

**Cambridge, Pembroke College 25:
The Manuscript and Its Historical Context**

by
Rebecca Rushforth

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT.....	2
Codicological Description.....	2
Quires.....	2
Ruling.....	3
Ink.....	3
Gold Flecks.....	3
Marks of Provenance.....	3
Henry of Kirkestedede, Bury Librarian.....	3
Sixteenth-Century Round Hand.....	5
William Smarte and Pembroke College.....	5
The Script of Pembroke 25.....	6
English Caroline Minuscule.....	6
The Two Hands of Pembroke 25.....	7
A Palaeographical Dating for Pembroke 25.....	8
Added Historical Content on Flyleaves.....	10
CONTEXT OF PRODUCTION.....	10
Bury St Edmunds before the Norman Conquest.....	10
Abbot Baldwin.....	11
Baldwin at Bury.....	13
Baldwin's Successors.....	15
The Bury St Edmunds Library and the Significance of Pembroke 25.....	15
Pembroke 25 and Other Script Specimens from Bury St Edmunds.....	16
Scribal Comparanda and Book Production.....	16
English-Style Script at Bury.....	17
Importation of Books from France.....	17
Ninth-Century French Manuscripts.....	17
Pembroke 23 and 24.....	18
Links between Pembroke 23 and 24 and Pembroke 25.....	19
The Added Notes and the Pre-Conquest Past at Bury.....	19
A Note on fol. 181v concerning the Expulsion of Clerics from Bury St Edmunds.....	19
The Added Note on fol. 1r concerning King Henry II.....	20
The East of England and the Anglo-Saxon House of Wessex.....	20

DESCRIPTION OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Codicological Description

The manuscript as it now stands consists of 181 parchment folios, plus two modern paper flyleaves at each end. Each page is approximately 315 mm × 205 mm. It is bound in a nineteenth-century binding, which is in need of repair, on five medieval sewing stations.

Quires

The manuscript is arranged in twenty-three quires as follows: a singleton (fol. 1), I⁸ (fols. 2–9), II⁸ (fols. 10–17), III⁸ (fols. 18–25), IV⁸ (fols. 26–33), V⁸ (fols. 34–41), VI⁸ (fols. 42–49), VII⁸ (fols. 50–57), VIII⁸ (fols. 58–65), IX⁸ (fols. 66–73), X⁸ (fols. 74–81), XI⁸ (fols. 82–89), XII⁸ (fols. 90–97), XIII⁸ (fols. 98–105), XIV⁸ (fols. 106–13), XV⁸ (fols. 114–21), XVI⁸ (fols. 122–29), XVII⁸ (fols. 130–37), XVIII⁸ (fols. 138–45), XIX⁸ (fols. 146–53), XX⁸ (fols. 154–61), XXI⁴ (fols. 162–65), XXII⁸ (fols. 166–73), XXIII⁸ (fols. 174–81). In short, the manuscript consists entirely of regular quires of eight, with two exceptions: it starts with a singleton, and the twenty-first quire is a quire of only four leaves, two bifolia. M. R. James thought that the first quire had once contained five sheets, making ten leaves, and that the partner to fol. 1, which would have come between fols. 9 and 10, had been excised. I think it more likely, given the regularity of the rest of the manuscript and the fact that no text is missing between fols. 9 and 10, that fol. 1 was added to the manuscript in the mid-twelfth century to enlarge the blank space available for the addition of historical material. (On this added historical material, see below, p. 13.) James suggests that the note on fol. 1r is only the end of a longer text; if this were true, fol. 1 would be the last leaf of an added quire.

The sheets within the quires are almost without exception arranged HFFH, so that within each opening either both verso and recto are the hair side of the parchment or both are the flesh side. This was good practice in medieval book production because the hair side of the parchment was usually darker than the flesh side and showed follicles, while the flesh side might be greasier and have vein patterning. (Early Insular techniques of parchment preparation, however, rendered this arrangement unnecessary by producing a hair and flesh side which were very difficult to tell apart.) The parchment in Pembroke 25 is of a practical quality, rather than being highly prepared. It is quite stiff; the hair-side is yellow-brown with clearly visible follicles; the flesh-side is paler and often shows a pattern of veining, typically caused by inadequate draining of blood from the animal's body at slaughter, leaving a residue of iron to react with chemicals used later in the parchmending process. Some folios, made from the edge of the skin, lack their lower corners. Many slits, tears, or holes in the parchment have been mended with chamfered patches or sewing, sometimes in colored thread. The impression left is of a workmanlike book, not high-status, but practical in its construction. The one exception to the arrangement of hair facing hair and flesh facing flesh occurs in the thirteenth quire, where the second sheet of the quire, fols. 99 and 104, is arranged with hair outwards instead of inwards. This means that in the openings of fols. 98v–99r (*image*), 99v–100r (*image*), 103v–104r (*image*), and 104v–105r (*image*), hair faces flesh or vice versa. However, in this quire the hair and flesh sides of the parchment are much more alike than elsewhere in the book, and the contrast in the openings is hardly noticeable. This similarity presumably led to a mistake by the scribe.

