

BISHOP ÆTHELWOLD

His Career and Influence

edited by
BARBARA YORKE

THE BOYDELL PRESS

88/1122

Chapter 5

THE TEXT OF THE BENEDICTIONAL OF ST ÆTHELWOLD

Andrew Prescott

In Memory of Derek Howard Turner

It has become increasingly apparent that one of the central aims of the ecclesiastical reform in England during the tenth century was the improvement and embellishment of the liturgy of the English church. The achievements of the reformers in this field were numerous and wide-ranging. The latest continental types of hymnal, psalter and other liturgical books were introduced¹ and such imaginative innovations were made as the reenactment during matins on Easter day of the visitation to the sepulchre,² which has been described as the 'earliest recorded liturgical music-drama'.³ Concern for the liturgy is also evident in the artistic products of the reform. The musical innovations of the period were, of course, entirely directed towards the enhancement and beautification of church services.⁴ Dunstan and Æthelwold

Work on this paper was begun by D.H. Turner, Deputy Keeper in the Department of Manuscripts, British Library, who was one of the organisers of the exhibition 'The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art', held at the British Museum in 1984 to commemorate the millenium of the death of St Æthelwold. Mr Turner tragically died on St Æthelwold's day 1985. I had been working with Mr Turner in compiling a description of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold for the Department of Manuscripts' *Catalogue of Additions* and so took over the preparation of this article. Mr Turner left detailed notes on the contents of the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Sacramentary of Ratoldus, which have been used here. Table Three is based on Mr Turner's transcripts of the incipits of blessings in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus. My conclusions have been deeply influenced by Mr Turner's ideas. In fact, this article is in many respects simply a review of the evidence supporting his statement about the Benedictional in *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art*, ed. J. Backhouse, D. H. Turner and L. Webster (London, 1984), p 60:

There are two main textual traditions in benedictionals, the so-called 'Gregorian' and 'Gallican' ... Not the least interesting thing about the Benedictional of St Æthelwold is that it is a conflation of complete benedictionals of both traditions ... This suggests a definite concern for completeness, correctness, by someone, probably Æthelwold himself.

I am grateful to my colleagues Janet Backhouse and Michelle Brown for their assistance in the compilation of this paper.

¹ H. Gneuss, *Hymnar und Hymnen im englischen Mittelalter*, Buchreihe der Anglia 12 (Tubingen, 1968); *The Salisbury Psalter*, ed. C. and K. Sisam, EETS 242 (London, 1959), pp 47-52. Canterbury, however, continued to use the 'Roman' psalter: see further N. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (Leicester, 1984), pp 261-5. There are useful general comments on the introduction of new types of liturgical books into England during the tenth century in H. Gneuss, 'Liturgical books in Anglo-Saxon England and their Old English terminology', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies presented to Peter Clemoes*, ed. M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp 91-142.

² *Regularis Concordia*, pp 49-51. On the Easter play, see now G. Bryan, *Æthelwold and Medieval Music-Drama at Winchester* (Berne, 1981).

³ Bryan, *op. cit.* p 99.

⁴ See Berry (ch 6 below).

used their metalworking skills to produce such objects for liturgical use as crosses, bells and chalices.⁵ At Winchester, the centre of the most important liturgical reforms, a superb new setting for church services was created by the rebuilding of the Old Minster, 'one of the architectural wonders of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom'.⁶

The outstanding English work of art to have survived from this period is the Benedictional of St Æthelwold (London, British Library, Additional MS 49598).⁷ A long Latin poem in golden capital letters at the beginning of the manuscript explains that it was written for Æthelwold by Godeman, a monk, probably at the Old Minster, who afterwards became Abbot of Thorney.⁸ It is written in a beautiful caroline minuscule and sumptuously decorated with twenty-eight full-page miniatures (several more are now missing) and nineteen decorated initial pages. It dates from between the translation of St Swithun in 971 and Æthelwold's death in 984.⁹ On the basis of iconographical evidence linking the Benedictional with the coronation of King Edgar in 973, R. Deshman has proposed that it was executed in that year.¹⁰ The decoration of the Benedictional has been studied in great detail, but its text has been comparatively neglected. This is unfortunate, since it is a service book of a special and interesting kind which embodies one of the most characteristic of the liturgical reforms associated with Æthelwold. The Benedictional consequently provides a most striking illustration of the link between the artistic achievements of the monastic revival and its concern for the improvement of English liturgical life.

Benedictionals are collections of solemn blessings for the use of bishops.¹¹ They are closely related to pontificals, a type of liturgical book containing rites which could be celebrated only by a bishop. The distinction between pontificals and benedictionals is not always very clear-cut: benedictionals often occur as part of a pontifical and may include in addition to blessings a

⁵ See e.g. *Chron. Abingdon*, I, 344-345.

⁶ M. Biddle, *Excavations near Winchester Cathedral 1961-1967* [reprint of articles from the *Winchester Cathedral Record*], 3rd edn (Winchester, 1968), p 47.

⁷ A black and white facsimile, with a valuable introduction and edition of the text, is G. Warner and H. Wilson, *The Benedictional of St Æthelwold*, Roxburghe Club (Oxford, 1910). For colour reproductions of some of the miniatures, see F. Wormald, *The Benedictional of St Æthelwold* (London, 1959). In addition to the bibliography in E. Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts 900-1066* (London, 1976), no. 23, see J. Alexander, 'The Benedictional of St Æthelwold and Anglo-Saxon Illumination of the Reform Period', *Tenth-Century Studies*, pp 169-183, 241-245, pls iii-xiv; F. Wormald, 'The "Winchester School" before St Æthelwold', *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge, 1971), pp 305-312, and reprinted in his *Collected Writings*, I (London and Oxford, 1984), pp 76-84; R. Deshman, 'Christus rex et magi reges: Kingship and Christology in Ottonian and Anglo-Saxon Art', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976), 367-405, figs. 16, 25, 40, 41; *idem*, 'The Leofric Missal and Tenth-Century English Art', *ASE* 6 (1977), 145-173, pls iii, v.

⁸ Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, pp xiii-xiv.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp lvi-lvii.

¹⁰ 'Leofric Missal', 154-155; 'Kingship and Christology', 398-404.

¹¹ This general account of benedictionals is based chiefly on CBP pt 3, pp vi-lxv, *The Benedictionals of Freising*, ed. R. Amiet, HBS 78 (1974), pp 3-22, and Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, pp xlv-lv. There are also some helpful remarks in G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 2nd edn (London, 1945), pp 511-521, and J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, trans. F. Brunner (New York, 1951), II, pp 294-297.

few miscellaneous forms for such ceremonies as the reconciliation of penitents and the consecration of chrism on Maundy Thursday. Benedictionals have consequently been described as a 'sub-division of Pontificals'.¹² Blessings are, of course, used in many different church services, but those in benedictionals were mainly intended to be pronounced by the bishop at mass, just before the communion.

Pre-communion blessings first began to appear in the liturgy in the fourth and fifth centuries. Their purpose was, in the words of one early eastern liturgy, that 'we may be made worthy to take communion and share in thy holy mysteries'.¹³ They also provided a link between the anaphore, the section of the service containing the eucharistic prayer and other acts preparatory to communion, and the communion itself. Moreover, at this time those attending mass were not obliged to take communion and people often left the service at the conclusion of the anaphore. A blessing at this point was a convenient way of dismissing those not staying for communion.

Pre-communion blessings were used widely in eastern churches and many early eastern liturgies make provision for them.¹⁴ They also appeared in North Africa, as is shown by a passage of St Optatus of Mela in which he refers to the laying on of hands before receiving communion.¹⁵ St Augustine of Hippo also mentions the use of blessings, which in the light of Optatus's comments would seem likely to be pre-communion blessings, and even gives the texts of some of them.¹⁶ Pre-communion blessings were not, however, used in Rome. It has been suggested that such features of the Roman mass as the post-communion *oratio super populum* and the declaration *pax vobiscum* before the kiss of peace may have had their origins in a blessing before the communion, but such theories are difficult to substantiate.¹⁷ It was in Spain and France that pre-communion blessings reached their most highly-developed form and became a particularly popular part of the mass.

They were used in Spain from an early date. The decrees of the fourth Council of Toledo in 633 condemned those celebrants who moved the blessing from before to after the communion,¹⁸ while the second Council of Seville in 619 ordered that mere priests should not give solemn blessings.¹⁹

¹² *The Claudius Pontificals*, ed. D.H. Turner, HBS 97 (1971), p xi.

¹³ The 'Liturgy of St James', cited by Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite*, II, p 294.

¹⁴ Examples include the *Euchologium* attributed to Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis in Egypt about 339-63, the Coptic and Ethiopic versions of the *Apostolic Tradition* ascribed to Hippolytus, the schismatic Bishop of Rome, who died in 236 or 237, as well as the liturgies of St James, St Basil and St Mark: see further CBP pt 3, pp ix-xi. Amiet sees the blessing before the communion as a purely Gallican practice and does not mention its appearance in the East.

¹⁵ *De Schismate Donatarum*, ii, 20: PL 11, col. 975. Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, pp 11-12, argues that the pre-communion blessing was probably not known in North Africa, but does not mention this passage.

¹⁶ *Letter 149*, 16; *Letter 179*, 4; *Ex Sermone contra Pelagianos*, 3: PL 33, col. 637, 775; PL 39, col. 1721.

¹⁷ On the *oratio super populum*, see G. Morin, 'Un recueil gallican inédit de Benedictiones episcopales en usage à Freising aux VIIe-IXe siècles', *Revue Bénédictine* 29 (1912), 170, Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, pp 10-11, and Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, p 518. On the *pax vobiscum*, see D. Buennner, *L'Ancienne Liturgie Romaine: le Rite Lyonnais* (Lyons and Paris, 1934), pp 279-280 and CBP pt 3, pp xvi-xvii.

¹⁸ Canon 18: PL 84, col. 372.

¹⁹ Canon 7: PL 84, col. 596-7.

St Isidore stated that such blessings should follow the three-fold form which Moses had been told to use:²⁰

The Lord said to Moses, 'Say to Aaron and his sons, Thus you shall bless the people of Israel: you shall say to them,
The Lord bless you and keep you:
The Lord make his face to shine upon you, and be gracious to you:
The Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace.'²¹

A number of Spanish liturgical books dating from before the romanisation of the Spanish rite in the eleventh century contain collections of pre-communion blessings.²² These are in three short clauses, as prescribed by St Isidore, and are written in an economic rhythmic prose, with rhymes between the middle and end of each clause.²³ Many of these forms probably predate the Muslim conquest and are interesting specimens of Visigothic literature.

