt, *Anglo-Saxon church councils, AD 650–850*, Leicester 1993, 99–152, esp. pp. 149–51.

⁴⁵ Note, for example, that found in BL, MS Royal 2.A.XX (*Anglo-Saxon litanies of the saints*, ed. M. Lapidge [HBS cvi, 1991], 212–13), a Mercian prayerbook copied in the second half of the eighth century and thus a book to which this ruling should have applied. See also *ibid.* 63, on the likelihood that the name 'Augustinus' usually refers to Augustine of Hippo rather than Augustine of Canterbury.

⁴⁶ *Liber Gregorii pape Rome*, §32, p. 138; cf. Thacker, 'Memorializing Gregory', 75.

⁴⁷ *Charters of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, and Minster-in-Thanel*, ed. S. E. Kelly, Oxford 1996, p. xiv.

⁴⁸ It is unfortunate that the opening sentences are all that has survived of a potentially significant Old English homily with the promising rubric 'In die depositionis beati Augustini anglorum doctoris', ed. P. H. Tristram, in *Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition*, Freiburg-im-Breslau 1970, 428. The fragment was copied in the second half of the eleventh century onto the recto of a homiliary that belonged to the abbey (CCCC, MS 162, p. 563). See N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford 1957, no. 38, p. 56.

⁴⁹ *Charters of St Augustine's*, no. 37, p. 131. Repeated reference to the saint leads the editor to infer that this notice was drawn up at the abbey. It is possible that it was 'redrafted' to include

likewise, as 'pastor apostolicus anglorum' and Gregory as 'presul apostolice sedis' in a Ramsey saint's *Life* that was adapted with little alteration from a *Life* of St Mildrith composed at the abbey between 1030 and 1061.⁵⁰ This lost *Life* may well have been part of a much larger cycle of texts later rendered redundant by that produced by Goscelin and subsequently jettisoned.

The evidence is not irrefutable, but the monks appear to have followed the rest of the English Church in regarding Gregory as the English apostle until the mid-eleventh century. The introductory rubric to the abbey's tenth-century copy of John the Deacon defines his work as the 'Vita sancti Gregorii pontificis et anglorum gentis apostoli'.⁵¹ The contents of the calendar in the Bosworth psalter suggest, likewise, that the identity of the English apostle was not an issue at the moment between 988 and about 1016 when it was produced at the abbey.⁵² Gregory figures as 'BEATUS GREGORIUS PAPA'. Augustine's natal feast is entered in majuscules with the title usual for this period: 'SANCTUS AUGUSTINUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS ANGLORUM PRIMUS'.⁵³ It is possible that the change at St Augustine's

these references, since the surviving copy was produced in the thirteenth century. Cf. *ibid.* nos 15, 18, 20, 23A, 35, 38, 39.

⁵⁰ *Passio beatorum martyrum Ethelredi atque Ethelbricti* (BHL 2641), ed. D. W. Rollason in *The Mildrith legend*, Leicester 1982, 90–102 at pp. 90, 93. A statement to the effect that Mildrith's relics rest before the abbey's high altar, between the *cancelli* (*ibid.* 93), indicates that the *Life* of Mildrith on which this *passio* depends was composed between 1030, when they were brought to the abbey, and the reign of Abbot Wulfric (1045–61), when, according to Goscelin, *Historia translationis S. Augustini et aliorum sanctorum* (BHL 781), ii. 4, ed. D. Papebroch, *AASS Maii* vi (1688), 411–43 at p. 433, they were removed to the northern *porticus* in preparation for the demolition of the old church. For the archaeological evidence, which seems to confirm the reliability of Goscelin's account of the earlier building, see the works cited in n. 60 below.

⁵¹ Bodl. Lib., MS Bodley 381, fo. 1r. The provenance depends on its end-papers (now *ibid.* ms. lat. bibl. b. 2) and the presence of two metrical prayers in honour of St Augustine copied by a twelfth-century hand on fo. 192v. On John the Deacon's *Vita Gregorii magni* see n. 138 below.

⁵² BL, MS Add. 37517, fos 2–3 (*English kalendars before AD 1100*, I: *Texts*, ed. F. Wormald [HBS lxxii, 1934], 58–9 at pp. 60, 62). N. Orchard, 'The Bosworth psalter and the St Augustine's missal', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 87–94, has now overturned all but one of the arguments for Christ Church provenance offered by M. Korhammer in 'The origin of the Bosworth psalter', *Anglo-Saxon England* ii (1973), 173–87. The remaining argument is easily dispatched: given Augustine's belated emergence as *apostolus anglorum*, the failure to use this epithet cannot be taken as 'clear proof' (*ibid.* 178) that this calendar has a Christ Church and not a St Augustine's origin. The *terminus ad quem* for the production of the calendar is often placed in 1008, given that Edward the Martyr's feast was entered under 17 March and later erased while the provision requiring celebration of the feast on 18 March is first attested in one manuscript of the Enham code of 1008: V Æthelred 15–16, *Councils and synods*, I/2, 353–4. It appears, however, that the manuscript of this law code was subjected to revision by Bishop Wulfstan II. If so, there can be no certainty that 18 March was the prescribed date prior to Cnut's accession in 1016: see now P. Wormald, *The making of English law: King Alfred to the Norman Conquest*, Oxford 1999–, i. 343–4.

⁵³ Cf. BN, lat. 10062, fos 162, 163, a fragment covering the period from 1 May to 31 August, which also uses the title *archiepiscopus anglorum primus*. This calendar has additions which suggest

was inspired by the example of Limoges: Adémar's attempt to present Martial as an apostle reached its first climax in the late 1020s, shortly before the English abbey appears to have begun its own project; England enjoyed good communications with Aquitaine during Cnut's reign,⁵⁴ and Martial appears among the apostles in the litanies found in several service books copied in England in the early eleventh century.⁵⁵

It is worth noting also that the inception of the abbey's campaign to make Augustine the *anglorum apostolus* coincides with other signs of renewal. In about 1030 Abbot Ælfstan had the relics of St Mildrith, a seventh-century abbess of Minster-in-Thanel, translated to the abbey. This translation legitimised his largely successful effort to reassemble and obtain the extensive endowments of her now extinct monastery.⁵⁶ With these lands the abbey achieved an equality of resources with the cathedral priory,⁵⁷ and its attempt to reclaim the minster's once valuable share of the tolls on ships using the Wantsum Channel brought it into direct competition with the priory, which owned the port of Sandwich. Richard Sharpe has suggested, furthermore, that Ælfstan chose 18 May for the translation of Mildrith's relics in 1030 so that the abbey might have a festival on that date which would compete in future years with the natal feast of St Dunstan that Christ Church celebrated on 19 May.⁵⁸ An attitude of rivalry also seems to have taken hold at the cathedral priory at this time: Eadui Basan ignored certain prominent saints of the abbey, along with those of other communities, and gave Augustine's feast a lower grading than that of Dunstan when he compiled the calendar of the Arundel psalter.⁵⁹ In the late 1040s, furthermore, the abbey began investing

that it was produced at Christ Church, namely, several entries for the translation of St Ælfheah (8, 11, 14 June) and for the obits of two archbishops of Canterbury, Ælfric and Lyfing (6 May, 12 June). It omits to add Mildrith's *translatio* (18 May).

⁵⁴ See G. Beech, 'England and Aquitaine in the century before the Conquest', *Anglo-Saxon England* xix (1990), 81–101.

⁵⁵ For example, CCCC, MS 411, fos 140r–v (ed. Lapidge in *Litanies*, 122–4), which is much more likely to have been produced at Abingdon, than at St Augustine's, as had sometimes been argued (*ibid.* pp. 65–6). The evidence for awareness of St Martial's claim to apostolicity is usefully assembled in M. J. Toswell, 'St Martial and the dating of late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts', *Scriptorium* li (1997), 3–14.

⁵⁶ See *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. xix–xx, xxx–xxxii; R. Sharpe, 'The date of St Mildrith's translation from Minster-in-Thanel to Canterbury', *Mediaeval Studies* liii (1991), 349–54.

⁵⁷ Domesday Book shows that the lands of both houses were reckoned at £600–£700 in 1086: D. Knowles, *The monastic order in England, 940–1216*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 1963, 101–2, 702–3.

⁵⁸ 'Goscelin's St Augustine and St Mildrith: hagiography and liturgy in context', *JTS* n.s. xli (1990), 502–16 at p. 503. This is not the only juxtaposition of conflicting festivities that emerged in the sanctoral cycles of the two churches. For the creation of conflicting ordination feasts on 16 November see n. 202 below.

⁵⁹ *Kalendars before 1100*, 170–81. The calendar omits the feasts of Abbot Hadrian (9 Jan.) and those of Archbishops Mellitus (24 Apr.), Theodore (19 Sept.), Honorius (30 Sept.), Nothelm (17 Oct.) and Justus (10 Nov.), whose relics were all enshrined in the abbey: N. P. Brooks, *The early*

in its architectural profile. Abbot Wulfric (1045–61) remodelled the crossing of the abbey church to accommodate a massive octagonal rotunda of the type then fashionable in Lotharingia.⁶⁰

Indirect evidence suggests that the campaign to make Augustine the *anglorum apostolus* was taken up by the Norman abbots, Scolland (1072–87) and Guy (1087–1093×1106).⁶¹ Scolland seems to have secured some recognition for the abbey's primacy. His attestation is placed at the head of the list of abbots appended to the proceedings of the 1072 Council of London, which was much concerned with questions of rank,⁶² even though most of the abbots present had been appointed before him.⁶³ His attestation appears in the same position in the record of the 1075 Council of London,⁶⁴ and in a royal charter of 1081 for Bury St Edmund's the authenticity of which is no longer in doubt.⁶⁵ Guy also exercised the privilege of having his name recorded first.⁶⁶ This was a new dignity – prior to 1072 the ranking of the abbots in witness lists had been determined by their length of service.⁶⁷ Scolland also began rebuilding the abbey, a project which was continued by Guy, who translated the relics of the abbey's saints to the new church in 1091.⁶⁸ Unfortunately, it is only for the first two decades of the twelfth century

history of the church at Canterbury, Leicester 1984, 264–5. On the matter of grading, note that Eadui entered the major feasts, like Dunstan's, in capitals.

⁶⁰ See further R. D. H. Gem, 'Reconstructions of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, in the Anglo-Saxon period', in N. L. Ramsay, M. Sparks and T. Tatton-Brown (eds), *Dunstan: life, times and cult*, Woodbridge 1992, 57–73 at pp. 67–71; 'The significance of the 11th-century rebuilding of St Augustine's, Canterbury, in the development of romanesque architecture', in N. Goldstream and P. Draper (eds), *Medieval art and architecture at Canterbury before 1220* (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions v, 1982), 1–19 at p. 16; and 'The Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman churches', in R. D. H. Gem (ed.), *English Heritage book of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, London 1997, 109–10; T. Tatton-Brown, 'The buildings and topography of St Augustine's Canterbury', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* cxliv (1991), 61–91.

⁶¹ On Scolland's Norman ancestry see Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. Chibnall (OMT, 1968–80), ii. 248.

⁶² *Councils and synods*, I/2, 603, no. 91.

⁶³ According to the *Acta Lanfranci* (ed. Bately, 85), for what it is worth, Scolland was present, as *electus abbas*, to welcome Lanfranc on his arrival at Canterbury in 1070, but was not actually consecrated until a few days after the council; cf. R. Emms, 'The historical traditions of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 159–68 at p. 160.

⁶⁴ *Councils and synods*, I/2, 607–16, no. 92.

⁶⁵ *Regesta regum anglo-normannorum: the acta of William I (1066–1087)*, ed. D. Bates, Oxford 1998, no. 39. All the other charters bearing Scolland's attestation are forged to some degree. For a full discussion of the present document see *ibid.* pp. 201–5.

⁶⁶ *RRAN* i, nos 315, 318, with the commentary in M. Brett, 'Gundulf and the cathedral communities of Canterbury and Rochester', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 15–25 at pp. 23–4.

⁶⁷ See S. D. Keynes, *The diplomas of Æthelred 'the Unready', 978–1016*, Cambridge 1980, 156–7.