Ruling

The manuscript is written in a single column, fols. 1–165 in 28 lines, and fols. 166–73 in 27 lines. Fol. 174r (*image*) was ruled for 28 lines, but only 27 were written, and from fol. 175r to the end of the manuscript there are 27 ruled lines per page. These were ruled drypoint before the parchment was folded. The prickings in the outer margin seem to have been made with a triangular point. The size of the writing area is approximately 250 × 145 mm, with 9–10 mm between ruled lines, and with a double vertical bounding line ruled to provide space for litterae notabiliores. On occasion the gap between lines is not regular, for example on fol. 180r (*image*).

Ink

The ink is shiny and black; this is more typical of the Anglo-Saxon than the Continental tradition at this time. *Litterae notabiliores* have been picked out in red.

Gold Flecks

An odd feature of this manuscript is that tiny spots of gold can be seen on several pages, e.g. fol. 12v5 (*image*); see also the gold flecks on fols. 13r11, 41r27, 42r22, 72v5, 73v3, 84v9, 94v14, 153v1, 153v11, 154r3, 154r11, and 154v25. The flecks are all on top of the script. They are not regular at all and play no decorative role in the manuscript. One possible explanation for their appearance is that the manuscript was being made in the same environment as a much more complex and high-grade project involving gilding, and particles of gold leaf either became air-borne and landed on the manuscript or were transferred to it through human contact. Another possibility is that the manuscript was used to store gold leaf, and some small flecks were not successfully removed.

Marks of Provenance

The manuscript contains several marks of provenance that assign it to Bury St Edmunds abbey in Suffolk.

Liber S. Edmundi

The manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds were exposed to a number of helpful inventorying campaigns by librarians of the institution. As a result, there are several different ways to identify a manuscript from Bury. Pembroke 25 contains a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century Bury St Edmunds ownership inscription at the top of fol. 3r that reads “*Liber sancti Edmundi regis et martyris*” (*image*). This inscription is found in a number of other Bury St Edmunds books, including Pembroke College manuscripts 23 and 24. It shows that Pembroke 25 was part of Bury St Edmunds’ main working library collection at that date, since the manuscripts so marked are mostly working books for monks.¹

Henry of Kirkestede, Bury Librarian

The manuscript also contains annotations by Bury St Edmunds’ great medieval librarian, Henry of Kirkestede, sometimes known as Boston of Bury.² His work in Pembroke 25 corresponds to his

usual pattern of activity and involves three different types of addition: an *ex libris*, a contents list, and a classmark.³

Kirkestede found an *ex libris* inscription already in place on fol. 3r (*image*), written in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century as discussed above. He added to it the words “*in quo continentur omelie uel sermones . xcv . item tractatus alani porrei de arte praedicandi.*” Kirkestede felt the need to expand the *ex libris* to include a brief summary of contents, and this might suggest that, in this case at least, he dealt with the *ex libris* before he decided to add a detailed contents list on the facing page. The second item is to be identified with the *Summa de arte praedicandi* written by Alanus ab Insula, also known as Alain of Lille (*ca.* 1128–1203), which suggests that the manuscript was composite at this time.

As was his usual practice, Kirkestede wrote a contents list on fol. 2v (*image*) that reads as follows:

*Liber monachorum sancti edmundi in quo continentur
Omelie uel sermones . xcv . ab adventu deum usque ad festum sancti andree . et de apostolis .
martyribus . confessoribus . et uirginibus . et de dedicacione ecclesie
Rabanus de officio misse et eius misterio et de significacione canonicarum horarum .*

This list repeats the *ex libris* information, although Kirkestede’s preferred form was to refer to the book as a possession of the monks of St Edmund, rather than of the saint himself.⁴ In contrast to the note on fol. 3r, this contents list does not mention the *Summa* of Alanus ab Insula. The contents list also does not mention the extra sermons, on particular themes rather than about particular occasions, at the end of the volume.

Kirkestede also gave the volume a classmark. He devised a system whereby each book in the Bury St Edmunds library had a two-part classmark consisting of a letter and an Arabic numeral. (This is quite an early use of Arabic numbers in England.) These classmarks are easily recognized and are very useful in the reconstruction of the Bury library. Books from other libraries survive with classmarks in a similar format, but in the Bury manuscripts the letter of the classmark always corresponds to its contents, e.g. “B” for “Biblia.” The Arabic number makes the classmark unique, but it is not clear whether the numbers were originally serial and continuous, or whether Kirkestede left some numbers empty for further accessions. If they were continuous, then adding up the highest surviving number in each letter allows the Bury library to be estimated as containing around 2000 manuscripts in Kirkestede’s time, of which 218 survive.⁵ As well as marking these classmarks within the manuscript, Kirkestede seems, from exiguous binding evidence, to have put them on the outside of the manuscript, presumably to make them more easily findable.