Early church councils in France also made decrees relating to pre-communion blessings. The Council of Agde in 506 followed by the first and third Councils of Orleans in 511 and 538 ordered that no one should leave mass until the blessing had been pronounced.²⁴ St Caesar of Arles (470-540) stressed the importance of making proper preparation for communion by receiving the blessing in a humble fashion, with a bowed head. He also denounced the habit of leaving mass before the blessing.²⁵ The Council of Agde further decreed that priests should not give the blessing.²⁶ The *Expositio Antiquae Liturgiae Gallicanae* provides a short set form of blessing which priests could use.²⁷ The more elaborate forms varying according to the season were reserved to bishops. The *Expositio* also repeats St Isidore's statement that the solemn episcopal blessing should follow the form given in the Book of Numbers.

No complete early Gallican benedictional survives. There are, however, a few fragmentary collections, the most substantial of which are in the *Missale Gothicum* (Rome, Vatican Library, MS Reg. lat. 317), compiled towards the end of the seventh century in the diocese of Autun,²⁸ and the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Rome, Vatican Library, MS Palat. lat. 493), written in the middle of the eighth century.²⁹ It is not possible to establish the relationship

²⁰ *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, i, 17: PL 83, col. 754.

²¹ Numbers 6, 22-26 (RSV).

²² Listed in *CBP pt 3*, pp xxi-xxii.

²³ E.g. *CBP* no. 1421, analysed in *pt 3*, p xxii.

²⁴ C. Munier, *Concilia Galliae A. 314-A. 506*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 148 (1963), p 212; C. de Clercq, *Concilia Galliae A. 511-A. 695*, Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 148A (1963), pp 11, 125-6.

²⁵ PL 39, col. 2276-2282; see also *CBP pt 3*, p xiii.

²⁶ Munier, *Concilia Galliae*, p 211.

²⁷ I. 26a-26b: *Expositio Antiquae Liturgiae Gallicanae*, ed. E. C. Ratcliff, HBS 98 (1971), pp 15-16.

²⁸ Edited by L. C. Mohlberg, *Missale Gothicum*, *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, series maior, Fontes 5 (1961). The blessings are listed in *CPB pt 3*, pp 75-6.

²⁹ Edited by L. C. Mohlberg, L. Eizenhöfer and P. Siffrin, *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, series maior, Fontes 3 (1958). The blessings are listed in *CBP pt 3*, pp 74-5. Three other fragments of eighth-century Gallican benedictionals also survive, containing altogether four blessings (*CBP* nos. 101, 240, 1162, 1857). They are printed in an appendix to this edition of *Gallicanum Vetus*.

between these collections. They only contain a handful of blessings and none of the forms are common to both manuscripts. The blessings are in a variety of styles and are apparently taken from more than one source. They are more prolix and elaborate than the Visigothic blessings, often assuming the character of general prayers and containing more than three clauses.³⁰ Some, however, use internal rhyme in a way which suggests that they were influenced by Visigothic forms.³¹

During the eighth century, the Gallican liturgy became increasingly subject to Roman influence, chiefly as a result of the introduction of two famous types of service book. The first were the so-called Gelasian sacramentaries of the eighth century, a misleading name which refers to a tradition that a service-book was compiled by the fifth-century pope, Gelasius I. In fact, the Gelasian sacramentaries of the eighth century consist of material taken from prayer collections used by Roman priests combined with some Gallican elements.³² They probably first appeared in France in the third quarter of the eighth century. The other vehicle of Roman influence was the *Hadrianum*, a service book sent by Pope Hadrian I in response to a request of Charlemagne following his visit to Rome in 781. This sacramentary was said by the Pope to contain the pure Roman use, uncontaminated by other traditions. Charlemagne commanded that the *Hadrianum* should be used throughout his dominions, but it lacked many of the most familiar features of services in the Frankish church. The eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary consequently continued in use as a supplement to the *Hadrianum*, a practice which seems to have had official sanction, perhaps from Alcuin himself.³³ This was a very cumbersome arrangement and eventually an appendix to the *Hadrianum* was produced which contained a digest of the additional material in the eighth-century Gelasian.³⁴

None of these Roman books made provision for pre-communion blessings. Various attempts were made to produce collections of blessings for use with them, so that the pattern of development of the Gallican benedictional was extremely complex. Different types of benedictional appeared and almost all the surviving manuscripts differ from one another in important respects. The most convincing attempt so far to establish the relationship between these texts occurs in a series of remarkable studies by the great liturgical scholar, Dom Jean Deshusses.³⁵

³⁰ E.g. CBP no. 781 (from *Missale Gothicum*: no. 22 in Mohlberg's edition).

³¹ E.g. CBP nos. 9, 605 (from *Missale Gothicum*: nos. 122 and 169 in Mohlberg's edition), analysed in CBP pt 3, pp xxiii-xxiv.

³² B. Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1976), particularly pp 168-174.

³³ J. Deshusses, 'Le "Supplement" au Sacramentaire Grégorien: Alcuin ou saint Benoît d'Aniane?', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1965), 58-59.

³⁴ For an analysis of its contents, see Deshusses 'Le "Supplement" au Sacramentaire Grégorien', 48-58, 60-63. It has been printed frequently. The latest edition is J. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, Spicilegium Friburgense, 16, 24, 28 (1971-1982), nos. 1019-1805.

³⁵ In addition to the works by him already cited, see 'Le benedictionnaire gallican du VIII^e siècle', *Ephemerides Liturgicæ* 77 (1963), 169-187. There is also a useful discussion of the Gallican benedictional in Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, pp 23-63, but this does not consider a number of important issues, such as the relationship between the short and long benedictionals, so Deshusses's interpretation is followed here.

Two main types of Gallican benedictional emerged in the eighth century.³⁶ One consisted in its original version of perhaps about seventy-five blessings, while the other was much shorter, probably containing at first about twenty-five blessings, many of which are also found in the long benedictional. Deshusses has shown that the long benedictional was produced first, being perhaps compiled in the diocese of Autun towards the end of the seventh century from a variety of sources, including the collections in the *Missale Gothicum* and *Gallicanum Vetus*. The short benedictional, which seems to date from the middle of the eighth century, was essentially an abridgement of the long version, with the addition of a few other forms such as three blessings in *Gallicanum Vetus* which do not appear in the long version.³⁷ It was probably intended for use in monasteries, where, since bishops were not regularly present, service books did not need to offer a wide variety of blessings covering many different sorts of occasions.

The eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary only began to appear widely in cathedrals towards the end of the century, when it was used as a supplement to the *Hadrianum*. In cathedrals, a larger range of blessings was required than was available in the short benedictional and the longer version was preferred. The most important surviving copies of the long benedictional all date from this period and mainly occur as additions to Gelasian sacramentaries. They show great textual variety. They are all further removed from the original archetype than the recension used in compiling the short benedictional. The version which appears to be closest to the original is that in the Sacramentary of Angoulême (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 816),³⁸ but even here the order of the blessings has been changed, apparently under the influence of the short benedictional, so that they begin at Advent. A manuscript from Freising (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. lat. 6430) contains versions of both the short and long benedictionals.³⁹ In this manuscript, a recension of the long benedictional was used in which not only had the order of the blessings for general Sunday use been radically altered, but blessings inserted from another source and new blessings created by running together groups of three post-communion prayers. In the long benedictional in the Sacramentary of Gellone (Paris, BN, MS lat. 12048),⁴⁰ special blessings were provided for all the Sundays after Easter and Pentecost. The extra blessings were obtained by splitting in half forms intended for general Sunday use, as well as by borrowing material from the short benedictional and the source of the long benedictional in the Freising manuscript.

During this transitional period when the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary and the *Hadrianum* were used together, a completely new benedictional

³⁶ The next two paragraphs are based on Deshusses, 'Le benedictionnaire gallican'.

³⁷ CBP 81, 245, 341 (nos. 222, 228, 234 in the edition of Mohlberg *et al.*); cf. Deshusses, 'Le benedictionnaire gallican', 180.

³⁸ Edited by P. Cagin, *Le Sacramentaire Gélasian d'Angoulême* (Angoulême, 1919). The blessings are nos. 1799-1872 and 2317-2318.

³⁹ Both benedictionals have been edited by Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, and the shorter benedictional also by W. Dürig, 'Das Benedictionale Frisingense vetus', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 4 (1955), 223-244.

⁴⁰ P. de Puniet, *Le Sacramentaire romain de Gellone* (Rome, 1938) [reprint from *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 52 (1938)]. The long benedictional is nos. 1987-2100. This manuscript also contains a version of the short benedictional: nos. 1974-1985.

was composed in the Visigothic style, using rhythmic prose with internal rhymes.⁴¹ This benedictional was accompanied by a collection of prefaces, mostly drawn from the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary, but also including some new pieces which were reworkings of Gelasian prayers, again in the Visigothic style. This collection of blessings and prefaces seems originally to have been produced for local use as an appendix to the Gelasian sacramentary, but subsequently enjoyed an illustrious career. When a digest of material from the Gelasian sacramentary was produced for use as a supplement to the *Hadrianum*, these prefaces and blessings were added as an appendix. The supplement contained some new prayers in the same style as the blessings and prefaces, which shows that they are all the work of the same person. This compilation was issued with an explanatory preface and became a standard addition to the Gregorian sacramentary.

This supplement was long thought to have been the work of Alcuin, but this is extremely unlikely, since, as Deshusses has stressed, it was produced by someone steeped in Visigothic traditions. Deshusses has argued that the author was more probably the Visigoth Witiza, who, as Benedict of Aniane, became the spiritual leader of the Empire under Louis the Pious.⁴² This theory is supported by stylistic parallels between the preface to the supplement and known works of Benedict.⁴³ Aniane's benedictional seems originally to have been composed for use in a monastery and is quite short, containing fifty-two blessings. It makes provision only for the most important feasts and contains a large selection of forms for general daily use. As its use spread, additional blessings were inserted and the general forms were assigned to specific occasions. A number of expanded versions of Aniane's benedictional appeared. The most common is found in a group of manuscripts associated with the monasteries of St Amand near Tournai and Corbie in Amiens.⁴⁴ This contains about thirty-six extra blessings, most of which are in the same style as those of Aniane, making use of internal rhyme,⁴⁵ and sometimes even borrowing old Visigothic forms.⁴⁶ This version of Aniane's benedictional is familiar from the *Missale Sancti Eligii* (Paris, BN, MS lat. 12051), the basis of Ménard's edition of the Gregorian sacramentary, which was reprinted by Migne.⁴⁷ This form of benedictional has been called 'Gregorian',⁴⁸ because of its association with the version of the Gregorian sacramentary in the *Hadrianum*.

