The Cult of St Mary at Beodericisworth *and then in Bury St Edmunds Abbey to* c. *1150*

by ANTONIA GRANSDEN

This paper argues that the earliest church at Beodericisworth, *the later Bury St Edmunds, was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Probably in the reign of Athelstan, the (supposed) body of St Edmund, king and martyr, was translated into this church. The cult of St Edmund burgeoned and before the end of the eleventh century St Edmund's shrine had become one of England's foremost pilgrim centres and attracted the wealth which helped pay for the great Romanesque church built to house it. Nevertheless, a wide variety of sources, both written and visual, demonstrate that the cult of St Mary retained much vitality, becoming the pre-eminent secondary cult in Bury St Edmunds, one especially fostered by Abbot Anselm (1121–48). Finally, similar examples are cited of other churches where dedications to saints like St Mary, who enjoyed widespread veneration, were replaced by those of saints of more local fame but whose (supposed) bodies those churches possessed.*

Before embarking on the subject of St Mary's cult at *Beodericisworth* (the later Bury St Edmunds), the terms 'dedication' and 'spiritual patronage' in the Middle Ages need explanation. Strictly speaking, all churches were dedicated to God whether explicitly stated in the name of the church as 'St Saviour', 'Christ' or 'Holy Trinity', or merely implied.[1] Dedication to a saint meant that the church was built in honour of that saint and was under his or her spiritual patronage; he or she would intercede

---

I have cited Latin texts in English translation and, if the quotation is crucial for understanding the argument, cited the Latin in a footnote. In the latter case, I have silently extended abbreviations, unless the extension is doubtful and then the doubtful letters are put between square brackets. The use of capitals for initial letters is according to modern practice.

[1] For changes in medieval church dedications see Alison Binns, *Dedications of monastic houses in England and Wales*, Woodbridge 1989, 3–38 passim; Wilhelm Levison, 'Medieval church-dedications in England: some problems', *Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland* x (1946), esp. pp. 65, 76–9, and *England and the continent in the eighth century*, Oxford 1946, repr. 1949, 1956, 259–65. Both Levison and Binns demonstrate the popularity of dedications to St Mary, especially in the early period: *England and the continent*, 263–4; *Dedications*, 18–38 passim. For uncertainty about the identity of a spiritual patron see, for example, the case of the Benedictine abbey at Cardigan: Binns, *Dedications*, 67.

with God on that church's behalf. Normally, the saint appears as dedicatee in the dedication ceremony, but it could happen that if the ceremony were long delayed a dedicatee named in the ceremony was not the saint who by common repute was recognised as the church's spiritual patron. Moreover, if the church were never formally dedicated, as seems to have been the case with the post-Conquest abbey church of St Edmund, attribution of spiritual patronage depended solely on common repute which was *ipso facto* equivalent to liturgical dedication. It is with this in mind that the change in the spiritual patronage of the principal church at *Beodericisworth*/Bury St Edmunds from St Mary to St Edmund must be considered.

Since the first known evidence about the Virgin Mary's cult at Bury St Edmunds occurs in sources relating to the origins of St Edmund's church at *Beodericisworth* it is necessary to begin with that obscure subject. Edmund, king of the East Angles, died at the hands of the Danes in 869. Over a century later Abbo of Fleury wrote the *Passio Sancti Eadmundi* giving an account of Edmund's martyrdom and of his early cult.[2] Abbo states that once the country was again settled after the Danish incursions, pious Christians carried the body from its first humble grave to 'the royal vill called in English Bedricesguerd, and in Latin Bedricicurtis'. There they built 'a very large church, wonderfully constructed of wooden planks' and translated the body into it.[3] Bertrann, 'the archdeacon', a monk of St Edmunds, in his *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*, which he wrote *c.* 1000, seems to date the translation to the reign of King Athelstan (925–39).[4] Thenceforth, there was a shrine church dedicated to St Edmund and served by a community of secular clerks at *Beodericisworth.* By the mid-tenth century it must have been quite an important cult centre, since it was one of the main beneficiaries

---

[2] See Marco Mostert, 'Le Séjour d'Abbon de Fleury à Ramsey', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* cxliv (1986), 199–208, and *The political theology of Abbo of Fleury*, Hilversum 1987, 17–18, 40–64; Antonia Gransden, 'Abbo of Fleury's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*', *Revue bénédictine* cv (1995), esp. pp. 20–3 and nn.

[3] 'prouinciae multitudo … construxit permaximam miro ligneo tabulatu aecclesiam, ad quam eum ut decebat transtulit cum magna gloria': *Three Lives of English saints*, ed. M. Winterbottom, Toronto 1972, 82; cf. Richard Gem and Lawrence Keen, 'Late Anglo-Saxon finds from the site of St Edmund's Abbey', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* xxxv (1981), 1.

[4] '"Liber de miraculis Sancti Eadmundi"', in Thomas Arnold (ed.), *Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*, London, 1890–6, i. 29–30. The *De miraculis* has previously been attributed to 'Hermann, the archdeacon', who has never been identified, but I believe that 'Hermann' is a misnomer for 'Bertrann' who is known to have been an archdeacon and hagiographer at the time. I have, therefore, adopted this identification in the present article. See my 'The composition and authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi* attributed to "Hermann the archdeacon"', *Journal of Medieval Latin* v (1995), 33–9. For the historical value of the work see ibid. 11. Gem and Keen, 'Late Anglo-Saxon finds', 1, accept that the translation took place under King Athelstan. For a more cautious reading of the Latin see S. J. Ridyard, *The royal saints of Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge 1988, 213 and n. 14, 222 and n. 45, 224.

of the will of Theodred, bishop of London, who died sometime between 951 and 953.[5]

However, the picture is not as simple as that. It is very likely that there was already a minster at *Beodericisworth*. Bede states that Sigeberht, king of the East Angles from 630 or 631 until sometime towards the mid-seventh century, built a minister to which he himself retired.[6] The location of this minster is not mentioned by Bede. The *Liber eliensis* reproduces the passage from Bede but adds that Sigeberht's minster was at *Beodericisworth*.[7] There seems no good reason to doubt the *Liber*'s testimony and other evidence suggests that the minster was dedicated to St Mary, a favourite dedication at the time.[8] One of the thirteenth-century registers of St Edmund's abbey contains an account in a hand of *c.* 1300 of the foundation of the Benedictine monastery under Cnut in 1020.[9] It begins by asserting that the body of St Edmund was found in the wooden minster of St Mary at *Beodericisworth*. His shrine was served by secular clerks without due reverence and proper religious observance, for the clerks collected the oblations, dividing them among themselves and treated the holy body without proper honour. Cnut, therefore, 'ordered that there should be monks in the said church (*basilica*), who should serve God and St Mary devoutly, day and night, and care for the body of the precious martyr with the greatest diligence and reverence'.

Although the copy of the foundation account is late and the account itself is unreliable in some particulars,[10] the statement that St Edmund's body still lay in 1020 in a church dedicated to St Mary is probably true. It is corroborated by almost identical foundation accounts which occur in two sources not written at St Edmunds, but in the abbey of St Benet of Hulme in Norfolk. Again, the copies are late. One copy, in a hand datable to the early fifteenth century, occupies the first paragraph of the so-called *Cronica buriensis*, a history of St Edmunds from 1020 to 1346.[11] The *Cronica* was originally compiled in the late thirteenth century at St Edmunds, was later revised and continued at St Benets, and subsequently returned to St Edmunds.[12] It would seem that the foundation account was added to the original work at St Benets

[5] *Anglo-Saxon wills*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Whitelock, Cambridge 1930, 4, 5; cf. p. 638 n. 54 below.

[6] Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. Charles Plummer, Oxford 1896, repr. 1961, i. 162–3 (bk III, ch. 18); ii. 168.

[7] *Liber eliensis*, ed. E. O. Blake (Camden 3rd ser. xcii, 1962), pp. xxiii–xxiv, 11 and n. *e*.

[8] See Binns, *Dedications*, 18–22.

[9] BL, MS Harleian 1005, fo. 35, printed in W. Dugdale, *Monasticon anglicanum*, ed. J. Caley, H. Ellis and B. Bandinel, London 1817–30, iii. 135.

[10] See n. 14 below.   [11] *Memorials of St Edmund's*, iii. 14–73.

[12] Antonia Gransden, 'The *Cronica buriensis* and the abbey of St Benet of Hulme', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* xxxvi (1963), 77–82, repr. in her *Legends, traditions and history in medieval England*, London 1992, 239–44 passim, esp. pp. 240, 243–4.

in the late thirteenth century, since an almost identical account occurs in the register of St Benets.[13] Although the latter was compiled *c.* 1300 the first section comprises copies of eleventh- and twelfth-century documents: some such document must lie behind at least part of the foundation account, including the statement that in 1020, at the time of the foundation of the Benedictine monastery, St Edmund's body lay in the church of St Mary at *Beodericisworth.*

The answer to the question why the tradition about the early church at *Beodericisworth* existed at St Benets may lie in the foundation account itself. It asserts that when Cnut replaced the secular community serving St Edmund's shrine by a monastic one, he ordered half the community of monks at St Benets to colonise the new foundation at *Beodericisworth*; therefore, in 1020, the prior Uvius accompanied by eleven monks (whom the account names) went there and Uvius became the first abbot of St Edmunds. Some details of this account are misleading or even wrong[14] but it is almost certainly right in attributing to St Benets an important part in the foundation of the Benedictine monastery at *Beodericisworth.* Corroborative evidence comes from another source, though one of very uncertain authority. A tract was produced relating to the dispute between two bishops of East Anglia and Baldwin, abbot of St Edmunds from 1165 to 1197/8, over the bishops' attempts to move the East Anglian see to St Edmunds. The bishops involved were Herfast (1070–85) and Herbert Losinga (1091–1119). Baldwin successfully resisted the attempt to move the see to St Edmunds but Losinga continued the struggle to establish episcopal control over the abbey even when he had moved the East Anglian see to Norwich which he did in 1094 or 1095. The tract was edited by V. H. Galbraith who, with some hesitation,

---

[13] *St Benet of Holme, 1020–1210: the eleventh and twelfth century sections of Cott. MS. Galba E. ii: the register of the abbey of St. Benet of Holme*, ed. J. R. West (Norfolk Record Society ii, iii, 1932), i. 34–6; cf. G. R. C. Davis, *Medieval cartularies of Great Britain*, London–New York 1958, 56.