In addition to designating classmarks for the manuscripts, Henry of Kirkestede presumably must have also made a library catalogue that listed the books. Unfortunately such a catalogue does not survive. Without this evidence it is not clear what implications the classmarks have for the physical storage of the manuscripts.⁶ The existence of some volumes containing two different classmarks implies that the classmark did not necessarily relate directly to where they were kept.⁷ Possibly it indicated a particular *armarium* or book closet, which could have been shared by manuscripts of more than one letter.

Kirkestede gave Pembroke 25 the classmark “O.55,” where the “O” stands for “Omeliae.” He

wrote this classmark on both fols. 2v and 3r. This puts the manuscript in a class that also contains works of Origen. Other surviving volumes of homilies in this class are Kirkestede's O.52 and O.54, now classed as Pembroke College manuscripts 23 and 24.

Sixteenth-Century Round Hand

Another contents note was added on fol. 2v (*image*) in a round hand, probably from the sixteenth century:

Homiliae usque festum S. Andrea, de Apostolis martyribus confessoribus et uirginibus, et
 dedicatione Ecclesiae
 Rabanus Maurus de officio missa et mysterio et horis canonicis
 Magistri Alani summa (uerbum abbreviatum dicta)

By the side of the note on Hrabanus Maurus a hand of similar date has written "non occurrit his tractatus." This hand has not been identified. It may be that of William Smarte or a previous secular owner, or it might be that of a fellow of Pembroke College.

William Smarte and Pembroke College

On fol. 3r, above the medieval *ex libris* inscription, has been added in a round hand "Liber sociorum Aulee Pembroke ex dono Gulielmi Smarte Aldermani Gyponicens 1599" (*image*). William Smarte was from a prosperous Ipswich family and became Portman, bailiff, and member of parliament for that city.⁸ He seems to have played a prominent role in local life; in the famine of 1586 he seized food intended for troops garrisoned in the Netherlands to alleviate the conditions in Ipswich. William owned a number of manuscripts from Bury St Edmunds Abbey that are now at Pembroke College, Cambridge. According to John Foxe, William's father Richard was a staunch Catholic, involved in the persecution of Protestants under Mary, although he repented after her death. If under Henry VIII and Edward VI, Richard's loyalties had been to the old Catholic ways rather than tempered to suit the times, then perhaps William inherited volumes that his father obtained from Bury St Edmunds at its dissolution in 1539.

William Smarte's will of January 1598/9 bequeaths all of his Latin books, printed and handwritten, to the church of St Mary Tower in Ipswich, to be kept there for the use of preachers. Before his death in September of the same year, however, he had given all his manuscripts except for a handful to Pembroke College, Cambridge, whose Master at the time was the theologian Lancelot Andrewes. (From the inscription's date of 1599 one would assume the gift was later than March of that year.) He was persuaded to make this donation to Pembroke College by a fellow of that college, Richard Buckenham, a local man whose family had close connections with the Smartes. It was presumably also through Buckenham's influence that Smarte set up a number of scholarships to send boys from Ipswich Grammar School to Pembroke College.⁹

Unfortunately the donations of William Smarte to Pembroke College were not immediately treated with the respect they deserved, and there were losses from the collection. Matthew Wren listed 79 items of Smarte's donation in his catalogue of the Pembroke manuscripts published in 1617, and lamented that Richard Buckenham had not thought to catalogue them: "si catalogum datorum

nobis reliquisset, egregium fidem praestississet. Dedit enim praeter hos proculdubio non paucos qui nunc (proh dolor) absunt.”¹⁰ For example, a manuscript of Alexander Nequam which had moved to the Bodleian Library by 1620, where it is now MS Bodley 356 (*J.C.* 2716), was possibly given as early as 1601 in response to one of Sir Thomas Bodley’s early donation drives. Other manuscripts have also strayed very early, probably mostly to the Bodleian Library.¹¹

The Script of Pembroke 25

English Caroline Minuscule

The script of Pembroke 25 is a form of Standard Late English Caroline Minuscule, also known as Style IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule. Caroline minuscule was invented around the late eighth century in Francia, combining elements from Cursive Half-Uncial and local minuscules to produce a clear, elegant script with fewer ligatures and variant letter forms.¹² Its association with the court of Charlemagne gives it its modern name. Typical features include the **a** like a modern printed **a**, with an arched top stroke over the round body; **g** like a formal printed **g**, with a round top bowl above a tail (which may have been open or closed); **r** like a modern **r**; and **s** much like a modern **f** but without the cross bar and not descending below the line. This style of script usually has a neat, restrained aspect.