Pre-communion blessings provide one of the most striking examples of the occasional triumph of Gallican over Roman practice. With the spread of the *Hadrianum* and its supplement, they passed from France to many other

⁴¹ See the analysis of the contents of this supplement in Deshusses, 'Le "Supplement" au Sacramentaire Grégorien', 48-58, 60-3.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 60-5. Reiterated by Deshusses in *Sacramentaire Grégorien*, III, 67-75. For a different view, see L. Wallach, *Diplomatic Studies in Latin and Greek Documents from the Carolingian Age* (New York, 1977), pp 252-255, and K. Gamber, 'Der fränkische Anhang zum Gregorianum im Licht eines Fragments aus dem Anfang des ix. Jhts.', *Sacris Erudiri* 21 (1972-3), 267-289.

⁴³ Deshusses, 'Le "Supplement" au Sacramentaire Grégorien', 65-9, and *Sacramentaire Grégorien*, III, pp 71-4.

⁴⁴ Listed and discussed in Deshusses, *Sacramentaire Grégorien*, I, pp 72-5, and II, p 29.

⁴⁵ E.g. CBP nos. 1337, 1804.

⁴⁶ E.g. CBP nos. 149, 169, 360, 380, 1388, 1523, 1745, 1815, 1880.

⁴⁷ PL 78, cols 25-240. See also Deshusses, *Sacramentaire Grégorien*, nos. 3811-3847 and 3872-3892, which prints similar collections in Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MSS 162-164.

⁴⁸ Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, pp xi-xii.

countries and remained in use throughout most of western Europe until the sixteenth century.⁴⁹ As has been seen, two main forms of benedictional had been established: the 'Gallican', with its short and long versions, and the 'Gregorian', based on the benedictional of Benedict of Aniane. Later benedictionals drew extensively on these traditions, but combined, reworked and developed them in many different ways. The order of blessings was altered and they were assigned to different feasts. Extra blessings were added to suit local circumstances and to give celebrants a greater choice of forms. Old blessings were dropped and replaced with material from other sources. Moreover, the composition of new forms of blessing was a popular form of literary activity and almost every benedictional contains at least one or two pieces which are apparently new works. As the use of pre-communion blessings spread and more benedictionals were produced, the cumulative effects of this continual transposition, substitution and addition became increasingly complex. It is consequently rare to find that the text of any two benedictionals is exactly the same, and it is perhaps more difficult to establish the sources and interrelationship of benedictionals than any other type of liturgical manuscript.

Since the forms of service brought to England by St Augustine were Roman, they did not include pre-communion blessings. St Boniface was evidently surprised by the practice when he encountered it on the continent and he wrote to Pope Zacharias asking whether it was permissible. In his reply, dated 4 November 751, the Pope roundly condemned such blessings as foreign to apostolic tradition.⁵⁰ They nevertheless spread to England with the importation of Frankish service books in the ninth century. One of the decrees of the Council of Chelsea in 816 refers to a *liber ministerialis* containing a rite for the consecration of churches, of which all the bishops in the province of Canterbury needed to have a copy. This was probably a pontifical which may perhaps have included a benedictional.⁵¹

The oldest complete English benedictional to have survived is in the Leofric Missal (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 579).⁵² This manuscript is

⁴⁹ On the later history of the pre-communion blessing, see CBP pt 3, pp xviii-xx and Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, pp 15-22. The practice disappeared from general use in the sixteenth century but persisted in France until the campaign to secure greater uniformity with the Roman rite in the nineteenth century, when it was suppressed except as a local custom in the cathedrals of Lyons and Autun. In 1970, however, a new Roman missal appeared which included twenty blessings to be used 'at the discretion of the priest, at the end of the Mass, or after the liturgy of the word, the office, and the celebration of the sacraments'. Most of these forms were based on blessings composed by Aniane: *Roman Missal Revised By Decree of the Second Vatican Council* [Official English Text] (London, 1974), pp 364-377. See also CBP nos. 2068-2093 and T. Krosnicki, 'New Blessings in the Missal of Paul VI', *Worship* 4 (1971), 199-205.

⁵⁰ PL 89, col. 951.

⁵¹ Canon 2: A. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland* (Oxford, 1869-71), III, 580. Brooks, *Church of Canterbury*, pp 164-5 suggests that this service book may correspond to the pontifical in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 12052). On the Sacramentary of Ratoldus, however, see further below, pp 135-42.

⁵² Edited by F. Warren, *The Leofric Missal* (Oxford, 1883). See also C. Hohler, 'Some Service Books of the Later Saxon Church', *Tenth-Century Studies*, pp 69-70, 78-80, and N. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), no. 315. H. Gneuss, 'Manuscripts written or owned in England up to 1100', *ASE* 9 (1981), 15 (no. 202) notes a fragment of a benedictional in Cambridge, Trinity Hall, MS 24, ff 78-83, which he tentatively

basically a copy of an English service book made by a foreign scribe in about 900. A Glastonbury calendar of about 970-980 was later inserted in it, indicating that it was probably at Glastonbury about this time. It subsequently found its way to Exeter, where further prayers and other material were added to it in the tenth and eleventh centuries. In the main text, the blessings have been placed in the order of service rather than in an appendix. They were all drawn from the benedictional of Benedict of Aniane, omitting only one form, the alternative blessing for Easter Day. This suggests that the earliest form of benedictional known in England was that found in the supplement to the *Hadrianum*.

The Benedictional of St Æthelwold provides a striking contrast to the benedictional in the Leofric Missal.⁵³ Æthelwold is very much longer, containing more than three times as many blessings as the Leofric Missal. It not only provides blessings for a more extensive range of occasions, but also gives alternative forms for major feasts. It in fact combines together two almost complete benedictionals: a Gregorian benedictional similar to that in the *Missale Sancti Eligii* and a version of the long Gallican benedictional. The text of the Gallican benedictional which was used was closely related to that in the Sacramentary of Angoulême but also contained a few additional forms which are found in the Freising manuscript.⁵⁴ For major feasts Æthelwold usually gives a Gregorian blessing first then a Gallican alternative. In addition to this continental material, Æthelwold also includes a number of blessings which occur only in English manuscripts or those closely related to English traditions.

The systematic and skilful fashion in which these different types of blessing were combined together in the Benedictional of St Æthelwold is apparent from the following table, which shows the sources of all the blessings in Æthelwold. It is based on the edition of the text by H. Wilson included in the 1910 facsimile. Some blessings are missing because of the removal of leaves from the manuscript, but the lost text was reconstructed by Wilson. These blessings are shown in square brackets. The figures preceded by the letters CBP give the number of the blessing in the monumental collection of episcopal blessings compiled by Dom Edmond Moeller, which contains detailed collations with a wide range of other manuscripts. For Gregorian blessings, references are also given to Deshusses's edition of the Gregorian sacramentary. They relate either to the supplement of Aniane (S),⁵⁵ which Deshusses prints from Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 164, or to the blessings added to Aniane's benedictional in the St Amand group of manuscripts, which Deshusses prints as 'Textes Complémentaires' (TC) from Cambrai MSS 162, 163 and 164.⁵⁶ References are also given to the column numbers of Ménard's edition of the *Missale Sancti Eligii* as reprinted in the

dates as eighth century.

⁵³ The text of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold is printed in Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, pp 1-47.

⁵⁴ Cf. Amiet, *Freising Benedictionals*, pp 54-5 and Deshusses, 'Le benedictionnaire gallican', 176. Neither mentions the appearance of Gregorian and English forms in Æthelwold and other English texts.

⁵⁵ Deshusses, *Sacramentaire Grégorien*, nos. 1738-1789.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, nos. 3811-3847 and 3872-3892.

Patrologia Latina, volume 78 (EL). For Gallican blessings, the number of the blessing in P. Cagin's edition of the Sacramentary of Angoulême⁵⁷ is given (A) or, if it does not appear in this source, its number in R. Amiet's edition of the Benedictionals of Freising (F).⁵⁸

TABLE ONE The sources of the blessings in the benedictional of St Æthelwold

1. Advent 1	Gregorian:	CBP 1544; S 1768; EL 191
2. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 37; A 1802
3. Advent 2	Gregorian:	CBP 663; TC 3845; EL 191
4. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1352; A 1803
5. Advent 3	Gregorian:	CBP 1722; S 1769; EL 192
6. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1307; A 1799
7. Advent 4	Gregorian:	CBP 1200; TC 3847; EL 194-195
8. Feria IV	Gallican:	CBP 1072; A 1804
9. Feria VI	Gallican:	CBP 909; A 1818
10. Sabbato in XII Lectionibus	Gallican:	CBP 286; A 1819
11. Christmas Eve	Gregorian:	CBP 1643; S 1738; EL 30
12. In Gallicantu	Gallican:	CBP 1857; A 1805
13. Primo Mane	Gallican:	CBP 1021; A 1808
14. Christmas Day	Gregorian:	CBP 321; S 1739; EL 31-32
15. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 932; A 1806
16. St Stephen	Gregorian:	CBP 854; S 1740; EL 33
17. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 38; A 1809
18. St John the Evangelist	Gregorian:	CBP 1566; S 1741; EL 34
19. [Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1161; A 1811]
20. Holy Innocents	Gregorian:	CBP 1600; S 1742; EL 35-36
21. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 579; A 1812
22. Octave of Christmas	Gregorian:	CBP 1545; S 1743; EL 37
23. Christmas 1	Gregorian:	CBP 1168; TC 3824; EL 38
24. Epiphany	Gregorian:	CBP 732; S 1744; EL 39
25. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1087; A 1815
26. Epiphany 1	Gregorian:	CBP 926; TC 3825; EL 40
27. Epiphany 2	Gregorian:	CBP 1143; TC 3826; EL 41
28. Epiphany 3	Gregorian:	CBP 1711; TC 3827; EL 47
29. Epiphany 4	Gregorian:	CBP 2019; TC 3828; EL 48
30. Epiphany 5	Gregorian:	CBP 855; TC 3829; EL 49
31. Epiphany 6	Gregorian:	CBP 1005; TC 3830; EL 49
32. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 42; A 1868
33. St Sebastian	Gallican:	CBP 1160; A 1840
34. St Agnes	Gregorian:	CBP 175; S 1775; EL 172
35. St Vincent	English:	CBP 156

⁵⁷ *Le Sacramentaire Gélisien d'Angoulême* (Angoulême, 1919).

⁵⁸ *The Benedictionals of Freising*, HBS 88 (1974), pp 76-120.