⁶⁸ Gem, 'Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman churches', 110–21; E. C. Fernie, *The architecture of Norman England*, Oxford 2000, 106–8; R. Sharpe, 'The setting of St Augustine's translation, 1091', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 1–13 at pp. 1–3.

that we have textual materials – diplomas and hagiographical narratives – that spell out the implications of Augustine’s apostolic status in detail. The diplomas comprise some five forged papal privileges,⁶⁹ a charter attributed to Augustine himself known as the *Bulla plumbea* on account of its lead seal⁷⁰ and various charters ascribed to the early kings of Kent,⁷¹ together with various authentic documents of recent date that were interpolated solely for the purpose of showing that Augustine was the recognised *anglorum apostolus*.⁷² The hagiographical material includes poems by Reginald, a Poitevin who became a monk of the abbey,⁷³ but is dominated by the monumental cycle that Goscelin, an itinerant hagiographer of Flemish origin who often worked for communities at odds with their Norman bishops and abbots,⁷⁴ was commissioned to produce in honour of the abbey’s patron saints.⁷⁵ In Goscelin’s cycle Augustine and Gregory figure as enjoying apostolic authority in equal measure, the former as *anglorum apostolus*, the latter as the successor of the Apostle Peter. Augustine is expressly presented as the pre-eminent saint of the English Church: he figures as ‘*beatus prothoparens regenerationis gentis Anglicaë*’,⁷⁶ ‘*summus ... sanctorum*

⁶⁹ *Cartularium saxonicum*, ed. W. de G. Birch, London 1885–99, nos 11 (Boniface IV), 31 (Adeodatus), 38 (Agatho), 915, 916 (John XII). The privileges of Pope John XII are also printed in *Papsturkunden*, nos 142–3.

⁷⁰ *Charters of St Augustine’s*, no. 4.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* esp. nos 1–3, 5, 29, 37.

⁷² Note, for example, two charters of William I, both of which survive in a version describing Augustine as *apostolus anglorum* and another which does not: *Acta of William I*, nos 81, 86. For a similar charter ascribed to the king’s brother, Odo of Bayeux, see Thomas of Elmham, *Historia monasterii S. Augustini cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (RS viii, 1858), 353.

⁷³ ‘Raginald von Canterbury’, ed. F. Liebermann, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* xiii (1887–8), 517–56 at pp. 549–55 (items xx–xxx).

⁷⁴ Goscelin’s career has been surveyed many times but for an appreciation of his politics read *The Life of King Edward who rests in Westminster attributed to a monk of St Bertin*, ed. F. Barlow, 2nd edn (OMT, 1992), 133–45, in the light of Hayward, ‘Translation-narratives’, 73–85.

⁷⁵ The cycle has yet to be printed in full. Its chief components are an account of the translations of 1091, *Hist. trans. Augustini* (see n. 50 above), two works on Augustine – *Historia maior de aduentu [seu Vita] S. Augustini* (BHL 777), ed. D. Papebroch, *AASS Maii* vi (1688), 375–95, and *Historia maior de miraculis S. Augustini* (BHL 779), *ibid.* 397–411 – and three on Mildrith – *Vita deo dilectae Mildrethae* (BHL 5960), in Rollason, *Mildrith*, 108–43, *Translatio S. Mildrethae uirginis cum miraculorum attestatione* (BHL 5961, 5964), ed. D. W. Rollason, in ‘Goscelin of Canterbury’s account of the translation and miracles of St Mildrith: an edition with notes’, *Mediaeval Studies* xlviii (1986), 154–210, and the *Libellus contra inanes sanctae uirginis Mildrethae usurpatores* (BHL 5962), ed. M. L. Colker, in ‘A hagiographic polemic’, *Mediaeval Studies* xxxix (1977), 68–97. The works on Augustine also survive in a shorter format: *Historia minor de vita S. Augustini* (BHL 778), ed. H. Wharton, in *Anglia sacra*, London 1691, ii. 51–71, and the unpublished *Historia minor de miraculis S. Augustini* (BHL 780). In the preface to *Historia minor*, Goscelin explains that these texts were produced so that the religious of England’s other churches could rejoice over the saint’s achievement ‘with native love as much as the daughter of their protoparent’ – i.e. as much as St Augustine’s. For the peripheral items see T. D. Hardy, *Descriptive catalogue of materials relating to Great Britain and Ireland to the end of the reign of Henry VII* (RS xxvi, 1862–71), i, nos 502, 587, 591, 600, 657, 682, 850, 916–17.

⁷⁶ *Historia minor de vita Augustini*, §8, p. 59.

Angliae patronorum princeps',⁷⁷ 'in suo apostolatu sanctus sanctorum',⁷⁸ and so on.

The dating of these documents to the first two decades of the twelfth century needs some explanation. The central work of the cycle, the *Historia translationis S. Augustini*, was certainly completed between 1100 and 1109, since it is addressed to Anselm who died in 1109, and alludes to the foundation of the kingdom of Jerusalem in 1099.⁷⁹ Much of the cycle was probably completed along with it. The dating of forgeries is always an uncertain business,⁸⁰ but this decade also appears the most likely occasion for the production of the eight charters preserved in BL, MS Cotton Vespasian B.xx, one of two surviving compendia of Goscelin's works for the abbey. The book was copied in or close to the second decade of the twelfth century. Its contents comprise the chief components of the cycle together with copies, on fos 2rv and 277r–84v, of the *Bulla plumbea*, of two of Æthelberht's supposed charters and of the five alleged papal privileges.⁸¹ None of these alleged diplomas survives in an earlier manuscript.⁸² There is, furthermore, a strong case for associating the production of both the forgeries and Goscelin's cycle with the legal proceedings which the abbey initiated against Archbishop Anselm in late 1106 or 1107.⁸³

⁷⁷ *Historia maior de miraculis Augustini*, §14, p. 400.

⁷⁸ *Hist. trans. Augustini*, ii. 7, p. 434. ⁷⁹ *Ibid.* pref. and i. 46, pp. 411, 426.

⁸⁰ Most commentators opt for an earlier dating: W. Levison, *England and the continent in the eighth century*, Oxford 1946, 174–233, argues that the ten most important documents were all forged around 1070; Gibson, *Lanfranc*, 169–70, implies that the campaign began well before Lanfranc's arrival in 1070; S. E. Kelly, 'Some forgeries in the archive of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, iv. 347–70, and *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. lxii–lxxi, argues for an extended process of forgery and revision beginning in the 1060s and continuing into the twelfth century. An exception is M. Chibnall, 'From Bec to Canterbury: Anselm and monastic privilege', *Anselm Studies: An Occasional Journal* i (1983), 30–1, 35, who inclines towards a date in the first decade of the twelfth century.

⁸¹ For recent accounts of the manuscript see *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. lxiv, xxxix–xl; Rollason, *Mildrith*, 104; Sharpe, 'Goscelin's Augustine and Mildrith', 506–7.

⁸² Their 'prior existence' might be presumed from Goscelin's references to charters of King Æthelberht (*Hist. trans. Augustini* ii. 26, p. 440) and King Eadbald (*ibid.* ii. 9, p. 434), since the charters attributed to these rulers now extant among the abbey's muniments are forgeries: *Charters of St Augustine's*, nos 1–3, 5. But his references are not precise enough to rule out the possibility that he knew earlier versions of these documents destroyed when the present items were produced. It is entirely possible, moreover, that he worked alongside the forgers.

⁸³ Exactly when this particular conflict broke out is unclear. Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 188–9, introduces the story once he has completed his account of the synod which settled the investiture dispute in August 1107, but he appears to compress events. Allowance needs to be made for an extensive correspondence with Rome, and it is likely that the two conflicts ran in parallel to each other. Thomas of Elmham, a fifteenth-century monk of the abbey, preserves Henry I's notification of Hugh's election and dates it to 1106, but his chronology is often flawed: *Historia monasterii S. Augustini*, 31, 366; cf. *RRAN* ii, no. 871. It is possible that Hugh was elected years earlier. John of Worcester, *Chronicon*, ed. and trans. R. R. Darlington, P. McGurk and J. Bray (OMT, 1995–), iii. 64, places the obit of his predecessor, Guy, in 1093, implying

The abbey protested to the royal court against Anselm's insistence that Guy's successor, Abbot Hugh de Flori (1108–26×27) be consecrated before the high altar in the cathedral. Eadmer's account, if it can be trusted, shows that deficiencies in the documents then deployed by the abbey were exposed during the court proceedings. According to Eadmer, the abbey at first claimed to have privileges validating its right to have the abbot consecrated in its own church, but these were found to be 'nullus vel non ratus', 'non-existent or un-proven', and had to be 'condemned', but its advocates were still able to persuade the king that it had been the custom to consecrate the abbot in his own church. Anselm refused to carry out this ruling. The ensuing impasse appears to have lasted for several years, during which time Anselm obtained help from Rome. Pope Paschal II wrote to Henry no less than three times, instructing him to have Hugh blessed without delay lest the abbey should succumb to rack and ruin.⁸⁴ A compromise was finally reached in the final months of 1107 or in January 1108. Anselm offered to perform the blessing in the chapel of the bishop of Rochester's house at Lambeth, where he was then staying. The king accepted his offer, and Hugh was duly blessed there on 27 February 1108. Given that the bishopric of Rochester was the property of the archbishop and that Lambeth was already the archbishop's usual London residence,⁸⁵ this was an outcome fraught with ambiguity. The abbey was to achieve a much clearer victory in 1120. Pope Calixtus II, in the same month that he issued his devastating privilege for York, authorised another validating the papal privileges that the abbey had presented to him and wrote directly to Archbishop Ralph expressly freeing St Augustine's from the symbols of its subjection: the monks were not to be required to make payments in return for chrism or to ring their bells for the canonical hours only when Christ Church had done so first.⁸⁶

that the abbacy was vacant for over fourteen years. This seems improbably long, but John's dating is not contradicted by other evidence: Guy appears in the witness-lists of *RRAN* i, nos 286 (a forgery), 315 (issued at Dover on 27 Jan. 1091) and 318 (a forgery). See D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke and V. C. M. London, *The heads of religious houses, England and Wales, 940–1216*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 2001, 36. It is worth asking whether Hugh was elected in 1100 or 1101, for in the first two years of his reign Henry I, keen to secure his shaky position, filled all the eleven other ecclesiastical vacancies which William Rufus had left outstanding at his death: L. H. Jared, 'English ecclesiastical vacancies during the reigns of William II and Henry I', this *JOURNAL* xlii (1991), 362–93, esp. pp. 375, 390–1.

⁸⁴ Paschal's third letter survives among Anselm's correspondence: *Sancti Anselmi cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, Edinburgh 1946–61, v. 290–1, *ep.* cccli.

⁸⁵ M. Brett, 'The Church at Rochester, 604–1185', in N. Yates and P. A. Welsby (eds), *Faith and fabric: a history of Rochester Cathedral, 604–1994*, Woodbridge 1996, 1–27 at pp. 20–1.

⁸⁶ *Papsturkunden in England*, ed. W. Holtzmann, Berlin 1930–52, i, nos 10, 11. See Schilling, *Guido von Vienne*, 443–4, 793. The so-called 'Domesday monachorum', fo. 1r (*The Domesday monachorum of Christ Church, Canterbury*, ed. D. C. Douglas, London 1944, 78), shows that the chrism payment was very much a rite of submission. As Douglas comments (p. 6), the payment was to be made 'with particular solemnity, the money being either placed upon the high altar

This victory was probably achieved, in part at least, by investing considerable effort in the 'improvement' of the abbey's arsenal of documents and historical records in the interval between Hugh's election and its appeal to Pope Calixtus.

Goscelin's cycle and the forgeries now extant are likely to be products of those efforts. Three passages in book II of Goscelin's *Historia translationis* speak to the consecration issue. In the first Goscelin records how Abbot Wulfric (1045–61) was blessed: chosen to succeed when Abbot Ælfstan had become too infirm to continue, Wulfric was blessed 'at the apostolic altar of St Peter, evidently by the ancient custom of the Roman privilege and liberty, which was first affirmed by apostolic authority'.⁸⁷ In the second Goscelin says that Abbot Æthelsige (1062–70) was consecrated in the royal palace, and in the third he claims that Scolland was 'ordained in his monastery like his predecessors'.⁸⁸ The contents of the cycle show, however, that by claiming apostolic status for its patron the abbey hoped to gain not just control over where the abbot was consecrated but also primatial status and all the privileges that went with it. Thus, Goscelin has Pope Leo IX affirm the abbot's right to a *primatus sedendi* at the synod of Rheims, citing his former patron Bishop Herman of Salisbury as his witness. By apostolic authority Abbot Wulfric was seated after the abbot of Montecassino and the archbishop of Canterbury next to the cardinal bishop of Silva Candida.⁸⁹ Pope Alexander II, likewise, is made to confer on Æthelsige the right to wear the pontifical mitre and sandals on the basis of Augustine's status as a representative of Rome and as an apostle of a particular *gens*: 'We decree', the pope is supposed to have said, 'that the ruler of St Augustine's shall hold this honour in perpetuity on account of St Augustine's dignity as a Roman *alumnus* and as the apostle of the

of Christ Church, or given personally into the hands of the sacristan of that church. With less formality, a large supplementary render was made, and the whole transaction took place on Thursday in Holy Week, the day on which according to ecclesiastical usage the chrism was, and is, bestowed'. It would be nice to know when these requirements were first imposed. On the matter of bell-ringing, the abbey's historians make Lanfranc responsible for compelling the monks to ring the canonical hours only after Christ Church had done so first: see, for example, Thorne, *Chronica*, vii. 8, 10, cols 1791–2.