Caroline minuscule spread quickly through much of Western Europe but was not taken up in England in the ninth century even though the importation of books in Caroline minuscule and of Continental scholars to the court of King Alfred would have been an obvious occasion for this to occur. Caroline minuscule was first written in England in the middle of the tenth century.¹³ It quickly became closely associated with the Benedictine Reform movement promoted by King Edgar and Sts Dunstan, Æthelwold, and Oswald in the 960s and 970s. Two styles of English Caroline script have been identified from the first half century of its existence. Style I involves writing Caroline minuscule to make it as indistinguishable as possible from that written on the Continent, and it is particularly associated with St Æthelwold. Style II retains some Insular features and is associated with St Dunstan. In the first two decades of the eleventh century, elements from both of these scripts were combined, probably at Canterbury, to produce a typically English script known as Standard Late English Caroline, or Style IV Anglo-Caroline minuscule. This script spread throughout England and has been seen as “a badge of Englishness.”¹⁴ It survived for about half a century after the Norman Conquest in some houses.

The characteristic features of Standard Late English Caroline Minuscule are usually taken from the hand of the master Canterbury-based scribe Eadwig Basan (*fl.* ca. 1020), whose work represents the apogee of this style.¹⁵ The script is usually round and elegant, restrained and inactive in aspect. It has wedges on ascenders and at minim height and also usually has small finishers or feet at the baseline which help give it a sense of thick/thin contrast. The enclosed parts of both **a** and **e** are small and narrow, and **a** might sometimes be written so that the arched top stroke extends upwards above minim height. The form of **g** has a short descending stroke linking the round upper body to the tail, although in later examples this line is sometimes omitted completely and a clear gap is left between the two parts. The top part of **r** is sharply zig-zagged; in later specimens the right-hand or top part of the letter might join the stem quite low down near the baseline, leading to a “split” appearance so that the letter looks a bit like a very narrow **v**. The form of **s** has a heavy shoulder at

minim height. The **c+t** ligature is often very close and “loaf-shaped.” Features like two sorts of **r+a** ligature (with Caroline **a** and with “cc” **a**), small majuscule **N**, and small majuscule **H** (particularly in the *ihc* abbreviation for *Iesus*) are also typical of this script. In the hands of a master practitioner — such as Eadwig Basan, as well as the mid-eleventh-century scribe of a Canterbury Pontifical (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 44), some scribes at Exeter in the third quarter of the eleventh century,¹⁶ and the two Bury scribes who wrote a gospel book at the end of the eleventh century (Cambridge, St John’s College, C. 23 (73)) — it is a supremely elegant and beautiful script. However, when written inexpertly, it can easily appear clumsy, almost cartoonishly exaggerated, stalled, and ragged.

The Two Hands of Pembroke 25

In the continuum of performances of Standard Late English Caroline Minuscule, the script of Pembroke 25 is to be placed at the high end of the middle. The script is quite attractive, but not highly calligraphic. It is written in an undisciplined, workmanlike fashion. As with other aspects of the manuscript’s production, the script gives a clear impression that the first concern has been to produce a straightforward, usable book.

More than one scribe is at work in this manuscript, but the exact identification of stints is complicated by the undisciplined nature of the writing. Major writing habits remain constant, while small habits and the aspect of the script change gradually over time. (Similar shifts in writing habits can be paralleled in other manuscripts written at Bury St Edmunds at this period, for example in London, British Library, Royal 7. C. II, where the scribe unsuccessfully attempts to eradicate descending **s** from his work on fol. 167.) I have not been able to identify the change in hand which M. R. James detected between his items 34 and 35. However, there is a change in hand between fols. 89v and 90r (*image*), corresponding with a change in quire, but not in text. The difference between these two hands is not a consistent difference of habit, but a difference of aspect and pen: the first hand is large, dense, and round, written flowingly with quite a thick pen, while the second is written slightly smaller and less fluently with a thinner pen. Since these hands are otherwise very similar, I shall refer to them together in the following full description of the script of Pembroke 25. The aspect of both hands is quite dense on the page and round, though these features are more marked in the first hand. Both hands have suggestions of a slight forward lean. Ascenders have tapering wedges, and minims have small wedges. At the baseline there are small, slightly slanted feet or occasionally very small turned-back descenders; full descenders usually turn back a little. **a** exhibits the Caroline form with quite a large compartment; it is sometimes tall in initial position, e.g. 56v9 *autem*. It often has an emphatic top arch, leaning to the left, in a form one might call “quiffed,” e.g. 8r22 *anima*, 90v24 *aliquas* (*images*).¹⁷ At line-end or sometimes word-end, **a** often has an upwards-flicking hair-line finisher. Very occasionally round rather than Caroline **a** appears, e.g. 85r24–25 *face/re*. Both straight-backed **d** and round-backed **d** occur frequently. In the round-backed form the letter often does not rise much above minim height and has a very small ascending part, e.g. 131r24 *aliquid*. **e** has a medium-sized, slightly slanting compartment and occasionally a hooked back. There are five different types of **e**-caudata: one with a hooked tail approximating a modern cedilla, e.g. 65r25 *male* (*image*); one with a spurred tail, e.g. 39v11 *preceptum* (*image*); one with a looped tail, e.g. 122v25 *celi* (*image*); one with a short lightning-stroke descender slanting down to the left from the bottom left of the letter, e.g. 141r5 *eternam* (*image*); and one that combines a loop and a spur, e.g. 107r8 *iudeis* (*image*). On rare occasions two different types of **e**-caudata are used in a single word, e.g. 14v2 *eue*, or in contiguous words, e.g. 37r8 *uite eterne*. The **æ** digraph is also found with