36. Conversion of St Paul	Gregorian:	CBP 940; TC 3811; EL 44
37. St Agnes (alia)	Gregorian:	CBP 149, 169; TC 3833; EL 176
38. Form of blessing of candles on Feast of the Purification		
39. Purification	Gregorian:	CBP 1674; S 1745; EL 46
40. St Agatha	Gallican:	CBP 1956; A 1846
41. St Vedast	Gallican:	CBP 704, 910; F XV
42. St Peter in Cathedra	Gallican:	CBP 851; F XVIII
43. St Gregory	Gallican:	CBP 807; A 1843
44. Annunciation	Gallican:	CBP 874; A 1834
45. St Ambrose	Gallican:	CBP 1254; A 1842
46. Septuagesima	Gregorian:	CBP 1584; TC 3813; EL 53
47. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1913; A 1800, 1859
48. Sexagesima	Gregorian:	CBP 632; TC 3814; EL 54
49. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 42; A 1868
50. Quinquagesima	Gregorian:	CBP 1694; TC 3815; EL 55
51. Feria IV	Gallican:	CBP 82; F CXXXVII
52. Beginning of Lent	Gallican:	CBP 247; A 1816
53. Lent 1	Gregorian:	CBP 192; S 1746; EL 58
54. Lent 2	Gallican:	CBP 101; A 1870
55. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1924; A 1817
56. Lent 3	Gregorian:	CBP 702; EL 142
57. Alia	Gregorian:	CBP 1576; S 1747; EL 62
58. Lent 4	Gallican:	CBP 909; A 1818
59. Alia or Lent 5	Gallican:	CBP 286; A 1819
60. Palm Sunday	Gregorian:	CBP 180; S 1751; EL 77
61. Alia ... in passione Domini	Gregorian:	CBP 1671; S 1752; EL 81
62. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 13; A 1820
63. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1097; A 1821
64. Maundy Thursday	Gregorian:	CBP 233; S 1753; EL 83-84
65. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 113; A 1822
66. Holy Saturday	Gregorian:	CBP 879; S 1754; EL 91
67. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1010; A 1823
68. Easter Day	Gregorian:	CBP 292; S 1755; EL 92
69. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 858; A 1824
70. Feria II	Gregorian:	CBP 1106, 510; TC 3879; EL 93
71. Feria III	Gregorian:	CBP 1207; TC 3816; EL 94
72. Feria IV	Gregorian:	CBP 1268; TC 3817; EL 94
73. Feria V	Gregorian:	CBP 1815; TC 3818; EL 95
74. Feria VI	Gregorian:	CBP 216; TC 3819; EL 96
75. Saturday after Easter	Gallican:	CBP 995; A 1825
76. Octave of Easter	Gregorian:	CBP 679; S 1756; EL 97
77. Easter 1	Gregorian:	CBP 314; S 1757; EL 104
78. Alia	Gregorian:	CBP 1070; S 1758; EL 104-105
79. Easter 2	Gallican:	CBP 576; A 1826

80. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 884; A 1827
81. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 877; A 1828
82. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1799; F XLVIII
83. SS Tibertius & Valerian	Gregorian:	CBP 153; S 1772; EL 166
84. Invention of Holy Cross	Gregorian:	CBP 310, 190; S 1764; EL 102
85. In Laetania maiore	Gregorian:	CBP 1560; S 1759; EL 106
86. Alia ... de Ieiunio	Gallican:	CBP 1919; A 1829
87. Eve of Ascension	Gregorian:	CBP 380; TC 3831; EL 110
88. Ascension Day	Gregorian:	CBP 281; S 1760; EL 109
89. Sunday after Ascension	Gallican:	CBP 1152; A 1830
90. Eve of Pentecost	Gregorian:	CBP 186, 294; S 1761; EL 111
91. Pentecost	Gregorian:	CBP 948; S 1762; EL 112
92. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1086; A 1831
93. Saturday after Pentecost	Gregorian:	CBP 301, 187; TC 3821; EL 115
94. Octave of Pentecost	Gregorian:	CBP 1804; TC 3822; EL 116
95. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1258; A 1832
96. Pentecost 1	Gregorian:	CBP 159; S 1777; EL 175
97. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1913; A 1800, 1859
98. Pentecost 2	Gregorian:	CBP 1880; TC 3832; EL 175
99. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 22; A 1860
100. Pentecost 3	English:	CBP 287
101. Pentecost 4	Gregorian:	CBP 1337; TC 3834; EL 177
102. Alia	English:	CBP 120
103. Pentecost 5	Gregorian:	CBP 1696; S 1778; EL 177
104. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 220; A 1863
105. Pentecost 6	Gregorian:	CBP 31; TC 3835; EL 178
106. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1251; A 1865
107. Pentecost 7	Gregorian:	CBP 1433; S 1779; EL 179
108. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1256; A 1866
109. Pentecost 8	Gregorian:	CBP 1962; TC 3836; EL 179
110. Alia	English:	CBP 128
111. Pentecost 9	Gregorian:	CBP 1499; S 1780; EL 180
112. Alia	English:	CBP 381
113. Pentecost 10	Gregorian:	CBP 921; TC 3837; EL 180
114. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 42; A 1868
115. Pentecost 11	Gregorian:	CBP 1236; S 1781; EL 181
116. Alia	English:	CBP 128
117. Pentecost 12	Gregorian:	CBP 1388; TC 3838; EL 181-182
118. Alia	English:	CBP 1935
119. Pentecost 13	Gregorian:	CBP 631; S 1782; EL 182
120. Alia	English:	CBP 218
121. Pentecost 14	Gregorian:	CBP 360; TC 3839; EL 183
122. Alia	English:	CBP 129
123. Pentecost 15	Gregorian:	CBP 571; S 1783; EL 183
124. Alia	English:	CBP 901

125. Pentecost 16	Gregorian:	CBP 1745; TC 3840; EL 184
126. Alia	English:	CBP 1920
127. Pentecost 17	Gregorian:	CBP 1528; S 1784; EL 184
128. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 108; F CXXXI
129. Pentecost 18	Gregorian:	CBP 1562; S 1785; EL 185
130. Alia	English:	CBP 1912
131. Pentecost 19	Gregorian:	CBP 1886; S 1786; EL 185
132. Alia	English:	CBP 1432
133. Pentecost 20	Gregorian:	CBP 1703; S 1787; EL 186
134. Alia	English:	CBP 707
135. Pentecost 21	Gregorian:	CBP 1563; S 1788; EL 187
136. Alia	English:	CBP 742
137. Pentecost 22	Gregorian:	CBP 365; TC 3841; EL 187
138. Pentecost 23	Gregorian:	CBP 1523; TC 3842; EL 188
139. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 98; A 1871
140. St Ætheldreda	English:	CBP 1805
141. Nat. St John the Baptist	Gregorian:	CBP 179; S 1763; EL 122
142. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 835; A 1836
143. SS Peter and Paul	Gregorian:	CBP 193; S 1765; EL 123
144. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 981; A 1837
145. St Swithun	English:	CBP 1088
146. St Benedict	English:	CBP 1770
147. St Laurence	English(?):	CBP 1948
148. Assumption BVM	Gregorian:	CBP 1053; S 1766; EL 134
149. St Bartholomew	Gallican:	CBP 905; A 1839
150. Decoll. St John the Baptist	Gregorian:	CBP 1194; S 1767; EL 136
151. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 1264, 1900; F LXVIII
152. [Nativity BVM	English(?):	CBP 1697]
153. Alia	English:	CBP 1654
154. Exaltation of Holy Cross	Gallican:	CBP 792; A 1833
155. St Matthew	Gallican:	CBP 101; A 1870
156. Sabbato mense septimi	English:	CBP 381
157. Michaelmas	English:	CBP 1501
158. Alia	English:	CBP 342, 227
159. All Saints	English:	CBP 1743
160. Alia	English(?):	CBP 297
161. St Martin	Gallican:	CBP 1090; A 1844
162. Alia	Gallican:	CBP 807; A 1843
163. St Cecilia	English(?):	CBP 1948
164. St Clement	English:	CBP 1706
165. Eve of St Andrew	English:	CBP 1695
166. St Andrew	English:	CBP 817
167. Alia	English:	CBP 1252
168. St Thomas	English:	CBP 602
169. One Apostle	Gregorian:	CBP 1203; S 1770; EL 51

170. One Martyr	Gregorian:	CBP 57; S 1771; EL 164-165
171. Many Martyrs	Gregorian:	CBP 153; S 1772; EL 166
172. One Bishop Confessor	Gregorian:	CBP 1733; S 1773; EL 168
173. Many Confessors	Gregorian:	CBP 1968; S 1774; EL 147, 170
174. One Virgin	Gregorian:	CBP 149, 148, 169; TC 3833; EL 176
175. One Virgin Martyr	Gregorian:	CBP 175; S 1775; EL 172
176. Many Virgins	Gregorian:	CBP 1742; S 1776; EL 172
177. Dedication of a church	Gregorian:	CBP 123; EL 161

The systematic fusing together in the Benedictional of St Æthelwold of two virtually complete texts representing the main traditions then current on the continent is a remarkable achievement. In most benedictionals, the borrowing of blessings from other sources is a more haphazard process. Moreover, Æthelwold does not extensively rearrange the blessings and remains very close to its original sources. Where the position of blessings is changed, they are usually assigned to related feasts, so that, for example, two Gallican blessings given for the beginning of Lent in the Sacramentary of Angoulême are allocated in Æthelwold to two Ember Days in Advent (nos. 9, 10). Sometimes, blessings are moved to different places in the same season, as during Easter, where four blessings provided in the Sacramentary of Angoulême as alternatives for Easter Day are used for the Saturday after Easter and as alternatives for Easter 2 (nos. 75, 80-82). Blessings for the common of saints are also occasionally assigned to the feasts of particular individuals⁵⁹ and forms for general use may be allocated to set days.⁶⁰ On the whole, however, blessings are still used in Æthelwold for the same feasts as in the *Missale Sancti Eligii* and the Sacramentary of Angoulême. The only place in Æthelwold where the alternation of Gregorian and Gallican forms breaks down so that there is a radical departure from the original sources is in Lent. Here, Æthelwold omits the forms given in Aniane's supplement for the third, fourth and fifth Sundays in Lent and Aniane's blessing for the second Sunday in Lent is used only as an alternative for the following week (no. 57). The Gregorian form given as a first blessing for the third Sunday in Lent (no. 56) is used in the *Missale Sancti Eligii* for an Ember Day in September. The rest of the blessings in Lent are Gallican.⁶¹

The immediate question raised by this analysis of the text of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold is whether it was compiled at Winchester or imported from elsewhere. The splendid appearance of the manuscript certainly suggests that it was a de-luxe copy of a special text and a Winchester compilation is more likely to have received such treatment than one from elsewhere. Moreover, the systematic arrangement of the text and its proximity to the original sources all suggest that it was a recent production which had not been subjected to extensive recopying. The appearance of a Gallican blessing for the feast of St Vedast (no. 41) might be taken as an indication that the text originated in northern France, but it may simply

⁵⁹ E.g. nos. 34, 40, 41, 83.