[14] This account makes Cnut the founder and does not mention Ælfwine, bishop of Elmham, who according to a reliable witness, that is the note in the margin of the Easter tables in the Vatican psalter (see p. 631 below and n. 17), 'established the rule of monks in the monastery of St Edmund'. The emphasis on Cnut's part in the foundation and the omission of Bishop Ælfwine's suggest that this passage in the account was composed when Abbot Baldwin (1065–97/8) was struggling to obtain exemption from episcopal control, and, therefore, was loath to acknowledge the abbey's debt for its foundation to a bishop of East Anglia. Moreover, the last section of the foundation account stipulates mutual help between St Edmunds and St Benets in times of trouble. A formal and detailed arrangement of this kind would seem less appropriate to the eleventh century than to the thirteenth, when such 'confederacies' between houses were not unusual. See David Knowles, *The monastic order in England*, Cambridge 1940, 2nd edn 1963, 474–5. I previously took a more dismissive view of the authority of the foundation account. See my 'The legends and traditions concerning the origins of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds', *EHR* c (1985), 16–19, reprinted in *Legends, traditions and history*. I have modified my views after discussion with Simon Keynes, to whom I am deeply indebted. Cf. n. 22 below.

dated it to between 1103 and 1119.[15] The purpose of the tract was to support the bishops' case for establishing their see at St Edmunds. Galbraith pointed out the tract's numerous inaccuracies and misrepresentations resulting from its strongly partisan bias but admits that some of the details may be true. The tract begins with an account of the earliest church at *Beodericisworth* before proceeding to describe the abbot's dispute with the East Anglian bishops.[16] The opening passage concerns us here. It alleges that Felix, the first bishop of the East Angles (630 or 631–647 or 648) built the church of 'the blessed Mary, mother of God' at *Beodericisworth*' and established an episcopal cathedral there, which was served by clerks, and ordained that it was to be the mother church of all the churches of East Anglia;[17] this situation remained unchanged until Cnut appointed Ælfric, monk and prior of Ely, to be bishop,[18] entreating him to expel the clerks, who had been living 'irreligiously', and to establish monks; Ælfric did so and made a monk of St Benets prior (that is, of the new cathedral priory).[19] Despite the obviously sententious character of this passage, comparison with more trustworthy sources show that the author used some authentic material: facts are mixed with fiction.

Thus, when under Cnut the reformed monastery was established at *Beodericisworth*, there was almost certainly already a church there dedicated to St Mary, though probably jointly with St Edmund, and also a church dedicated to St Mary alone.[20] Moreover, Cnut made an 'Ælfric' bishop of Elmham (that is, Ælfric II, 1023 × 1038–December 1038) who, as will be seen,

---

[15] V. H. Galbraith, 'The East Anglian see and the abbey of Bury St Edmunds', *EHR* xl (1925), 222. For Baldwin's dispute with the East Anglian bishops see David Knowles, 'Essays in monastic history, IV: The growth of exemption', *Downside Review* l (1932), 208–13, and Antonia Gransden, 'Baldwin, abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065–1097' (Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies iv, 1982), 67–72 and nn. The surviving text, BL, MS Harleian 1005, fos 197, 197v, is in the hand of Henry of Kirkstead, monk of St Edmunds, a notable antiquary active in the 1360s and 1370s. For him see especially R. H. Rouse, 'Bostonus buriensis and the author of the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiae*', *Speculum* xli (1966), 471–99.

[16] Galbraith, 'East Anglian see', 226.

[17] The note in the margin of the Easter tables in the Vatican psalter, Reg. lat. 12, on the foundation makes no mention of Bishop Ælfric but states that Bishop Ælfwine 'established the rule of monks' at *Beodericisworth*. See n. 14 above. Ælfwine had been a monk of Ely since his childhood: *Liber eliensis*, 144 and n. 7, 155. For traditions about Ely's part in the new foundation see Gransden, 'Legends and traditions concerning the origins of the abbey', 13–18 passim. In any case, if the generally accepted date, 1020, for the foundation of the Benedictine monastery at *Beodericisworth* is correct, Ælfwine was bishop of East Anglia at the time (? x1019–24 or 25 Dec. 1020). Ælfric II was his successor.

[18] A similar statement concerning the earliest church of St Mary at *Beodericisworth* is in a tract composed at St Edmunds early in Henry II's reign. See p. 633 below and n. 28.

[19] The passage reads: 'Is Alfricum monachum et priorem Elyensis monasterii ascitum in ecclesia Beodrichesworth pontificem elegit, obsecratus ut clericos qui ibidem irreligiose vivebant expelleret et monachos constitueret. Qui secundum eius iussa non ignavus clericos expulit, monachos subintroduxit, eisque Homensis monasterii monachum priorem constituit': Galbraith, 'East Anglian see', 226.   [20] See p. 633 below and n. 28.

almost certainly played a crucial role in the early history of the new monastic church at *Beodericisworth*.[21] Finally, it is surely true that St Benets was involved in the new monastery's foundation.[22] It is not surprising that facts about the origins of St Edmund's church were known to the author of the Losinga tract or, indeed, to Losinga himself. St Benets was in the diocese of Norwich and lay only nine miles from that city. Another possible source of information was Ramsey Abbey. Before becoming bishop of Norwich Losinga had been abbot of Ramsey (1087–90 or 1091). One of his recent predecessors, Abbot Ælfwine (1043–79 or 1080), certainly knew about St Edmunds' early history; he was one of the witnesses in the trial before Lanfranc in 1070 of the dispute between Baldwin and Herfast and testified to the privileges of St Edmund's church in the time of Cnut.[23]

We must now turn to a much more reliable source than the Losinga tract for St Edmunds' early history, the beautiful psalter in the Vatican Library, Reginensis Latini MS 12.[24] It was written (mostly by one scribe) and ornamented for St Edmunds probably at Christ Church, Canterbury. Its date is controversial, estimates ranging from the second quarter of the eleventh century to *c*. 1050.[25] The text of the psalter itself is preceded and

---

[21] See pp. 636 below and n. 48.

[22] A charter, allegedly of Cnut, was forged at St Edmunds in the late eleventh century granting to the monastery, among other things, freedom from interference by a bishop of East Anglia. This is printed, for example, in Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iii. 137–8. This forgery may well be an interpolated copy of a genuine charter of Cnut issued soon after the foundation of the Benedictine monastery in 1020: the original charter presumably would not have included the sentence granting freedom from interference by the East Anglian bishop: P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters: an annotated list and bibliography*, London 1968, 293–4 (no. 980) and references. See especially F. E. Harmer, *Anglo-Saxon writs*, Manchester 1952, repr. 1959, Stamford 1989, 433–4. For discussion of the date of the forgery see Gransden, 'Baldwin', 70–1. Comparison of this charter with the authentic charter granted by Cnut to St Benets, datable to 1020 × 1022 (Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters*, 295 [no. 984], printed, for example, in the *Register of St Benet*, i. 1–2), led Simon Keynes to the tentative conclusion that there was a connection between St Benets and St Edmunds at the time. He writes 'A copy of S 984 appears to have been used at Bury St Edmunds for the forgery of S 980': 'Cnut's earls', in A. R. Rumble (ed.), *The reign of Cnut*, London 1994, 49 n. 39.

[23] *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 65. Cf. Gransden, 'Baldwin', 70; for the attribution to Ramsey of a major part in the establishment of the Benedictine monastery at *Beodericisworth* see her 'Legends and traditions concerning the origins of the abbey', 18–21.

[24] André Wilmart gives a detailed description of Reg. lat. 12 in his *Codices reginenses latini*, Vatican 1937, 1945, i. 30–5.

[25] See, for example, *Cod. reg. lat.*, i. 30; R. M. Harris, 'The marginal drawings of the Bury St Edmunds psalter (Rome, Vatican Library MS reg. lat. 12)', unpubl. PhD diss. Princeton 1960, 111, 561–2; E. M. Thompson and others (eds), *New Palaeographical Society facsimiles*, 2nd ser., London 1926, plates 166–8, commentary; *A survey of manuscripts illuminated in the British Isles*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander, ii; Elżbieta Temple, *Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, 900–1066*, London 1976, 100–2 (no. 84), with extensive bibliography; Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: a list of manuscripts and manuscript fragments written or owned in England up to 1100*, Tempe, Az 2001, 140 (no. 912).

followed by various items, among them Easter tables, a litany, a calendar and a set of twenty-one private prayers; all, barring a few later additions, are in the main hand of the psalter. In the margins of the Easter tables are two notes in a hand which Leonard Boyle identified without hesitation as that of the scribe of the tables. The first note is opposite the entry in the tables for the years 1020–4.[26] It records that 'Bishop Ælfwine, under Earl Thorkil and at the wish and with the permission of King Cnut established the regular rule in St Edmund's monastery'. The second note faces the entry in the tables for the years 1032–5 and states: 'At this time Archbishop Æthelnoth of blessed memory consecrated the church built under King Cnut in honour of Christ, St Mary and St Edmund'.[27]

It seems clear that at St Edmunds the oldest church was dedicated to St Mary. St Edmund's body initially lay in it but sometime before Abbo wrote the *Passio* a grander church had been constructed and St Edmund's body translated into it. However, the old St Mary's was left standing though probably it was a replacement of the original St Mary's, and was, perhaps, a better built, stone, church.[28] That there should have been two churches at *Beodericisworth* is not surprising since groups of churches at one place were common in England and on the continent from early medieval times. It was not unusual for the principal, oldest church to be dedicated to an apostle or martyr and a subsidiary church to be built in honour of St Mary; nor was it unusual for the principal church to be dedicated to St Mary and a subsidiary church (or churches) to have another spiritual patron (or

---

[26] 'Hinc denique presul Ælfwinus sub comite Thurkyllo constituit regulam monachorum sancti Eadmundi monasterio, et sub voluntate licentiaque Cnutoni [sic] regis permanet usque in presens': Reg. lat. 12, fo. 16v, in Thompson and others, *New Palaeographical Society facsimiles*. I wrote to Leonard Boyle asking him for his opinions about the hand of the two notes. He kindly examined them and in a letter of 20 July 1992, wrote: 'I have no doubt that the hand of the notes you cite is that of the Easter Tables'. Wilmart expressed the same opinion, but qualified it with 'ut videtur': *Cod. reg. lat.*, i. 31.

[27] 'Hic sub Cnutono [sic] rege constructam basilicam beate memorie archipresul Ægelnotus consecrauit eam in honore Christi et sancte Marie sanctique Eadmundi': Reg. lat. 12, fo. 17v, in Thompson, *New Palaeographical Society facsimiles*.