some frequency, e.g. 165r25 *hæc*. **f** has the Caroline form; it has either a little tailed-back descender at the baseline or a small foot. Occasionally Insular minuscule **f** is used to avoid a descender from the line above, e.g. 54r28 *finem*. **g** has the Caroline form; between bowl and tail it usually has a small stem stroke which often slants to the left. Occasionally bowl and tail are separated by a gap, e.g. 42v26 *dignetur*; the tail is sometimes open, sometimes closed with a hair-line. Small majuscule **H** is sometimes used, as is small majuscule **N**. **r** is sharp, sometimes split, e.g. 8r24 *regis*; occasionally it descends a little. **s** has either a heavy shoulder or just a spur; it often has a small tailed-back descender, but occasionally a foot. Ascender-height round **s** is sometimes found at line end, e.g. 165r28 *caelis*. A **v**-shaped form of **u** is occasionally used, e.g. 55v19 *venit*. **x** usually does not descend below the line. **y** is curved or straight limbed and always dotted. **z** is either minim-height and uncrossed (e.g. 7r4 *zacharie*, 135r14 *zabulus*), minim-height and crossed (e.g. 56v24 *Lazare*), or slightly tall and uncrossed (e.g. 99r15–16 *bapti/zetur*). A descending form of **z** is used once, 25v23 *baptizari* (image). The **c+t** ligature is quite close, and the ligaturing stroke does not rise very high, e.g. 6v10 *intacta* (image). **r+t** and **s+t** ligatures are also used. The **r+a** ligature with “cc” form of **a** is found, and the **r** in this ligature often descends below the line, e.g. 37r9 *sinistra*, 180r23 *cetera*. The abbreviation for *Iesus* sometimes has a small majuscule **H**, e.g. 117r5 *Iesu*. The Insular abbreviations for *est* (÷) and *enim* are used, the latter in the form much like a small majuscule **H** without a protruding cross bar, e.g. 127v1 *enim*. The abbreviation mark is usually a horizontal line but is sometimes curved like a tilde or jagged like a lightning stroke, e.g. 151r12 *spiritus sancti*. The tironian *et nota* is occasionally used, e.g. 57v5 *et*, 115r28 *et*. The question mark is used, e.g. 8r13 *tui?*. Major initials are drawn entirely in red, two or three lines high. *Litterae notabiliores* are drawn from the various majuscule options, *viz.* Uncial, Rustic Capitals, and Square Capitals; variation is seen in the form chosen. They are often picked out in red ink, with one downward stroke of red highlighting an important stroke of the letter. In some places rough paragraph marks are also added in red. The same red is used for rubrics. These are written in mixed majuscules, with Rustic Capital forms predominating, e.g. 125r1. However, sometimes primarily Uncial forms are used, e.g. 3r2 and 166r1–2.

A Palaeographical Dating for Pembroke 25

There has not yet been sufficient study of the development of English Caroline minuscule over the course of the eleventh century to permit close dating of individual specimens. Neither of the two major monographs on the script addresses this issue thoroughly. T. A. M. Bishop’s *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971) is necessarily circumscribed by its particular format, and Bishop chose to represent far more manuscripts from the tenth century, during the script’s introduction and early development in England, than from the eleventh. Likewise David Dumville, in his *English Caroline Script and Monastic History* (Woodbridge, 1993), concentrates on the early years of English Caroline, though he does discuss the first quarter of the eleventh century in detail. Otherwise, palaeographical scholarship has focused on the Norman Caroline minuscule, which was introduced after the Conquest in 1066, and English Caroline minuscule of this period has largely been defined in contrast to it. Neil Ker’s invaluable *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1957) is the best survey of this period. Ker describes the “beautiful eleventh-century English script, in whose history the Norman Conquest was only a disturbing incident” as “perfectly upright, fairly large, and widely spaced.” The features that Ker thought would stand out as odd to the Norman reader include “the amply curving head of **a**, the larger form of **a** used commonly at the beginning of a word, the bold ligature for **et**, and the handsome **g** with a sharp angle in the stroke connecting the upper and lower parts of the letter,” as well as the **r+a** and **r+t** ligatures and the Insular *autem*

abbreviation. Ker also examines the script of this period in his article on the early manuscripts of Salisbury Cathedral. He talks in particular about the “bad habits” of eleventh-century script that a Norman master might wish to eradicate, including:

writing a hyphen at the beginning of a line as well as at the end; making an *rt* ligature; making the *et* ligature in the middle or at the beginning of a word; using rounded *d* as an alternative to upright *d*, not solely in order to save space; writing *ae* or *æ* instead of *ę*; allowing *f*, *r*, and *s*, one, two, or three of them, to fall below the line; using round *s*; making a special form of *a* after *r* [the **r+a** ligature with “cc” **a**]; using peculiar forms of abbreviation for *autem* and *enim* [the old Insular forms]; finishing minims with horizontal feet or serifs . . . the last three are characteristic of older English not older Norman script.¹⁸

David Dumville has also commented on post-Conquest script from this angle, talking of “late eleventh-century scribal evils” in his brief study of the St Nicholas-related additions to London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. v.¹⁹ He summarizes the bad habits of these script specimens as “lines irregularly ruled,” “ill-formed and inconsistent letters,” frequent tall-headed **a**, and frequent corrections.

