

Goscelin and the consecration of Eve

KATHERINE O'BRIEN O'KEEFFE

ABSTRACT

This article rethinks the current assessment of the relationship between Goscelin of Saint-Bertin and his one time pupil Eve of Wilton, suggesting that the difference in their ages was less than André Wilmart assumed and that Eve was not an oblate of Wilton but a girl entrusted to the convent for education and safe-keeping. Drawing on the liturgical evidence for consecrations in Anglo-Saxon England and on the rhetoric of Goscelin's *Liber confortatorius* the article argues that Goscelin describes Eve's consecration (not oblation as Wilmart and others assume) and suggests a date around 1078 for the ritual. An appendix follows detailing surviving manuscript evidence for the consecration of nuns in Anglo-Saxon England.

Eve, a woman who spent her early years at the convent of Wilton and then left for a life of reclusion in Angers, is a figure of some mystery. The little information we have on her life in England comes from the lengthy instructional work, the *Liber confortatorius*, which Goscelin of Saint-Bertin wrote for her (c. 1080–2) after her abrupt departure for exile and reclusion in Angers.¹ By turns broken-hearted and directive, the book presents 'the secret of two' ('*archanum duorum*') in the unequal relationship between the writer as spiritual director and the young woman entrusted to the convent of Wilton for her protection. It is likely that Eve's Lotharingian mother and Danish father were well connected: in placing their daughter at Wilton, they were putting her in the wealthiest convent in England, whose post-Conquest royal inmates included Gunnhild, daughter of Harold Godwinson, and perhaps his sister, Edith, widow of Edward the Confessor.² Their reasons for placing her at Wilton,

¹ *The Liber Confortatorius of Goscelin of Saint Bertin*, ed. C. H. Talbot, *Analecta Monastica*, 3rd ser., *Studia Anselmiana* 37 (Rome, 1955), 1–117 (= LC). Hilarius of Orléans wrote a poem on Eve, 'Veni, dator omnis boni', after her death. See *Hilarii Aurelianensis Versus et Ludi, Epistolae*, ed. W. Bulst and M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Mittelateinische Studien und Texte* 16 (Leiden, 1989), 21–5. On Hilarius's information about Eve, see below, pp. 256–7. Two translations of the *Liber confortatorius* have appeared: M. Otter, trans., *Goscelin of St Bertin: the Book of Encouragement and Consolation (Liber Confortatorius)* (Cambridge, 2004) and *Writing the Wilton Women: Goscelin's Legend of Edith and 'Liber confortatorius'*, ed. S. Hollis, with W. R. Barnes, R. Hayward, K. Loncar, and M. Wright (Turnhout, 2004).

² LC 41.20–1. On Edith at Wilton, see P. Stafford, *Queens, Concubines, and Dowagers: the King's Wife in the Early Middle Ages* (Athens, GA, 1983), pp. 54–5 and 179. On Gunnhild see my 'Leaving Wilton: Gunnhild and the Phantoms of Agency', *JEGP* 106 (2007), 203–23. Certainly, Edith had taken a considerable interest in Wilton, overseeing the convent church's rebuilding in stone. See *The Life of King Edward Who Rests at Westminster*, ed. F. Barlow, 2nd ed., OMT

Eve's age at the time, and the date of her entrance have been matters of some speculation. In what follows, I should like to look again at what we know and think we know about Eve during her life at Wilton.

Current knowledge about Eve of Wilton is considerably indebted to André Wilmart, whose studies of 1934 and 1938 effectively brought her to modern attention.³ In these he sketches the life of a woman closely associated with two men: at Angers, Eve was a recluse at Saint-Eutrope with St Hervé for almost a quarter of a century;⁴ earlier, at Wilton, Goscelin of Saint-Bertin made her his 'spiritual daughter' for a shorter, though highly formative, period. Although writers on Eve's early life at times add inferences or fanciful details,⁵ by and large they have tended to follow the outline of Eve's life that Wilmart constructed. The general agreement among them would seem to include four points: 1) that Eve was an oblate at the convent of Wilton (Wiltshire) where Goscelin met her;⁶ 2) that Eve was 'about seven' in 1065;⁷ 3) that there was considerable difference in their ages;⁸ 4) that there was nothing improper in the relationship.⁹ Despite this general agreement, there is reason to question the tidy picture these inferences paint.

(Oxford, 1992), pp. 70–5 and p. 138. On Wilton's wealth, see J. Crick, 'The Wealth, Patronage, and Connections of Women's Houses in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *RB* 109 (1999), 154–85, Table 1, 162–3, and S. Foot, *Veiled Women: the Disappearance of Nuns from Anglo-Saxon England*, 2 vols. (Aldershot, Hants., 2000) II, 224–5.

³ A. Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, I', *RB* 46 (1934), 414–38 and 'Ève et Goscelin, II', *RB* 50 (1938), 42–83.

⁴ Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, I', p. 438, summarizes his evidence: 'Pour résumer, cette première face du diptyque nous présente Ève et Hervé, "inclus" à Saint-Eutrope dans un faubourg d'Angers nommé Lévière, depuis 1102 environ. Vers 1125 Ève était décédée . . .'

⁵ As, for example, T. Latzke, 'Robert von Arbrissel, Ermengard, und Eva', *MJ* 19 (1984), 116–54, at 136–7, who imagines a long association between Goscelin and Eve's parents.

⁶ Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, I', p. 424, n. 2; Talbot, *Liber Confortatorius*, p. 22, appears to suggest two separate ceremonies: '[Goscelin] had been present at her acceptance into the community there and at her profession.' D. Stroud, 'Eve, Nun of Wilton and anchoress of Angers', *Hatcher Review* 4, no. 37 (Spring 1994), 3–13, at 5, suggests that Goscelin first encountered Eve when she was a little girl committed to Wilton, though not, perhaps, as an oblate.

⁷ Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, II', p. 58, n. 2. Barlow, *The Life of King Edward Who Rests at Westminster*, p. 138, n. 43; Stroud, 'Eve, Nun of Wilton', p. 5; Latzke, 'Robert von Arbrissel, Ermengard, und Eva', p. 137: 'Sie war sieben Jahre alt.' (Latzke appears to believe that Eve was professed in 1065, aged seven!)

⁸ Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, II', p. 51, makes Goscelin twenty years older than Eve. Stroud, 'Eve, Nun of Wilton and anchoress of Angers', pp. 3–4, gives 'c. 1040' as the year of Goscelin's birth and '1059/60' as that for Eve.

⁹ Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, II', p. 60, n. 3. 'Même s'il y a quelque excès dans l'expression . . . nous aurions grand tort d'y trouver scandale; songeons plutôt qu'un bras de mer séparait désormais ces deux âmes.' Barlow, *The Life of King Edward*, p. 139, accepts Wilmart's judgement but thought that the friendship 'although probably innocent, was nevertheless dangerous.' Stroud, 'Eve, Nun of Wilton and anchoress of Angers', p. 3, states 'Their relationship was an innocent one.' R. Hayward, 'Spiritual Friendship and Gender Difference', *Writing the Wilton Women*, ed. Hollis, 341–53, reads the LC as an example of chaste, ennobling love.