⁸⁷ 'Abbatem sibi ad apostolicum S. Petri altare, antiqua videlicet Romani privilegii ac libertatis consuetudine, apostolica auctoritate primitus firmata, ordinari fecit': *Hist. trans. Augustini* ii. 2, p. 432.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* ii. 6–7, pp. 433–4. The manner of Guy's consecration is not detailed (i. 2, p. 413), possibly because it happened *in sede metropoli* as the *Acta Lanfranci* (ed. Bately, p. 87), alleges. Note also that the first abbot, Peter, is simply said to have been chosen by the abbey's *sancti institutores*: *Hist. trans. Augustini* ii. 26, p. 440 – an opportunity missed?

⁸⁹ *Hist. trans. Augustini* ii. 3, pp. 432–3. The entire episode is contradicted by Anselm of Reims, *Historia dedicationis ecclesiae S. Remigii* (BHL 4825), §26, ed. J. Hourlier, in *Contribution à l'année Saint-Benoît (480–1980): la Champagne bénédictine*, Reims 1981, 200–60 at pp. 234–6, who reports that Wulfric was seated sixteenth of the abbots present at the synod.

English.⁹⁰ The forgeries, likewise, provide the abbey with a far-reaching exemption of the kind a primatial abbey could expect. The *Bulla plumbea*, for example, enjoins the archbishop not to use his right to bless the new abbot as a means of imposing his lordship upon the abbey, and limits his ability to control the conditions under which this and other rites would be performed. The abbot is to be blessed in the abbey;⁹¹ the abbey is to be free from the payment of dues for customary services; and the abbot shall have the right to say when the archbishop can perform ordinations and celebrate masses there. Given such comprehensive control over when bishops could perform consecrations and blessings, a monastery could negotiate with its diocesan from a position of strength and could thus avoid arbitrary and humiliating demands for money and other services.

Lanfranc and St Augustine's Abbey

The reasons why the monks of St Augustine's attempted to claim apostolic status for their patron are clear enough, but there is some obscurity as to exactly when Lanfranc set about defeating this project. He seems to have been willing to go some way towards accommodating the abbey's aspirations at the beginning of his pontificate – Scolland's primacy among the abbots at the 1072 Council of London could not have been achieved without his tacit approval.⁹² But certain aspects of the abbey's project are likely have proved

⁹⁰ *Hist. trans. Augustini* ii. 6, p. 433. In *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. xxi–xxii, and 'Some forgeries', 364 n. 66, Kelly is inclined to think this grant genuine, citing its similarity to rights won by Fulda at the same synod. However, Goscelin's awareness of developments on the continent (which are amply attested in *Liber confortatorius*, ed. C. H. Talbot, *Studia Anselmiana* xxxvii [1955], 26–117), and his skill in forging claims of this kind have to be taken into account. It is moreover strange that no such grant, not even a purported grant, was entered in the abbey's cartularies.

⁹¹ *Charters of St Augustine's*, no. 4, p. 20. Chibnall, 'From Bec to Canterbury', 23–44, argues that the central issue in the present dispute was that of whether the abbot had to make a written profession or an oral vow of obedience to the archbishop, a question that was much debated in Normandy during this period. But this is to put too fine a point on the matter. The forgeries nowhere deny the archbishop the right to extract a promise, oral or written; rather they attempt to reduce his control over when and where the oath was to be made so that it cannot be used to make unwelcome demands. The professions made by Scolland and Guy are printed by C. E. Woodruff in 'Some early professions of canonical obedience to the see of Canterbury by heads of religious houses', *Archaeologia Cantiana* xxxvii (1925), 53–72 at pp. 60–1. No profession survives for Abbot Hugh de Flori, but this need not imply that none was ever made: S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: the innocence of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent*, Berkeley 1987, 326–7.

⁹² Eadmer, likewise, permits the monastery's first abbot, Peter, to declare that his monastery is 'the first and chief in dignity of all the abbeys of Britain', but on the basis of the church's relative antiquity among 'British' houses rather than of Augustine's apostolic status: *Vita beati Petri primi abbatis cenobii gloriosorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli quod Cantuariæ situm est* (BHL 6702m), ed. A. Wilmart, in 'Edmeri cantuariensis cantor's nova opuscula de sanctorum

unacceptable. An archbishop might sometimes tolerate exemptions in the other dioceses of his province, no matter how hostile a posture he might have to adopt in public, for the purpose of maintaining good relations with his bishops, for these privileges tended to generate business for his own court;⁹³ but an exempt house in his own diocese would be subject to no superior save the pope.⁹⁴ A would-be primate may have been particularly annoyed, moreover, by the existence of such a monastery, for its special relationship with the papacy stood to detract from the quasi-papal aspect of his own authority. The privileges of the primacy were, as Southern explains, three-fold: 'first, the possession of *permanent papal legatine authority* in England; second, ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole of the British Isles; and third, the right to hold councils and summon to meetings participants from this whole area'.⁹⁵ Given that Lanfranc's plan was to establish a vicariate in which matters that would otherwise have been taken to Rome would be diverted to Canterbury, he is most unlikely to have indulged the abbey's desire for an exemption. It follows that Lanfranc may have set about undermining its claims for the apostolic status of its founder as soon as the enormity of its primatial ambitions became clear. Leaving aside the heady mix of fact and propaganda put out by the *Acta Lanfranci*⁹⁶ and the anachronistic data provided by Gervase of Canterbury's *Imaginationes*⁹⁷ and the abbey's historians,⁹⁸ the foundation in about 1085 of St Gregory's provides the best evidence for Lanfranc's opposition.

eneratione et obsecratione', *Revue des sciences religieuses* xv (1935), 554–61 at p. 558. The point is reiterated by another Christ Church monk writing in the margins of the Eadmer's manuscript (CCCC, MS 371): see *ibid.* n. 1.

⁹³ Note, for example, Pope Alexander II's privilege for Bury St Edmund's: *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold (RS xcvi, 1890–6), i. 343–7. This permitted the abbot to appeal to his archbishop over the head of his diocesan, and Lanfranc soon became involved in Abbot Baldwin's dispute with Bishop Herfast. Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 132–3, would have his readers think that Lanfranc 'taking this privilege with difficulty' ('molestè accipiens ipsum privilegium') at first attempted to suppress it, but how could he rescind a papal bull? He might attempt to deploy his primatial authority but to put this to the test in direct opposition to the pope was surely to risk a serious rebuff at a time when papal recognition for this new dignity was far from secure. Indeed, in *Letters*, no. 47, pp. 150–3, he invokes the primacy not in order to check Baldwin's activities but in order to discipline Herfast.

⁹⁴ Knowles, *Monastic order*, 583; Chibnall, 'From Bec to Canterbury', 35.

⁹⁵ *Portrait in a landscape*, 335 (my italics); cf. F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066–1154*, London 1979, 39–46, 119–21.

⁹⁶ The present author has in hand an article on the *Acta Lanfranci*, a document which is far from being a reliable record: 'Some reflections on the historical value of the *Acta Lanfranci*', *Historical Research* lxxvii (2004).

⁹⁷ *Chronica*, ed. W. Stubbs, in *Gervasii opera historica*, i. 68–83. Gervase was writing in the context of a later phase in the dispute, for which see E. John, 'The litigation of an exempt house: St Augustine's, Canterbury, 1182–1237', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* xxxix (1956–7), 390–415.

⁹⁸ The earliest of these is Thomas Sprott's *Gesta abbatum*, an as-yet unprinted mid thirteenth-century chronicle which became the basis of William Thorne's *Chronica* and

The creation of St Gregory's, a college for Canterbury's secular clergy located outside the city's Northgate, has long been recognised as an assault upon the abbey, but less for its dedication than for other features.⁹⁹ The existing foundation charter stresses Gregory's status as the English apostle,¹⁰⁰ but this is recognised as having been heavily revised if not wholly forged in the mid thirteenth century.¹⁰¹ Contemporary materials – comprising Goscelin's *Libellus contra inanes sanctae virginis Mildrethae usurpatores* (BHL 5962), Lanfranc's obituaries and archaeological evidence – draw attention to the college's cemetery and its other cults. The obituaries focus on the college's cemetery, which was certainly an attack upon the abbey, but it is unlikely to have been directed against the abbey's finances, as has been supposed. Assigning the canons revenues from other sources,¹⁰² Lanfranc made the new cemetery open to all free of charge.¹⁰³ Now it is unlikely that a cemetery of this kind will have attracted those with the means to purchase the spiritual advantages of a monastic burial. This much is confirmed by the recent archaeological dig which found some 1,300 skeletons but little sign of

Thomas of Elmham's *Historia monasterii S. Augustini*, produced between 1375 and 1415: *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. lv–lvii, xcvi–xcviii; cf. Emms, 'Historical traditions', 164–8.

⁹⁹ Of the various discussions only Gibson, *Lanfranc*, 190, emphasises the dedication; cf. Rollason, *Mildrith*, 21–5, 62–4; Sharpe, 'Goscelin's Augustine and Mildrith', esp. pp. 503–5; *Charters of St Augustine's*, p. xxiii; R. Fleming, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman cartulary', in C. W. Hollister (ed.), *Anglo-Norman political culture and the twelfth-century renaissance*, Woodbridge 1997, 83–155 at pp. 98–101; E. Cowie, *Religious patronage in Anglo-Norman England*, Woodbridge 1998, 105. For a critique of the view that St Gregory's was established as a challenge to St Augustine's see M. Sparks, 'St Gregory's Priory, Canterbury: a re-assessment', *Archaeologia Cantiana* cxviii (1998), 77–90, esp. p. 85.

¹⁰⁰ 'beatissimus patronus noster et tocius Anglie Gregorius papa', 'et tocius Anglorum terre patronus': *Cartulary of the priory of St Gregory, Canterbury*, ed. A. M. Woodcock (Camden 3rd ser. lxxxviii, 1956), no. 1. Note also Anselm's grant (no. 2), made between August 1108 and April 1109, in honour of the college's dedication.

¹⁰¹ See M. Brett, 'A supplementary note on the charters attributed to Archbishop Lanfranc', in G. d'Onofrio (ed.), *Lanfranco di Pavia e l'Europa del secolo XI nel IX centenario della morte (1089–1989)*, Rome 1993, 521–7 at pp. 523–4. For what it is worth, the foundation charter is attested by Scolland, abbot of St Augustine's, and would have to predate his death on 9 September 1087 if it were genuine.

¹⁰² The college appears to have been financed initially with the rents on thirty-two houses in the city. These were supporting a gild of clerics in 1086, but had been assigned to the college by about 1100: Domesday Book, fo. 3a; Domesday monachorum, fo. 2v (*Domesday monachorum*, 82); T. Tatton-Brown, 'The history of St Gregory's Priory', *Archaeologia Cantiana* cvii (1989), 314–27 at p. 315. It seems likely that some or all of the members of the gild were assigned places in the college.

¹⁰³ 'Similiter foris ciuitatem beati Gregorii ecclesiam composuit, in qua clericos posuit, a quibus morientes et unde sibi sepulturam possent præparare non habentes, absque pretio susciperentur, suscepti illuc deferrentur, delati honeste sepelirentur': *Obitum Lanfranci*, lines 25–9 (ed. M. Gibson in *Lanfranc*, 227–9). See, likewise, Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 15–16; William of Malmesbury, *De gestis pontificum anglorum libri quinque* i. 44, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton (RS lii, 1870), 72.

the use of coffins.¹⁰⁴ Burial dues comprised a share of the deceased's possessions rather than a fixed charge,¹⁰⁵ so the abbey is unlikely to have lost much income with the loss of its monopoly on this end of the burial market. The move had the effect, however, of cutting St Augustine's out of an important pastoral and civic office, precisely because it was an act of charity towards the poor and towards the dying who had been left in the care of Lanfranc's other foundation, the hospital of St John which was located across the road from the college. The measure will not have detracted from the abbey's appeal as a burial church for the rich, but it threatened its position in the hearts of the local community.