In Pembroke 25 we can see many of the features described by Ker and Dumville, both standard English ones and those described pejoratively as “faults” common to this period. The tall **a**, with an extended arching top part, is used often in Pembroke 25, usually at the start of words as Ker notes. The **e+t** ligature is found in the middle and end of words, and not just to represent the word *et*. The **r+a** ligature with “cc-**a**” was frequently used; Ker said that this was “hardly found after the Conquest,” but Bury St Edmunds does seem to have been one of the places where it lasted longer.²⁰ The **r+t** ligature, said by Ker to be “hardly [found] after 1100,” is also used. The Insular *enim* abbreviation is found, although the Insular *autem*, in the form of an **h** with a hook on the right-hand side of the lower half, is not found.

Ker also looked at the methods of book construction and changes in codicology in the century after the Norman Conquest. He points out that in the twelfth century it became common for manuscripts to be written in two columns. Pembroke 25 is written in one column, not two, which could suggest a late eleventh-century rather than a twelfth-century date, but since Bury St Edmunds remained backward-looking in its book-production for quite a while after the Conquest, it is probably better not to lay too much emphasis on this detail.

The scribes of Pembroke 25 frequently use Insular letter-forms to avoid clashes between an ascender and a descender from the line above, a habit found in other Bury script of this period. For example, the Insular form of **f** does not rise above minim-height, and is therefore frequently used for this purpose. (The round form of **s** is also used in this way, instead of the tall Caroline form.) Other Insular habits are also used, for example the old Insular abbreviation for *enim*, and the tironian *et-nota*. Although the tironian *et-nota* is an old symbol, at this date it was not commonly found in Continental or English Latin manuscripts, although it was used frequently in Insular script, which was still used in Gaelic and Welsh areas, and in England for writing vernacular texts. These habits suggest that the scribes of Pembroke 25 are working in the English tradition, which is in keeping with normal Bury practice at this time.

These features together suggest a palaeographical dating for the manuscript probably within fifteen

years on either side of 1100. Many of the practices in Pembroke 25 are old-fashioned, and look back to the pre-Conquest English scribal tradition, but because this is the general tenor of Bury work at the time, it is safest not to rule out a post-1100 dating for this manuscript.

At some point early in the history of Pembroke 25, a studious reader went through the entire manuscript marking word division, where it is not readily apparent in the manuscript, with a thin brown vertical line. This same hand seems to have gone through other Bury manuscripts in the same way, in particular the predominantly French ninth-century manuscripts imported to Bury in the eleventh century (see discussion below); at the same time this scribe also “corrected” round **a** into Caroline **a**, presumably to make it clearer for a reader used to Caroline script. It is not possible to date these marks because they are too insubstantial, but they were probably added before the manuscript was very old. This form of word-division mark originated in France in the eleventh century, particularly at Dijon and Fécamp, but it soon spread and became very common in Western Europe and even survived into the era of printing.²¹

Added Historical Content on Flyleaves

Two notes, one dated 1154 and the other datable after 1153, appear on fols. 1r–2v, in two different hands, an early grand Gothic *textualis precissa/quadrata* and a documentary cursive. These two hands may have been written by the same scribe using a different cut of pen for each note, since they seem to be written in the same ink. Their linked contents suggest that they were added on the same occasion. (For a discussion of these two notes see further below.) Probably fol. 1, the only singleton in the manuscript, was added to the manuscript at this time specifically to provide extra blank space to contain these two items.

A third historical note, now barely legible, was added to fol. 181v, probably in the first half of the twelfth century, judging from the script. This folio is very battered and has a number of worm holes and stains. It seems to have been used as a paste-down at some point in the manuscript’s history, probably after this note was written. The ink is now extremely faint in places. See below for a discussion of the significance of this third historical note.