Goscelin's affectionate language provides little help in assessing Eve's age at the time of her entry into Wilton. Superlatives and diminutives abound. She is 'specialis anima',¹⁰ 'desideriosa anima',¹¹ 'anima mi dulcissima',¹² 'anima mi carissima',¹³ although occasionally simply 'anima'.¹⁴ She is 'karissima',¹⁵ 'dulcissima'¹⁶ and 'dilectissima',¹⁷ as well as 'pignus anime mee dulcissimum'¹⁸ and 'dulcis partus anime mee'.¹⁹ Goscelin's parallel inclination to affectionate diminutives makes it difficult to assign strong weight to his use of age-related terms. He calls her Christ's 'pupilla' ('little girl') when she is clearly an adult recluse at the time.²⁰ He has the devil call her 'pupa' ('girl') and 'adolescentula' at the same point in her life.²¹ Within the literary context of their spiritual relationship, Goscelin seems anxious to emphasize the difference between them in power and age. Referring to his first arrival in England in the bishop's retinue (c. 1062), he says that at that time she was an 'infantula' when he was 'adolescentulus'.²² Even discounting the diminutives in these words, it is difficult to be precise about the chronological difference between *infantia* and *adolescentia*, since that difference varies depending on which scheme of reckoning life spans is called on.²³ If Goscelin is following the scheme of 'Six Ages' the difference in age between an individual in *infantia* and one in *adolescentia* may be as small as eight years or as great as twenty-seven.²⁴ If his sense of the words referred to the tetradic division of the ages of man, the difference in their ages might be as small as one year or, again, as great as twenty-seven.²⁵ Within the scheme of

¹⁰ LC 91.9. ¹¹ LC 61.35. ¹² LC 28.2; 45.21; 'dulcissima anima', 106.10.

¹³ LC 28.21–22. ¹⁴ LC 39.2; 40.35: 'anima mi'; LC 46.4: 'anima mea'; LC 46.1 'anima'.

¹⁵ LC 34.17–18; 72.9; 89.3; 90.16. ¹⁶ LC 36.20; 92.7. ¹⁷ LC 55.10; 88.1.

¹⁸ LC 103.8: 'sweetest child of my soul'. ¹⁹ LC 116.26: 'sweet offspring of my soul'.

²⁰ LC 26.3; 106.28.

²¹ LC 70.11; for 'adolescentula' *The Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* glosses 'girl' and cites 'hec [adolescentul]a, puella xiiij [annorum]' from Wright-Wülker's *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies*. ²² LC 102.11.

²³ E. Sears, *The Ages of Man: Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle* (Princeton, 1986), pp. 54–79 and 174–83, discusses the diffusion of the scheme of six ages of man (*infantia, pueritia, adolescentia, iuventus, senectus, senium*), in the works of Augustine, Isidore, Bede and Byrhtferth (among others). She points out that Venerable Bede also used a tetradic division when mapping ages upon seasons in *De temporum ratione* xxxv (see C. W. Jones, *Beda Opera de temporibus* (Cambridge, MA, 1943); Isidore, *Etymologiae* XI.2.1–8 lists the stages as *infantia, pueritia, adolescentia, iuventus, gravitas* and *senectus*, and makes the first three stages last seven years apiece. See *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originem Libri XX*, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911) II, n.p. See also Isidore, *Differentiarum libri duo* II.19–21 (PL 83: 81–2).

²⁴ See *Collectanea Pseudo-Beda*, ed. M. Bayless and M. Lapidge, SLH 14 (Dublin, 1998), 182 and 273.

²⁵ See J. A. Burrow, *The Ages of Man: a Study in Medieval Writing and Thought* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 12–21. The tetradic scheme used by Bede appears in Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* (Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, ed. P. Baker and M. Lapidge, EETS ss 15 (Oxford, 1995), I.i.102–3 (p. 10) and IV.i.73–4 (p. 202) and note p. 343). Burrow, *Ages of Man*, p. 18, calls attention to the interesting detail in the diagram in Oxford, St John's College 17, 7v (his fig. 2), which specifies the

six ages of the world, *infantia* is generally the first seven years of life. But in the tetradic scheme, the period of *infantia* extends to age fourteen.²⁶ How old was Eve when Goscelin says he annoyed her in her childhood?²⁷

Wilmart believed that around fifteen years elapsed between the events Goscelin chronicles in the 'Partus dilectionis' section of the *Liber confortatorius* and Eve's departure for the Continent, that is, between 1065 and 1080.²⁸ This fifteen-year period is a result of a chain of inferences about Eve's age at the time of her departure for Angers. In bk III, Goscelin imagines for Eve the ways in which the devil might try to seduce her from reclusion. He has the devil whisper to her 'Pupa es, adolescentula es, flos ipse uite repente peristi. An hic uicenna etatula in quinquagesimum uel centesimum sedebis annum, in senectam et senium, in finem longeuum et longinquum, in tam longos dies, tam profundas noctes, in tam prolixos labores, tam iuges carceres, tam continuas desolationis mortes?'²⁹ From 'uicenna etatula' Wilmart calculated Eve's date of birth from the presumed date of the composition of the LC, 1080–2.³⁰ He suggests that she was thus born around 1058, the year he thought that Herman (with Goscelin) returned from Saint-Bertin to assume the episcopal see of Sherborne in Wiltshire (recte 1062).³¹

Yet Goscelin's account, while carefully inflected for narrative time, resists attempts to create a datable chronology. The first section of bk I ('Partus dilectionis,' a title that Talbot accepts as genuine), charts the course of their relationship up to the point that Goscelin has to leave his post at Wilton. Its

lengths of 'puericia vel infantia' and of 'adolescentia' as fourteen years each. Baker and Lapidge, *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, p. liii, date this manuscript to 1110–11 and edit the figure on 7v in Appendix A.3.

²⁶ A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A.D.* (Oxford, 1949), s.v. 'infans', cites Jerome: 'Nec miremur habere barbaram linguam proprietates suas, cum hodieque Romae omnes filii uocentur infantes', where the chronological meaning of the word is considerably blunted. See *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Hebraicae Quaestiones in Libros Geneseos*, 21.14, ed. P. de LaGarde, CCSL 72 (Turnhout, 1959), p. 25, lines 30, 1–2.

²⁷ The *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* gives 'childhood' as meaning 'c' for 'infantia'.

²⁸ Talbot, *Liber confortatorius*, pp. 28–9. Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, II', p. 58, n. 2.

²⁹ LC 70.11–15: 'You are a child, a young woman; in the prime of life all of a sudden you've died. In your twenties, are you going to sit here until your fiftieth or hundredth year, in old age and senility, until an aged and far distant death, for such long days, such boundless nights, in such protracted hardships, in such a perpetual prison, such an ongoing death of desolation?'

³⁰ For a global assessment of Goscelin's career and works, see now M. Lapidge and R. C. Love, *The Latin Hagiography of England and Wales (600–1550)* vol. 3 of *Hagiographies*, ed. G. Philippart (Turnhout, 2001), pp. 225–33. Lapidge and Love follow Barlow, *The Life of King Edward*, in dating the LC to 1080 × 1082.

³¹ Simon Keynes has shown that the dating of Herman's appointment as bishop of Sherborne to 1058 is an error, since his predecessor, Ælfwold, was still bishop in 1062. See S. Keynes, 'Regenbald the chancellor (*sic*)', *ANS* 10 (1988), 185–222, at 202–3, n. 102. Herman died 20 February 1078 and Osmund succeeded him.

temporal markers move deliberately forward from their first contact: from their early exchanges – books from her, advice from him – he marks a point of change. ‘Adhuc tamen te tolerabiliter forinsecus tantum in spe bona Christi dilexi.’³² But the crucial difference between events ‘adhuc’ and those that follow comes with her embracing of the religious life. His emotional description of the ritual she undergoes, which I will argue below was a consecration, not an oblation, is marked by *ubi*: when he witnessed her consecration he wept. Thereafter, he arranged for her to be present at two church dedications. The time elapsed between this ritual and the dedications is not specified, other than that her good conduct and the good reports of her superior heightened his feelings for her. As a consequence of her exemplary behaviour, he reminds her, ‘Feci ut ipsa dicata interesset proxime dedicationi ecclesie, cupiens te tantis sacramentis proficere.’³³ His description indicates that Herman, bishop of Sherborne, officiated at the dedication. Her attendance at a second dedication was arranged, though in this case (‘transitum est ad alterius dedicationis solemniam’),³⁴ no time frame connecting the two dedications is specified. The rest of ‘Partus dilectionis’ recalls the depth of their great affection between this second dedication and the death of Bishop Herman in 1078, after which Goscelin was forced to leave the area.