[28] There was probably a church dedicated to St Mary at *Beodericisworth* from the earliest times. The statement in the Losinga tract about the existence of such a church (see p. 631 above) receives some corroboration from the tract on the dedication of altars, chapels etc. at St Edmunds composed in the abbey early in Henry II's reign and continued later. The relevant passage reads: 'Arbitror etiam quod parochia villae a tempore antiquo in memoria sanctae Mariae virginis fuerit constructa, videlicet ab inicio primae Christianitatis istius provinciae, id est a tempore primi praedicatoris felicis memoriae et sanctissimi episcopi Felicis orientalium Anglorum. Ideoque antiquum monasterium in memoria eius et beati Eadmundi et post aliud a Cnutone rege et Aeluiua eius regina et Alfwino episcopo provinciae et fratribus loci constructum fuit': *De dedicationibus altarum, capellarum, etc., apud Sanctum Edmundum*, in *The customary of the Benedictine abbey of Bury St Edmunds in Suffolk*, ed. Antonia Gransden (Henry Bradshaw Society xcix, 1973), 116; cf. G. M. Hills, 'The antiquities of Bury St Edmunds', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* xxi (1865), 109.

patrons).[29] The main purpose of subsidiary churches was usually to supplement the pastoral care of the local populace provided by the monks or secular clerks of the principal church. Subsidiary churches proliferated in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries as the populations of urban centres, such as Bury St Edmunds, grew.[30]

The prominence of the cult of St Mary at *Beodericisworth* is very apparent in the Vatican psalter. The calendar enters the anniversary of St Mary's church (13 May)[31] and the litany, having begun with an invocation to Christ marked for repetition, follows with three to St Mary, who is invoked variously as St Mary, the Holy Mother of God and the Holy Virgin of virgins.[32] Among the feasts marked in gold as principal feasts in the calendar are the Assumption of St Mary (15 August) and her Nativity (8 September), and the commemoration of the dedication of the church of SS Mary and Edmund. The Annunciation (25 March) is in small capitals.[33] Again, St Mary's importance appears in the set of prayers. André Wilmart states that the texts of eleven of the twenty-one are found only in this manuscript and are of great interest.[34] The third of these eleven seemingly unique prayers is in honour of 'St Mary, Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, ever glorious Virgin',[35] and another of the prayers, a supplication to the Lord, mentions her 'illumination by the Holy Spirit'.[36] The last prayer is a supplication to the Lord for the monastery 'of your Holy Mother Mary and the triumphant martyr Edmund'.[37]

---

[29] John Blair, 'Anglo-Saxon minsters: a topographical review', in John Blair and Richard Sharpe (eds), *Pastoral care before the parish*, Leicester–London–New York 1992, esp. pp. 249–56 and n. 112 and figs.

[30] Gervase Rosser, 'The cure of souls in English towns before 1000', in Blair and Sharpe, *Pastoral care*, esp. pp. 270–4.

[31] 'Dedicatio ecclesie Sanctae Marie': *English kalendars before A.D. 1000*, ed. Francis Wormald (Henry Bradshaw Society lxxii, 1934, repr. 1988), 244.

[32] 'Sancta Maria … Sancta dei genitrix … Sancta uirgo uirginum': Reg. lat. 12, fo. 159; *Anglo-Saxon litanies of the saints*, ed. Michael Lapidge (Henry Bradshaw Society cvi, 1991), 296. These were usual terms in invocations to St Mary.

[33] *Kalendars*, 247, 248, 249, 242 respectively.

[34] André Wilmart, 'The prayers of the Bury psalter', *Downside Review* xlviii (1930), 198–216, discusses the prayers, describes in turn those known from other sources and prints the 'unique' ones in full.   [35] Ibid. 204–5.

[36] Ibid. 207. For prayers to St Mary, including reference to this example, see Mary Clayton, *The cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge 1990, 109–10.

[37] 'Audi domine deus meus ymnum anime … ut sint oculi tui super hoc sanctuarii tabernaculum, benedic et sanctifica illud, tibi ad laudem et gloriam, et sancte genitrici tuae Mariae ad uirginitatis thalamum, et sancto Eadmundo uictori ad martyrii nobilitatem, …': Wilmart, 'Prayers', 215. Possibly the Marian features in Reg. lat. 12 influenced its early fate. By *c.* 1100 it had left St Edmunds and by that date or perhaps a little later it was at the nunnery of Jouarre in Normandy, a house dedicated to St Mary. Evidence for this transfer is provided by two additions to the original volume. One is a prayer copied in a hand of *c.* 1109 as an addition to the original set of prayers. The other is a list in a twelfth-century hand of relics at

The psalter itself provides another piece of evidence which probably relates to the Marian cult. It is renowned for its remarkably lively and expressive marginal illustrations in pen-outline.[38] It also contains two full-page illuminations in the 'Winchester' style, the initial letters 'B' of Psalm i and the 'Q' of Psalm li.[39] The latter is a Davidian Psalm supplicating for divine mercy. Above the 'Q' is written 'Oliva fructifera' – 'a fruit-bearing olive', a metaphor used by the psalmist of himself in the prayer: 'Ego autem, sicut oliva fructifera in domo Dei; speravi in misericordia Dei, in aeternum et in saeculum saeculi' (Psalm li.10). In the Authorised Version the verse is rendered thus: 'But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God: I trust in the mercy of God for ever and ever' (Psalm lii.8). Within the oval of the 'Q' a woman sits enthroned on a cushioned bench with a curtain drawn back on each side. She wears blue robes and a crown, and holds a sceptre in her left hand and a palm frond in her right. The tail of the 'Q' is represented as a fierce red dragon under the figure's feet; it is coiled around and is biting itself. The enthroned figure in the 'Q' has been variously identified as St Mary and as a personification of the Church, that is as *ecclesia*.[40] Given the vitality of the cult of St Mary at *Beodericisworth* so manifest elsewhere in Reg. lat. 12, the identification of the figure with St Mary seems indisputable. Figures personifying *ecclesia* usually include a building or other architectural detail in the setting. But although these are absent here, it is not impossible that the artist intended the figure to represent both *ecclesia* and St Mary since the two images are not mutually exclusive. St Mary was sometimes represented as *ecclesia*: both images represent the conquest of sin; in this instance the image of the self-biting dragon under the figure's feet represents sin defeated.[41] But

Jouarre. Wilmart concluded from the content of the prayer that it was copied for a woman, 'apparently an abbess'. It seems likely that when the volume left St Edmunds it went straight to Jouarre. It is tempting to speculate that whoever was responsible for its acquisition was at least partly attracted by the prominence it gave to St Mary, Jouarre's spiritual patroness. Noticed and the prayer printed in Wilmart, 'Prayers', 200, 215–16; cf. *Cod. reg. lat.*, i. 34.

[38] The fullest description of these illustrations is by R. M. Harris in his brilliant dissertation, 'The marginal drawings' (see n. 25 above). See also William Noel, 'The lost Canterbury prototype of the 11th-century Bury St Edmunds psalter', in Antonia Gransden (ed.), *Bury St Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy* (Conference Transactions of the British Archaeological Association xx, 1998), 161–71.

[39] Reg. lat. 12, fos 21, 62 respectively. Fo. 21 is reproduced, full-page in black and white, in Thompson, *New Palaeological Society facsimiles*, plate 166, and fo. 62 is described and reproduced, full-page in black and white, in Temple, *Anglo-Saxon manuscripts*, 100 (no. 84), illustration 262. Both are described and reproduced, full-page in black and white, in T. H. Ohlgren, *Anglo-Saxon textual illustration*, Kalamazoo 1992, 41, 44, ills 3.1, 3.17. A fuller description of the 'Q' miniature is in idem, *Insular and Anglo-Saxon illuminated manuscripts*, New York–London 1986, 207 (no. 189 § 19).

[40] Temple, *Anglo-Saxon manuscripts*, 100, identifies the figure as St Mary without hesitation. Ohlgren, *Insular and Anglo-Saxon illuminated manuscripts*, 44, decides that 'possibly' it is St Mary, but alternatively it might be a personification of the Church.

[41] This miniature is noticed in Clayton, *Cult of the Virgin Mary*, 169, 170.

the artist's primary intention was probably to represent St Mary as Queen of Heaven, *Maria regina*.[42] The palm frond and the sceptre are common motifs in Marian iconography: the palm frond was a symbol of her victory over sin and the sceptre of her regality.[43] Just possibly the image was intended in addition as a reference to the Anglo-Saxon queen at the time, Cnut's wife, Ælfgifu or Emma, who jointly with Cnut was a generous supporter and benefactor of the monastic reform movement.[44] She appears with Cnut in the frontispiece of the *Liber vitae* (the 'Book of Life') of the New Minster, Winchester (a register of the monastery's monks, associates, and benefactors, alive and dead), produced there in 1031: Emma on the left and Cnut on the right place a splendid golden cross on the high altar; above, Christ in a mandorla presides, with St Mary and St Peter on either side; below monks pray.[45]

Meanwhile, the cult of St Mary at *Beodericisworth* was increasingly overshadowed by that of St Edmund. In the additional material in Reg. lat. 12, he rivals St Mary in prominence. The note in the margin of the Easter Tables on the reform of the monastery under Cnut refers to it as 'St Edmund's monastery'. While the third of the set of prayers is for St Mary, the fourth is 'a special and very celebrated prayer to St Edmund, soldier of Christ'.[46] The litany includes an invocation to him marked for repetition and the calendar marks in gold the anniversary of his martyrdom (20 November) and the feast of his translation.[47] The year of St Edmund's translation into the church which Archbishop Æthelnoth consecrated in 1032 is unknown. There are two entries in the calendar for the feast of his translation, both in gold, one for 30 March and the other for 31 March.[48] The first reads 'Translatio Sancti Eadmundi' and the second 'Hic translatus est Sanctus Rex Eadmundus ab Ælfrico episcopo'. It seems likely that the feast on 30 March celebrated St Edmund's original translation to *Beodericisworth* which took

---

[42] For *Maria regina* see ibid. 164–5.

[43] For the palm frond in Marian iconography see ibid. 158–9, 167–9 passim, 172; for the sceptre see pp. 164, 169, 171, 172.

[44] This idea was first suggested to me by Richard Pfaff in conversation. It is also mentioned by Clayton, *Cult of the Virgin Mary*, 164–7 passim.

[45] Ibid. 166–7. For this famous picture (BL, MS Stow 944, fo. 6) see Simon Keynes (ed.), *The 'Liber vitae' of the New Minster and Hyde Abbey, Winchester*, Copenhagen 1996, 37–9, 66–8, 79–80; *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, ed. Alistair Campbell (Camden 3rd ser. lxxii, 1949), repr. with supplementary introduction by Simon Keynes, Cambridge 1998, pp. xxvi and n. 4 for further references, xxvii (illustration 1), xxviii; Francis Wormald, *English drawings of the tenth and eleventh centuries*, London 1952, 64, 65, 69, 72 (no. 42) and plate 15 (omitting top part with Christ etc.); D. H. Turner, 'Illuminated manuscripts', in Janet Backhouse, D. H. Turner and Leslie Webster (eds), *The golden age of Anglo-Saxon art*, London 1984, 77 (plate 62), 78.

[46] 'Specialis et precluis ad Christi militem Eadmundum oratio': Wilmart, 'Prayers', 205–6.

[47] *Kalendars*, 250, 242 respectively.