CONTEXT OF PRODUCTION

The monastery at Bury St Edmunds in West Suffolk was one of the richest and most important in medieval England. In addition to its considerable estates, it possessed the incorrupt body of St Edmund, king and martyr, one of England’s most revered native saints, a valuable source both of income and of religious prestige. In the late Middle Ages the abbey produced notable historical writers;²² its abbots had an impact on the political events of the day;²³ and it also had a large and important library.²⁴ When the shrine of St Edmund was stripped in 1538, it yielded 5000 marks of gold and silver plus many precious stones, and at the abbey’s surrender in the following year its abbot received one of the highest recorded pensions given to an ex-monastic at the Dissolution, £330 per year.²⁵

Bury St Edmunds before the Norman Conquest

The abbey of Bury St Edmunds was certainly founded before the Norman Conquest, but pre-Conquest evidence for its history is sparse. The evidence of two wills suggests that there was a church of St Edmund at *Bedricesworth* (the original name of the place that came to be known as Bury St Edmunds) in the mid-tenth century,²⁶ and a charter of 963 records a grant of land to “ecclesie sancti Martiris sui Edmundi quæ sita est in loco celebri appellativa rucolarum appellatione at Beodrichesworth nuncupato.”²⁷ A dubious charter of King Edmund, dated 945, calls the church a *monasterium*; although problematic as it stands, this text is likely to have some underlying authentic basis.²⁸ However, all these documents are preserved only in later Bury archives and may have been altered in copying.²⁹ Abbo of Fleury’s *Passio S. Eadmundi*, written while Abbo was staying at Ramsey in 985–987, only mentions *Bedricesworth* briefly but implies that St Edmund’s church was established there before the death of Theodred, bishop of London, in 951.³⁰ There is no mention of Bury St Edmunds in any text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* written before the Conquest,³¹ and the Old English text on the resting-places of saints, probably compiled in the early tenth century, says that Edmund lies at *Bedricesworth* in East Anglia, but does not specify *on þam mynstre* as it does in several other entries.³²

Just as the date of Bury’s foundation is difficult to discover, so it is not easy to tell what sort of estates Bury had in its early history; it may have been a very wealthy house from the beginning, or it may have achieved prominent wealth only in the reign of Edward the Confessor. In 1043 Emma, who had been the lady, *blæfdige*, of England since her marriage to Æthelred in 1002, surviving two changes of dynasty, was deprived of her lands and treasures by her son Edward the Confessor.³³ These included extensive liberties in Suffolk that were granted to Bury St Edmunds, making it a very wealthy house.³⁴ It seems likely that the monastery was already well staffed by this time, as this grant carried with it heavy administrative responsibilities. In 1044 Leofstan became abbot of Bury, and it was probably at about this time that he made the survey of some of the abbey’s possessions which survives in a contemporary hand at the back of Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197.³⁵ This survey includes a list of books and vestments, some of which are said to be in the possession of particular personnel, giving us the names of seven members of the community as well as of Abbot Leofstan: these are Brihtric (a priest, or perhaps the prior), Blacere, Siferth, Ætheric, Thurstan, Oscytel, and another Leofstan.³⁶ Of course, there may have been further members of the community who did not have any books in their possession at this time, and eight is therefore a minimum number for the personnel of the abbey at this time. The grant of extensive privileges in 1043 and Leofstan’s survey, probably made soon after 1044, set the tone for Bury’s subsequent history, which has often been seen as one of wealth and careful administration.³⁷

Abbot Baldwin

In 1065, perhaps as one of his last royal acts, Edward the Confessor appointed a new abbot at Bury St Edmunds, replacing Leofstan, who had held this office since 1044. King Edward did not choose to promote one of the resident Bury monks; instead he set over them one of his own chaplains, a French physician named Baldwin.³⁸ (This appointment ran entirely contrary to the right to choose their own abbot which the Bury monks under Baldwin claimed had been theirs since time immemorial.) Baldwin was one of several of Edward the Confessor’s overseas chaplains who were promoted to high ecclesiastical office, along with Giso of Wells and Regenbald of Cirencester.³⁹ *Baldwin before Bury*. Our evidence for the career of Baldwin before he became abbot of Bury St

Edmunds comes from two sources: later hagiographical writing and documents relating to English estates granted to Saint-Denis.

According to notes surviving in an interpolated Bury St Edmunds copy of John of Worcester's *Chronicle*, Baldwin was born at Chartres, but brought up at the monastery of Saint-Denis in Paris, where he became a monk.⁴⁰ Later he was made prior of Leberaw, a dependency of Saint-Denis in Germany. It is not entirely clear why he first came to England. He may have been sent to look after Saint-Denis's English interests. By the late eleventh century, Saint-Denis was asserting rights over Anglo-Saxon lands, and there may be some truth in its claims to have held these since well before the Norman Conquest. Alternatively, it is possible that Edward the Confessor had requested a skilled physician at his court. No small number of Lotharingian and French clerics came to England during the reign of Edward the Confessor, whose long exile in Normandy gave him a European outlook on England's situation.⁴¹

A grant of land at Taynton, Oxfordshire, attests to Baldwin's immediate success at Edward's court. This grant survives in two originals, both from the Saint-Denis archive: an Old English writ and a single-sheet Latin diploma.⁴² The writ, which is datable 1053 × 1057, informs the bishop of Dorchester and the king's other men in Oxfordshire that King Edward has given the manor of Taynton to St Dionysius's holy minster beyond the sea, and directs that the bishop should have a charter drawn up to this effect.⁴³ There is no reason to doubt the document's authenticity, and until recently it had attached to it the best impression in existence of Edward the Confessor's genuine seal.