⁶⁰ E.g. the Gallican blessings used for Sundays after Pentecost.

⁶¹ This was first pointed out by Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, pp xvi-xvii.

mean that the version of the Gallican benedictional used by the compiler of Æthelwold came from that area.

The English blessings do not greatly assist in determining where the main text was compiled. They are in a variety of styles and are apparently drawn from a number of different sources. The English blessings for Sundays after Pentecost, for example, consist of short, simple clauses, varying in number, while on the other hand the blessing for the feast of St Ætheldreda (no. 140) is in three lengthy sections written in extremely high-flown language. Some of the English blessings are probably entirely native compositions,⁶² while others are adaptations of continental forms.⁶³ A few were undoubtedly composed at Winchester in St Æthelwold's time, the most obvious example being the blessing for St Swithun's Day (no. 145), with its reference to recent miracles at the saint's shrine, but this is not sufficient to establish that the whole text was compiled there. Moreover, some of the English forms are taken from sources outside Winchester, such as the first blessing for St Andrew's Day (no. 166), which, since it describes Andrew as a special patron, was probably written at Wells sometime after it became an episcopal see in 908.⁶⁴

In attempting to determine whether the text of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold originated at Winchester, an obvious starting point is a comparison with the 'Ramsey' Benedictional (Paris, BN, MS lat. 987).⁶⁵ This was at one time thought to be the benedictional sent from Ramsey Abbey to Gauzlin, Abbot of Fleury (1004-1029),⁶⁶ but it contains at the end an additional group of blessings clearly intended for use at Canterbury which were inserted in the manuscript sometime after the Translation of St Ælfheah in 1023.⁶⁷ It seems more likely that it was produced at Winchester rather than Ramsey and sent to Canterbury not Fleury. Apart from where leaves have been physically removed from one or other of the manuscripts, 'Ramsey' contains the same blessings as Æthelwold in precisely the same order, with three exceptions. It omits the blessings for the feasts of SS Ætheldreda and Swithun (nos. 140, 145), which were perhaps not needed at Canterbury, and the alternative blessing for the feast of SS Peter and Paul (no. 144). However, the headings given for particular blessings in 'Ramsey' sometimes differ from those in Æthelwold, so that the blessings are assigned to different feasts.

For example, 'Ramsey' occasionally gives a long series of alternative blessings which in Æthelwold are allotted to specific occasions, producing a neater arrangement. Thus, in 'Ramsey', after the blessing for the last Sunday in Advent, there are three blessings described as 'alia de adventu domini',

⁶² E.g. nos. 124, 134, 157, 164 are all considered by Moeller to be 'probablement d'origine anglaise'.

⁶³ E.g. nos. 35 (based on a blessing in the Sacramentary of Gellone: CBP no. 239); 100 (based on a blessing in the Sacramentary of Angoulême: CBP no. 288); 167 (based on a blessing in the *Missale Gothicum*: CBP no. 1252).

⁶⁴ See Hohler, 'Service Books', p 66, and Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, p ix.

⁶⁵ Not published, but fully collated with the text of Æthelwold in Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, pp 1-56, and CBP. Extensive use has also been made of notes on the contents of 'Ramsey' left by D. H. Turner.

⁶⁶ L. Delisle, 'Mémoire sur d'Anciens Sacramentaires', *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 32 pt 1 (1886), 215-16.

⁶⁷ *The Canterbury Benedictional*, ed. R. M. Woolley, HBS 51 (1917), pp xix-xxv.

intended for general use in Advent. In Æthelwold, these are assigned to the three Ember Days in Advent (nos. 8-10). It seems that the confusion in Æthelwold over the arrangement of the blessings in Lent was the result of a similar process. 'Ramsey' does not give blessings for the last three Sundays in Lent, but includes three alternative Gallican blessings for the beginning of Lent, together with other blessings for Ember days and weekdays. In Æthelwold, these have been reallocated to provide blessings for all the Sundays in Lent, but, since the original sequence in 'Ramsey' has been retained, the Gregorian and Gallican forms do not alternate in the same way as elsewhere. This table shows what happened:

TABLE TWO Blessings for Lent in the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold

'RAMSEY'	=	ÆTHELWOLD
Beginning of Lent (Gallican)	=	52: Beginning of Lent
Alia (Gregorian)	=	53: Lent 1
Alia (Gallican)	=	54: Lent 2
Alia (Gallican)	=	55: Alia
Sabbato in xii lectionibus (Gregorian)	=	56: Lent 3
Lent 2 (Gregorian)	=	57: Alia
Feria (Gallican)	=	58: Lent 4
Alia (Gallican)	=	59: Alia or Lent 5

The overall arrangement of the text has also been improved in Æthelwold. For example, in 'Ramsey' the blessings for Septuagesima come straight after those for the Sundays after Epiphany. There then follows a group of blessings for saints' days and after that the blessings for the rest of the Sundays before Lent. In Æthelwold, the headings have been slightly altered, so that the blessings for Septuagesima immediately precede those for Sexagesima and Quinquagesima (nos. 46-50). Another interesting difference between 'Ramsey' and Æthelwold is that forms for blessing palms on Palm Sundays are included in 'Ramsey' but not in Æthelwold. 'Ramsey' also gives a blessing for use at vespers on Easter Day, which in Æthelwold becomes the alternative blessing for mass on Easter Day (no. 69). This suggests that a deliberate attempt was made in Æthelwold to remove extraneous material and ensure that the text consisted entirely of blessings for use at mass before the communion. This seems to reflect the influence of someone who liked clear-cut, neat distinctions between service books.

The differences between the texts of the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold suggest that 'Ramsey' provided the immediate source of Æthelwold. The changes in the headings in Æthelwold represent attempts to produce a tidier and more rational structure. 'Ramsey' does not, however, provide any further clues as to the ultimate origins of this hybrid form of benedictional. It is also a Winchester manuscript and appears to be not much older than Æthelwold. Indeed, its hand is very similar

to that in Æthelwold and, in view of the close relationship between the two texts, it seems almost certain that both manuscripts are the work of the same scribe, Godeman.⁶⁸

The two leading students of benedictionals, Dom Jean Laporte and Dom Edmond Moeller, have both placed the Benedictional of St Æthelwold in a group of French manuscripts which they call the family of St Vedast in Arras.⁶⁹ The basis on which they arrived at this classification is not entirely clear. They include in this group, for example, the benedictional in an eleventh-century pontifical of Trèves adapted to the use of Cambrai (Paris, BN, MS lat. 13313), which is a copy of the blessings in the supplement to the *Hadrianum*, with just eight additional forms, all except one of which are drawn from German sources. This manuscript displays none of the characteristics of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold and seems to bear no relationship to it.

Dom Laporte and Dom Moeller consider the chief source of this group to be Paris, BN, MS lat. 12052, the well-known Sacramentary of Ratoldus, which has been the subject of a penetrating discussion by Christopher Hohler.⁷⁰ This manuscript was owned by Ratoldus, abbot of Corbie in Amiens from 972 until his death in 986. Corbie was, of course, the house from which Æthelwold requested monks to teach his community at Abingdon the proper singing of the chants and which exercised an important influence on liturgical development in England during the tenth century.⁷¹ The Sacramentary of Ratoldus was not, however, compiled at Corbie. New leaves had to be inserted to make it suitable for use there. Since it contains a calendar of the monastery of St Vedast in Arras, it has been assumed that the text was put together there, but Hohler has shown that its origins lie much further back. It appears to be a Saint Denis sacramentary adapted for use by the Bishop of Dol in Brittany in the 920s and further modified by the Breton and Norman clergy who took refuge from the Vikings in the church of Saint Symphorien at Orleans.

At some stage, an English pontifical was incorporated into the text. The origins of this pontifical are apparent from the inclusion of an English coronation service, which has been imperfectly adapted for use in France. The blessings in Ratoldus, which have been placed in the order of service, would have been part of the pontifical and so are English in origin, rather than French. This is confirmed by the appearance of the Wells blessing for St Andrew's day which describes the saint as a special patron. If Ratoldus is indeed the source of a group of benedictionals which includes Æthelwold, this group would be of English origin, not, as Laporte and Moeller suggest,

⁶⁸ On the hand of 'Ramsey', see T.A.M. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971), p 10; Wormald, *Benedictional*, p 10; *New Palaeographical Society*, 1st ser., pl 83.

⁶⁹ J. Laporte, 'Quelques Particularités de Recueil des "Benedictiones Pontificales" de Durand de Mende', *Mélanges en l'Honneur de Monseigneur Michel Andrieu*, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, vol. hors série (1956), 282; *CBP* pt 3, p xxxviii.

⁷⁰ Hohler, 'Service Books', pp 64-9. See also Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, pp xxx-xxxiii. This account of the blessings in Ratoldus is based on notes of their incipits left by D.H. Turner.

⁷¹ *Chron. Abingdon* I, 129. On Corbie, see further *The Missal of the New Minster, Winchester*, ed. D.H. Turner, HBS 93 (1962), pp xiii-xviii, and C.A. Gordon in London, British Library, Additional MS 44920, ff 20-26.

north French. Although Hohler disagrees with Laporte and Moeller as to the provenance of this collection, he concurs in their view that it predates Æthelwold, since he argues that the pontifical was incorporated in Ratoldus in the 930s.

The following table shows the sources of the blessings in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus. If a blessing is also found in Æthelwold, its number in Table One is given, preceded by the diphthong Æ. Where Ratoldus uses a blessing for a different feast to Æthelwold, this is noted in round brackets, except for the Sundays after Pentecost, which are numbered in Ratoldus from Pentecost and in Æthelwold from the Octave. Otherwise references are in the same form as in Table One.