Goscelin's *Libellus contra usurpatores* defends St Augustine's from the attempts of the canons of St Gregory's to claim possession of the body of St Mildrith, one of its most important saints. By publicising their claim to possess her relics the canons were contesting the justice of the abbey's possession of the lucrative estates and rights associated with Minster-in-Thamet.¹⁰⁶ It is likely, however, that this move was a deviation from the original scheme. Goscelin states that two bodies were discovered at Lyminge and translated to St Gregory's, where they were placed side-by-side upon the altar. The first was treated from the outset as that of Abbess Eadburg, but the identity of the second was not declared until three years later, when the canons revealed that they believed the body was St Mildrith's.¹⁰⁷ Goscelin also quotes a saint's *Life* produced by the canons in which this purported translation is dated to 1085.¹⁰⁸ It follows from this version of events, which is supported by a set of Old English annals of Christ Church provenance that name Eadburg alone as having been translated to St Gregory's,¹⁰⁹ that the canons first came out in public with a claim to Mildrith's relics in 1088/9 – that is, during the final year of Lanfranc's life. His judgement may have failed him, or he may simply have been unable to restrain the canons from making these extravagant claims. In any case, the claim and the hagiography with which it was promoted played into the abbey's hands by giving Goscelin

¹⁰⁴ See the interim reports by T. Anderson, *Archaeologia Cantiana* cvii (1989), 309, and M. J. Hicks, *ibid.* cvi (1988), 173–4. The general implications of the recent research are summarised with informative maps and plans by T. Tatton-Brown, 'The beginnings of St Gregory's Priory and St John's Hospital in Canterbury', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 41–52.

¹⁰⁵ M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I*, Oxford 1975, 227.

¹⁰⁶ The manor of Minster-in-Thamet was bringing in £100 for the abbey in 1086: Domesday Book, i, fo. 12b; *Charters of St Augustine's*, pp. xix, xxx–xxxii.

¹⁰⁷ *Libellus contra usurpatores*, §4, pp. 73–4.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* §11, p. 79; cf. *Vita SS. Æthelredi et Æthelberti martirum et SS. virginum Miltrudis et Edburgis* (BHL 2644ab, 2384a, 5964b), §21, ed. M. L. Colker, in 'Hagiographic polemic', 97–108 at p. 108. The latter text appears to combine the two lives Goscelin's mentions in his account of the Gregorians' propaganda: see *ibid.* 63.

¹⁰⁹ 'Lanfranc arcebisop let nimian sancte Eadburgan on Liminge and bryngan æt Sancte Gregor': BL, MS Cotton Caligula A.xv, fos 138v–9r (*Ungedruckte Anglo-Normannische Geschichtsquellen*, ed. F. Liebermann, Strasbourg 1879, 4), s.a. 1085.

ample opportunity to lambaste the canons: their grasp of early Kentish history was minimal,¹¹⁰ their idea that Lyminge was a refuge from Viking attack absurd,¹¹¹ their attempt to prove their claims with an ordeal by water comic.¹¹² The canons alleged that Lanfranc ordered Gundulf, bishop of Rochester (1075×76–1108), to enshrine the relics,¹¹³ but it is hard to believe that such an ill-conceived project was central to his plans for the college. It is the contention of this essay that the dedication to Gregory was the cutting edge of the original scheme.

What is needed is an insight into the nature of the rhetoric involved – further evidence as to the slant which the archbishopric was giving to Gregory’s cult. There survives, fortunately, a sermon that answers this need. Preserved in a Christ Church manuscript, it appears to have been devised and delivered by Lanfranc’s successor, Anselm, and it defends yet another measure in support of Gregory’s cult, this time a reform of the feast of Gregory’s ordination. We will examine this sermon shortly, but if we are to avoid succumbing to mistaken assumptions that might stand in the way of a proper appreciation of its significance we must first attempt to unravel the tangled strands of evidence that bear witness to this feast and its reform.

The feast of the ordination of St Gregory

Though no legislative ruling has yet come to light,¹¹⁴ it is clear from the liturgical record that the feast of Gregory’s ordination was reformed at some point during the late eleventh century. Idiosyncratic dates are attested,¹¹⁵ but scribes producing liturgical calendars before this time usually provide for the feast’s observance on or close to 29 March, those working after it almost always prescribe its celebration on or close to 3 September. Of, for example, the twenty-three calendars known to have been copied and used in England before about 1100,¹¹⁶ seven provide for its observance under this

¹¹⁰ *Libellus contra usurpatores*, §3, pp. 72–3.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* §4, pp. 74–5.

¹¹² *Ibid.* §20, pp. 88–9: a boy tied to a wooden sphere was placed in a vat of water, but when he failed to sink, as an affirmative outcome required, the canons tried to force him under with violent punches to the back and head; when this failed they attempted to disguise the purpose of the ritual. The satirical dimension of the *Libellus contra usurpatores* warrants further investigation. ¹¹³ *Vita Æthelredi et Æthelberti et Miltrudis et Edburgis*, §21, p. 108.

¹¹⁴ There is, for example, no sign of the reform in the canons of the 1072 Council of Winchester, which attended to a couple of liturgical issues, including an alteration in the day on which the feast of St Bartholomew was observed. The Anglo-Saxon practice of celebrating this on 25 August was altered in preference for the more usual date of 24 August, which was followed in Normandy: *Councils and synods*, I/2, 607, no. 91; M. Brett, ‘A collection of Anglo-Norman councils’, this *JOURNAL* xxvi (1975), 301–8 at pp. 303–5.

¹¹⁵ The feast appears, for example, at the otherwise unparalleled (?) date of 3 August in a ‘very ancient’ calendar from Vallombrosa, which is printed in *PL* cxxxviii. 1287–92.

¹¹⁶ Twenty-one of these calendars have been printed, nineteen in *Kalendars before 1100*, one in *The missal of Robert of Jumièges*, ed. H. A. Wilson (HBS xi, 1916), 9–20, and now that from the

date,¹¹⁷ while another five specify 30 March.¹¹⁸ From about 1100, on the other hand, the feast is found under 3 September in the vast majority of monastic calendars now in print,¹¹⁹ and in a few more cases under 2 September.¹²⁰ Of these texts, only one, a late twelfth-century calendar from St Werburgh's, Chester, prescribes the earlier date.¹²¹ The same pattern is to be observed in many calendars produced on the continent, though there is, as will emerge below, a geographical divergence in the distribution of the two dates, since 29 March seems to have survived longer in Germany than in France.

I say monastic, furthermore, because the feast appears to have been dropped altogether at England's foremost secular church, Salisbury Cathedral. It is true that the old day was retained in a calendar which is one of the earliest products of the scriptorium which was established at Old Sarum in about 1089 × 1091, when it became the new seat of the recently combined sees of Sherborne and Ramsbury: today BL, MS Cotton Vitellius A.xii, fos 65v–71r.¹²² But this is probably an aberration of no great significance. For the feast was not included, under any date, in the Sarum Rite when it was devised during the episcopate of Richard Poore (1214–37).¹²³

'Junius Psalter' (Bodl. Lib., MS Junius 27, fos 2r–7v) in D. N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the ecclesiastical history of late Anglo-Saxon England*, Woodbridge 1992, 3–14. Two early eleventh-century calendars remain unprinted: BN, lat. 7299, fos 3–12 (possibly from Ramsey), and lat. 10062, fos 162, 163 (for which see n. 53 above). As will emerge shortly, it is a moot point whether the Cotton Vitellius A.xii calendar (*Kalendars before 1100*, 86–97) should be included in this corpus.

¹¹⁷ *Missal of Robert of Jumièges*, 11; *Kalendars before 1100*, 4, 18, 60, 144, 186, 228.

¹¹⁸ *Kalendars before 1100*, 46, 74, 88, 200, 214.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, *English Benedictine calendars after AD 1100*, ed. F. Wormald (HBS lxxvii, lxxxi, 1939–46), i. 27, 42, 59, 76, 92, 125, 141, 157, 176; ii. 52, 71, 87, 100; F. Wormald, 'The liturgical calendar of Glastonbury Abbey', in J. Autenrieth and F. Brunhölzl (eds), *Festschrift Bernhard Bischoff zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 1971, 325–45 at p. 336; L. G. Wickham Legg, 'Liturgical notes on the Sherborne missal', *Transactions of the St Paul's Ecclesiological Society* iv (1900), 1–31 at p. 19; Heslop, 'Canterbury calendars', 72–7 at p. 76. For the appearance of the feast in the calendar of Bibliothèque municipale, Valenciennes, MS 116 (109), the twelfth-century breviary of Winchcombe Abbey, see V. Leroquais, *Les Bréviaires manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1934, iv. 283–5.

¹²⁰ For example, the calendar of the Eadwine psalter (Trinity College, Cambridge, R.17.1, fos 1b–4a), which was printed in facsimile by M. R. James, *The Canterbury psalter*, London 1935. For discussion see R. W. Pfaff, 'The calendar', in M. T. Gibson, T. A. Heslop and R. W. Pfaff (eds), *The Eadwine psalter: text, image and monastic culture in twelfth-century Canterbury*, London 1992, 62–87, esp. p. 71.

¹²¹ Bodl. Lib., MS Tanner 169*, pp. 3–14 (*Kalendars after 1100*, i. 100–11 at p. 102).

¹²² *Kalendars before 1100*, 86–97. On this calendar's date and relationship to its Exeter exemplar see especially N. R. Ker, 'The beginnings of Salisbury Cathedral Library', in J. Alexander and M. Gibson (eds), *Medieval learning and literature*, Oxford 1976, 23–49, repr. in N. R. Ker, *Books, collectors and libraries*, ed. A. G. Watson, London 1985, 143–73 at pp. 159–61; T. Webber, *Scribes and scholars at Salisbury Cathedral*, c. 1075–c. 1125, Oxford 1992, 12–16, 69, 74, 144–5; Dumville, *Liturgy*, 41–50, 64–5.

¹²³ Thus, the feast is entirely absent from the calendars in two of the three thirteenth-century missals which J. Wickham Legg used in his edition of *The Sarum missal*, Oxford

It seems likely that the feast was quietly dropped as the new church assumed its secular identity. The move to Salisbury had been initiated between 1075 and 1078 by Bishop Herman (1045–78), who probably intended to bring his Benedictine priory with him. But the new cathedral was not completed and dedicated until 1092, and his successor, Osmund (1078–99), the first Norman to preside over the see, installed canons in the church, reconstituting the priory of the old cathedral as the priory of Sherborne.¹²⁴ The canons may have wished to avoid lending support to Gregory's cult, since he was often cited as having first authorised the use of monastic communities to provide services in English cathedrals.¹²⁵ Indeed, books in the Sarum tradition often accord minor status to the 12 March feast, prescribing the propers from the Common of saints rather than those exclusive to the day.¹²⁶ The Vitellius A.xii calendar does not appear, furthermore, to have remained in use for very long: it was emended only the once and soon after it was produced, to include the feast of the translation of Wulfram, a saint of the Norman monastery of Fontenelle.

Precisely when and how the reform was introduced and promoted is far from clear. In their pioneering work on Lanfranc's liturgical policies, Gasquet and Bishop suggested that the observance was suppressed by the archbishop prior to its being revived by his successors at the new date.¹²⁷ But in this as in many other points of detail they were misled by their view that the calendar of the Arundel psalter was a post-Conquest document. The book is actually the work of a scribe who flourished in the 1020s and 1030s, Eadui Basan,¹²⁸ but its calendar remains significant for present purposes: that capital letters were used when the reformed feast was inserted by an early twelfth-century scribe helps to demonstrate the importance which Christ

1916: John Rylands University Library, Manchester, MS L.24 (the 'Crawford missal'), which provides the base-text for the edition, and Bologna University Library, MS 2565 (see *Sarum missal*, pp. xxi–xxxii, 511–18). The reformed feast is present, however, in the third witness, Bibliothèque de l' Arsenal, Paris, MS 135 (*Sarum missal*, 499–510 at p. 507). Cf. V. Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1924, ii. 132–5).

¹²⁴ See D. E. Greenway, 'The false *Institutio* of St Osmund', in D. E. Greenway, C. J. Holdsworth and J. E. Sayers (eds), *Tradition and change: essays in honour of Marjorie Chibnall*, Cambridge 1985, 77–101.

¹²⁵ For example, Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, 20. It is ironic, therefore, that Lanfranc should have dedicated a house of canons to St Gregory.

¹²⁶ See A. Hughes, 'British rhymed offices: a catalogue and commentary', in S. Rankin and D. Hiley (eds), *Music in the medieval English liturgy*, Oxford 1993, 239–84 at pp. 264–5.

¹²⁷ F. A. Gasquet and E. Bishop, *The Bosworth psalter*, London 1908, esp. pp. 27–34, whom Southern follows in both *Anselm and his biographer*, 365–6, and *Portrait in a landscape*, 386–8.