In the absence of a firm chronology, two dates of church dedications offered themselves to Wilmart: the first, 3 October 1065, was the date on which Bishop Herman consecrated the new stone church at Wilton, given by Edith, then queen of England.³⁵ The second was the date for the dedication of Westminster Abbey, 28 December 1065.³⁶ Since Goscelin reports that he arranged for Eve to attend two church dedications (LC 28.16–17 and 35–6), Wilmart concluded that these were the ceremonies referred to.³⁷ If they were, and if Wilmart were correct in assigning the year of Eve’s birth to 1058, then Eve would have been around seven years old at the time she attended these

³² LC 28.6–7: ‘To that point, I loved you outwardly well enough, only in the good hope of Christ.’

³³ LC 28.16–17: ‘After you were consecrated I arranged for you to be present at the next dedication of a church, desiring that you would make progress in such mysteries.’

³⁴ LC 28.35–6: ‘the time came for the dedication of another church.’

³⁵ Barlow, *The Life of King Edward*, pp. 72–3: ‘... premonitoque ad hoc opus Herimanno, eiusdem dioceseos clarissimo et competenter erudito pontifice . . .’ (indeed, she warned in advance Herman, the famous and well-educated bishop of the diocese . . .). On the connection between Edith and the Anonymous’s ‘typicum . . . epitalamium’ on the dedication of the church see M. Otter, ‘Closed Doors: an Epithalamium for Queen Edith, Widow and Virgin’, *Constructions of Widowhood and Virginity in the Middle Ages*, ed. C. L. Carlson and A. J. Weisl (New York, 1999), 63–92.

³⁶ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, CD 1065, E 1066; See also *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. R. R. Darlington and P. McGurk, trans. J. Bray and P. McGurk, 3 vols. OMT (Oxford, 1995) II, 598.

³⁷ Wilmart, ‘Eve et Goscelin, II’, p. 58, n. 5.

ceremonies. However tidy Wilmart's construct, it is less robust than it might initially appear.

A series of worrying questions troubles the tidiness of Wilmart's argument. Goscelin describes with the self-deprecating 'ut primo tuam irritauerim infantiam'³⁸ the various actions that contributed to the 'partus dilectionis'. How long a span of time is represented by the events in LC 28.2–7, that is, between the efforts at correction that he describes as annoying her and the ritual? Over what period of time did their conversations, her gifts of books and the ritual Goscelin describes in LC 28.7–14 take place? In Wilmart's chronology, the time between her birth and the dedications of 1065 was very brief. Yet how credible would Goscelin's interest be in a seven-year-old-girl? Would a seven-year-old girl be able (financially or intellectually) to give Goscelin books?³⁹ Since Eve was already an inmate of Wilton at the time of the dedications, why would Goscelin have needed to arrange her attendance at the October 1065 dedication of the new church of her own convent (LC 28.16–17)? Given his frequent and affectionate reference to Wilton by name in the course of the LC, would he have passed up an opportunity to celebrate the dedication of Wilton's new stone church, had that been the event in question?⁴⁰ How likely is it that a seven-year-old girl would have been permitted to travel in winter from Wilton to Westminster for a dedication ceremony, especially one which appears to have been arranged somewhat hastily (on 28 December 1065), given Edward the Confessor's impending death?⁴¹

An important further element that raises doubts about the accuracy of Wilmart's dating of the events of Eve's early life is Goscelin's description of Eve's ritual of religious commitment (LC 28.7–14). Wilmart's note to this passage, while not precisely identifying the liturgy, rather suggests what he thought it was not: '... elle fut donc reçue parmi les moniales de Wilton à la fleur de l'âge; par suite, elle ne fit pas la profession proprement dite, mais fut "donée" par ses parents, comme la règle de saint Benoît le permettait à l'égard des enfants.'⁴² It suited Wilmart's argument to have Eve as young as possible in 1065, and he followed Hilarius of Orléans in believing Eve to have been an oblate.

Hilarius, friend to the recluse Hervé, spent considerable time in Angers between roughly 1105 and 1122/3.⁴³ Hilarius's poem, 'Veni, dator omnis boni', makes Eve noble ('non de plebe, sed re vera generosis patribus' (33)) and has

³⁸ LC 28.2: 'when I first annoyed you as a child'. ³⁹ LC 28.4–5: 'libros optatos dedisti'.

⁴⁰ See LC 27.18–19; 32.20–1; 113.10; 114.31; 115.10–22 for explicit references to Wilton.

⁴¹ Barlow, *The Life of King Edward*, p. 112, n. 285.

⁴² Wilmart, 'Ève et Goscelin, II', p. 58, n. 2.

⁴³ *Hilarii Aurelianensis Versus et Ludi*, ed. Bulste and Bulst-Thiele, p. 15.

her parents (whom it names 'Apis' and 'Oliva') intend her for a heavenly spouse ('Natam suam moniali sacrauerunt habitu/ Iam in ipso fere uite mortalis introitu' (46–7)), almost at the beginning of her mortal life. Quatrains 12 and 13 deal with her parents' intention:

Cum in prima namque foret etate uirguncula,
Vt non posset criminali sordidari macula,
Patres eam moniali miserunt sub regula,
Quę seruiuit ibi deo plus quam posset paruula.

Prouiderunt quendam locum qui erat in Anglia,
Locum bonum et famosum, *nomine Wiltonia* [ms. Clintonia]
Ibi dei genitrici in quadam ecclesia
Tam a patre quam a matre data fuit filia.⁴⁴

Quite apart from the poem's unfamiliarity with Wilton's name,⁴⁵ we get little detail here. The convent is simply 'good and famous'; her oblation takes place 'in quadam ecclesia.' Whatever the possibility that Hilarius knew the names of Eve's parents (recalled perhaps by Hervé), the story of her oblation, as Hilarius presents it, is pious fiction. That Eve spent a portion of her girlhood at Wilton is beyond argument, but the pretty generalities of Hilarius's poem do not compel assent. The details we get of the child's piety are generic, if in the heroic range: she shuts off her senses lest anything impure contact her (quatrain 16); at her spiritual exercises the abbess and her sisters are astounded that a child of such tender years could achieve what she achieved (quatrain 17). But Goscelin writing to Eve herself gives quite a different picture of Eve's early attitude to life at Wilton. 'Irritauerim infantiam', though clearly meant to be self-deprecating, suggests that his attentions to Eve, early on at least, were an annoyance. And his subsequent reminder to her, 'Aliquando indignabaris uocari monacha; modo non dedigneris uocari inclusa, et Christi pauperula, et Christi elemosinaria',⁴⁶ suggests not an oblate but a girl entrusted to Wilton for safe-keeping, perhaps a girl who once resisted being a target of Goscelin's attention.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 22 (emphasis in original): 'When she was a little virgin in her childhood, so that she could be defiled by no sinful stain, her parents placed her under the nun's rule, who served God there more than a child could. They had provided for a certain place in England, a good and famous place called Clintonia [emended Wilton], where in a certain church their daughter was given to the Mother of God, as much by her father as her mother.'

⁴⁵ Which Wilmart ('Ève et Goscelin, I', p. 425) generously assigns to scribal corruption. All modern editors emend to 'Wilton'.

⁴⁶ LC 104.1–3: 'Once you disdained to be called nun; now you do not refuse to be called anchoress, and Christ's little poor girl, and Christ's almoner.'