TABLE THREE Sources of the blessings in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus

1. Dedication of a church	Æ 177: Gregorian
2. Consecration of a bishop	CBP 1081; A 1852: Gallican
3. For kings	Not in CBP: beg. Omnipotens pater et genitus sanctus
4. Daily for kings	Not in CBP: beg. Christus rex regum
5. Christmas Eve	Æ 11: Gregorian
6. De Nocte	Æ 12: Gallican (In gallicantu)
7. Mane Primo	Æ 13: Gallican
8. Christmas Day	Æ 14: Gregorian
9. Alia	Æ 15: Gallican
10. St Stephen	Æ 16: Gregorian
11. St John the Evangelist	Æ 18: Gregorian
12. Holy Innocents	Æ 20: Gregorian
13. Christmas 1	Æ 138: Gregorian (Pentecost 23)
14. Eve of Octave of Christmas	CBP 1797; A 1813: Gallican
15. Octave of Christmas	Æ 22: Gregorian
16. 1st Sunday after Octave	Æ 23: Gregorian (Christmas 1)
17. Epiphany	Æ 24: Gregorian
18. Epiphany 1	Æ 26: Gregorian
19. St Hilary	Æ 25: Gallican (Epiphany, <i>alia</i>)
20. Epiphany 2	Æ 27: Gregorian
21. SS Sebastian & Fabian	Æ 33: Gallican (St Sebastian)
22. St Agnes	Æ 34: Gregorian
23. St Vincent	Æ 35: English
24. Epiphany 3	Æ 28: Gregorian
25. Conversion of St Paul	Æ 36: Gregorian
26. Purification	Æ 39: Gregorian
27. Epiphany 4	Æ 29: Gregorian
28. St Agatha	Æ 40: Gallican
29. St Vedast	Æ 41: Gallican
30. Epiphany 5	Æ 30: Gregorian
31. St Valentine	Æ 43: Gallican (St Gregory)

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 32. St Peter in Cathedra | Æ 42: Gallican |
| 33. Epiphany 6 | Æ 31: Gregorian |
| 34. St Gregory | Æ 43: Gallican |
| 35. St Cuthbert | Æ 45: Gallican (St Ambrose) |
| 36. St Benedict | Æ 45: Gallican (St Ambrose) |
| 37. Annunciation | Æ 44: Gallican |
| 38. Septuagesima | Æ 46: Gregorian |
| 39. Sexagesima | Æ 48: Gregorian |
| 40. Quinquagesima | Æ 50: Gregorian |
| 41. Feria IV | Æ 52: Gallican (Beginning of Lent) |
| 42. Lent 1 | Æ 53: Gregorian |
| 43. Feria II | Æ 54: Gallican (Lent 2) |
| 44. Feria IV | Æ 55: Gallican (Lent 2, <i>alia</i>) |
| 45. Ordination of Deacons | CBP 218, 138: only otherwise occurs in English MSS. Probably adaptation of Æ 120 (Pentecost 13, <i>alia</i>) |
| 46. Ordination of priests | Æ 56: Gregorian (Lent 3) |
| 47. Alia | CBP 1803: only otherwise occurs in English MSS |
| 48. Lent 2 | Æ 57: Gregorian (Lent 3, <i>alia</i>) |
| 49. Feria II | Æ 58: Gallican (Lent 4) |
| 50. Feria IV | Æ 59: Gallican (Lent 4, <i>alia</i> , or Lent 5). |
| 51. Feria VI | Æ 37: Gregorian (St Agnes, <i>alia</i>) |
| 52. Lent 3 | CBP 1577; S 1748: Gregorian |
| 53. Feria II | CBP 1554: only otherwise occurs in a sacramentary of St Thierry in Rheims, on which see pp 142-3, below |
| 54. Feria IV | Æ 47: Gallican (Septuagesima, <i>alia</i>) |
| 55. Feria VI | Not in CBP: beg. Omnipotens Deus qui a muliere |
| 56. Lent 4 | CBP 1193; S 1749: Gregorian |
| 57. Feria II | Æ 59: Gallican (Lent 4, <i>alia</i> , or Lent 5) |
| 58. Feria IV | Not in CBP: beg. Deus qui genus humanum |
| 59. Feria VI | Not in CBP: beg. Benedicat vos omnipotens Deus qui per humilitatem |
| 60. Lent 5 | CBP 8; S 1750: Gregorian |
| 61. Feria IV | Æ 62: Gallican (Passion, <i>alia</i>) |
| 62. Feria VI | CBP 288; A 1864: Gallican |
| 63. Palm Sunday | Æ 60: Gregorian |
| 64. Feria II | Æ 61: Gregorian (<i>Alia ... in passione domini</i>) |
| 65. Feria IV | Æ 63: Gallican (Passion, <i>alia</i>) |

66. Feria V	—Æ 64: Gallican
67. Feria VII	Æ 66: Gregorian
68. Easter Day	Æ 68: Gregorian
69. Feria II	Æ 70: Gregorian
70. Feria III	Æ 71: Gregorian
71. Feria IV	Æ 72: Gregorian
72. Feria V	Æ 75: Gallican (Sat. after Easter)
73. Feria VI	Æ 79: Gallican (Easter 2)
74. Feria VII	CBP 1076, F XLVI: Gallican
75. Octave of Easter	Æ 76: Gregorian
76. Easter 1	Æ 73: Gregorian (Easter, feria v)
77. Easter 2	Æ 74: Gregorian (Easter, feria vi)
78. SS Tibertius & Valerian	Æ 83: Gregorian
79. St George	Æ 170: Gregorian (One martyr)
80. Easter 3	Æ 69: Gallican (Easter Day, <i>alia</i>)
81. Easter 4	Æ 77: Gregorian (Easter 1)
82. In Litanía Maiore	CBP 112; F CXLVII: Gallican
83. Die Secundo	Æ 85: Gregorian (<i>In laetania maiore</i>)
84. Die Tertio	Æ 86: Gallican (<i>Alia ... de ieiunio</i>)
85. Ascension Day	Æ 88: Gregorian
86. Sunday after Ascension	Æ 87: Gregorian (Eve of Ascension)
87. Ascension (<i>alia</i>)	Æ 89: Gallican (Sun. after Ascension)
88. SS Philip & James	Æ 169: Gregorian (One apostle)
89. Invention of Holy Cross	Æ 84: Gregorian
90. SS Nereus & Achilleus	CBP 1916: only otherwise occurs in English MSS
91. Eve of Pentecost	Æ 90: Gregorian
92. Pentecost	Æ 91: Gregorian
93. Feria II	Æ 92: Gallican (Pentecost, <i>alia</i>)
94. Feria III	Æ 93: Gregorian (Sat. after Pentecost)
95. Feria IV	Æ 94: Gregorian (Octave of Pentecost)
96. Feria VII	Æ 95: Gallican (Octave of Pentecost, <i>alia</i>)
97. Octave of Pentecost	CBP 351, F CIV: Gallican
98. Pentecost 2	Æ 139: Gallican (Pentecost 23, <i>alia</i>)
99. St Medard	Not in CBP: beg. Domine Iesu Christe pastor bone. Perhaps adapted from Æ 108 (Pentecost 7, <i>alia</i>)
100. Feria VI	Æ 139: Gallican (Pentecost 23, <i>alia</i>)
101. Pentecost 3	Æ 98: Gregorian
102. SS Basilides, Cyrinus, Nabor & Nazarius	Not in CBP: beg. Enutri quaesumus domine plebem tuam. Occurs in an English MS not collated in CBP ⁷²

⁷² Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, p 76 (SS Alexander and Eventius).

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 103. Pentecost 4 | Æ 37, 174: Gregorian (St Agnes; One virgin) |
| 104. SS Gervase & Protase | CBP 1266: only otherwise occurs in English MSS |
| 105. Pentecost 5 | Æ 101: Gregorian |
| 106. Eve of Nat. St John the Baptist | Æ 142: Gallican (Nat. St John the Baptist, <i>alia</i>) |
| 107. Nat. St John the Baptist | Æ 141: Gregorian |
| 108. Pentecost 6 | Æ 99: Gallican (Pentecost 2, <i>alia</i>) |
| 109. SS Peter & Paul | Æ 143: Gregorian |
| 110. St Paul | Æ 144: Gallican (SS Peter & Paul, <i>alia</i>) |
| 111. Pentecost 7 | Æ 105: Gregorian |
| 112. SS Processus & Martinian | CBP 1916: only otherwise occurs in English MSS |
| 113. Pentecost 8 | CBP 171; F CXXV: Gallican |
| 114. Pentecost 9 | Æ 109: Gregorian |
| 115. Pentecost 10 | CBP 1855, F CXIIIa: Gallican |
| 116. Pentecost 11 | Æ 113: Gregorian |
| 117. Pentecost 12 | CBP 2024, F CXXXb: Gallican |
| 118. St Laurence | CBP 597; F XVII, LXVI: Gallican |
| 119. Pentecost 13 | Æ 117: Gregorian |
| 120. Assumption BVM | Æ 148: Gregorian |
| 121. Pentecost 14 | CBP 239: Gallican (from the Sacramentary of Gellone) |
| 122. St Bartholomew | Æ 149: Gallican |
| 123. Pentecost 15 | Æ 121: Gregorian |
| 124. Decoll. St John the Baptist | Æ 150: Gregorian |
| 125. Nativity BVM | Æ 152: English(?) |
| 126. Pentecost 16 | CBP 77; A 1869: Gallican |
| 127. SS Protus & Hyacinth | CBP 1916: only otherwise occurs in English MSS |
| 128. Exaltation of Holy Cross | Æ 154: Gallican |
| 129. Pentecost 17 | Æ 125: Gregorian |
| 130. Pentecost 18 | CBP 340, 220; F CV: Gallican |
| 131. Feria VII | Æ 112, 156: English (Pentecost 9, <i>alia</i> ; <i>Sabbato Mense Septimi</i>) |
| 132. Pentecost 19 | CBP 288; A 1864: Gallican |
| 133. St Matthew | Æ 155: Gallican |
| 134. Pentecost 20 | Not in CBP: beg. <i>Adesto domine propitius</i> |
| 135. Michaelmas | CBP 14; F LXX: Gallican |
| 136. Pentecost 21 | CBP 1852: only otherwise occurs in English MSS |
| 137. SS Denys, Rusticus & Eleutherius | CBP 1347; F LXV: Gallican |

138. Pentecost 22	Æ 31, 113: Gregorian (Epiphany 6; Pentecost 10)
139. Pentecost 23	Not in CBP: beg. <i>Dirigat vos dominus</i>
140. All Saints	CBP 1925; A 1841: Gallican
141. Pentecost 24	Not in CBP: beg. <i>Benedicat vos dominus caelorum</i>
142. Pentecost 25	Æ 54: Gallican (Lent 2)
143. St Martin	Æ 161: Gallican
144. Pentecost 26	Æ 104: Gallican (Pentecost 5, <i>alia</i>)
145. St Cecilia	Æ 163: English(?)
146. St Clement	Æ 164: English
147. St Chrysogonus	CBP 1561: only otherwise occurs in English MSS
148. Pentecost 27	CBP 725; F CXXXVIII: Gallican
149. Eve of St Andrew	Æ 165: English
150. St Andrew	Æ 166: English
151. Advent 1	Æ 1: Gregorian
152. Advent 2	Æ 3: Gregorian
153. St Lucy	Æ 10: Gallican (<i>Sabbato in xii lectionibus</i>)
154. St Thomas	Æ 2: Gallican (Advent 1, <i>alia</i>)
155. Advent 3	Æ 5: Gregorian
156. Feria IV	Æ 9: Gallican (Advent 4, fer. vi)
157. Feria VI	Æ 6: Gallican (Advent 3, <i>alia</i>)
158. Feria VII	Æ 8: Gallican (Advent 4, fer. iv)
159. Advent 4	Æ 7: Gregorian
160. De Sancta Trinitate	Æ 94: Gregorian (Octave of Pentecost)
161. Ad Poscendam Suffragia Sanctorum	Æ 153: English (Nativity BVM, <i>alia</i>)
162. Ad Suffragia Angelorum	CBP 779; TC 3823; EL 143: Gregorian
163. De Sapentia	Æ 103: Gregorian (Pentecost 5)

This analysis confirms the English origins of the benedictional in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus. For example, the blessing given for the feast of St Ambrose in Æthelwold (Æ no. 45) is assigned in Ratoldus to St Cuthbert (Rat. no. 35), a change which would be unlikely in a French manuscript. A number of forms are otherwise found only in English manuscripts. Indeed, there appear to be some strong parallels between the blessings in Ratoldus and those in the 'Lanalet' Pontifical (Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS A. 27),⁷³ probably compiled in the first half of the eleventh century for the bishop of Crediton. 'Lanalet' is the only other manuscript in which the English forms used in Ratoldus for the feasts of SS Gervase and Protase,

⁷³ Edited by G. H. Doble, *Pontificale Lanaletense*, HBS 74 (1937).