¹²⁸ See Brooks, *Canterbury*, 256–8, 264–5; R. W. Pfaff, 'Eadui Basan: *scriptorum princeps*?', in C. Hicks (ed.), *England in the eleventh century: proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton symposium*, Stamford 1992, 267–83, esp. pp. 273–6.

Church assigned to this reform.¹²⁹ But the absence of the old feast from the original festal cycle cannot be taken as a sign of its suppression. It is entirely possible that Lanfranc introduced the reform, replacing the older date in a single step. The attention given to the 12 March feast in the monastic statutes and his decision to choose Gregory as patron of his college of canons suggest, after all, that Lanfranc was attempting to promote the cult. Indeed, the feast of 3 September is present in a calendar which Sandy Heslop has adduced – now that that of the Arundel psalter no longer applies – to show that the archbishop did indeed purge some Anglo-Saxon observances from the liturgy: that is, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Add. C.260.¹³⁰ But this calendar does not, unfortunately, constitute proof that the reform was adopted early in Lanfranc's reign, since it survives as copied in the 1120s and includes a number of observances which were probably recovered in the wake of Lanfranc's initial purge, such as the feast of St Ælfheah's *passio* (19 April), or instituted at a later date, such as the feast of Ælfheah's *ordinatio* (16 November).¹³¹ It is residual similarities with the sanctoral cycle observed at Bec which form the basis of Heslop's argument.

Two charters would appear to offer a precise *terminus ad quem* for the adoption of the new date. Issued at Windsor on 3 September in 1101, both mention the feast in their dating clauses.¹³² Richard Southern seized on these documents as a sign that the reform may have been inaugurated at this very meeting of the royal court. Mention in dating clauses of the saint of the day is so unusual, he argues, that it would require an exceptional event such as this to bring it about. The attraction of this theory is that Anselm was then attempting to secure Henry I's acceptance of the papal decrees on investitures and he might have wished to 'renew the ancient bond between England and Rome established by Gregory the Great', giving 'this Old English observance ... a new relevance'.¹³³ But with deference to a scholar who has contributed so much to our understanding of Anselm and his times, it has to be said that these charters may not be so significant. They are both foundation charters for religious institutions, establishing Bath and Norwich

¹²⁹ 'ORDINATIO SANCTI GREGORII (PAPE)': BL, MS Arundel 155, fos 2r–7v (*Kalendars before 1100*, 70–81 at p. 178). Compare the less emphatic emendations which were made to the calendar of the Leofric missal (Bodl. Lib., MS Bodley 579, fos 39r–44v) and to that of Bishop Wulfstan II's personal service book, his *Portiforium* (CCCC, MS 391, pp. 3–14): *Kalendars before 1100*, 52, 220. The calendar of Bodley 579 is now recognised as a Canterbury product, but need not have been there when this alteration was introduced: Dumville, *Liturgy*, 41–50, 64–5.

¹³⁰ 'Canterbury calendars', 53–85.

¹³¹ Cf. Hayward, 'Translation-narratives', 70–3. Another irregularity is that Augustine appears as the *anglorum apostolus*, a further sign that the calendar dates from after about 1120.

¹³² *RRAN* ii, nos 544 ('apud Wyndelsoram in die ordinationis Sancti Gregorii'), printed in *Monasticon anglicanum*, ed. W. Dugdale and others, London 1817–30, ii. 267, and 547 ('ordinatione beati papae Gregorii apud Wyndesores'), printed in *The charters of Norwich Cathedral Priory*, ed. B. Dodwell (Pipe Roll Society n.s. xl, xlvi, 1965, 1978), i, no. 3.

¹³³ *Anselm and his biographer*, 366; *Portrait in a landscape*, 388.

respectively as seats for the dioceses of Somerset and East Anglia. It is in fact not unusual for charters of this kind to mention the saint of the day in their dating clauses, almost invariably through forgery or ‘elaboration’ by scribes of the house in question.¹³⁴ That neither of these charters uses the same formula and that neither survives as an original is, therefore, crucial. Indeed, at least one other charter was issued at this meeting of the royal court, a grant of land to Norwich, and the feast is not mentioned in its dating clause.¹³⁵ These charters have no value as evidence for the timing of the reform. The best that can be said is that it was introduced during the archiepiscopates of Lanfranc and Anselm.

Now at first glance this reform may seem relatively insignificant, but a little reflection shows that it represents a considerable promotion of Gregory’s cult. Gregory’s primary feast, that of 12 March, probably provided the Anglo-Saxons with an opportunity to take a welcome break from Lenten abstinence much as the 17 March feast of St Patrick, the national saint of Ireland, still does for some people today. Indeed, the 12 March feast was prescribed by the Laws of Alfred as one of four saints’ days which were ‘to be given to all men, but not to slaves or unfree labourers’.¹³⁶ The 29 March feast, on the other hand, was far less conveniently situated, for it is likely to have clashed with the celebration of Easter in most years. A glance at the tables in Cheney’s *Handbook of dates* shows that 29 March falls in the week immediately before Palm Sunday, in Holy Week or within the Easter Octave two years running out of every four.¹³⁷ Moving the feast to 3 September had the effect, however, of moving it to a time in the church year when it could be celebrated without hindrance. The new date was also in keeping with the established narrative of how Gregory was appointed. His predecessor, Pelagius II, had died during an epidemic in February 590. Gregory was elected soon afterwards, but had insisted upon consulting Constantinople in the hope, it was claimed, that the Emperor Maurice (582–602) would accept his desire to retreat from the world and call for the appointment of someone else. It was not until after the emperor’s response had been received that he resigned himself to his fate. He was then consecrated in late August or early September. This much will have been regarded as fact by readers of the thorough *Life* in four books which John the Deacon compiled for Pope John VIII (872–82), the work which had become the standard guide to Gregory’s achievement by the end of the eleventh century.¹³⁸ That its chronology is

¹³⁴ Cf. P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters: an annotated list and bibliography*, London 1968, nos 958 (issued to Ely on St Ethelthryth’s Day, 1022), 1037a (a spurious grant purportedly issued on St Silvester’s Day, 1065), 1041 and 1043 (the spurious foundation charters of Westminster Abbey, purportedly issued on the feast of the Holy Innocents, 1065).

¹³⁵ *RRAN* ii, no. 548.

¹³⁶ *Councils and synods*, I/1, 34, no. 7, §43.

¹³⁷ C. R. Cheney, *Handbook of dates for students of English history*, London 1970, 156–61.

¹³⁸ See John the Deacon, *Vita S. Gregorii magni* (*BHL* 3641–2), i. 37–44, ed. D. Papebroch, *AASS Martii* ii (1668), 137–210 at pp. 144–5, and its source, Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*

substantially correct is confirmed by the contents of Gregory's register, whose earliest items belong to September 590.¹³⁹

All of this begs the question of how the feast came to be celebrated on 29 March in the first place. It seems likely that the observance originated in England, given that Gregory's cult took hold there much sooner than it did in Rome.¹⁴⁰ The feast was certainly in existence by the 740s, for it was added to the Calendar of Willibrord by a near-contemporary hand, possibly that of Willibrord himself,¹⁴¹ and it is arguably the after-life of the service books which the eighth-century Anglo-Saxon missionaries brought with them to the continent that explains the earlier feast's appearance in so many Austrasian and East Frankish calendars. The feast appears, for example, under 29 March in calendars which have been traced to Echternach,¹⁴² to Lorsch,¹⁴³ to Reichenau,¹⁴⁴ to St Gall¹⁴⁵ and to St Vaast.¹⁴⁶ The older observance even appears to have reached Italy by this route, being found in the

x.x. 1, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum* 1.1, Hanover 1937–51, 477–81. On John's aims and methods see W. Berschin, *Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Stuttgart 1988–91, iii. 372–87; C. Leonardi, 'L'agiografia romana nel secolo IX', in E. Patlagean and P. Riché (eds), *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés 4e–12e siècles*, Paris 1981, 481–5. For evidence that the work was known in pre-Conquest England see H. Gneuss, 'A preliminary list of manuscripts written or owned in England up to 1100', *Anglo-Saxon England* ix (1981), 1–60, nos 448, 465, 570, 674.

¹³⁹ Gregory, *Reg. epist.* i. 1–3. For the circumstances of Gregory's ordination see Markus, *Gregory the Great*, esp. pp. 1, 13–14.

¹⁴⁰ See Thacker, 'Memorializing Gregory', 71–4; Jounel, 'Le Culte de saint Grégoire le Grand', 671–80.

¹⁴¹ BN, MS lat. 10837, fos 34–41 (*The calendar of Saint Willibrord*, ed. H. A. Wilson [HBS lv, 1918], 3–14 at p. 5). The margins contain material written in Willibrord's own hand, but it is uncertain whether the calendar as first devised was copied in England or on the continent: E. A. Löwe, *Codices latini antiquiores: a palaeographical guide to Latin manuscripts prior to the ninth century*, Oxford 1934–71, v. 606a; K. Gamber, *Codices latini liturgici antiquiores*, 2nd edn, Freiburg 1968, no. 414.

¹⁴² BN, MS lat. 9433, s.ix/x, fo. 7r (*The sacramentary of Echternach*, ed. Y. Hen [HBS cx, 1996], 56–76 at p. 60). On this calendar's debt to the calendar of Willibrord see *ibid.* 24–6.

¹⁴³ Deutsches Staatsbibliothek, Berlin, MS lat 131, s.ix, fos 11–11r (*Die karolingische Kalenderreform*, ed. A. Borst, MGH *Schriften* xlvi, Hanover 1998, 254–98 at p. 264); W. Böhne, 'Das älteste Lorsch Kalender und seine Vorlagen', in F. Knöpp (ed.), *Die Reichabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764*, Darmstadt 1977, 214–20 at p. 215 (I wish to thank David Ganz for drawing this useful article to my attention).

¹⁴⁴ Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, Rheinau 30, s.viii/ix, fos 331–6 (ed. L. Delisle, in 'Mémoires sur d'anciens sacramentaires', in *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 32.1, Paris 1886, 57–423 at p. 312). An entry for the feast of St Gertrud is thought to show that the calendar depends, in part at least, upon an exemplar from Nivelles: R. Hesbert, *Antiphonale missarum sextuplex*, Brussels 1935, p. xii, with Gamber, *Codices liturgici*, no. 802n. On the manuscript see also Delisle, 'Sacramentaires', 83–4; Löwe, *Codices latini antiquiores*, vii. 1019.

¹⁴⁵ See E. Munding, *Die Kalendarien von St Gallen aus XXI Handschriften neuntes bis elftes Jahrhundert*, Beuron 1948–51, i. 46; ii. 8, 47.

¹⁴⁶ BN, MS lat. 12052, s.x², fos 35–40 (ed. Delisle, in 'Sacramentaires', 345–60 at p. 349). Cf. *ibid.* 188–90. The calendar contains additions made after it was brought to Corbie.

calendar of an eleventh-century sacramentary from Aquileia which is clearly indebted to a northern exemplar.¹⁴⁷ There are more examples.¹⁴⁸ All bear witness to the early origin and wide dissemination of the older observance. One theory has it that 29 March was derived erroneously from the date of Gregory's election,¹⁴⁹ another that it was originally the anniversary of Gregory's ordination to the priesthood.¹⁵⁰ Neither theory is impossible,¹⁵¹ but there is a stronger possibility: that the observance arose through confusion with a feast of Gregory of Nazianzus attested in Irish sources.¹⁵² The *Féilire Oenguso*, compiled in about 800, gives 29 March as the date of an unspecified feast of this saint.¹⁵³ The same feast also turns up in liturgical calendars from two continental monasteries, both touched by Irish influence: Regensburg and St Gall.¹⁵⁴ Now this feast is no less bizarre – Gregory

¹⁴⁷ Bibliotheca dell' Università, Bologna, codex 2679, fos 4–10. See A. Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter*, Freiburg 1896, 19. I have been unable to consult the edition by S. Borgia, *Kalendarium Venetum saec. XI, ex cod. MS. mbr. bibliothecae S. Salvatoris Bononiae ... nunc primum in lucem editum*, Rome 1773, 16f.

¹⁴⁸ See B. Bischoff, 'Das karolingische Kalendar der Palimpsesthandschrift Ambros. M. 12 sup.', in B. Fischer and V. Fiala (eds), *Colligere fragmenta: Festschrift Alban Dold zum 70. Geburtstag*, Beuron 1952, 247–60 at p. 251; G. Zilliken, 'Der Kölner Festkalendar: seine Entwicklung und seine Verwendung zu Urkundendatierungen', *Bonner Jahrbücher* cxix (1910), 13–157 at p. 56.