⁴⁷ On girls sent to the convent for safekeeping in the wake of the Conquest, see E. Searle, 'Women and the Legitimation of Succession at the Norman Conquest', *ANS* 3 (1981), 159–70.

Wilmart wishes to see as an oblation the liturgy Goscelin describes at least partly because that is the only ritual that would fit into his chronology of Eve's life.⁴⁸ In the eleventh century, a seven-year-old girl would be canonically incapable of making a *propositum uirginitatis* or advancing to consecration. While a girl of twelve might be canonically capable of a simple *propositum*, again, the indications are that consecration as such was reserved for older girls or women.⁴⁹ A material difficulty in assessing the age for consecration in the late eleventh century is that the early history of conciliar decrees and the papal pronouncements on the proper age for consecration are mutually contradictory. In this situation, René Metz suggests, the judgement of the bishop on the candidate's maturity in her spiritual life was determinate.⁵⁰ A closer look at the liturgy Goscelin describes suggests that Wilmart's ruling out of consecration was mistaken.⁵¹

CONSECRATING EVE

Early in 'Partus dilectionis' Goscelin recalls to Eve the defining event of her life – one that he witnessed and that moved him profoundly:

Adhuc tamen te tolerabiliter forinsecus tantum in spe bona Christi dilexi. Vbi uero inter quattuordecim uirgines, coruscantibus cereis tanquam syderibus et lampadibus supernis, ad dominicas nuptias trepida et penultima accessisti ac, populosa caterua sollemniter expectante, pignus fidei diuine cum sacrata ueste induisti, ille humilis habitus, ille tremebundus accessus, ille suffusus uultus, tanquam ab igneo throno Dei sedentis super cherubim, sapienter metuentis, altius uiscera me percussere cum hoc epithalamico carmine admirabilis gratie: *Ipsi sum desponsata, cui angeli seruiunt, et an(n)ulo suo subarrauit me. Tactus sum rore celesti et feruore irriguo fleui.*⁵²

⁴⁸ By referring to 'profession' Wilmart appears to distinguish between the girl's making a *propositum* (that is, profession as a public vow, made to a religious superior in the Canon Law of Wilmart's day) and consecration proper. For a general discussion of the distinction between 'profession' and 'consecration' as it applied before the second Vatican Council, see R. Behrendt, *The Consecration of Virgins: Conferences to Benedictine Sisters* (Collegeville, MN, 1964), pp. 61–71.

⁴⁹ See K. O'Brien O'Keeffe, 'Edith's Choice', *Latin Learning and English Lore: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature for Michael Lapidge*, ed. K. O'Brien O'Keeffe and A. Orchard, 2 vols. (Toronto, 2005) II, 253–74, at 262.

⁵⁰ For a discussion of the problems in determining the canonical age for the consecration of young women in the middle ages, see R. Metz, 'Les conditions juridiques de la consécration des vierges dans la liturgie latine des origines à nos jours', *Revue de Droit Canonique* 1 (1951), 261–80, at 270–1. See also his 'La consécration des vierges dans l'église franque d'après la plus ancienne vie de sainte Pusinne (VIII^e–IX^e siècle)', *Revue de Sciences Religieuses* 35 (1961), 32–48, at 40–1.

⁵¹ Stroud, 'Eve, Nun of Wilton and anchoress of Angers', at 5–6, assumes that the liturgy is a profession without further discussion.

⁵² LC 28.6–14: 'To that point, I loved you outwardly well enough, only in the good hope of Christ. But when among fourteen virgins, with wax tapers shining as if constellations and

In this passage Goscelin describes a liturgy that would have taken place in the convent of Wilton. Those writers who place Goscelin at Eve's 'oblation' do so by reference to this liturgy, which appears to take place in close proximity to the two church dedications that Goscelin describes.⁵³ Assessing whether this is a ceremony of oblation is complicated by the lack of surviving oblation rituals for girls.⁵⁴ However, if it is possible to extrapolate from a contemporary oblation ritual for a boy, we may get a sense of the contrasting preoccupation and tone of one such formula in London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, 93r–93v.⁵⁵

OBLATIO PARENTVM.

[E]GO F<RATE>R .N. offero hunc pueru<m> ill<um> cu<m> oblatione in manu atq<ue> peticione, altaris palla manu(m) ei<us> inuoluta(m), ad nom<en> s<an>c<t>or<um> quor<um> hic reliq<ui>ę continent<ur> & domni .N. ep<iscop>i p<re>sentis. Trado cora<m> testib<us> regularit<er> p<er> mansuru<m>, ita ut ab hac die n<on> liceat illi collu<m> de sub iugo excutere regulę, sed magis ei<us>de<m> regulę fidelit<er> se cognoscat instituta seruare & d<omi>no cu<m> ceteris gratanti animo militare. Et ut hæc n<ost>ra traditio inc<on>uulsa p<er>maneat, p<ro>mitto cu<m> iure iurando cora<m> eade<m> S<an>c<t>a MARIA q<ui>a nunqua<m> p<er> me, nunq<uam> p<er> suspecta<m> p<er>sonam, nec q<uo>libet m<odo> p<er> rerum mearu<m> facultates aliquando egrediendi ei de monasterio tribua<m> occasione<m>. Et ut hæc petitio firma permaneat, manu mea subter firmaui testib<us>q<ue> tradidi roboranda.⁵⁶

heavenly torches, trembling and the last but one you approached the Lord's nuptials and put on the pledge of divine faith with the sacred garment, while a large crowd solemnly looked on, that habit of humility, that trembling approach, that countenance of one fearing wisely, blushing as if from the fiery throne of God sitting above the cherubim, pierced me to the core along with this epithalamium of admirable grace: "I am espoused to him whom the angels serve and he has pledged me with his ring." I was touched by a celestial dew and I wept with overflowing ardour.'

⁵³ On this point Talbot (n. 6 above) appears to follow Wilmart. Latzke (n. 7 above) is confused.

⁵⁴ M. de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996), p. 184, found no ceremony of oblation recorded for girls, although she points out the influence of oblation ritual on the ordo for consecration of a virgin in the Romano-Germanic Pontifical (=PRG).

⁵⁵ See Appendix below.

⁵⁶ 'I, brother N., offer this boy N. with the offering and petition in his hand, and his hand wrapped with the altar cloth, in the name of the saints whose relics are contained here and in the name of our lord bishop N. present here. Before witnesses I commit him to remain under the rule so that from this day he may not remove his neck from the yoke of the rule, but rather that he may know that he will observe the requirements of the rule faithfully and serve the Lord along with the others with a joyful mind. And that our gift may remain intact, I promise by oath before this same Saint Mary that never through me nor any respected person, nor in any way through the power of my possessions will I provide opportunity for him to leave the monastery. And that this petition remain firm, I have affirmed below with my hand and have handed over to witnesses what are to be confirmed.'