[48] Ibid. 242. The problems raised by these two entries in the calendar are discussed, but without consideration of the relevant passage in the 'Losinga' tract, by D. N. Dumville, *English Caroline script and monastic history: studies in Benedictinism A.D. 950–1030*, Woodbridge 1993, 42.

place towards the middle of the tenth century. The feast on 31 March probably celebrated his translation into the new church. There were three bishops of East Anglia called Ælfric: Ælfric I, 966 × 970–970 × 974; Ælfric II, 1023 × 1038; and the latter's immediate successor, Ælfric III, 1039–1042 × 1043. Since St Edmund is not known to have been translated in Ælfric I's time, the latter's claim to be the officiant recorded in the calendar can fairly safely be eliminated.[49] If credence is to be given to the above-mentioned statement in the Losinga tract that Cnut made 'Ælfric' bishop and gave him responsibility for the reform of the monastery at *Beodericisworth*, this would indicate that the officiant was Ælfric II. It is to be supposed that when the new church was consecrated on 18 October 1032, building was still in progress (perhaps only the presbytery was completed).[50] Since 31 March was on a Sunday in 1034, possibly the translation took place then. The building would presumably have been nearer completion.

The foundations of this, or just possibly of the original tenth-century church at *Beodericisworth*, were discovered in 1275 when Abbot Simon of Luton (1257–79) built a spacious new lady chapel, extending from the east side of the north transept along the north wall of the presbytery with a doorway into the latter.[51] Possibly what the monks discovered were the foundations of part of the aisle of the old church. In any case, the excavations revealed that the church was round and of impressive size and that the altar was in the centre.[52] Other examples of round churches are known to have existed in Anglo-Saxon England. They were considered especially appropriate for mausolea and martyria.[53] As tomb-churches they were suitable both

[49] Dumville takes a more cautious view: *English Caroline script*, 42.

[50] In 1095 Abbot Baldwin translated St Edmund's body into his new Romanesque church when the presbytery was complete: *De miraculis*, 85. Building of the Romanesque church continued under Baldwin's successors and even after half a century the work remained unfinished. For further references see E. C. Fernie, 'The Romanesque church of Bury St Edmunds abbey', and J. Philip McAleer, 'The west front of the abbey church', both in *Bury St Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy*, 1–2, 22–3; cf. p. 639 below and n. 60.

[51] 'Deposita est capella sancti Eadmundi et in eodem loco capella sancte Marie est constructa. Vbi sub terra inuenti fuerunt muri cuiusdam ueteris ecclesie rotunde, que quidem multo latior fuit quam capella et ita constructa quod altare capelle quasi in medio eius fuerat. Et credimus illam fuisse que ad opus sancti Eadmundi primo fuit constructa': *The chronicle of Bury St Edmunds*, ed. and trans. Antonia Gransden, London–Edinburgh 1964, 58.

[52] See Gilyard-Beer, 'Eastern arm', 258–9; Gem and Keen, 'Late Anglo-Saxon finds', 2; A. B. Whittingham, 'Bury St Edmund's Abbey: the plan, design and development of the church and monastic buildings', *Archaeological Journal* cviii (1952), 173–4; Hills, 'Antiquities', 112–13; M. R. James, *On the abbey of S. Edmund at Bury*, II: *The church* (Cambridge Antiquarian Society, oct. ser. xxviii, 1895), 188 and, for the verses, murals etc. adorning the new lady chapel, pp. 189–94.

[53] On the iconography of round churches I am indebted to Richard Gem's article, 'Towards an iconography of Anglo-Saxon architecture', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* xlvi (1983), 7–12 and nn. He discusses this and other examples (notably at Abingdon and St Augustine's, Canterbury) of round churches in Anglo-Saxon England and their

for the cult of St Mary and for that of St Edmund. The prototype for a round church for St Mary's cult was the church outside Jerusalem which was supposed to contain her tomb. The prototype of a round martyrium was the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and of a royal mausoleum Charlemagne's chapel-tomb at Aachen: the round church at *Beodericisworth* was doubly appropriate for a church dedicated to St Edmund who, besides being a martyr, was a king. It is clear that the church was built as a shrine-church for St Edmund.

The community serving St Edmund's shrine must have recognised from the beginning that the spiritual prestige and temporal prosperity of its church depended on the successful promotion of St Edmund's cult. Indeed, from the mid-tenth century onwards gifts of lands and jurisdiction had been to St Edmund at *Beodericisworth*, not to St Mary.[54] The survey compiled under Abbot Leofstan (1044–65) and continued under Abbot Baldwin shows Edward the Confessor's devotion and generosity to St Edmund.[55] The name *Beodericisworth* was replaced by 'Bury St Edmunds' in the mid-eleventh century and the earliest known extant copy of Abbo of Fleury's *Passio Sancti Eadmundi* (Lambeth Palace Library, MS 362) was probably made in the abbey at about the same time: in it the text of the *Passio* is followed by two hymns and a mass in St Edmund's honour.[56] No abbot was more zealous and effective in promoting St Edmund's cult than Baldwin.[57] Under him Abbo's *Passio* was revised and new copies made, and Baldwin took copies abroad for distribution, together with secondary relics of

significance, with detailed references. For the rotunda at St Augustine's see p. 652 below and nn. 140, 141.

[54] The earliest known example is in the will of Theodred, bishop of London (909 × 926–951 × 953), which bequeaths estates to 'St Edmund's church, as the property of God's community': *Anglo-Saxon wills*, 4 (no. 1) (see pp. 628–9 above and n. 5). Most bequests in the last half of the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh were to 'St Edmund's *stow* at *Beodericisworth*' or to 'St Edmunds': ibid. 6 (no. 2), 34 (no. 14), 42 (no. 16(i)), 68 (no. 24), 72 (no. 26), 74 (nos 27, 28); Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters*, nos 1526 (Theodred's will), 1483, 1501, 1527, 1489, 1537, 1490 respectively.

[55] The text, the first three quarters of which are in Anglo-Saxon and the rest in Latin, is printed in D. C. Douglas, 'Fragments of an Anglo-Saxon survey from Bury St Edmunds', *EHR* xliii (1928), 376–83, and, with English translation and notes, in *Anglo-Saxon charters*, ed. and trans. A. J. Robertson, Cambridge 1939, 192–201, 440–7. The only reference to St Mary is to Abbot Baldwin's gift of 10s. for her Nativity. He made gifts for the feast of two other saints; they were smaller – 8s. for St Denis, and 4s. for St Nicholas, 'and in addition two fat pigs or 4s. for lard': ibid. 198. Edward the Confessor, in his writs in favour of the monastery, always refers to it as 'St Edmunds' or 'St Edmund's Bury': *Anglo-Saxon writs*, ed. and trans. F. E. Harmer, Manchester 1952, repr. 1959, 2nd edn Stamford 1989, 153–65.

[56] For the strong case for dating Lambeth Palace Library, MS 362 to the mid-eleventh century and attributing it to St Edmunds see Gransden, 'Abbo', 63 and n. 267, 64 and plate 1. However, Helmut Gneuss is uncertain about its date and provenance, veering between the first and last half of the eleventh century, and attributes it alternatively to St Edmunds or St Augustines, Canterbury: *Handlist*, 87 (no. 514).   [57] Gransden, 'Baldwin', 66–7, 72–6.

St Edmund.[58] He also commissioned one of the monks, Bertrann 'the archdeacon', to write the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*, a history of the cult and monastery.[59] And he began the construction of the gigantic Romanesque church, a shrine, as it were, for the shrine of St Edmund.[60] He finished the presbytery and the body of St Edmund was solemnly translated into it on 29 April 1095.[61] Bertrann relates that Baldwin tried but failed to obtain a licence from William Rufus to consecrate the new church.[62] It seems clear from Bertrann's account that the dedication would have been to St Edmund alone: he makes no mention of St Mary in this or any other context.[63] Subsequent abbots continued the policy of promoting Edmund's cult and his church became one of the greatest shrine-churches in England, a magnet for pilgrims from far and wide.

Nevertheless, neither Baldwin nor his successors neglected the cult of any saint for whom they could make some kind of claim. They fully realised the benefit of fostering veneration for many saints and foremost among them was

---

[58] *Three Lives of English saints*, 8–10; Gransden, 'Abbo', 63–78.

[59] 'Ad quae contexenda non nos provocat, quod absit, nostra praesumptio, sed felicis memoriae patris Baldewini obsequenda jussio, fratrumque sibi subjectorum caritativa exhortatio,': *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 27.

[60] For the building of the Romanesque church see n. 50 above. The church as representing a shrine for St Edmund's shrine is apparent in its architectural iconography. The same iconography appears in the street-plan of the borough which arguably was laid out in Baldwin's time. This date is postulated by Bernard Gauthiez, 'The planning of the town of Bury St Edmunds: a probable Norman origin', in *Bury St Edmunds: art, architecture, archaeology and economy*, 81–7 and figs. Gauthiez bases his opinion on comparison of St Edmunds' street-plan with examples of similar date in Normandy. However, Margaret Statham is more cautious, pointing out that if the street-plan originated under Baldwin, it must have been modified under Abbot Anselm. She bases her conclusion on close study of the literary and archaeological evidence: 'The medieval town of Bury St Edmunds', ibid. 99–100.

[61] *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 87–9; cf. Gransden, 'Baldwin', 72.

[62] *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 85–6; cf. Gransden, 'Baldwin', 72, and 'The question of the consecration of St Edmund's church', in Ian Wood and G. A. Loud (eds), *Church and chronicle in the Middle Ages: essays presented to John Taylor*, London–Rio Grande 1991, 60.

[63] Thomas N. Hall states that Baldwin planned to dedicate the church to St Mary and St Edmund: 'The earliest Anglo-Latin text of the *Trinubium Annae* (BHL 505zl)', in Thomas N. Hall (ed.), with assistance from Thomas D. Hill and Charles D. Wright, *Via crucis: essays on early medieval sources and ideas in memory of J. E. Cross*, Morgantown 2002, 120 and n. 39. I believe that he is mistaken. The references he cites in n. 38 are to evidence for the dedication to St Mary and St Edmund at the 1032 consecration, that is *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 342; Dumville, *English caroline script*, 32–4, 41; Gransden, 'The question of the consecration', 59–80, esp. pp. 65–6. His reference to the *Memorials* is in fact to one of the additions to the St Edmunds' copy of the chronicle of John of Worcester which were made at St Edmunds shortly before 1143, contemporaneously with the copying of the chronicle there. The additions are printed in appendices to the three volumes of *Memorials of St Edmund's* but most recently in *The chronicle of John of Worcester*, 3 vols (i forthcoming), ii, ed. and trans. R. R. Darlington, Patrick McGurk and Jennifer Bray, Oxford 1995; iii, ed. and trans. Patrick McGurk, Oxford 1998. For the present reference see ii. 643.