¹⁴⁹ Böhme, 'Das älteste Lorscher Kalendar', 187–8.

¹⁵⁰ Southern, *Portrait in a landscape*, 387 n. 8. It should be noted, however, that ordination feasts seem to occur only when the saint in question was a bishop and seem to refer almost exclusively to their consecration to the episcopate. This was certainly the understanding of the author of the sermon discussed below.

¹⁵¹ Some impossible theories have been put forward. Richard Pfaff has twice suggested that the date of 29 March was derived from that of the translation of some stolen relics of Gregory to St Medard, Soissons, in 826: 'Lanfranc's supposed purge', 104; 'The calendar', 68. He cites Odilo of St Medard, *Liber de translatione reliquiarum S. Sebastiani martyris et Gregorii I papae* (BHL 7545), in the edition by J. Mabillon, *Acta sanctorum ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, 1st edn, Paris 1668–1701, v. 385–410, as reprinted by Migne, *PL* cxxxii. 579–622. But this work, which was written a century after the events it describes, implies that the *depositio* of the relics in question took place on the second Sunday in Advent in 826 (§23). The second Sunday in Advent fell on 9 December in 826, and it is under 9 December that the enshrinement is entered in the calendar of the Sacramentary of Echternach (*Sacramentary of Echternach*, 76). As printed by Mabillon and Migne, Odilo's work mentions no other events that might have generated a feast on 29 March. Moreover, as its appearance in the Calendar of Willibrord demonstrates, the 29 March feast predates the Soisson cult of Gregory and is in no way derived from it. On the relics of Gregory that were claimed by St Medard see now Judic, 'Le Culte de saint Grégoire le Grand', 287–8.

¹⁵² *Calendar of Willibrord*, 26.

¹⁵³ *Martyrology of Oengus the culdee*, ed. W. Stokes (HBS xxix, 1905), 84; cf. *The martyrology of Tallaght from the Book of Leinster and MS 5100–4 in the Royal Library, Brussels*, ed. R. I. Best and H. J. Lawlor (HBS lxxviii, 1931), 28: 'Ordinatio Grigorii. Grigorii Nazareni in Armenia'. Dating from 826 × 833, this martyrology contains a layer of entries which appear to derive from a Deiran recension of the Hieronymian martyrology: P. Ó Riain, *Anglo-Saxon Ireland: the evidence of the martyrology of Tallaght* (H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 3), Cambridge 1993.

¹⁵⁴ See the 'late eleventh-century' Regensburg calendar printed from a manuscript 'in the monastery of Muri' in M. Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris liturgiae alemannicae*, St Blasien 1777–9, i.

of Nazianzus was usually commemorated in the west with a feast under 25 January;¹⁵⁵ but it may well represent an authentic tradition which Theodore of Tarsus brought to the British Isles when he became archbishop of Canterbury (668–90).¹⁵⁶ It is not difficult to imagine, moreover, how it could have been mistaken by an English scribe, for whom Gregory of Nazianzus was an unknown quantity, as referring to a second feast of Gregory the Great. Lacking information about how the latter had been appointed pope, the scribe may have guessed that this was the anniversary of his ordination. Certainly, the author of the Whitby *Life* knew very little about how and when Gregory came to be consecrated pope.¹⁵⁷ Having arisen in this muddled fashion, the festivity may then have gone on to supplant that of the obscure Cappadocian prelate in English calendars.

But if it seems likely that the feast spread from England, the idea of moving it to a better date need not have originated there. I have been careful thus far to avoid saying as much, for the new feast is widely attested from about 1100 in liturgical books from northern and eastern France – especially in those from Normandy.¹⁵⁸ It is true that no provision is made for it in the surviving, thirteenth-century, missal of Bec,¹⁵⁹ or in the calendar of St Neot's (which, though located in England, was a priory of Bec);¹⁶⁰ but there is much evidence of its adoption in liturgical books from Fécamp,¹⁶¹ Jumièges,¹⁶²

492–500 at p. 494, and the references to Stiftsbibliothek, St Gallen, MS 394 in Munding, *Kalendarien von St Gallen*, i. 46; ii. 8, 47.

¹⁵⁵ It is worth asking whether the feast may refer to Gregory's 'enthronement' as patriarch of Constantinople, which took place on an unknown day during the months leading up to 31 May 381: J. Mossay, 'Gregor von Nazianz in Konstantinopel (379–381 AD)', *Byzantion* xlvii (1977), 223–38, esp. pp. 227–8; B. Wyss, 'Gregor von Nazianz', in T. Klauser and others (eds), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart 1950–, xii, cols 793–863 at col. 796.

¹⁵⁶ The terminology used by Bede in his martyrology is thought to show knowledge of an eastern martyrological document: C. Hohler, 'Theodore and the liturgy', in M. Lapidge (ed.), *Archbishop Theodore: commemorative studies on his life and influence*, Cambridge 1995, 222–35, esp. p. 229. But Bede has nothing for either Gregory the Great or Gregory of Nazianzus under 29 March: J. Dubois and G. Renaud, *Édition pratique des martyrologes de Bede, de l'Anonyme Lyonnais et de Florus*, Paris 1976, 22. See also B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge (eds), *Biblical commentaries from the Canterbury school of Theodore and Hadrian*, Cambridge 1994, 153–73.

¹⁵⁷ See *Liber Gregorii pape Rome*, §11, p. 92.

¹⁵⁸ For the full list of examples see the indices in Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, iii. 371, and *Bréviaires*, v. 129. See also his *Les Psautiers manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1940–1, ii. 228.

¹⁵⁹ BN, MS lat. 1105 (*The Bec missal*, ed. A. Hughes [HBS xciv], Leighton Buzzard 1963).

¹⁶⁰ *Kalendars after 1100*, ii. 107–18.

¹⁶¹ For example, Bibliothèque municipale, Rouen, MS 290, s.xii¹: Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, i. 195.

¹⁶² For example, Bibliothèque municipale, Rouen, MS 209, 210 (Y.175), s.xii²: Leroquais, *Bréviaires*, iv. 104; R.-J. Hesbert, 'Les Manuscrits liturgiques de Jumièges', in *Jumièges: congrès scientifique du XIII^e centenaire*, Paris 1955, ii. 855–72 at pp. 865–6. See also Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, i. 304, and, on the abbey's calendars in general, J. Lambert, 'Les Calendriers de Jumièges', in *Jumièges*, ii. 883–8.

Mont St Michel¹⁶³ and St Évrout.¹⁶⁴ The simplest explanation is that these Norman monasteries took up the reform at the same time as it was instituted in England and that it spread from both regions to the rest of Europe. But the possibility that the reform originated on the continent cannot be ruled out until the provenance and date of all the service books in which it is attested have been determined.¹⁶⁵ The feast of Gregory's ordination is often regarded as an observance peculiar to the Anglo-Saxons,¹⁶⁶ but by the late eleventh century this was no longer the case. It had become a regular feature of the ecclesiastical year for churches throughout western Europe, and its reform might conceivably have originated at any of them. It does not affect the argument of the present article, however, if the reform was first mooted outside England. What matters are the reasons for its adoption by monastic cathedrals and abbeys throughout England and in Normandy. Fortunately, the sermon mentioned above helps to answer this question.

The sermon

The sermon *De ordinatione beati Gregorii anglorum apostoli* is solely preserved in Eadmer of Canterbury's 'personal manuscript', today Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 371 (at pp. 176–90).¹⁶⁷ This manuscript was compiled by Eadmer over a long period, from about 1112 until his death in about 1130, but the sermon is thought to belong to the first phase, which preceded his departure for the continent with Archbishop Ralph in 1116.¹⁶⁸ Eadmer's

¹⁶³ For example, Bibliothèque municipale, Avranches, MS 42, s.xiii¹, fos 2v–8r (calendar), 178v (sanctorale), and MS 214, s.xii/xiii (martyrology): J. Lemarié and H. Tardif, 'Le Calendrier du Mont Saint-Michel', in J. Laporte (ed.), *Millénaire monastique du Mont Saint-Michel*, Paris 1966, i. 287–301 at pp. 296–7. See also Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, ii. 41, and *Bréviaires*, i. 100.

¹⁶⁴ For example, Bibliothèque municipale, Rouen, MS 273, s.xi/xii: Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, 177. The presence of prayers on behalf of the *rex anglorum* implies manufacture after the Conquest: Delisle, 'Sacramentaires', 306–9.

¹⁶⁵ The earliest liturgical book to prescribe the 3 September date is apparently the 'missal of Hugh des Salins', archbishop of Besançon (1031–66), today BN, MS lat. 10500. The feast is also attested in Bibliothèque municipale, Besançon, MS 72, another allegedly 'late eleventh-century' sacramentary from this city. See Delisle, 'Sacramentaires', 281–5; Leroquais, *Sacramentaires*, i. 141, 174; A. Castan, *Catalogue générale des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France: départements, XXXII–XXXIII: Besançon*, Paris 1897–1904, i. 46–8.

¹⁶⁶ For example, Pfaff, 'Lanfranc's supposed purge', 104; Southern, *Anselm and his biographer*, 366.

¹⁶⁷ 'Edmeri cantuariensis nova opuscula', ed. Wilmart, 207–19. In what follows I quote from the manuscript itself, citing Wilmart's occasionally errant edition for the reader's convenience.

¹⁶⁸ The sermon could not, therefore, have been preached by Eadmer at St Andrew's in 1120, as suggested by Rule: Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, p. lxxix. On the construction and development of Corpus 371 and its companion volume, CCCC, MS 452, see Southern, *Anselm and his biographer*, 367–74, and *Life of Anselm by Eadmer*, pp. xx–xxi. See also Muir and Turner,

main reason for making the book appears to have been to keep a record of his own works, but he also copied into it works of other writers that were relevant to his interests, such as the letter of Nicholas, monk and later prior of Worcester, on the identity of Edward the Martyr's mother (pp. 6–7),¹⁶⁹ and that on the relationship between Canterbury and York (pp. 7–9).¹⁷⁰ Indeed, the manuscript contains a version of a sermon *De beatitudine perennis vitae* which Anselm is known from its preface to have preached (pp. 261–78). Eadmer took down a rough copy as it was being delivered which he then revised with, he says, Anselm's help and approval. Southern suggested that the present text also records a sermon preached by Anselm and taken down by Eadmer, pointing out that it uses one of the archbishop's favourite images – that of the complete man as a four-squared stone.¹⁷¹ There is one passage in particular which strongly suggests that the sermon was delivered by someone who was not himself English:

Eia fratres – forte enim aliqui de gente illa hæc me dicentem præsentibus auscultant – eia inquam uos angli, fratres nobis in Christiana fide effecti, uobis a deo prædestinatum et missum beatum Gregorium pro apostolo suscepistis, et eo per suos legatos prædicante iugo fidei Christianæ colla uestra subiecistis.¹⁷²

This passage certainly appears to rule out Eadmer's authorship, leaving Anselm as the most likely candidate;¹⁷³ but whether it also indicates, as Southern went on to argue, that few Englishmen were present in the audience and that Anselm was attempting – on their behalf – to overcome Norman hostility to the feast is doubtful. A close reading of the rest of the sermon suggests that it was directed against 'English' rather than Norman resistance to the feast. This passage is better seen as an attempt at irony, the

Life of Wilfrid by Eadmer, pp. lxxiii–lxxv; T. Webber, 'Script and manuscript production at Christ Church, Canterbury, after the Norman Conquest', in Eales and Sharpe, *Canterbury and the Conquest*, 145–58, esp. pp. 148–50; Eadmer, *Historia nororum*, pp. lxxviii–lxxxiv; M. R. James, *A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* 1911–12.

¹⁶⁹ *Memorials of St Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. W. Stubbs (RS xliii, 1874), 422–4.

¹⁷⁰ *Anglia sacra*, ii. 234–6.

¹⁷¹ *Anselm and his biographer*, 362–6, which passage is reproduced with little change in *Portrait in a landscape*, 385–8. See, likewise, R. Sharpe, *A handlist of the Latin writers of Great Britain and Ireland before 1540*, Turnhout 1997, 104. For the sermon's use of the image see Corpus 371, pp. 183–5; Wilmart, pp. 213–15.

¹⁷² 'Yes, brothers – for perhaps some persons from that race are present giving ear to me saying these things – behold I say, you English, brothers brought to us in the Christian faith, you received the blessed Gregory predestined and sent to you an apostle by God, and you were subjected to your shared yoke of the Christian faith by him preaching through his representatives': Corpus 371, p. 182; Wilmart, pp. 212–13.