Following this formula are the 'Benedictio cuculle' and the ceremony for hooding and clothing the child in the habit.⁵⁷ Striking about the tenor of the father's commitment on behalf of the child are its legal tone, its focus on the father (who is undertaking the commitment on the part of his son), and its repeated emphasis on the irrevocability of the act that is taking place. Apart from handing over the offering and petition, the child's role in this ritual is essentially passive.⁵⁸ In a contemporary mass designed to accompany the oblation of a child, the opening prayer stresses the child's youth ('qui in primaeva iuventutis suae flore maiestati tuae offertur . . .') and the resonance of his sacrifice with that of Isaac and Samuel.⁵⁹

Even allowing for possible ambiguity arising from Goscelin's perfervid rhetoric, particular expressions in the passage in question indicate that the ceremony he describes is a consecration and not an oblation.⁶⁰ In Goscelin's recreation of this liturgical scene there are four telling elements: fourteen girls take part in the ceremony, lighted candles play a prominent liturgical role; a 'populosa caterva' witnesses the ceremony, and he quotes as 'epithalamium' two antiphons commonly found in the consecration of virgins. In the following discussion of the consecration ritual in which Eve likely took part, I use the *ordines* for the ritual of consecration found in the Romano-Germanic Pontifical.⁶¹ This is in part a usage of convenience: it is very likely that the PRG form of consecration was used in early post-Conquest England, although it is impossible to be certain of usage in particular instances, given the complex evidence of the rituals surviving from Anglo-

⁵⁷ Following the formulas for oblation a boy, are a separate profession and prayers for a *convertus*, that is, an adult who has decided to embrace monastic life, in which he makes the required three Benedictine vows of stability, conversion of life, and obedience. This profession locates the book at Sherborne. Ker's description of the material contained in Tiberius C. i, 93r–95r, as 'order of benediction of a monk' (followed by Wilcox, *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, item 48 (oblation) and T. Webber, *Scribes and Scholars at Salisbury Cathedral c. 1075–c. 1125* (Oxford, 1992), Appendix I, p. 143) is misleading. On 93r, line 18, beginning with the change of hand, the texts for 'Oblatio parentum' begin. At the completion of the prayer '[A]desto d<omi>ne supplicationib<us> n<ost>ris' the rubrics for the profession of an adult (not oblating) begin, concluding on 99r, line 10.

⁵⁸ See DeJong, *In Samuel's Image*, p. 180.

⁵⁹ J. Leclercq prints this mass for the oblation of a child from Metz, Bibliothèque municipale 245, a manuscript he dates to the end of the eleventh century. See his 'Messes pour la profession et l'oblation monastiques', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1955), 93–6, at 95–6.

⁶⁰ On consecration, see R. Metz, *La Consécration des vierges dans l'église Romaine. Étude d'histoire de la liturgie* (Paris, 1954), pp. 182–222. O. G. Harrison, 'The Formulas *ad virgines sacras*: a Study of the Sources', *Ephemerides Liturgica* 66 (1952), 252–[273] and 352–66, suggests that the 'Te invocamus' and its collect were used in a ceremony for the first vow (pp. 266–7).

⁶¹ *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du dixième siècle*, ed. C. Vogel and R. Elze, 3 vols. *Studi e Testi*, 226, 227, 269 (Vatican City, 1963–72) I, 38–46.

Saxon England.⁶² Rituals pre-dating the PRG survive (with a few significant exceptions) in sacramentaries and later in early pontificals, and while they share many prayers, they do not incorporate the detailed *ordines* that characterize the PRG. I list the manuscripts of surviving consecration rituals from Anglo-Saxon England in the Appendix.

The scene that Goscelin sets, where Eve advances to the Lord's nuptials as one of fourteen virgins, conforms closely to a consecration. Consecration was a ritual reserved to the bishop and celebrated at specific times in the liturgical year: Epiphany, Easter Week and feasts of the apostles.⁶³ Given a bishop's heavy pastoral schedule, it was likely that more than one young woman would be consecrated on any given episcopal visit: consecration rituals, if copied with singular forms, are thus frequently glossed for the plural, and vice versa. Although much of the ritual may be performed corporately, veiling of the candidate must be done individually, and the rubrics for the PRG specify that each girl must sing the antiphon 'Induit me dominus' separately.⁶⁴ That Goscelin indicates that Eve was second from last in the ceremony makes it clear that the other thirteen girls he mentions are not witnesses but full participants in the liturgy he describes. His use of the word 'uirgines' rather than 'puellae' or 'infantes' is not by itself convincing, but its echo of the general descriptor of the ritual ('consecratio uirginis' or 'benedictio uirginis') confirms the other details of the description.

The candles to which Goscelin refers in this passage *corruscant[es] cere[i]* ('shining tapers') have a specific liturgical function that Goscelin signals by comparing them to lamps. *Lampades*, particularly in the context of 'dominicas nuptias', as he calls the ritual that Eve undergoes, draws on the parable of the wise and foolish virgins of Matt. XXV:1–8, 'quae accipientes lampades suas exierunt obviam sponso et sponsae.'⁶⁵ Beyond the biblical allusion, the word and the reference to Matt. XXV: 1–8 appear prominently in the conclusion of the formula of consecration proper 'Deus castorum corporum benignus',

⁶² M. Lapidge has demonstrated the availability of the PRG in the later eleventh century in England in 'The Origin of CCCC 163', *TCBS* 8.1 (1981), 18–28, at 19: '... CCCC 163 was copied in England from a manuscript of the Romano-German Pontifical which originated in Cologne sometime after 1021.' See also his 'Ealdred of York and MS Cotton Vitellius E. xii', *Yorkshire Archaeol. Jnl* 55 (1983), 11–25. M. Gullick, 'The Origin and Date of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 163', *TCBS* 11.1 (1996), 89–91, argues that CCCC 163 was produced at Worcester in the last quarter of the eleventh century.

⁶³ See PRG, I.38, 'Consecratio sacrae virginis quae in epiphania vel in alvis paschalibus aut in apostolorum nataliis celebratur'. Metz, *La Consécration des vierges*, p. 140, discusses the development of these periods for consecration. CCCC 163, p. 257/14, specifies Easter Monday rather than Easter week. Tiberius C. i, 113v20: specifies 'i<n> dieb<us> solennib<us>'.

⁶⁴ PRG, I.44, item 17: 'Et si plures fuerint velatae, per singulas incipiatur eadem antiphona ut supra' ('and if many are consecrated, let the same antiphon be started individually as above').

⁶⁵ 'who taking their lamps went out to meet the bridegroom and the bride'.

which the bishop pronounces over the woman prostrate before the altar.⁶⁶ During the consecration ritual as the *ordo* is specified in the PRG, the woman retires before the Introit to the *sacrarium* to put on the newly blessed habit, though the veil is kept aside for the bishop's ritual action of consecration. Now wearing the habit, the woman (or women) returns to the church with two lighted candles which she continues to hold in her hands throughout the consecration.⁶⁷ There is some variation on how long she holds the candles: in one strand of the PRG she hands the candles away in order to make her offering, but takes them back again until the end of the mass. Another strand makes no mention of the return of the candles.⁶⁸ In Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 163, the candles are reserved for the consecration proper, and the newly consecrated woman returns the candles after the episcopal banns are pronounced.⁶⁹ In the version in Tiberius C. i, the candles are part of both consecration and mass. In either variation, candles have an integral ritual function.⁷⁰

The crowd of solemn onlookers that Goscelin recalls ('populosa caterua sollemniter expectante') has no exclusive liturgical connection to a consecration, but the rubrics in the PRG indicate that more than simply the bishop, his assistants, and the candidates took part in the ritual. In a liturgical gesture borrowed from oblation, the PRG has the virgin to be consecrated offered by her parents, along with her offering. The bishop receives her, taking her by the hand that has been wrapped in the altar cloth.⁷¹ With these ritual gestures, the first of the antiphons in the consecration ritual is sung by those surrounding the candidate(s) ('cum astantibus'). Apart from the woman (or women) to be consecrated, these would include their sisters in religion. Adding to the crowd would be any parents who had conveyed their daughters at the start of the

⁶⁶ 'Deus castorum' is found in a long and in abbreviated versions. For a preliminary study of this prayer of consecration, see O. G. Harrison, 'The Formulas *ad virgines sacras*', pp. 270–3. The prayer is also treated in J. Magne, 'La prière de consécration des vierges "Deus castorum corporum"', *Ephemerides Liturgica* 72 (1958), 245–67.