St Mary. In 1071 Baldwin visited Rome and Alexander II granted him the coveted privilege of exemption from episcopal authority 'for the glory and praise of the most blessed king, Edmund', but Alexander also gave him 'an altar of precious porphyry and solemnly consecrated it himself in honour of God, St Mary and the most holy king Edmund'.[64] The construction of the new Romanesque church soon necessitated the destruction of two parish churches in the cemetery, the church of St Denis and St Mary's. Both were replaced under Abbot Anselm (1121–48) by new churches elsewhere in the cemetery, very necessary because of the burgeoning population of the town.[65] As will be seen, the new St Mary's was an impressive building.[66] Obviously, assuming that Baldwin had planned that the dedication of the new Romanesque church was to be solely to St Edmund, it must have had a lady chapel but where this was located is unknown. It has been suggested that it was the easternmost of the apsidal chapels.[67] But most recently Richard Gem has made the attractive and plausible suggestion that the central part of the old round church of Christ, St Mary and St Edmund, from which Edmund's body was translated in 1195, became the lady chapel of the new Romanesque church. The ambulatory of the rotunda had been demolished to make room for building the eastern arm of the Romanesque church under Abbot Robert II (1102–7). As mentioned above, part of the foundation of the ambulatory was discovered in 1275 during the construction by Abbot Simon of a new lady chapel on the site.[68] If the rotunda had served as a lady chapel in the Romanesque church, this would illustrate continuity at St Edmunds between its pre- and post-Conquest history. It was not unusual for a lady chapel to be located in the eastern arm of a church.[69]

[64] *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 345; *Chronicle of John of Worcester*, iii. 309; ii. 646 respectively.
[65] *Bury customary*, 116–17. The new church replacing the old church of St Denis was dedicated under Abbot Anselm to St James: ibid. 118; cf. Hills, 'Antiquities', 44–5 and plate 2; A. B. Whittingham, 'St Mary's church, Bury St. Edmunds', and 'St James' Cathedral, Bury St Edmunds', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* xxi (1865), 187–8, 188; Gem and Keen, 'Late Anglo-Saxon finds', 2. For such subsidiary churches in the vicinity of a principal church see pp. 633–4 above and nn. 29, 30.   [66] See pp. 645–6 below.
[67] James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, 121 and plan at the end of the book.
[68] *Bury chronicle*, 58; *William Worcestre itineraries*, ed. J. H. Harvey, Oxford 1969, 160, 161; James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, 121, 142; Gilyard-Beer, 'Eastern arm', 258–9 and fig. 33.
[69] The new lady chapel at Peterborough, founded in 1272, and that at Ely, founded in 1321, were in similar locations to the one at St Edmunds. Richard Gem kindly gave me his views on this matter in a letter of 15 September 2001. I quote the relevant paragraph with his permission: 'In the case of Ely, the first Lady Chapel was built at the beginning of the 11th c. by Leofwine Athulf's son, and formed a porticus on the south side of the church, containing the golden Virgin and Child (*Liber eliensis*, 132). The golden image had been lost before the 1075 inventory was made, so there was no necessity to provide a new setting for it in Abbot Simeon's building: but that does not indicate that he did not provide a Lady Chapel – we simply have no relevant references. Whether the later appearance of the Lady Chapel at Ely in a corresponding position to that at St Edmund's (and at Peterborough) is significant is open to discussion. It may be noted, however, that Winchester Cathedral, on which Simeon based his

   Baldwin's plan for the new Romanesque church did not, therefore, neglect the cult of St Mary. However, a more remarkable manifestation of the continued vitality of her cult appears in the monks' manuscript collection which contains an unusual number of late eleventh-century Marian texts. Their number alone deserves comment, especially as it must represent only a fraction of the monks' original holding, though how unusual the size of the original holding was is hard to estimate since the survival rate of manuscripts in general from St Edmunds is high compared with that from most religious houses in England. Possibly other houses had similar holdings of Marian texts but the manuscripts containing them are lost. Perhaps some survive in extant manuscripts but have been overlooked, maybe because they are untraceable in both medieval and modern catalogues. Nevertheless, the examples from St Edmunds prove that there was a lively interest in St Mary's cult in the abbey. Some of St Edmunds' early Marian texts are in a manuscript which, together with a fellow volume, was almost certainly acquired by Baldwin from St Denis in Paris where he had previously been a monk. The manuscripts are now in Pembroke College, Cambridge, MSS 23 and 24, constituting part of a version of the homiliary of the influential Carolingian scholar, Paul the Deacon (d. *c.* 795), the former for the temporale and the latter for the sanctorale. The script and ornament of both are northern French and datable to the last half of the eleventh century.[70] Pembroke MS 24 provides the evidence that the volumes had reached St Edmunds by *c.* 1100 since at the end of the volume is an addition in the hand of a scribe active at St Edmunds at that time; the addition is a homily for the feast of the Assumption of St Mary.[71] The Marian element in this version of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon itself is unique; instead of the two regular homilies prescribed by the original homiliary for the Assumption and for St Mary's Nativity respectively, it substitutes five others, three for her Assumption and two for her Nativity.[72]

design, had an extended east chapel (of unknown dedication), which replaced a similarly extended east chapel in the preceding Anglo-Saxon building. The later medieval Lady Chapel at Winchester was in the eastern position.' Simeon, abbot of Ely (1082–1102), was the brother of Walkelin, bishop of Winchester, and was prior of St Swithun's 1081–2. Walkelin was one of the two officiants at the translation of St Edmund in 1095: *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 86–7.

   [70] Gneuss, *Handlist*, 40 (no. 130); M. R. James, *A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Pembroke College, Cambridge*, Cambridge 1905, 25; Gransden, 'The composition and authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*' (see n. 4 above), 30–1; 'The alleged incorruption of the body of St Edmund, king and martyr', *Antiquaries Journal* liv (1994), 151 and n. 106; and 'Some manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey: exhibition catalogue', in *Bury St Edmunds: art, architecture, archaeology and economy*, 230, 254; Teresa Webber, 'The provision of books for Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the 11th and 12th centuries', ibid. 188 and n. 12.

   [71] Gneuss, *Handlist*, 40 (no. 129). For other references see n. 70, but for the scribal evidence see Webber, 'Provision of books', 190 and plate xlva.

   [72] Hall, *Trinubium Annae*, 118–20.

Even more remarkable are two eleventh-century manuscripts surviving from St Edmunds which include Marian apocrypha. Such apocrypha were intended to supplement the brief information about St Mary in the Gospels: collectively they describe Mary's birth, childhood, adult life, death and corporal assumption to heaven.[73] Unfortunately it is uncertain whether either of these two manuscripts were at St Edmunds as early as *c*. 1100. The manuscripts are St John's College, Cambridge, MS 35 (B. 13) and Pembroke College, Cambridge, MS 25. Both descend from continental archetypes which just possibly were among Abbot Baldwin's imports from France. St John's MS 35 is a late eleventh-century copy of Gregory the Great's *Homilies on Ezechiel*. The volume is thought to have been at St Edmunds *c*. 1100 and to be no. 202 in the later twelfth-century book-list.[74] It ends (fo. 173v) with an eleventh-century version of the *Trinubium Annae*, a work originally abstracted from the *Epitome of sacred history* which was composed in the late ninth century.[75] At what date the *Trinubium* first began to circulate as an independent work is unknown, but the copy in St John's MS 35 is remarkable because it is the earliest known copy in England by a century.[76] St Anne's cult had grown slowly in the Christian west, though interest in her pregnancy and St Mary's birth appeared at the very inception of Marian apocryphal literature, in fact in the *Protoevangelium Jacobi* itself. The *Trinubium*'s purpose was to explain the anomaly of St Mary's perpetual virginity in face of the fact that it appears from the Bible that Jesus had brothers. Therefore, the author claimed that: Anne had been married successively three times; St Mary was the daughter of the first marriage, but Anne also had daughters, also called Mary, by her two later husbands; each Mary had sons, and since the Hebrew word for 'brother' could also mean 'kinsman', Jesus' 'brothers' who figure in the Bible were actually cousins, sons of St Mary's two half-sisters.

The first concrete evidence that the other manuscript containing Marian apocryphal material, Pembroke MS 25,[77] was at St Edmunds is the early

---

[73] For an excellent survey of the apocrypha see Mary Clayton, *The apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge 1998, 1–29.

[74] Gneuss, *Handlist*, 42 (no. 147), and R. Sharpe, J. P. Carley, R. M. Thomson and A. G. Watson (eds), *English Benedictine libraries: the shorter catalogues*, London 1996, 81 (no. 202). For descriptions of the manuscript see M. R. James, *A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of St John's College, Cambridge*, Cambridge 1913, 47; Gransden, 'Some manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds abbey', 265–6 and nn. 277–80 and plate lxxxa (part of fo. 105).

[75] See Hall, *Trinubium Annae*, 104–37, for a detailed account of the origins of the cult of St Anne, the purpose and argument of the *Trinubium* and evidence for its arrival in England in the late eleventh century, a time when the cult of St Anne was still little known in most of Europe.

[76] Ibid. 113–15, 120, 130–1.

[77] Discussed and the contents calendared in J. E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS 25: a Carolingian sermonary used by Anglo-Saxon preachers*, London 1987. Most scholars date Pembroke MS 25 to the last half of, or to the late, eleventh century. See, for example, Gneuss, *Handlist*, 40 (no. 131) and Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 129. But P. E. Szarmach, 'Cotton Tiberius A iii, arts 26

thirteenth-century *ex libris* inscription: it is like others which appear in a number of the abbey's books in a hand of that date.[78] But the volume has not been identified in the late twelfth-century list of the monks' books.[79] Nevertheless, since the date and, arguably, the character of the script suggest the possibility that it was copied at St Edmunds in the last half of the eleventh century, its Marian contents deserve mention.[80] It is a version of the homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres, a work probably composed at Tours in Carolingian times. Among the distinctive features of the version in Pembroke MS 25 are three homilies derived from Marian apocrypha. The first is a homily for the feast of the Nativity which derives from the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*.[81] The

and 27', in Michael Korhammer and others (eds), *Words, texts and MSS: studies in Anglo-Saxon culture presented to Helmut Gneuss on … his 65th birthday*, Cambridge 1992, 32 n. 15, dates it to the 1020s and D. N. Dumville argues for an early twelfth-century date: 'On the dating of some late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* x (1991), 41. Cross was uncertain whether the archetype was of insular or continental origin but François Dolbeau argues in favour of composition at Tours: 'Du Nouveau sur un sermonnaire de Cambridge', *Speculum* xlii (1988), 256–7.