¹⁷³ An impassioned allusion to the sufferings caused by episcopal vacancies suggests that the he was speaking during or soon after the reign of William II: Corpus 371, pp. 187–8; Wilmart, pp. 217–18.

homilist making it absolutely clear to his audience that it is the English section of the population who are the subject of his criticisms.

It is important to note, first of all, that the practice of celebrating the feast on 29 March is not mentioned. Rather, the text refers only to the feasts of 12 March and 3 September, contrasting them as follows:

Est quidem alia festiuitas eius, quæ celebratur de obitu eius, sed in illa pro meritis suis perenniter renaturus ad deum perrexit, in ista ad curam dominici ouilis constitutus eos ad fidei christianæ culmen erexit. Illam semper quadragesimalis meror inuoluit, hanc mensis September obtinere promeruit, mensis utique etiam in ueteri lege celeberrimus habitus, et ubique nouorum fructuum benedictione ditatus. Qui ergo festum læticiæ beato Gregorio soluere cupit, hanc amplectatur, hanc ueneretur; in hac illi nulla occursante mesticia integra suæ laudis præconia pendat.¹⁷⁴

That no reference is made to the need to reform the celebration of Gregory's *ordinatio* or to the fact that it had once been celebrated on 29 March seems to imply that the move had been adopted some time earlier, perhaps a decade or more before this sermon was devised. The homily is comprised, moreover, of attacks on those who were refusing to observe the new feast and of reasons why they should do so. Some of these reasons are of general application: Gregory was a saint of consummate, 'four-squared', goodness, thus he will show compassion to those who celebrate his sanctity;¹⁷⁵ he took over from St Peter the burden of looking after the Lord's flock, thus the whole world is obliged to celebrate the day of his ordination;¹⁷⁶ he set out a moral path for everyone, thus those who refuse to embrace his cult witness that they will not accept his guidance;¹⁷⁷ and so on. The first half of the sermon is largely addressed, however, to the veneration which one group in particular, the English, owes to Gregory.

The homilist begins by asserting that Gregory is the English apostle. He offers a reprise of the received conversion narrative complete with the legend of how the sale of certain Deiran slaves in Rome filled Gregory with the idea of bringing Christianity to England.¹⁷⁸ He makes the point explicit: the

¹⁷⁴ 'There is, indeed, his other feast, which is celebrated on the anniversary of his death, but in that he passed through to God about to be reborn forever on account of his virtues; constituted in this [feast] to the care of the Lord's flock he raised them to the summit of the Christian faith. Lenten sorrow always enfolds the first feast. He deserved to receive this month of September – a month indeed held in the highest honour even under the old Law and everywhere enriched with the blessing of new fruits. Let him, therefore, who wishes to perform for the blessed Gregory a festival of joy embrace this [feast], let him revere it; in it he may weigh out in full the declaration of his praise, none of the gloom in the other [feast] intruding': Corpus 371, p. 181; Wilmart, pp. 211–12.

¹⁷⁵ Corpus 371, pp. 183–5; Wilmart, pp. 213–15.

¹⁷⁶ Corpus 371, p. 189; Wilmart, p. 219.

¹⁷⁷ Corpus 371, pp. 181–2; Wilmart, pp. 211–13.

¹⁷⁸ Corpus 371, pp. 177–8; Wilmart, pp. 208–9, seemingly after John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii magni* i. 21–2, p. 141. For earlier versions of the story see *Liber Gregorii pape Rome*, §9,

English received the faith 'at Gregory's instigation';¹⁷⁹ Gregory's encounter with the Deiran slaves was 'the very beginning and the cause of the salvation of this people'.¹⁸⁰ He goes on to argue that conversion is the greatest of benefits, for which the English ought to be especially grateful: since they have received so much more from Gregory than other races, how much more veneration do they owe him than others;¹⁸¹ 'as they beyond other peoples of the nations have felt his benevolence with a certain singular grace, so they more than other peoples are obliged by merit to be devoted around his cult with a singular solicitude'.¹⁸² He goes on, using Gregory's own teachings, to show that as their apostle he still plays a crucial role in the life of every English man and woman. Gregory had taught that at the last judgement the peoples of the world would be presented to God and defended by their respective apostles:

Ponamus ante oculos nostros illum tantae districtiois diem quo iudex ueniet, et rationem cum seruis quibus talenta credidit ponet. Ecce in maiestate terribili inter angelorum atque archangelorum choros uidebitur. In illo tanto examine electorum omnium et reproborum multitudo deducitur et unusquisque quid sit operatus ostenditur. Ibi Petrus cum Iudaea conuersa, quam post se traxit, apparebit. Ibi Paulus conuersum, it ita dixerim, mundum ducens. Ibi Andreas post se Achaïam, Iohannes Asiam, Thomas Indiam in conspectu sui regis conuersam ducit.¹⁸³

pp. 90–1; Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* ii. 1, pp. 132–4; Paul the Deacon, *Vita Gregorïi*, §§15–16, pp. 171–3; Ælfric, *Catholic homilies: second series* ix. 53–80, p. 74; and for two contemporary versions, William of Malmesbury, *De gestis regum anglorum* i. 45, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (OMT, 1998), 62–3; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia anglorum* iii. 12, ed. and trans. D. E. Greenway (OMT, 1996), 158–61.

¹⁷⁹ 'quando illius [Gregori] instantia est ad christum exufflata idolatria conuersa': Corpus 371, p. 177; Wilmart, p. 208.

¹⁸⁰ 'Hæc res, disponente clementia Christi, ut uere fas est credere gesta, ipsius gentis salutis quædam causa et exordium fuit': Corpus 371, p. 178; Wilmart, p. 209.

¹⁸¹ 'Cum itaque præ cæteris gentibus angli per sanctum et sepefatum papam tot ac tanta bona susceperint, quantam ei præ cunctis hominibus uenerationem debeant': Corpus 371, pp. 179–80; Wilmart, pp. 210–11.

¹⁸² 'Itaque sicut eius beniuolentiam singulari quadam præ aliis nationum populis gratia experti sunt, ita circa cultum illius singulari præ cæteris gentibus sollicitudine deuoti existere merito debent': Corpus 371, p. 180; Wilmart, p. 211.

¹⁸³ 'Let us imagine that day of accounting when the judge will come and demand a reckoning from the servants to whom he entrusted his talents. We will see him in dreadful majesty, among choirs of angels and archangels. In that great examination the multitude of the elect and the condemned will be led forth, and it will be revealed what each one has done. Peter will appear there with a converted Judea, which he drew after him; Paul will appear leading a converted world, so to say; Andrew will lead a converted Achaia with him, John Asia Minor, and Thomas a converted India into the presence of their King': Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in euangelia* l.xvii. 17, ed. R. Etaix, CCL cxli (1999), 131–2; translation adapted from *Gregory the Great: forty gospel homilies*, trans. D. Hurst, Kalamazoo, Mich. 1990, 147–8. The same passage was exploited to similar effect by the author of the Whitby *Life: Liber Gregorïi pape Rome*, §6, pp. 82–3.

The homilist paraphrases this passage and goes on to develop its implications for his audience. It is Gregory who will lead the English on that great day of judgement, 'for if everyone will be the leader of those whom they converted to Christ, it is established that the blessed Gregory, who converted [the English] to Christ, will be their leader on that day'.¹⁸⁴ It behoves the English, then, that they adhere to the path their *ductor* has set out for them. If they glorify Gregory in Christ's presence by doing good works that demonstrate the merit of his converts, then they will feel in their every prayer the intercessions of the most effective patron that they have in heaven.¹⁸⁵

It is most improbable that such arguments were devised to deal with Norman hostility to the new feast. The homilist usually speaks of the debt which the English *natio* or *gens* owes to Gregory, but given that he occasionally speaks of that owed by the 'English Church above all others',¹⁸⁶ one might still contrive to argue that it was merely a matter of explaining to Norman churchmen why they had to tolerate Gregory's cult now that they had taken over the *ecclesia anglicana*. But one should recall how much evidence there is that Norman monasteries were willing to accommodate the feast. The various Norman monasteries that adopted the reform cannot have done so under duress. They were beyond Canterbury's jurisdiction, and if there had been a general policy of enforcing the feast in Normandy one would expect to find that it had been adopted at Bec. There is simply no basis for the view that the hostility to this particular cult was coming from the invaders' side. Indeed, several of the homilist's arguments are founded on the premise that the feast's detractors have more enthusiasm for English saints than they have for Gregory, a point which could not have applied to many Norman listeners. He argues, for instance, that the English should have for Gregory the same devotion that they have for the saints who have arisen among their own people, for they would have had nothing of or from these persons if they had not been brought out darkness by him:

Si aliquem de sua gente creatum pro sanctitatis eius merito cum deo gloriari perpetuo credunt, et diligendo eum de eius æterna lætitia gaudent, utique non tantum suæ dilectionis et gaudii bonum quod se pro sancti illius felicitate lætantur

¹⁸⁴ 'Si enim omnes erunt ductores illorum quos ad christum conuerterunt, constat quod beatus Gregorius, qui eos ad Christum conuertit, in illa die eorum ductor erit': Corpus 371, p. 182; Wilmart, p. 212.

¹⁸⁵ 'Satagite potius ut quem in terra degentem, nullo uestro merito præcedente benignissimum circa salutem uestram persensistis, nunc cum christo regnantem de bono studio uestro coram eo gloriari faciatis, ac sic bonis meritis uestris adiuuantibus, in omni oratione uestra efficacissimum patronum apud eum sentiat': Corpus 371, p. 182; Wilmart, p. 213.

¹⁸⁶ 'Tacita igitur interim ueneratione quam tota æcclesia dei beato Gregorio merito debet, paucis cum uestra caritate considerare iuuat, quid ei præ ceteris omnibus Anglorum æcclesia debeat': Corpus 371, p. 178; Wilmart, p. 209.

habere, sed et gaudium ipsius sancti quod est adeptus, si recto sapiunt, beato Gregorio ascribere debent.¹⁸⁷

Even the feasts of their saints proceed from that of Gregory's ordination, for they would not have such celebrations if he had not been ordained, since becoming pope allowed him to proceed with his plans for their conversion:

Liquet ergo plurima eos per annum in diuersis domini et sanctorum eius festiuitatibus gaudia solere habere, quæ nimirum omnia si recte considerentur ex hodierna eis festiuitate processere. Ex ista [festiuitate] nanque processit ut ad fidem Christi uenirent, sine qua omnis boni gaudii expertes extiterant.¹⁸⁸

This sermon is best interpreted as an attack upon some section of the local population that was largely English in identity and that could be accused of denying Gregory his due. We should allow for the likelihood that the homilist is misrepresenting their faults, but it seems almost certain that this group had bestowed on some saint subordinate to Gregory in the kingdom's sacred history a dignity that was his as an apostle. The content and provenance of this sermon suggests, moreover, that the archbishops had adopted the reform of the ordination feast as a way of challenging this group, and that they were promoting the cult in general as a means of implicating them before a wider audience, Norman and English, in the sin of showing disrespect for its apostle. That the homilist wanted to publicise his position is clear: he expresses the hope that his words will be repeated on suitable occasions for the instruction of both 'English and others'.¹⁸⁹ It is not hard to identify these unnamed Englishmen who were denigrating Gregory by showing favour for their own saints. The homilist's preoccupation with episcopal authority provides a further clue. The sermon concludes with an extended discussion of the significance of ordination feasts which comes close to making the celebration of these days a test of a believer's respect for the episcopal structure of Christ's Church. These feasts recall, the homilist argues, the miracle of a good man who is willing to accept the burden of episcopal office,

¹⁸⁷ 'For if they believe that some being of their own nation was glorified with God for eternity because his holiness merited it and if they rejoice in his everlasting joy out of love for him, they ought, not only to have the benefit of love and delight in which they rejoice on account of this saint's happiness, but also, if they understand aright, to attribute to the blessed Gregory the joy that the saint attained': Corpus 371, p. 179; Wilmart, 210.

¹⁸⁸ 'It is clear, therefore, that they are accustomed to have much rejoicing through the year in various feasts of the Lord and his saints, which clearly have all come down to them, if considered rightly, from today's festivity. For it proceeded from this [festivity] that they might come to Christ's faith, without which they would stand bereft of the benefit of all celebration': Corpus 371, p. 180; Wilmart, p. 211.