⁶⁷ PRG, I.42. Similarly CCCC 163. Tiberius C. i, 114r, specifies a single candle. The damaged London, BL, Cotton Vitellius A. vii, guard page 169r, reads '[san]ctimoniales tenere debent cereos' (see Appendix).

⁶⁸ PRG I.46, item 28. Tiberius C. i indicates 'post hec relinquens puella cereu<m> offerat oblatione<m>. iteru<m>q<ue> accipiens cereum stet inclinata usq<ue> dum communicet & missa celebretur ordine suo' ('giving back her candle after this, let the girl make her offering, and taking the candle back again, let her stand with her head bowed until she takes communion and the mass is celebrated in this order').

⁶⁹ At p. 264: 'post hec relinquens puella cereos. st<et> inclinata usq<ue> || dum missa finiatur' ('after this (the reading of the banns), let the girl return her candles and stand with her head bowed until the mass is completed'). See Appendix below.

⁷⁰ On the liturgical association of candles, especially with marriage rites, see Metz, *La Consécration des vierges*, pp. 198–200. ⁷¹ PRG I.39, item 1.

consecration. In the case of fourteen girls, the crowd witnessing the consecration (and Goscelin included himself in that number), would have been noticeable.

Perhaps the part of Goscelin's account that points most clearly to consecration as the ritual in question is the 'epithalamium' that he says pierced him to the core. The phrases he cites, 'Ipsi sum desponsata, cui angeli seruiunt, et an<n>ulo suo subarravit me' (LC 28.13–14), abbreviate and combine two separate antiphons which are recited in the Office of St Agnes and the Common of Virgins. But these antiphons are also central to the consecration of virgins, where the *ordines* of the PRG specify their recital at key moments in the ritual action. In its full form, 'Ipsi sum desponsata cui angeli seruiunt cuius pulchritudinem sol et luna mirantur',⁷² is the first antiphon sung in a consecration, after the bishop has received the girl from her parents.⁷³ The second part of Goscelin's 'epithalamium', abbreviates 'Annulo suo subarravit me Dominus meus Jesus Christus, et tamquam sponsam decoravit me corona.'⁷⁴ The final antiphon in the ritual, it is sung between the conferral of the ring and crown on the newly consecrated nun and before the final benediction. In the conferral of both ring and crown, the bishop's charges to the girl emphasize that the consecration has effected her irrevocable spiritual marriage to Christ. Ring and crown are signs ('signaculum' and 'signum') marking her as: 'sponsa Dei' and 'uxor eius [i.e. Christi]'.⁷⁵ And Goscelin's 'epithalamium', by combining the opening and closing antiphons encapsulates the ritual that put Eve forever beyond his reach.⁷⁶

Thereafter, Goscelin mentions two occasions on which he arranged for Eve to attend the consecration of a church. For at least one of these, Bishop Herman was the celebrant. He may have dedicated the second one as well, but Goscelin's account does not mention him by name. Since *The Life of King*

⁷² 'I am betrothed to him whom the angels serve, at whose beauty the sun and moon marvel.'

⁷³ PRG, I.39, item 1. *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, ed. R.-J. Hesbert, 6 vols., *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, series maior, fontes vii–xii* (Rome, 1963–79) III, item 3407.

⁷⁴ PRG, I.46, item 25. Hesbert, ed. *Corpus Antiphonalium Officii*, ed. Hesbert, III, item 1426.

⁷⁵ PRG, I.45, items 23, 24.

⁷⁶ In his *vita* of Mildrith (written for St Augustine's Canterbury in the 1090s), Goscelin imagines, if anachronistically, the consecration of St Mildrith, arranged by her mother, Domneafe, with Archbishop Theodore presiding. To construct this scene for his contemporaries, Goscelin provides for the seventh/eighth-century Mildrith ritual actions identical to those he describes for Eve. In his elaborate treatment of Mildrith's consecration, Goscelin describes an attendant crowd of witnesses (here angels), the candidates carrying candles, other sisters held back for consecration with Mildrith, imposition of the veil by Theodore, pledging with a ring, and the singing of 'Ipsi sum desponsata'. Goscelin also uses some of the same language: 'pignus', 'lampades', 'epithalamica', 'caterua', 'anulo subarrat'. See the *Vita S. Mildrethe*, ed. D. Rollason, *The Mildrith Legend: a Study in Early Medieval Hagiography in England* (Leicester, 1982), c. xxi, pp. 134–5. I should like to thank Rosalind Love for drawing this passage to my attention.

Edward mentions that Bishop Herman consecrated the new stone church at Wilton (dated to 3 October 1065), Wilmart assumed that this was the dedication to which Eve had been invited at Goscelin's behest (LC 28.16). If the phrase 'vicenna aetatura' ('in your twenties') describing Eve's age in 1080 × 1082 is to be given any credit, however, Eve's age in 1065 would have been between perhaps five and ten. Wilmart thought it likely that she was born in 1058. But the probability that Goscelin is describing her consecration means that this ritual could not have taken place in 1065 because Eve would have been too young in that year. As a result, the church dedications that Goscelin refers to are not those of the stone church at Wilton and Westminster Abbey. It is unfortunate that we have no record of Herman's church dedications during the decade and a half that he was bishop of Sherborne. In a period of church building and rebuilding, it is likely that Herman would have officiated at more than one in his diocese, but on this subject the record is silent.⁷⁷

CONCLUSION

Reading LC 28.6–14 as an account of Eve's consecration requires some adjustment in our account of the events in her early life. It is likely that Eve was older than seven when Goscelin met her.⁷⁸ Goscelin's comment that Eve had scorned the title 'nun', suggests that she, like many marriageable girls and women in the wake of the Conquest, found herself placed by her parents in a convent for safe-keeping. Her giving of books to Goscelin, early in their acquaintance, certainly suggests that she retained a considerable disposable income, at least early on. And Goscelin's references to reforming her suggest that at least some of his discourses were aimed at her conversion to the religious life. Such direct comments to her by one who knew her weigh more than the Hilarius's pious fiction on oblation. And yet the discourse of oblation, quite apart from its sentimental resonance, has another, perhaps protective, function. Much of the writing on Eve, beginning as early as Hilarius, tends to worry about a possible carnal element in a professedly spiritual relationship. Hilarius fends off in advance suspicion about the relationship between Eve and Hervé ('Fuge, frater, suspiciari, nec sit hic suspicio,/ Non in mundo, sed in Christo fuit hec dilectio.')79 Wilmart in his own way tries to protect Eve from similar suspicion in making her a small child throughout the formative years of her relationship with Goscelin. And

⁷⁷ See R. Gem, 'The English Parish Church in the 11th and Early 12th Centuries: a Great Rebuilding?', *Minsters and Parish Churches: the Local Church in Transition 950–1200*, ed. J. Blair, Oxford Univ. Committee for Archaeol., Monograph 17 (1988), 21–30.

⁷⁸ LC 102.11 '... adolescentulus, te infantula, unci ad episcopum ...' only specifies the difference in their ages, not that he necessarily knew her at the time.

⁷⁹ *Hilarii Aurelianensis Versus et Ludi*, ed. Bulst and Bulste-Thiele, p. 23, quatrain 25: 'Brother, do not be alarmed. Let there be no suspicion here. This love was not in the world but in Christ.'