[78] See the *ex libris* inscriptions in, for example, Pembroke College, Cambridge, MSS 24, 72, 88. See Gransden, 'Some manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey', 230–1, 253 (no. 4), 254 (no. 6), 256 (no. 10). Cross, *Pembroke 25*, does not mention this *ex libris*. He states (p. vi) that Pembroke MS 25 was written at St Edmunds, and Dumville, 'On the dating of some late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts', 41, considers this perfectly possible. It has been assumed that it was at St Edmunds by 1154, as indicated by a note on fo. 1 which must refer either to Stephen's recognition of Henry as his successor in 1153 or to Henry II's accession: Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 129. However, there is no evidence that the note was written at St Edmunds.

[79] The book-list is printed, with commentary, by Richard Sharpe, and two pages reproduced in Sharpe, Carley, Thomson and Watson, *English Benedictine libraries*, 50–87. Pembroke MSS 23 and 24 have both been tentatively identified in the book-list: ibid. 70 (nos 114, 115); cf. Gransden, 'Some manuscripts in Cambridge from St Edmunds abbey', 230, 258 (no. 18) and plate 73A.

[80] However, the contents of Pembroke MS 25 have only one distinctive feature which could be a clue to its or its exemplar's provenance – and that does not point to St Edmunds. The standard Saint-Père homiliary has a homily for 'one confessor'. In most copies this homily invokes some saint by name. In Pembroke MS 25 the saint named is 'Cudð (fo. 151). The name is clumsily written and followed by a $\frac{1}{2}$ in. space). Scholars agree, though hesitantly, that this is an abbreviation for 'Cuthbert': Cross, *Pembroke 25*, 88–9. If this identification is correct, it suggests a Durham provenance for Pembroke MS 25 or its exemplar (a possibility not mentioned by Cross). Such a provenance would not mean that Pembroke MS 25 or its exemplar could not have been at St Edmunds in the late eleventh century since the abbey's contacts with Durham were close. The cults and legends of the two saints show remarkable similarities. See *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i, pp. xiii–xiv; Gransden, 'Baldwin', 74; 'Abbo', 24, 34, 42–3; and 'The alleged incorruption', 138 and n. 30, 140 and n. 51, cf. 154 and n. 117. More specifically, Ranulf Flambard, who became bishop of Durham in 1099, was an officiant at the translation of St Edmunds in 1095: *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 86–7 (n. 127 below). The feast of St Cuthbert (20 Mar.) was a principal feast at St Edmunds before the Conquest: *Kalendar*, 242.

[81] Cross, *Pembroke 25*, 51. Hall, *Trinubium Annae*, 104–37 passim, gives a brief survey, with many references, to this and the other early texts of Marian apocrypha considered below. For a very useful account of the *Protoevangelium* see Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 11–18.

original of the latter was in Greek and apparently composed in the late second century. It enjoyed wide currency; it was soon translated into Latin and later into many vernacular languages, including Old English.[82] The second Marian apocryphon represented in Pembroke MS 25 is in one of the homilies for the feast of Holy Innocents, part of which derives from the *Pseudo-Matthew*, a work probably composed sometime between 550 and 700 and based on the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*. The third Marian homily in Pembroke MS 25 is one of the homilies for the feast of the Assumption: its source was the *Transitus Beatae Mariae*, an apocryphon which had circulated in England at least from the time of Bede.[83]

Abbot Anselm is an important figure in the history of St Mary's cult at St Edmunds. He had a deep devotion to her. To appreciate this aspect of his piety something must be said about his early monastic career. If, as seems likely, he is 'the young man called Anselm' at St Michael's abbey in Chiusa who occurs in an apocryphal miracle story demonstrating the intercessory power of St Mary, he was 'devoted with all his mind to the service of the Mother of God'.[84] This apocryphal story is so detailed and realistic that it must surely have been inspired by an actual event. It relates that one day when the young Anselm was serving at the altar he accidentally spilled some of the communion wine on the linen cloth (the corporal) in the tabernacle containing the chalice. The wine was the exceptionally dark local wine whose stains could not be removed by washing. In consternation, Anselm prayed for help to the 'Mother of God' – immediately the stains vanished. Abbot Anselm was a nephew of St Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, who visited Chiusa while his nephew was there. When he left the young Anselm accompanied him to France but later the archbishop sent him to Canterbury. The young Anselm remained as a monk of Christ Church until the death of the archbishop in 1109. He then returned to Italy and became abbot of St Saba's in Rome and subsequently, having returned to England, was elected abbot of St Edmunds in 1121.[85] Abbot Anselm's early close contacts with his uncle could well have enhanced his devotion to St Mary. St Anselm was himself one of her devotees. Before becoming archbishop, he had spent

---

[82] Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 30; Cross, *Pembroke 25*, 23. For the *Pseudo-Matthew* see Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 18–23.

[83] Cross, *Pembroke 25*, 36. For the *Transitus*, which is known in various versions, see Clayton, *Apocryphal Gospels*, 3, 4, 24–9.

[84] R. W. Southern, 'The English origins of the "Miracles of the Virgin"', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* iv (1958), 190–1.

[85] For Anselm's career see the late fourteenth-century note on him by Henry of Kirkstead in BL, MS Harleian 1005, fos 217v–18v, printed in *Bury customary*, 121–2; for a comprehensive modern account see *The letters of Osbert of Clare prior of Westminster*, ed. E. W. Williamson, Oxford 1929, 191–200.

thirty-three years at Bec, successively as cloister monk, prior and abbot. Bec was dedicated to St Mary and a monk of Bec urged St Anselm to add prayers to St Mary to the collection of prayers which he had already composed. Eventually, after much hesitation, he wrote three Marian prayers: they are expressive of the most fervent devotion.[86]

In the first half of the twelfth century three systematic collections of Marian miracles began to have limited circulation. These are the earliest such collections known and have been studied by Richard Southern.[87] He postulated that they were compiled between about 1100 and 1140 in monasteries with strong Anglo-Saxon traditions.[88] The miracle story about the young Anselm at Chiusa belongs to one of the three collections. It contains seventeen miracles[89] and besides the one cited, it has another Marian miracle with a Chiusa connection; it was recorded on the authority of a certain Peter, monk of Chiusa.[90] Yet another of the miracles was associated with the circle of Archbishop Anselm: the authority for it was Hugh, abbot of Cluny, whom the archbishop visited during one of his two periods of exile, in 1099–1100 and 1104–5; the miracle was recorded by one of his household.[91] Southern assembles the evidence in this collection which could have some bearing on the identity of the compiler and very tentatively suggests that Abbot Anselm himself was responsible for the compilation.[92] If so, this would explain the author's intimate knowledge of the accident at Chiusa with the communion wine, as well as his acquaintance with the miracle recounted by Peter, monk of Chiusa, and with the one recorded by a member of St Anselm's household. Moreover, the approximate dating of the collection accords with that of Abbot Anselm's adult life, and no monastic community was more conscious of its Anglo-Saxon tradition than was that of St Edmunds.

In Abbot Anselm's time the cult of St Mary flourished at St Edmunds. The altar in the crypt of the new church was dedicated to the Virgin Mary shortly before his succession to the abbacy.[93] While he was abbot the construction of the new parish church of St Mary, begun under Abbot Robert II by the

---

[86] R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm and his biographer*, Cambridge 1990, 34, 288–9, and *Saint Anselm: a portrait in a landscape*, Cambridge 1990, 106–9. For the dedication of Bec to St Mary see Margaret Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec*, Oxford 1978, 26, 29.

[87] Southern, '"Miracles"', 176–216.   [88] Ibid. 177.   [89] Ibid. 183.

[90] Ibid. 192.   [91] Ibid. 188–9.   [92] Ibid. 199–200.

[93] The dedication was performed by Ralph d'Escures, bishop of Rochester (1108–14), later archbishop of Canterbury: *Bury customary*, 114. William Worcestre notes that St Mary's crypt was under St Edmund's shrine and that the anniversary was on 5 November: *Itineraries* (n. 68 above), 160, 161. For the crypt itself see Hills, 'Antiquities', 43; James, *Abbey of S. Edmund*, 118, 121, 161; Gilyard-Beer, 'Eastern arm', 258–9; Fernie, 'Romanesque church', 6; Stephen Heywood, 'Aspects of the Romanesque church of Bury St Edmunds in their regional context', in Gransden, *Bury St Edmunds: art, architecture, archaeology and economy*, 16–18.

sacrist Godfrey, was completed by the sacrist Hervey. It must have been an impressive building. It had 'a tower and a belfry with melodious bells'.[94] However, the most notable expression of Anselm's devotion to St Mary was in liturgical innovations. These are recorded in a short biographical note by the distinguished antiquary and bibliographer Henry of Kirkstead, a monk of St Edmunds who held various offices and was active in the 1360s and 1370s.[95] He states that Anselm ordained that a mass for St Mary should be celebrated daily[96] besides 'other observances after the canonical hours'. These 'other observances' were probably the private recitation of the Little Office of St Mary, a devotion which became very popular among the religious and in the secular Church later in the Middle Ages.[97] Especially remarkable is Kirkstead's statement that Anselm decreed that the feast of St Mary's commemoration which 'Bishop Hildefonsus had instituted', should be celebrated. Hildefonsus, bishop of Toledo (d. 667), was an ardent supporter of St Mary's cult and among his acts was to ordain observance of the feast of the Annunciation on 18 December in churches in his diocese.[98] There is no certain evidence that the feast was observed anywhere in England before the Conquest,[99] and it is not known to have been observed anywhere in post-Conquest England except at St Edmunds and at one unidentified East

[94] Bury customary, 116–17; Gesta sacristarum, in Memorials of St Edmund's, ii. 289; Hills, 'Antiquities', 44–5 and plate 2; Whittingham, 'St Mary's church, Bury St Edmunds', 187.

[95] Kirkstead's note is in the bottom margin of the copy of De dedicationibus in BL, MS Harleian 1005, fos 217v–18v. The relevant passage reads: 'Hic Anselmus duas apud nos solemnitates instituit, scilicet Conceptionem sanctae Mariae, quae iam in multis ecclesiis per ipsum celebriter observatur, et commemoracionem eius in Adventu quam Hildefonsus episcopus instituit; et cotidie unam missam de ea et post canonicas horas alias in honore eius celebrandas decrevit': Bury customary, 122. This note is cited by Edmund Bishop, Liturgica historica, Oxford 1918, repr. 1962, 247 n. 1. For Kirkstead see n. 15 above.

[96] The daily mass of St Mary, as an addition to the office of the day, was introduced in some monasteries in the twelfth century. Besides its observance at St Edmunds it was almost certainly celebrated in Christ Church, Canterbury: Registrum Roberti Winchelsey cantuariensis archiepiscopi, ed. Rose Graham (Canterbury and York Society li, lii, 1952–6), ii. 820; cf. Roger Bowers, 'The liturgy of the cathedral and its music', in Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsey and Margaret Sparks (eds), A history of Canterbury Cathedral, Oxford 1995, 414. It is known to have been celebrated at Tewkesbury and Rochester in the first half of the twelfth century: S. E. Roper, Medieval Benedictine liturgy: studies in the formation, structure, and content of the monastic votive office, c. 950–1450, New York 1993, 46–7; Nigel Morgan, 'Texts and images of Marian devotion in English twelfth-century monasticism and their influence on the secular church', in Benjamin Thompson (ed.), Harlaxton medieval studies, VI: Monasteries and society in medieval Britain, Stamford 1999, 122 and n. 22, 123.