¹⁸⁹ 'His quoque adhuc pauca de præsentī solennitate addere in cor uenit, quatinus simili modo si causa extiterit, in Anglis et alii aduertant, quid de suis prædicatoribus non indebite facere debeant': Corpus 371, p. 180; Wilmart, p. 211.

they remind us of the great burdens and responsibilities bishops bear in leading the Church, they celebrate the redemption that comes through good leadership and the rewards that the good bishop receives in heaven.¹⁹⁰

One possibility is easily dismissed. There is some evidence that the Old Minster, Winchester, may have been promoting Birinus as *anglorum apostolus* from about 1100, when they produced a *Life* of this saint.¹⁹¹ Two twelfth-century copies, neither from Winchester – BL, MS Cotton Caligula A.viii, fos 121r–4v, and Hereford Cathedral Library, P.vii. 6, fos 134v–9r – use the epithet in their rubrics.¹⁹² But if this amounts to anything it is unlikely to represent more than a bid for a minor share of this honour, since there was no disguising the fact that Birinus' mission to the west Saxons had taken place three decades after that organised by Gregory the Great.¹⁹³ This leaves one strong possibility: St Augustine's, Canterbury. The abbey fits the profile on most counts: as has been seen already, St Augustine's was involved in a fierce struggle with its diocesan who was none other than the archbishop of Canterbury; it seems to have remained a refuge for English religious in spite of the appointment of a Norman abbot in 1070; and its saints' *Lives* and diplomas deny Gregory the honour of being the English apostle on almost every leaf.¹⁹⁴ There can be little doubt that the archbishopric's promotion of Gregory's cult was directed primarily against the efforts of the abbey to present Augustine as the *anglorum apostolus*.

How, then, is the archbishopric's promotion of Gregory's cult to be understood in relation to the development of the cult of saints in England after the Norman Conquest? It seems that Lanfranc's treatment of the cult is an important example, not of a Norman prelate warming to the English and their religious traditions, but of the search for better tactics. In the aftermath of the Conquest, many of the colonists had had considerable difficulty in coming to terms with the saints' cults of the English Church largely, this author has argued elsewhere,¹⁹⁵ because many of them were being used by Englishmen holding office in the Church to secure their survival. It proved difficult to legitimise their occupation of the English Church, to find pretexts for getting rid of these abbots and bishops, while cures were continuing to take place at the shrines in their care, miracles being evidence of divine approval for the custodians as well as a sign that their direct beneficiaries had had their sins forgiven. Some of the new elite, not least Lanfranc himself,¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁰ Corpus 371, pp. 185–9; Wilmart, pp. 215–18.

¹⁹¹ *Vita beatissimi Byrini episcopi anglorum apostoli* (BHL 1361), ed. R. C. Love, in *Three eleventh-century Anglo-Latin saints' lives* (OMT, 1996), 2–46.

¹⁹² See *ibid.* 2.

¹⁹³ Note especially the positive references to Augustine *ibid.* §14, p. 28.

¹⁹⁴ I say 'almost' because I have detected an exception, namely, the entry for the natal feast of St Gregory (12 March) in the abbey's martyrology: BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C.xii, fo. 122v. Elsewhere in this text, however, it is Augustine who is the English apostle.

¹⁹⁵ Hayward, 'Translation-narratives'.

¹⁹⁶ See the works cited in n. 1 above.

attempted to question the basis of those cults which were vulnerable to a reasoned critique, but the risks attached to these efforts were great. While the local population and custodian community continued to believe in the power of the saint, those who dared to question his or her claims to sanctity risked having their misfortunes interpreted as signs of divine disapproval. Given these difficulties, many of the colonists resisted the doubts that these cults raised about the righteousness of the Conquest by retreating into racial prejudice, dismissing English saints with derogatory comments.¹⁹⁷ Lanfranc's promotion of Gregory's cult typifies a third and far more cunning approach: that of appropriating their symbolism and of turning it against potential rivals and centres of resistance.¹⁹⁸

Lanfranc and Anselm certainly chose strong ground on which to challenge the abbey: Gregory had been seen as the English apostle for much longer and far more widely than had Augustine. But, in the event, their defence of Gregory's claim to the apostolic title proved futile. In the ensuing struggle – a struggle upon which depended the primacy of the archbishop over the English Church as a whole and that of St Augustine's over its monasteries – the abbey prevailed. To be sure, its surviving liturgical books show that the monks adopted the new date for the feast of Gregory's ordination. Indeed, the St Augustine's missal, produced around 1100, includes three collects for the feast, though not in their proper place in the sanctorale cycle which may indicate that the decision to adopt the feast was taken as the book was being produced. They are to be found entered in the main hand between the mass *In natali unius confessoris et pontifice* and the mass *De uno confessore qui pontifex non fuerit*.¹⁹⁹ The principal scribe of the abbey's martyrology enters the feast under 3 September.²⁰⁰ By the early thirteenth century, St Augustine's was even observing its octave.²⁰¹ But these were minor concessions. By the 1120s

¹⁹⁷ For the reality of that racism see R. Bartlett, *The making of Europe: conquest, colonization and cultural change, 950–1350*, Harmondsworth 1993, 272–3.

¹⁹⁸ Cf. P. A. Hayward, 'The *Miracula inventionis beate Mylburge virginis* attributed to "Ato, cardinal bishop of Ostia"', *EHR* cxiv (1999), 543–73.

¹⁹⁹ CCCC, MS 270, fos 141v–2r (*The missal of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, ed. M. Rule, Cambridge 1896, 130). The insertion of this mass set well out of sequence evidently caused some confusion, for at its correct place in the sanctorale cycle (fo. 116r) the near-contemporary hand that makes most of the many annotations has inserted a marginal note directing the book's users to employ for Gregory's *ordinatio* the service prescribed for St Martin's *ordinatio* (4 July): *Missal of St Augustine's*, 108. As for the dating of the manuscript, the text includes a mass in honour of the translations of 1091 (p. 110), and there is among the additions a mass for a king and queen (pp. 158–9), which may have been required by the marriage of Henry I to Matilda in 1100. William II never married. This may indicate that the book was produced between 1091 and 1100, but then, as we have seen, the intelligence of the annotations and additions is sometimes open to doubt. For bibliography see now M. Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and early Anglo-Norman manuscript art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, Kalamazoo, Mich. 1998, i. 693–704.

²⁰⁰ BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C.xii, fos 114–56 at fo. 139v.

²⁰¹ *Customaries of the Benedictine monasteries of Saint Augustine, Canterbury, and Saint Peter, Westminster*, ed. E. M. Thompson (HBS xxiii, xxviii, 1902–4), i. 387; but note also that the

the abbey had replied with an ordination feast for Augustine that was to be celebrated on 16 November with readings probably compiled by Goscelin.²⁰² There is no sign, moreover, that the abbey backed away from the essential premise upon which its project depended – Augustine’s apostolic status.

Indeed, the record shows that the abbey won widespread recognition for its claims in the Church at large. If they use the epithet *apostolus anglorum*, liturgical materials from the 1120s and later decades apply it to Augustine alone.²⁰³ This is true, for instance, of all the calendars edited by Wormald,²⁰⁴ including items from Christ Church Cathedral and those in the Sarum tradition.²⁰⁵ One hesitates to make a definitive statement since so much liturgical evidence remains to be checked, but Gregory seems to have been dropped as England’s apostle almost everywhere, though his cult was still accorded great respect at most abbeys and monastic cathedrals. Deeply impressed by Goscelin and his argument, William of Malmesbury nowhere describes Gregory as the nation’s apostle, denoting Augustine ‘precellentissimus anglorum apostolus’.²⁰⁶ The archbishopric succumbed from the 1120s. Its officers and advocates continued to reserve the title for Gregory the Great until around this time, the major exceptions being where they were compelled to quote papal correspondence in which Augustine was described as the

3 September feast is assigned to the relatively modest ‘seventh rank’ in the grading system set out at i. 430–3.

²⁰² Evidence for the feast of Augustine’s ordination first appears in manuscripts of about 1120. The feast is noted in the abbey’s martyrology (BL, MS Cotton Vitellius C.xii, fo. 149v) and reading material for the day appears in the principal manuscript of Goscelin’s saints’ lives for the abbey (MS Cotton Vespasian B.xx, fo. 251v–9v) and as prefixed to the November–December volume of a passion from the abbey (Bodl. Lib., MS Fell 2, pp. 45–56). The latter book was produced in about 1130, but the text for Augustine’s ordination is a later addition to the whole. Fell 2 is, unfortunately, a much mutilated manuscript and the text ends imperfectly. In both manuscripts, it appears under the rubric *Relatio de ordinatione sancti augustini et de ipsius questionibus ad beatum papam Gregorium*. The work’s contents are largely derived from Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* i. 26–7, pp. 78–102, and ii. 3, pp. 142–4, with an ‘original’ section of some 100 words linking the two parts. By the middle of the twelfth century the cathedral priory had responded to the creation of this *ordinatio* by instituting a feast of St Ælfheah’s ordination also to be celebrated on 16 November. This feast is attested in the Canterbury Martyrology of about 1150 (BL, MS Royal 7.E.vi, fo. 65r) and in the Calendar of the Eadwine psalter of about 1150 (Pfaff, ‘The calendar’, 74). See also *Kalendars after 1100*, i. 78.

²⁰³ For example, *Missale ad usum ecclesie westmonasteriensis*, ed. J. Wickham Legg (HBS i, v, xii, 1891–7), ii. 817.

²⁰⁴ *Kalendars after 1100*, i. 38, 55, 121, 153; ii. 12, 31, 111. Earlier calendars do not use the epithet for either saint.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.* i. 73; *Sarum missal*, pp. xxv, 503, 513.

²⁰⁶ *Gesta regum* i. 45, p. 62. For evidence of the effect of Goscelin’s rhetoric on William see *ibid.* iv. 342, pp. 592–3: ‘Huius quoque translationis seriem ita expoluit ut eam presentibus monstrasse digito futurorumque uideatur subiecisse oculo.’ See, likewise, *idem*, *Gesta pontificum*, i. 1, pp. 5–6, and compare John of Worcester, *Chronicle*, s.a. 605, ii. 76: it is a sign of John’s adherence to ‘old-fashioned’ source material that he applies the epithet *anglorum apostolus* to Gregory in his account of the English mission, which is otherwise abbreviated from Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica* ii. 1, p. 122.

English apostle. Eadmer, for example, quotes a letter of Pope Alexander II (1061–73) on the issue of monastic chapters in which Augustine is described as such.²⁰⁷ After 1120, however, references to Augustine as *anglorum apostolus* creep in unchecked.²⁰⁸ Even Archbishop Ralph's letter in defence of the primacy designates him as such.²⁰⁹ From the 1120s until the present Augustine has remained England's apostle. His hold on the title continues to be affirmed by such standard reference works as the *New Catholic encyclopaedia* and the *Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*.²¹⁰ The abbey's success has meant, moreover, that the archbishopric's campaign has left far less trace in the historical record. Yet it is a no less remarkable project not least because it led an Italian prelate devoted to the Norman cause to resurrect a tradition once central to English identity.

²⁰⁷ 'et venit ad manus statutum prædecessoris nostri beatæ memoriæ Gregorii majoris de ecclesiis Angliæ, quomodo scilicet præcepit Augustino gentis vestræ apostolo ut': *Historia novorum*, p. 20; cf. *ep.* 452 in Anselm's correspondence (*Anselmi opera* v. 400), in which Pope Paschal II speaks of beholding in Anselm himself the 'persona of the blessed Augustine himself, apostle of the English'. Southern, *Portrait in a landscape*, 332, admits, significantly, that Anselm 'never quoted this analogy'.

²⁰⁸ For example, John of Salisbury, *ep.* ccxcii, cccv, in *The letters of John of Salisbury*, ed. W. J. Millor, H. E. Butler and C. N. L. Brooke (OMT, 1955–79), ii. 668, 736. Note also that an insertion by the main scribe, s.a. 614, in the F-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (produced at Christ Church, Canterbury, after 1100 and probably before 1125) describes Augustine as 'apostolus Anglorum': *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: MS F*, ed. P. Baker (*The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: a collaborative edition* viii), Cambridge 2000, 30. For an attempt to narrow the dating of the manuscript see *ibid.* pp. lxxvi–ix.

²⁰⁹ 'Juxta quam prudentis viri [Johannis Levitæ] sententiam nequaquam successoribus Augustini Beatus Gregorius debere subtrahi præsignavit quicquid primatus seu dignitatis illi, sicut ejusdem gentis Apostolo, Apostolicæ sedis auctoritate concessit': *Epistola Calixto papæ missa*, 232, apparently misrepresenting John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii magni*, ii. 33–40, pp. 152–4. Throughout the letter Gregory appears as 'beatus Gregorius'.

²¹⁰ F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (ed.), *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd edn, Oxford 1997, 89; W. J. McDonald and others (eds), *New Catholic encyclopaedia*, New York 1967–89, i. 1058. For a noteworthy exception see D. H. Farmer, *The Oxford dictionary of saints*, 3rd edn, Oxford 1992, 27, 189.