Goscelin too, for doubtless more complex reasons, keeps her a child rhetorically, affirming his power and spiritual authority as conditions of his love while defending against the ‘nequam oculus, uafēr digitus, uentilator et cachinnator impurus’.⁸⁰ The consecration had to have taken place before 20 February 1078, the date of Herman’s death. Given Eve’s age, it is likely that it took place closer to 1077 than earlier. Thereafter, whether Eve departed for Angers by her own design or by the command of Bishop Osmund, it would appear that her consecration had raised the stakes in their personal relationship, ultimately sending Goscelin to a life as itinerant hagiographer and Eve to reclusion in Normandy.⁸¹

APPENDIX: LIST OF SURVIVING ANGLO-SAXON LITURGICAL
MANUSCRIPTS WITH RITUALS OF CONSECRATION

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 44, pp. 346/14– (Prayers of consecration, pp. 346–55)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 33.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 40, ‘Pontifical, s. xi^{2/4} or xi^{med} or xi^{3/4}, Canterbury (StA or CC?), (prov. Ely)’.

J. Brückmann, ‘Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals in England and Wales’, *Traditio* 29 (1973), 403–4.

M. Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 2 vols. (Kalamazoo, 1997) I, 675–85 (= item 46).

M. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies of the Saints*, HBS 106 (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1991), p. 63, dates the manuscript to the second quarter of the eleventh century, with the evidence of the litanies pointing, perhaps, to St Augustine’s, Canterbury. D. N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1992), p. 71, dates the script to ‘after about 1020’ and connects the book to Stigand (archbishop 1052–70) (p. 93).

Corpus Christi College Cambridge 146 (Prayers of consecration on pp. 152–7)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 37.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 46, ‘Pontifical, Benedictional: s. xiⁱⁿ, Winchester OM (or Canterbury CC??)’.

Brückmann, ‘Latin Manuscript Pontificals’, 405–6.

Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art* I, 495–9 (= item 31).

Although production of the manuscript is generally assigned to Winchester (with additions at Worcester under Samson’s pontificate (1096–1112)), Dumville (*Liturgy*, 72)

⁸⁰ LC 26.14–15: ‘the wicked eye, the pointing finger, the agitator and the filthy sneerer’.

⁸¹ Daphne Stroud’s article, ‘Eve of Wilton and Goscelin of St Bertin at Old Sarum c. 1070–1078’ (*Wiltshire Archaeol. and Natural Hist. Mag.* 99 (2006), 204–12), came to hand at proof-stage, and I have been unable to take her argument into account. I should like to acknowledge with thanks the kind help of Julia Barrow, John Blair, Peter Jackson, Simon Keynes, Michael Lapidge, Roy Liuzza, Rosalind Love and Paul E. Szarmach with various points in this article.

argues for Christ Church, Canterbury as origin on the basis of its Canterbury Style II Anglo-Caroline minuscule. L. M. Sole, 'Some Anglo-Saxon Cuthbert *Liturgica*: the Manuscript Evidence', *RB* 108 (1998), 104–44, at 132, also proposes use at Canterbury. Lapidge (*Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, p. 63) points out Winchester influence on some blessings. *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R. Pfaff, *OEN, Subsidia* 23 (1995), p. 95, suggests a connection with the translation of Ælfheah from Winchester to Canterbury in 1006. N. Orchard, *The Leofric Missal*, 2 vols., HBS 113, 114 (London, 2002) I, 75, maintains that CCC 146 'was clearly intended for use at Winchester', citing material shared only with Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 442, 'copied at Winchester in the mid-1060s for a house in the diocese of Sherborne'.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 163 (Prayers of consecration of a virgin (cloistered) on pp. 257–65)

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 51, 'Pontifical (Pontificale Romano-Germanicum) . . . s. xi², prob. xi^{4/4}, prob. Worcester (Winchester OM? at or for Nunnaminster?)'.

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 406–7.

Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon, and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art* I, 593–8 (= item 39).

Lapidge shows that the copy of the PRG in CCC 163 derives from London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius E. xii, fols. 116–60, brought to England by Ealdred, bishop of York (1060–9), perhaps in 1054 ('Ealdred of York and MS Cotton Vitellius E. xii', *Yorkshire Archaeol. Jnl* 55 (1983), 11–25). He points out ('The Origin of CCC 163', *TCBS* 8.1 (1981), 18–28 at 23) that all the *ordines* for women from the PRG are in CCC 163, but those for men are omitted and argues that it was copied for a nunnery, as yet unidentified. M. Gullick, 'The Origin and Date of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 163', *TCBS* 11.1 (1996), 89–91, argues from parchment, script, and initials that CCC 163 was produced at Worcester in last quarter of the eleventh century.

Durham Cathedral Library, A. IV. 19, 'Durham Collectar' (Prayers of consecration, 49v–1r)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 106.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 223, 'Collectar, Texts from pontifical services: s. ix/x, S England, prov. Chester-le-Street . . . OE gloss to all texts: s. x², Chester-le-Street, prov. whole MS Durham.'

Edition: *The Durham Collectar*, ed., A. Corrêa, HBS 107 (London, 1992), 218–20 (prayer nos. 605–10).

Corrêa, *Durham Collectar*, p. 81, dates the Collectar to between 890–930. The consecration formulas are in the original material of the collectar, part of the single campaign of writing by scribe O (*ibid.* p. 80).

London, British Library, Add. 57337 Anderson [or 'Brodie'] Pontifical (Prayers of consecration, 69r/9–72r/14)

Ker, *Catalogue* (Supplement), no. 416.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 302, x/xi (or 1020s?) Canterbury CC (or Winchester OM?).

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 431–2.

Edition: *The Dunstan and Brodie (Anderson) Pontificals: an Edition and Study*, ed. M. A. Conn (PhD dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1993), pp. 135–42 and pp. 284–8. *Les*

Goscelin and the consecration of Eve

Pontificaux du haut moyen âge: Genèse du livre de l'évêque, ed. N. K. Rasmussen, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents*, Fasc. 49 (Louvain, 1998), 167–257, prints a list of contents with selected notes; consecration of a virgin at p. 208.

The Anderson Pontifical is virtually identical to the Dunstan pontifical in its consecration of a virgin but lacks the blessing for the habit. Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 77, argues against A. Prescott, 'The Structure of English pre-Conquest Benedictionals', *Brit. Lib. Jnl* 13 (1987), 118–58 at 121–3, that the Anderson Pontifical was not written at Winchester but at Christ Church, Canterbury, though showing Winchester influence. Dumville dates the Anderson Pontifical before CCCC 146. But see T. A. Heslop, 'The Production of *de luxe* Manuscripts and the Patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma', *ASE* 19 (1990), 151–91 at 169–70, who suggests Canterbury 'after 1023', and for a blunting of that argument see N. Orchard, *The Leofric Missal* I, 76, n. 160.

London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 31–86, 106–50 (= Claudius Pontifical I; medieval order of folios = 31–8, 106–36, 39–86 and 137–50 [see Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 78]. Prayers of consecration on 80v–84r)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 141.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 314, s. x/xi, Worcester or York.

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 434–5.

Edition: *The Claudius Pontificals (from Cotton MS. Claudius A. iii in the British Museum)*, ed.

D. H. Turner, HBS 97 (Chichester, 1971 for 1964), 68–70.

Turner (p. x) dates the book to the last decade of Æthelwold's pontificate and localizes it to Winchester. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, p. 69, and Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 79, argue Worcester or York, c. 1000. Dumville argues 'the body of the pontifical is written in Style-I Anglo-Caroline of ca. A.D. 1000' and he is 'fairly certain' that this is Wulfstan's pontifical (Dumville, *Liturgy*, pp. 78 and 79). See now C. A. Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: the Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. M. Townend, *Stud. in the Early Middle Ages 10* (Turnhout, 2004), 325–52, at 344, n. 80.

London, British Library, Cotton Claudius A. iii, fols. 9–18, 87–105 (= Claudius Pontifical II; Prayers of consecration on 100v–105r)

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 313, 's. xi^{2/4} or xi^{med}, prob. Canterbury CC'.

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 434–5.

Edition: *The Claudius Pontificals (from Cotton MS. Claudius A. iii in the British Museum)*, ed.