Protus and Hyacinth and Chrysogonus (Rat. nos. 104, 127 and 147) are assigned to exactly the same feasts.⁷⁴

Like Æthelwold, Ratoldus contains a mixture of Gregorian and Gallican blessings. Ratoldus does not, however, combine the two traditions as systematically as Æthelwold. Alternative forms for particular feasts are generally not given. Gallican and other non-Gregorian forms appear haphazardly in no obvious pattern. The only point at which there is alternation between Gregorian and Gallican blessings like that in Æthelwold is in the Sundays after Pentecost, where a Gregorian form is given for one Sunday, then a Gallican form for the next and so on. Most of these Gallican blessings do not, however, appear in Æthelwold and there does not appear to be any direct relationship between the two manuscripts at this point. Since Ratoldus does not usually give alternative blessings, it does not contain many of the Gallican forms which appear in Æthelwold. Ratoldus cannot, therefore, have been the direct source of the hybrid benedictional in 'Ramsey' and Æthelwold.

The benedictional in Ratoldus draws on a wider range of sources than Æthelwold. It includes a number of extra Gallican blessings which are not found in the Sacramentary of Angoulême. This suggests that Ratoldus either used a different version of the Gallican benedictional to Æthelwold or that additional Gallican blessings were borrowed from another source. Whatever the explanation, it seems that the process by which the text of the benedictional in Ratoldus was put together was more complex than with Æthelwold. Ratoldus is not so close to the original Gregorian and Gallican sources, often assigning blessings to completely different feasts. In order to accommodate a new blessing for the twenty-third Sunday in Pentecost (Rat. no. 139), for example, the Gregorian blessing for that Sunday was moved to the first Sunday after Christmas (Rat. no. 13). Perhaps the most insensitive rearrangement is the use of a Gallican blessing for Epiphany at the feast of St Hilary (Rat. no. 19).

It sometimes seems in Ratoldus that spare alternative blessings from a compilation similar to Æthelwold have been used to fill up gaps. For example, the alternative blessing for Advent Sunday in Æthelwold and the blessing for one of the Ember Days (Æ nos. 2, 10) in Advent are used in Ratoldus for two saints' days which fall in Advent (Rat. nos. 153, 154). Indeed, occasionally the impression is given that Ratoldus was dependent on Æthelwold. The blessing in Ratoldus for St Medard (Rat. no. 99) is, for instance, perhaps based on the alternative blessing in Æthelwold for the seventh Sunday after Pentecost (Æ no. 108), while the blessing for use at the ordination of deacons (Rat. no. 45) is probably an adaptation of Æthelwold's alternative blessing for the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost (Æ no. 120). Although Ratoldus includes the Gregorian blessings for Lent omitted from Æthelwold, it nevertheless gives the blessings used by Æthelwold for Lent in exactly the same sequence, using them for different occasions (Rat. nos. 41-44, 46, 48-50). As has been seen, this arrangement of blessings is a very unusual one. Ratoldus only preserves this order by assigning one of the Lent blessings to the ordination of priests, a choice which perhaps reflects reliance on a source similar to Æthelwold.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 95, 97, 100.

If it was not for the fact that Hohler argues that the benedictional in Ratoldus is about forty years older than either 'Ramsey' or Æthelwold, one might be inclined to think that Ratoldus was derived from these Winchester texts. Hohler's dating is dependent upon the assumption that, because the blessings are incorporated in the order of service, they were inserted there at roughly the same time that the rest of the main text was put together.⁷⁵ However, since it is clear that the basic text of Ratoldus went through a number of copies, there is no reason to suppose that the material from the English pontifical could not have been added to the sacramentary at almost any time up until shortly before the death of Ratoldus. It is consequently reasonable to conclude that the benedictional in Ratoldus is a compressed and amended version of a text which was derived from either 'Ramsey' or Æthelwold but probably already contained some substantial additions and alterations. If it is assumed that the text of 'Ramsey' is a few years older than Æthelwold, this would mean that the pontifical in Ratoldus dates from between about 965 and 980.

Another continental manuscript which shows some similarities to 'Ramsey' and Æthelwold is a sacramentary of the abbey of St Thierry in Rheims (Rheims, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 214), which dates from the end of the tenth century. The blessings in this manuscript were edited by Ménard as an appendix to his edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary and reprinted by Migne.⁷⁶ The parallels between this compilation and the Winchester benedictionals are evident from the collation table by H. Wilson included in the facsimile edition of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold.⁷⁷ The St Thierry benedictional, however, makes use of material which does not appear in the Winchester texts. Like Ratoldus, it contains some Gallican blessings from a different version of the long benedictional to that used in Æthelwold.⁷⁸ Some only otherwise occur in later benedictionals from Sens and Nevers.⁷⁹ These may perhaps be new forms composed at St Thierry which were afterwards borrowed for use elsewhere. Alternatively, they may indicate that the compiler of the St Thierry text drew some material from another completely different tradition.

⁷⁵ Hohler, 'Service Books', p 68: '... the putting together of Ratoldus's text was certainly not done in the 970s, it was done in the 920s; and the coronations for which it was successively modified are manifestly those of Athelstan in 925 and Louis d'Outremer in 936'. This would presumably mean that, in Hohler's view, the pontifical was incorporated in Ratoldus shortly after 936. The appearance of a coronation service of this date in the pontifical does not necessarily mean that the pontifical itself dates from this period. There is no reason why a later compilation could not include a version of a particular rite which was put together slightly earlier. Brooks, 'Church of Canterbury', pp 164-5, notes that Ratoldus also contains a bishop's profession of faith and obedience in use in the early ninth century, which confirms that the pontifical in Ratoldus does include some much earlier material. Ratoldus also contains an unusual mass for St Cuthbert (Hohler, 'Service Books', pp 66-7), but this was presumably part of the pontifical – the other copy noted by Hohler is also in a pontifical.

⁷⁶ *PL*, 78, cols 605-628. This edition may be defective: it is surprising that there are no blessings for Holy Week. However, I have not been able to check the printed version against the MS. For a description of this MS, see *CBP* pt 3, pp 68-9, and V. Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires et les Missels manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France* (Paris, 1924), I, pp 91-94.

⁷⁷ Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, pp 52-5. See also pp lviii-lix.

⁷⁸ E.g. blessings nos. 74, 82, 97 in the Sacramentary of Ratoldus and *CBP* nos. 341, 351, 1855.

⁷⁹ E.g. *CBP* nos. 352, 970.

Although the St Thierry collection is more eclectic than Æthelwold, it seems at first sight to bear a closer relationship than Ratoldus to the Winchester texts. Unlike Ratoldus, the St Thierry benedictional gives alternative Gregorian and Gallican blessings in a number of places such as during Advent and for the Sundays preceding Lent. However, this is not done as consistently as in Æthelwold and only one form is given for such important feasts as Christmas and Easter. The St Thierry text differs completely from Æthelwold in the blessings for the Sundays after Pentecost. Like Ratoldus, it gives only one blessing for each Sunday, which is alternately Gregorian and Gallican. Indeed, detailed examination suggests that the St Thierry manuscript is more closely related to Ratoldus than Æthelwold. About three-quarters of the blessings in the *temporale* of the St Thierry text are common to both collections. In the *sanctorale* they share some unusual forms such as the Gallican inspired blessings for the feasts of St Laurence and SS Denys, Rusticus and Eleutherius (the latter used in the St Thierry benedictional for the feast of SS Cornelius and Cyprianus) which are otherwise only found in English manuscripts (Rat. nos. 118, 137). Indeed, one blessing (Rat. no 53) occurs only in these two manuscripts.

Since it is apparent from Ratoldus that a benedictional derived from 'Ramsey' or Æthelwold was known in France in the third quarter of the tenth century, it seems likely that the St Thierry benedictional also made use of this source. In the St Thierry text, the Winchester inspired exemplar has not been shortened, as it has in Ratoldus, but some forms have been omitted and a considerable amount of other material inserted.

This analysis of the Sacramentary of Ratoldus and the St Thierry sacramentary emphasises how, as the texts of benedictionals passed from place to place, they changed very rapidly in structure and content. Every time a text was copied, blessings were reworked, moved to other feasts or omitted, while new material was added from other sources. This makes the clearly defined structure and proximity to the original sources of the Winchester benedictionals all the more striking. Since benedictionals are such a fluid type of text, it is inconceivable that such a carefully organised collection as that found in 'Ramsey' and Æthelwold could be anything other than an original compilation made in Winchester during the episcopate of St Æthelwold which drew together the Gregorian and Gallican traditions and mixed them with a considerable quantity of English material.

This hybrid benedictional was extremely influential. Ratoldus and the St Thierry sacramentary indicate that it was known abroad within a short time of its compilation, but it also lies at the root of most later English benedictionals. It is not possible here to do more than sketch the broad outline of the development of English benedictionals up to the end of the eleventh century.⁸⁰ It seems that within a short time of the appearance of the 'Ramsey'/Æthelwold text an abridged version was produced which omitted most of the alternative blessings. An example of this form of benedictional occurs in the first of the pontificals in London, BL, Cotton MS Claudius A. iii

⁸⁰ A detailed account of the development of later English benedictionals with full references will be given in an article I am currently preparing for the *British Library Journal*. For a list of English benedictionals dating from before 1100, see Gneuss, 'Liturgical Books', pp 133-4.