[97] Morgan, 'Texts and images', 122–3 and nn. 23–5; Clayton, Cult of the Virgin Mary, 65–6.

[98] Alia Vita S. Hildefonsi per Rodericum Cerratensem scripta, PL xcvi.49–50. Ildefonsus was a thirteenth-century Spanish Dominican and bishop of Toledo 659–67. For the Mozarabic feast of St Mary on 18 December see Archdale A. King, Liturgies of the primatial sees, London 1957, 548–52.

[99] Clayton, Cult of the Virgin Mary, 57–60 passim, 100. For Ildefonsus see also pp. 12–13.

Anglian house.[100] The accepted date for the feast of the Annunciation was (and is) 25 March.

Another of Abbot Anselm's important liturgical innovations at St Edmunds noted by Kirkstead was observance of the feast of the Conception of the Virgin Mary (8 September). Abbot Anselm was one of those who contributed most to the spread of the feast in England. His uncle, St Anselm, never committed himself to belief in the doctrine underlying the observance, but his friend and biographer, Eadmer, wrote a treatise *c.* 1125 in its defence:[101] he argued that 'in former times' the feast was more widely celebrated than it was in his day, especially among the truly pious, and humble and simple folk; but later the observance was abolished because of the arrogance of the learned who asserted that the feast was contrary to reason. Eadmer proceeded to expound the doctrine's theological justifications. Possibly Abbot Anselm knew Eadmer's work but in any case the justifications for the feast were attracting attention in some circles. Eadmer exaggerated the extent of observance before the Conquest. The only certain evidence is that it was observed at the New Minster, Winchester, and at both Christ Church and St Augustine's, Canterbury.[102] Nevertheless, traditionalism would seem to have been one motive for its introduction fairly soon after the Conquest at Ramsey, a house with a strong Anglo-Saxon tradition. The abbot, an Englishman, Ælfsige (or 'Ælsi', 1080–7) was apparently one of the feast's earliest post-Conquest advocates.[103] It was said that when he was caught in a storm at sea (on returning from a mission for William I to Denmark) he had a vision of a bishop who promised him a safe crossing if he would propagate the feast of the Conception. This he did and introduced the

[100] King, *Liturgies of primatial sees*, 550. Nigel Morgan, to whom I am indebted for the following note, tells me that of the almost 1,200 British calendars he has recorded, only one has the commemoration of St Mary on 18 December. This is a twelfth-century calendar which is one of the items in BL, MS Cotton Cleopatra B III; it is clearly of East Anglian provenance. No post-Conquest calendar of St Edmunds survives. Kirkstead's note is the evidence for observance of the feast there. The late medieval ordinal of Barking supplies the evidence for the observance of the commemoration on 18 December in that house (University College, Oxford, MS 169). For collects for St Mary to be read at mass at various times of the year at St Edmunds see *Bury customary*, 90–2.

[101] Southern, *St Anselm and his biographer*, 290–2, and *A portrait*, 432–6. Eadmer's treatise was mistakenly attributed in the Middle Ages and in modern times to St Anselm: Southern, *A portrait*, 107 and n. 21, 432–6. It is printed in *PL* clix.301–18, and in Herbert Thurston and H. T. Slater (eds), *Eadmeri monachi cantuariensis Tractatus de conceptione sanctae Mariae*, Freiburg 1904.

[102] For a detailed discussion of the origins of the feast of the Conception in the ninth century and of how it reached England, all unsolved problems, see Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, 250–9. See also *Kalendars*, 136, 174, 178, 66, respectively; Southern, '"Miracles"', 196 and n. 1; Morgan, 'Texts and images', 120–2.

[103] Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, 248–9; Southern, '"Miracles"', 194–8. The 'vision' is printed in *PL* clix.322–6.

feast at Ramsey. The spread of the observance was slow. Henry I ordered that the feast should be celebrated in his new foundation at Reading.[104] It is also known to have been introduced in the Anglo-Norman period at Westminster, St Albans, Gloucester, Winchcombe and Worcester[105] as well as at St Edmunds. A few eminent ecclesiastics argued for a more widespread observance but the question whether the feast was historically or theologically justified aroused controversy. One of its most ardent champions was Osbert of Clare, monk and prior of Westminster. In response to a query from Warin, prior of Worcester (?1124–?1142), he wrote to him extolling the merits of the feast.[106] He also wrote to Abbot Anselm, whom he regarded as the prime mover in the spread of the observance, urging him to defend its cause with the help of Gilbert the Universal, bishop of London (1128–34), and Hugh of Amiens, abbot of Reading (1123–30).[107] Their main opponents were Roger, bishop of Salisbury (1103–39), and Bernard, bishop of St Davids (1115–48), who together had tried to stop the feast being celebrated at Westminster on the grounds that it had been prohibited as a novelty by an (unspecified) council. It would seem that Abbot Anselm and his supporters prevailed: according to a late twelfth-century chronicler, the Council of London in 1129 'in the presence of King Henry confirmed the feast of the Conception of St Mary, Mother of God, with apostolic authority'.[108]

Abbot Anselm's additions to the liturgical round at St Edmunds entailed extra work for the monks and this entitled them to extra pittances. Anselm duly included the new pittances among those that he ordained for various feast days.[109] Pittances would usually have constituted extra dishes at meals and Anselm gave numerous specific resources which, in cash or kind, were to provide the wherewithal for each pittance, including the new Marian ones. Some of the resources were rents from tenements mainly in the town of Bury St Edmunds and others were income from holdings on St Edmunds' estates. Thus, for example, Anselm granted 20s. for the feast of the commemoration of St Mary in Advent and 20s. for the feast of the Conception; for the pittance for the former he gave revenue from 'Sureie' (?Southery in Norfolk), and for the pittance for the latter (and for the feast of St Saba) a mill in the town and fishponds or fishing rights in Pakenham, Ingham and Stow. In addition, he gave the manor of, and pannage in,

---

[104] *Letters of Osbert of Clare*, 12, 67.   [105] Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, 247–8 and nn.

[106] Ibid. 247–9; *Letters of Osbert of Clare*, 79–80.

[107] *Letters of Osbert of Clare*, 65–8; Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, 242–7 (with English translation and Latin text at pp. 243–4 and n. 1).

[108] See the addition made to the chronicle of John of Worcester at St Peter's Gloucester: *Chronicle of John of Worcester*, iii. 187–8; cf. the Tewkesbury annals, *Annales monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, London 1864–9, i. 45, and Dorothy Whitelock, Martin Brett and C. N. L. Brooke (eds), *Councils and synods*, I: *871–1204*, Oxford 1981, repr. 1986, ii. 751 and n. 4.

[109] The list (which specifies the obedientiary responsible for the supply of each pittance) is printed in the *Bury customary*, 96–7.

Chepenhall for the pittance for the daily mass of St Mary, for her intercession for Henry I, for the king's prosperity when alive and salvation thereafter.[110]

So deep was devotion to St Mary under Abbot Anselm that it seems to have been intended that when the Romanesque church was consecrated it would be dedicated to St Mary and St Edmund jointly.[111] But that was not to be. Anselm himself had not neglected the cult of St Edmund: under his rule a revised and expanded version of Bertrann's *De miraculis* was composed; the text is preserved in the beautiful illuminated copy now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, MS 736.[112] St Edmund remained at the centre of the monks' religious life and Jocelin of Brakelond, who recorded Abbot Samson's ambition to have the Romanesque church consecrated, clearly implies that the dedication would be to St Edmund alone.[113] An incidental result of the monks' determination to promote St Edmund's cult seems to have been the rewriting of history with regard to one event in the abbey's past, that is, Archbishop Æthelnoth's consecration of the church in 1032 in honour of Christ, St Mary and St Edmund. 'Bertrann', writing *c.* 1100, says nothing about the event, but the interpolator of St Edmunds' copy of Marianus Scotus' Universal Chronicle, writing at St Edmunds early in Anselm's abbatiate, records the consecration and the triple dedication.[114] Towards the end of the twelfth century, Ralph Diceto, writing at St Pauls, apparently used, among his many sources, St Edmunds' interpolated version of Marianus, copied the entry about the consecration, but states that the dedication was to St Edmund, making no mention of Christ or St Mary.[115]

---

[110] The details of rents from tenements which were to pay for various pittances follow in the copy of Anselm's ordinance: ibid. 97–9. Anselm's grant of the more substantial holdings is specified in the charter printed in *Feudal documents from the abbey of Bury St Edmunds*, ed. D. C. Douglas, Oxford 1932, 112–13.

[111] *Bury customary*, 116. The passage states that the earliest monastery was built by Bishop Felix 'in memory of St Mary and the blessed Edmund'. It continues 'ac novum ut credo monasterium, quod nunc videmus, in memoria amborum similiter fiet eius dedicatio consecrabitur'. *De dedicationibus* was probably composed shortly after Abbot Anselm's death. See p. 633 above and n. 28.

[112] R. M. Thomson, 'Early Romanesque book-illustration in England: the dates of the Pierpont Morgan "Vitae Sancti Edmundi" and the Bury Bible', *Viator, Medieval and Renaissance Studies* ii (1971), 211–25, and 'Two versions of a saint's *Life* from St Edmund's Abbey', *Revue bénédictine*, lxxxv (1974), 384–7. On the professional artist who illuminated the manuscript, the 'Alexis Master', with references to Pierpont Morgan 736, see idem, *Manuscripts from St Albans Abbey, 1066–1235*, Woodbridge 1982, i. 25–32, and 124 (no. 80). See especially E. P. McLachlan, *The scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds in the twelfth century*, New York–London 1986, 74–119 and plates 21–60.

[113] *The chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond*, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler, London–Edinburgh 1949, repr. 1951, 47–8; cf. Gransden, 'The question of the consecration of St Edmund's church', 66–8.

[114] *Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ii. 643; *Memorials of St Edmund's*, i. 342.

[115] *The historical works of Master Ralph de Diceto, dean of London*, ed. William Stubbs, London 1876, i. 175. For Diceto's use of Marianus see vol. i, 23; ii, p. xvii. The occurrence of

His chronicle was one of the sources used by the annalist writing at St Edmunds *c.* 1200, and the annalist follows him in stating that the dedication was to St Edmund and does not make mention of the triple dedication,[116] and the thirteenth-century chronicler of St Edmunds does likewise.[117] The cornerstone of St Edmund's fame was the shrine of St Edmund. It was in the great Romanesque church and had the latter been dedicated it would apparently have been to St Edmund alone, not to 'St Mary' or even jointly to 'St Mary and St Edmund'.