D. H. Turner, HBS 97 (Chichester, 1971 for 1964), 109–12.

Dumville (*Liturgy*, p. 78) labels the script Style-IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule, and attributes it to the 'middle years of the eleventh century'. Pfaff (*Liturgical Books*, p. 92) suggests that the contents point to a Christ Church origin. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, p. 69, regards its litany as derivative of that in CCCC 44.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C. i, fols. 43–203 (Prayers of consecration, 113v–114v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 197.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 376, 's. xiⁱ or xi^{med}, Germany'.

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 436.

For fiches of the manuscript and a complete description of the contents, see J. Wilcox, *Wulfstan Texts and Other Homiletic Materials*, AS Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile 8 (Tempe, AZ, 2000), 30–45, items 48 (oblation) and 58b (consecration of a virgin).

Tiberius C. i contains 'extensive extracts' from the PRG, though Pfaff is unwilling to see the book as a witness to liturgical practice (Pfaff, *Liturgical Books*, 96–7). Of present interest are quire 6 (that for the oblation) and quire 9 (the consecration). (On the quiring, see N. R. Ker, 'Three Old English Texts in a Salisbury Pontifical, Cotton Tiberius C. i', *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their Heritage and Culture presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. P. Clemoes (London, 1959), pp. 262–79, at 262–3.) Ker assigns the writing of the formula of oblation to Scribe VIII (p. 268) and the writing of the formula of consecration to Scribe XI (pp. 268–9) who was active after Bishop Herman's episcopal see was transferred from Sherborne to Salisbury. He believed that the manuscript accompanied the bishop (p. 269). Scribe XI is associated with the writing of a number of Salisbury manuscripts. See Webber, *Scribes and Scholars*, pp. 143–4.

London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A. vii, fols. 1–112 (Prayers of consecration, guard pages 169r–175v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 213.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 397: 'Pontifical (incomplete), including two abbrev. sermons by Abbo of Saint-Germain; prob. Ramsey after 1030, and Exeter, 1046 × 1072.'

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 437.

Dumville, *Liturgy*, 79, suggests that 15v–54r 'may represent an original core, written in what appears to be a very late form of Style-I Anglo-Caroline minuscule'. He conjectures that Ælfward (bishop of London beginning 1035), former monk at Ramsey, was owner of Pontifical. Pfaff (*Liturgical Books*, p. 93) dismisses this as speculation, noting that the pontifical appears to have belonged to Leofric, bishop of Crediton and Exeter.

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579 ('Leofric Missal' = Leofric A, c. 900; prayers of consecration, 296r–97v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 315.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 585, 's. ix/x (c. 900), Saint-Vaast, Arras (or Cambrai diocese?)'.

Brückmann, 'Latin Manuscript Pontificals', 446–50.

Edition: N. Orchard, *The Leofric Missal II*, 422–3 (prayer nos. 2429–34).

Orchard suggests the same order of formulas in the Leofric Missal is found in the Durham Collectar (I, 97). But prayer no. 607 (beginning 'Respice Domine') in the Durham Collectar is a different prayer from no. 2431 (also beginning 'Respice Domine') in the Leofric Missal. Since the earliest supplementary matter to the core missal is in Phase-I Square minuscule, the Leofric Missal had come to southern England before c. 930. See Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 82. He supposes the book to have been at Canterbury, moved to Tavistock abbey in the early eleventh century, and been acquired by Leofric bishop of Devon and Cornwall, 1046 × 1072.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 943 (Dunstan (or Sherborne) Pontifical; between 960 and 973? prayers of consecration, 82v–85v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 364.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 879, prov. after 959 ‘prob. Canterbury CC’; prov. ‘whole MS Sherborne by s. x/xi, France, s. xi².’

Leroquais, *Pontificaux manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, ed. V. Leroquais, 3 vols. (Paris, 1937) II, 6–10, item 93.

Die angelsächsischen Handschriften in den Pariser Bibliotheken, ed. B. Ebersperger, Anglistische Forschungen 261 (Heidelberg, 1999), item 5.

Edition: *The Dunstan and Brodie (Anderson) Pontificals*, ed. M. A. Conn, pp. 135–42.

Les Pontificaux du haut moyen âge, ed. Rasmussen, pp. 258–317, describes the contents of the Dunstan Pontifical; the consecration of a virgin at pp. 277–9.

For a discussion see Pfaff, *Liturgical Books*, pp. 89–90. See also Dumville, *Liturgy*, pp. 82–4.

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 10575 (so-called ‘Egbert Pontifical’, prayers of consecration on 138v–45r)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 370.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 896, s. x^{med} or x² or x/xi, prov. Évreux, s. xi.

Leroquais, *Pontificaux manuscrits* II, 160–4, item 144.

Ebersperger, *Die angelsächsischen Handschriften*, item 22.

Edition: *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals: the Egbert and Sidney Sussex Pontificals*, ed. H. M. J. Banting, HBS 104 (London, 1989).

Pfaff, *Liturgical Books*, p. 90, tentatively supports a ‘Sherborne connection’. On the peculiar mixture of forms and prayers in this pontifical, see Harrison, ‘Formulas’, 265.

Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 274 (Y.6) (‘The Missal of Robert of Jumièges’; prayers of consecration on 197r–197v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 377.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 921, ‘Sacramentary: 1014 × 1023, prov. (And origin?) Peterborough or Ely, prov. Canterbury CC?, prov. Jumièges, s. xi med.’

V. Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits de bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1924) I, 99, item 40.

Edition: *The Missal of Robert of Jumièges*, ed. H. A. Wilson, HBS 11 (London, 1896), 273–4.

Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 87, says it is ‘unlikely to have been [written at] London’.

Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 368, A. 27 (‘Lanalet Pontifical’; formulas on 56v–60v)

Ker, *Catalogue*, no. 374.

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 922, ‘SW England (St. Germans?), prov. Crediton by 1027 × 1046 (or Wells before 1014?), (prov. Jumièges)’.

Leroquais, *Pontificaux manuscrits* II, 287–300, item 188.

Edition: *Pontificale Lanaletense (Bibliothèque de la Ville de Rouen A. 27 Cat. 368)*, ed. G. H. Doble, HBS 74 (London, 1937), 42–3 (collated against Wilson, *Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, pp. 135–8).

The manuscript is usually provenanced to Crediton or St Germans, but Dumville (*Liturgy*, pp. 92 and 117) suggests Wells and dates it to the early eleventh century on the

basis of its Style-I Anglo-Caroline script. J. Toswell, 'St Martial and the Dating of Late Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts', *Scriptorium* 51 (1997), 3–14 would date it to after *c.* 1020. The 'Lyfing' referred to as owner on 196r must be Lyfing bishop of Crediton (1027–46) not Lyfing bishop of Wells *c.* 999–1013. See N. Orchard, *Leofric Missal* I, 76, who adds that the book went to Wells later.

Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, 369 (Y.7) (Benedictional of Archbishop Robert; prayers of consecration on 156r–160r)

Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 923 's. x^{4/4} (s. xi^{2/4}?) Winchester NM, (prov. Rouen cathedral from s. xii¹).

Leroquais, *Pontificaux manuscrits* II, 300–5, item 189.

Edition: *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, ed. H. A. Wilson (London, 1903), pp. 135–8.

Many date and provenance the book to the 980s and the New Minster, Winchester, but David Dumville, *Liturgy*, p. 87, assigns its writing to Winchester, 'largely in Style-IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule and therefore probably not before the second quarter of the eleventh century', though Pfaff (*Liturgical Books*, p. 94) points out that the textual affinities all point to the earlier date. Lapidge, *Anglo-Saxon Litanies*, p. 83, ascribes it to New Minster.