(ff 106-132v).⁸¹ At the same time, the full text of the benedictional was being modified. The Anderson Pontifical (London, BL, Additional MS 57337) contains a version of Æthelwold in which, for instance, the Gregorian blessings for the third to fifth Sundays in Lent have been reinstated, extra Gallican blessings inserted to provide alternatives in a few places where Æthelwold does not give them and some blessings moved to different feasts. A shortened version of such a modified copy of Æthelwold then seems to have developed. This was in turn expanded by the addition of blessings for votive masses, masses on weekdays and such daily offices as vespers and matins. This appears to have been the most common type of English benedictional in the late tenth and eleventh centuries. Examples are the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert (Rouen, Bibl. Mun., MS Y. 7)⁸² and the closely related benedictional in the Sherborne Pontifical (Paris, BN, MS lat. 943).⁸³

The Benedictional of St Æthelwold appears to have inspired a tradition of composing new forms of episcopal blessings in England, the most remarkable product of which was the eleventh-century benedictional in London, BL, Additional MS 28188.⁸⁴ This is a copy, apparently made for use at Exeter, of a text which originated at Winchester.⁸⁵ It contains more than 170 blessings. All but a handful are new compositions or substantial reworkings of older pieces. There are more new blessings than in any previous benedictional, a notable literary *tour de force*. Some of these blessings were incorporated in the mainstream English tradition. The first attempt to do so was in the Winchester pontifical subsequently owned by Bishop Sampson of Worcester (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 146).⁸⁶ This is basically a modified version of the full text of Æthelwold also containing some of the additional material which appears in such compilations as the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert. However, a few of the forms from Additional MS 28188 have also been included together with some new blessings. The appearance of the new blessings suggests that the compiler of this benedictional may have been the author of Additional MS 28188. The benedictional in Bishop Sampson's pontifical was subsequently expanded and developed, with further new forms being inserted, to produce the Canterbury Benedictional (London, BL, Harley MS 2892).⁸⁷ The Canterbury Benedictional is a huge compilation, containing nearly twice as many blessings as Æthelwold, and may perhaps be regarded as the climax of the tradition of compiling benedictionals started by the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold.

The characteristic structure of the Winchester benedictionals, with the combination of different continental traditions as well as the inclusion of a

⁸¹ Edited by Turner, *Claudius Pontificals*, pp 1-28.

⁸² Edited by H. Wilson, *The Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*, HBS 24 (1903).

⁸³ Not published, but all the blessings from it are included in *CBP*.

⁸⁴ Not published, but the blessing for the feast of the Conception of the BVM is printed in E. Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), p 240 (reprinted in *CBP* no. 1987).

⁸⁵ Bishop, *op. cit.*, pp 239-240; M. Clayton, 'Feasts of the Virgin in the liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church', *ASE* 13 (1984), 227-9.

⁸⁶ M. R. James, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1912), I, pp 332-335. This work was extensively used by Wilson in the notes to his *Benedictional of Archbishop Robert* (see n 82).

⁸⁷ See n 67.

substantial amount of English material, is echoed in other products of the tenth-century monastic revival in England. A parallel which immediately springs to mind is the *Regularis Concordia*, which was the work of Æthelwold himself. This not only draws together different practices associated with the two great continental reform movements, one inspired by St Gerard of Brogne and based in Lotharingia and the other centred on Cluny, but also contains a significant English element. It has been suggested that this mixed customary was a local product,⁸⁸ in which case its similarities to the benedictionals would be very striking. However, it has also been argued that it is basically a continental compilation, transmitted to England by way of Fleury.⁸⁹ This view is supported by a description of the customs of Fleury written in about 1010 by a monk called Thierry of Amorbach, from which it seems that the practices of Fleury closely resembled those in the *Regularis Concordia*.⁹⁰ Whatever the ultimate origins of the *Regularis Concordia*, it is nevertheless clear from the preface that Æthelwold was conscious that this text brought together different practices 'even as honey is gathered together by bees from all manner of wild flowers and collected together into one hive'.⁹¹ A similar approach is evident in his Benedictional.

Other interesting parallels to the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold occur in the famous Winchester tropers,⁹² which, although they were produced after Æthelwold's death, are nevertheless based on the repertory established during his episcopate. These two manuscripts have recently been analysed in great detail by Alejandro Planchart.⁹³ Like benedictionals, the contents of tropers are extremely eclectic and varied, and no two tropers ever include exactly the same forms. They are often confusing in their arrangement, but the Winchester tropers are notable for their extremely clear and rational structure,⁹⁴ a quality shared by the benedictionals. Again, the Winchester tropers consist essentially of a combination of two different continental traditions, this time French and German.⁹⁵ Planchart considers that this reflects the use of a source from northern France, where such mixed compilations were common. The tropers also include, like the benedictionals, a substantial number of English forms.⁹⁶ This led Planchart to emphasise that the importation of continental practice during the monastic

⁸⁸ T. Symons, 'Sources of the *Regularis Concordia*', *Downside Review* 54 (1941), 14-36, 143-170, 264-289, and 'Regularis Concordia: History and Derivation', *Tenth-Century Studies*, pp 43-59.

⁸⁹ E. John, 'The Sources of the English Monastic Reformation: a comment', *Revue Bénédictine* 70 (1960), 201-203.

⁹⁰ A. Davril, 'Un Coutumier de Fleury du début du XIe siècle', *Revue Bénédictine* 76 (1966), 351-354, and 'Un moine de Fleury aux environs de l'an mil: Thierry dit d'Amorbach', *Études Ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales*, ed. R. Louis (Auxerre, 1975), pp 97-104; L. Donnat, 'Recherches sur l'influence de Fleury au Xe siècle', *Études Ligériennes*, pp 165-174. See also the comment by M. McC. Gatch, 'The Office in Anglo-Saxon Monasticism', *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, p 347, n 26, and in Lapidge ch 4, pp 98-9.

⁹¹ *Regularis Concordia*, p 3.

⁹² Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 473, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 775. Also discussed in this volume by Lapidge (ch 4, p 111) and Berry (ch 6, pp 155-7).

⁹³ *The Repertory of Tropes at Winchester* (Princeton, 1977).

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp 33, 72-95, 391-2.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp 131-141.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp 145-172.

revival was intended 'not to supplant an English practice but to strengthen and confirm a reform that had its origin within the English church and retained its English character until the first quarter of the 11th century'.⁹⁷ The benedictionals confirm this judgement by showing how, although continental traditions were imported and developed, the production of new local forms was encouraged and older English compositions retained.

It appears then that a characteristic of the tenth-century monastic revival in England was a self-conscious attempt to synthesise different continental traditions, whilst at the same time confirming and strengthening local practice. The two Winchester benedictionals provide perhaps the most clear-cut testimony to this outlook. It has been suggested, in connection with the *Regularis Concordia*, that this may reflect a concern to reconcile the practices of the different continental reform movements.⁹⁸ This is not a convincing explanation of the mixed character of the benedictionals, since there is no reason to connect the use of one or the other type of benedictional with a particular school of monasticism. The production of such hybrid texts in England perhaps rather reflects a determination to ensure that English practice represented the best available. It may also have been due to an attempt to embellish Roman rites by incorporating material from the Gallican liturgy. It was perhaps mistakenly assumed that the Gregorian benedictionals represented Roman use because of their association with the Gregorian sacramentary. The compiler of the Winchester benedictionals seems, like Æthelwold in the *Regularis Concordia*, to have had in mind 'the letters in which our holy patron Gregory instructed the blessed Augustine that, for the advancement of the rude English church, he should establish there the seemly customs of the Gallic Churches as well as those of Rome'.⁹⁹

The text of the Benedictional of St Æthelwold provides insights into many other aspects of the tenth-century monastic revival in England. For example, the elaboration of the ceremony of the episcopal blessing before communion evident in the Winchester benedictionals is a reminder of the important role played by the office of bishop in the reform. The early vocations of both Dunstan and Æthelwold were encouraged by Bishop Ælfheah of Winchester, while Oswald's mentors were Archbishops Oda of Canterbury and Osketil of York. Moreover, it was only when Æthelwold and the others themselves became bishops that they were able to implement effectively a thorough-going policy of reform. They did not, however, use their office simply as a platform to conduct a campaign of monastic plantation, but took their general responsibilities very seriously. Æthelwold's concern for his pastoral duties and the importance he attached to the episcopal blessing as a means of helping him to discharge them is apparent from Godeman's poem at the beginning of the Benedictional: 'This book the Boanerges aforesaid caused to be indited for himself in order that he might be able to sanctify the people of the Saviour by means of it and to pour forth holy prayers to God for the flock committed to him, and that he may lose no little lambkin of the fold.'¹⁰⁰

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p 391.

⁹⁸ E.g. Symons in *Regularis Concordia*, pp xlv-liv, and 'Regularis Concordia: History and Derivation', pp 43-59.

⁹⁹ *Regularis Concordia*, p 3.

¹⁰⁰ The quotation is from the translation of the prefatory poem by Warner and Wilson,

The leaders of the reform in England were anxious not only to revive monasticism in England, but also to make English church life in general more progressive and vigorous. The development of more elaborate benedictionals was one expression of this concern. The benedictional texts are not, however, only of interest as indirectly illustrating different aspects of the monastic revival. The 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold, together with the later benedictionals inspired by them, contain a large number of English Latin compositions of the period, which deserve greater attention as one of the most characteristic literary products of the reform.

There is, however, one final question to be considered, and that is whether Æthelwold or Godeman was primarily responsible for the compilation of the hybrid benedictional which appears in the 'Ramsey' Benedictional and the Benedictional of St Æthelwold. It would be surprising if Æthelwold, who produced such important texts as the *Regularis Concordia* and the translation of the Rule of St Benedict, took no part in the preparation of a liturgical collection for his own use. Moreover, as has been seen, the benedictionals show a concern for order and completeness which would seem to reflect the influence of a personality like Æthelwold's. However, since Godeman's prefatory poem is to a large extent a panegyric on 'the Boanerges aforesaid', one might expect that, if Æthelwold had taken any direct part in the preparation of the text, Godeman would have mentioned it. The involvement of Godeman in the preparation of both benedictionals is very striking. It was probably Godeman who, as the scribe of both manuscripts, was responsible for tidying up the 'Ramsey' text to produce the Benedictional of St Æthelwold. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that Godeman produced 'Ramsey' in accordance with general instructions given by Æthelwold to be sent to Canterbury, perhaps to Dunstan. Æthelwold, pleased with the results of Godeman's work, then instructed him to prepare a further copy, splendidly illuminated and decorated, for his personal use.

Benedictional, pp xii-xiii. The original poem is printed in full by Warner and Wilson, *Benedictional*, p 1, and M. Lapidge, 'The hermeneutic style in tenth-century Anglo-Latin literature', *ASE* 4 (1975), 105-7.