A few examples may be quoted of changes in dedications resembling that at St Edmunds. The examples are of other East Anglian churches or of more distant churches with which St Edmunds had a special connection. First, is Crowland. St Guthlac's original church was probably dedicated to St Bartholomew, but after St Guthlac's burial there in 714 it became known as 'St Guthlac's'.[118] A similar example comes from Thorney. It was founded in 972 or 973 by St Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, as a Benedictine abbey and dedicated to St Mary. But later St Ethelwold sent it relics of St Botolph and it became known as 'St Mary's and St Botolph's'.[119] The question of the dedication at Ely was more complicated. St Etheldreda founded a convent of nuns and monks in 673 which was dedicated to St Mary.[120] It was destroyed by the Danes, but re-established by St Etheldreda who retained the original dedication to St Mary.[121] St Etheldreda's body was translated into that church in 695. A period of decline of religious life at Ely followed, but *c.* 970 St Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, and St Ethelwold replaced the community of secular clerks serving the church by Benedictine monks and on 3 February 972 Dunstan consecrated the new church, dedicating the high altar to St Peter and the south aisle to St Mary.[122] King Edgar in one grant of 970 to the abbey referred to the dedication as to SS Peter and Mary, but in another grant of 970 the dedication appears as to SS Peter and Etheldreda.[123] The great new Romanesque church was begun by Abbot

---

St Edmunds' interpolations shows that he must have used the St Edmunds version of the chronicle or perhaps a now unknown house history of the abbey. It does not seem unlikely that Diceto was a native of Diss in Norfolk though Stubbs decided otherwise: vol. i., pp. xi–xv. St Edmunds was a land-holder in Diss: *Feudal documents*, 13.

[116] *Ungedruckte anglo-normannische Geschichtsquellen*, ed. F. Liebermann, Strasbourg 1879, 127; *Memorials of St Edmund's*, ii. 3.

[117] 'A critical edition of the Bury St Edmunds chronicle in Arundel MS 30 (College of Arms)', ed. Antonia Gransden, unpubl. PhD diss. London 1957, 195.

[118] Levison, *England and the continent*, 262; Binns, *Dedications*, 69.

[119] See the *Lives* of St Ethelwold by Ælfric and Wulfstan: *Three Lives of English saints*, 25, 48; *Wulfstan of Winchester, the Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom, Oxford 1991, repr. with addenda 1996, xlviii, cxxxii–cxxxiii, 38–43.

[120] Bede, *HE* i. 244 (iv.19).   [121] *Liber eliensis*, 33.   [122] Ibid. 119–20.

[123] Ibid. 81–2, 112–13; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon charters*, 249 (nos 780, 781).

Simeon (1081–93). St Etheldreda's shrine was situated to the east of the high altar,[124] a similar location to that of St Edmund in his church. In the plea held at Kentford in 1080 concerning Ely's rights and possessions, they are referred to as 'pertaining to St Etheldreda'.[125] Similarly, in the *Inquisitio comitatus cantabrigiensis*, they 'pertain to the church of St Etheldreda of Ely' or simply to 'St Etheldreda of Ely'.[126] Despite the formal dedication by St Dunstan, 'St Etheldreda's' had become the church's usual name.

At about the same time a similar change in spiritual patronage took place at the Old Minster, Winchester, where Abbot Simeon of Ely's brother, Walkelin, was bishop (1070–98).[127] The Old Minster was founded by Cenwealh, king of the West Saxons (642–72),[128] and dedicated to Holy Trinity and SS Peter and Paul. St Swithun, bishop of Winchester (852–62), was buried in the church. Under Bishop Ethelwold the original church was replaced by a larger, more impressive cathedral into which the relics of St Swithun's were translated in 971.[129] This cathedral was replaced after the Norman Conquest by a magnificent Romanesque one. Bishop Walkelin began building in 1079 and St Swithun's relics were translated into the new church in 1093. The new like the old cathedral was partly, if not mainly, intended as a shrine for St Swithun. Nevertheless, documents and literary sources continue to refer to it as being under the patronage of the traditional spiritual patrons, though with considerable variations, until the mid-twelfth century and even, exceptionally, later. In the late tenth century the church is called that of Holy Trinity or of Holy Trinity and SS Peter and Paul,[130] and rather later as the church of St Peter, or of SS Peter and Paul.[131] However, St Swithun begins to appear as a patron in the late eleventh century and then frequently in the twelfth: references occur to the church at Winchester of

---

[124] *Liber eliensis*, 120; cf. J. C. Wall, *Shrines of British saints*, London 1905, 56 and plate xvi; Eric Fernie, 'Observations on the Norman plan of Ely Cathedral', in Nicola Coldstream and Peter Draper (eds), *Medieval art and architecture at Ely Cathedral* (British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions ii, 1979), 6. The location of the lady chapel in the Romanesque church is unknown, but for an interesting suggestion by Richard Gem see n. 69 above.

[125] *English historical documents*, II: *1042–1189*, ed. D. C. Douglas and G. W. Greenaway, London 1981, 484; cf. Ben Nilson, *Cathedral shrines of medieval England*, Woodbridge 1998, 124 (*pace* the page reference in his n. 34).

[126] *Inquisitio comitatus cantabrigiensis* (compiled after 1086), printed in an English translation in *The Victoria history of Cambridgeshire*, i (1938), 400–26 passim.

[127] Walkelin, with Ranulf Flambard, a royal chaplain, later bishop of Durham, officiated at the translation of St Edmund in 1095: *De miraculis*, 86–7.   [128] Bede, *HE* cxl (iv.7).

[129] *Annales monastici*, ii. 13; *Kalendars*, 120, 134. For the early history of Winchester Cathedral see Martin Biddle and D. J. Keene, in Martin Biddle (ed.), *Winchester studies*, I: *Winchester in the early Middle Ages*, Oxford 1976, 305–13, and R. N. Quirk, 'Winchester in the tenth century', *Archaeological Journal* cxiv (1957), 28–68.

[130] For example, *Anglo-Saxon charters*, 52 (no. 26), 68 (no. 38), cf. p. 305.

[131] *Chartulary of Winchester Cathedral*, ed. A. W. Goodman, Winchester 1927, 2 (no. 2), 2–3 (no. 4), 5 (no. 9), 8 (no. 16), 9 (no. 18), 13 (no. 28).

God (or Christ), SS Peter and Swithun, or of God, SS Peter, Paul and Swithun and of all those saints whose relics were in the cathedral[132] and even to the church of St Swithun. By the late twelfth century St Swithun occurs jointly with St Peter or SS Peter and Paul,[133] and by the late thirteenth century references to the church or monastery of St Swithun have become the norm,[134] though SS Peter and Paul still occasionally occur with him at the end of the thirteenth century.[135] The change in patronage at Winchester was slower than at St Edmunds, but it eventually took place nevertheless.

A final example of a change in patronage providing a parallel to that at St Edmunds comes from St Augustine's, Canterbury. Æthelbert, king of Kent (560–616), together with St Augustine of Canterbury, built a monastery a little to the east outside the city walls.[136] St Augustine died before the consecration of the church. The consecration was performed by his successor, Archbishop Laurentius, who translated the body of St Augustine into it in 613 and dedicated it to SS Peter and Paul.[137] William Thorne, an early fifteenth-century chronicler of St Augustine's, states that St Dunstan re-dedicated the church in 978 to SS Peter, Paul and Augustine 'Apostle of the English'.[138] Possibly the re-dedication was a consequence of the enlargement of the church which took place in the tenth century.[139] Then, in the mid-eleventh century, Abbot Wulfric II undertook extensive reconstruction. It included the building of a rotunda, quite possibly intended to house the tombs of St Augustine and of other early archbishops of Canterbury and of other notable persons.[140] Soon after the Norman Conquest Abbot Scotland (1070–87) began the construction of the magnificent Romanesque church. It was known as 'St Augustine's'. The section on its holdings in (Little) Domesday is headed 'Terra Ecclesiae Sancti Augustini'[141] and Goscelin, in his detailed and florid account of the translation of St Augustine's and the other relics into the new church in 1091,[142] writes that 'the angels rejoiced over the Augustinian temple'.[143] This great shrine church was, indeed, under St Augustine's patronage.

---

[132]   For example ibid. 2 (no. 3).

[133]   For example ibid. 5 (no. 8), 7 (no. 15), 12 (no. 26), 14 (no. 31).

[134]   For example ibid. 16 (nos 36, 37), 17 (no. 39).   [135]   For example ibid. 192 (no. 452).

[136]   Bede, *HE* i. 70 (I.33).   [137]   Ibid. i. 86 (II.3).

[138]   William Thorne, *Chronicle of St Augustine's, Canterbury*, ed. A. H. Davis, Oxford 1934, 38.

[139]   Excellent accounts of the archaeological, architectural and documentary evidence, with plans, are in H. M. Taylor and Joan Taylor, *Anglo-Saxon architecture*, Cambridge 1965, i. 134–43; William St John Hope, 'Recent discoveries in the Abbey Church of St. Austin at Canterbury', *Archaeologia Cantiana* xxxii (1917), 1–26.

[140]   St John Hope, 'Recent discoveries', 8, but see also Gem, 'Towards an iconography', 9–11.

[141]   The section on the abbey's holdings in (Little) Domesday Book (1086) is headed 'Terra Æcclesiæ Sancti Augustini'.   [142]   Printed in *PL* clv.14–46.

[143]   'templum Augustinianum': ibid. clv.19.

The above examples of changes in the spiritual patronage, and consequently usually in the formal dedication, of other major churches in the late Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest periods show that the change of St Edmunds was part of the current trend. Such changes were not, of course, peculiar to these times and places, since similar examples can be found in various periods throughout medieval Christendom. Nearly always they were inextricably linked to the cult of relics, an essential component of the medieval Church. In England in the Anglo-Norman period a change in spiritual patronage could be especially useful. By adopting a saint who had lived early in Anglo-Saxon times, a church could claim to have a long, unbroken tradition rooted in the distant past, a bridge, as it were, over the chasm created by the Norman Conquest. In this way a church enhanced its prestige and so increased its chances of receiving benefactions. Since its claim to the saint's patronage rested on possession of his or her relics, a church might well seek to spread the fame of its relics by means of hagiography and visual display in order to raise money. The need for money was especially acute when a church undertook an ambitious building project. Therefore, it is not surprising that the trend towards the kind of changes in spiritual patronage described above received a powerful stimulus during the Anglo-Norman era, the period of the building of the great Romanesque churches. Each such church was a statement of ecclesiastical power, both that of the church concerned and that of the new regime of which it was an integral part.