The writ was for a long time sewn to a charter purporting to be the very original produced in response to the writ.⁴⁴ It is not immediately clear whether or not this is a genuine document, as it has some odd features. First, it dates itself to 1059, a few years later than the writ; secondly, it is certainly written in script untypical of mid-eleventh-century English work; and thirdly, it has a note following its witness-list explaining the circumstances of its production:

Et ego Balduinus sancti Dionysii monachus, sub regimine abbatis mei Hugonis constitutus, tunc temporis anglorum regis Eduuardy medicus, omnibus quorum hic adnotata sunt nomina sine cuiuslibet calumpnia scriptum huius donationis confirmantibus de manu eiusdem regis et scriptum et donum inperpetuum sancto Dyonisio habendum suscepi.

It could be that this is the original document, but it seems more likely that the original document received an addition by Baldwin, and that this edited version was then copied later (maybe *ca.* 1100 in France at a time when Saint-Denis was revising the records of its English holdings). The text, however, can be seen as essentially genuine, whatever the circumstances of the original single-sheet production. The Domesday book survey shows that in 1086 the abbey of Saint-Denis owned the manor of Taynton, but the abbot of Bury, that is Baldwin, held a house in Oxford pertaining to Taynton. It seems likely that the estate was a gift from Edward the Confessor given in gratitude for medical services rendered to him, and that, as was appropriate to his monastic vows, it went not to Baldwin personally but to his home monastery. The house probably remained in Baldwin's possession simply because he lived in it.

The records of Bury St Edmunds, both historical and hagiographical, confirm, independently from the note at the end of this single-sheet charter, that Baldwin was Edward the Confessor's personal

physician. Baldwin is said to have used his famous medical skills to Bury St Edmund's advantage. His appointment to the abbacy of Bury presumably released him from his duty to his original home abbey. However, his subsequent works at Bury show that he retained links with Saint-Denis, as well as with the Continent in general.

Baldwin at Bury

By the time of Domesday book, Bury St Edmunds was one of the richest abbeys in England, exceeded only by Glastonbury, Ely, and Christ Church, Canterbury. Baldwin had built on the abbey's already substantial holdings to achieve this, and he continued to work in the abbey's interests until his death in 1097 or 1098 (probably late 1097).

The abbey of Bury St Edmunds faced two threats during Baldwin's abbacy. The first, common to many Anglo-Saxon houses, was the incursion into the abbey's holdings of rapacious Normans who saw England as spoils of war, and who had little respect for native saints with their unfamiliar stories and barbaric names.⁴⁵ The other threat, more specific to Bury, was the bishop of East Anglia's desire to move his episcopal seat to Bury St Edmunds. If the bishop had been successful, the abbey would have been subsumed into his control, and the monks and abbot would have had to take a secondary role to the episcopal community. The consequences could have been worse: when Leofric successfully moved his see from Crediton to Exeter in 1050, he expelled the monks at Exeter and replaced them with canons living under the Rule of Chrodegang. Naturally Baldwin resisted the bishop's attempt to take over Bury.

These two threats required two related campaigns of action. On the one hand, Baldwin needed to obtain legal judgments to make the abbey safe from episcopal and lay interference; on the other, he needed to raise the abbey's prestige to increase respect for its sanctity among both the local people and those attached to William the Conqueror's court. The solution to both these requirements lay in the abbey's glorious past, and Baldwin set about making the most of it.

As I have explained above, the early history of Bury is not entirely clear. It is unlikely that it had a straightforward foundation date as such, but in common with other abbeys after the Conquest, Bury began to inquire into its own past in a way that required the provision of straightforward answers to questions about its own origin and antiquity. At some point during Baldwin's abbacy, the story arose that Bury St Edmunds had been founded by King Cnut in 1020. This foundation legend is first recorded in related annals copied into two important Bury St Edmunds manuscripts: a mid-eleventh-century Psalter (Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 12) and the earliest surviving copy of the bilingual *Benedictine Rule* (Oxford, Corpus Christi College 197).⁴⁶ These two annal entries asserting the abbey's foundation under Cnut were both added to the manuscripts in the last third of the eleventh century, during Baldwin's abbacy. Under Baldwin's leadership the abbey also began to augment and even completely manufacture its pre-Conquest past. A genuine grant of Cnut, probably from 1022 or early 1023, granting to Bury renders of fish and eels from the king's holdings and those of his queen, Emma, was augmented to include a long list of rights and privileges for the abbey (some of which were anachronistic for the time of Cnut).⁴⁷ The Cnut charter became associated with the date 1020, and was held to be the abbey's foundation charter. A charter of King Harthacnut was also forged, again laying out details of the abbey's privileges.⁴⁸ Baldwin also travelled to Rome and obtained from Pope Alexander II a bull proclaiming the independence of Bury St Edmunds from episcopal control.⁴⁹ Lanfranc, however, did not publish the bull, and the

dispute continued. In 1081 William I tried the case and issued a writ declaring in Bury's favor.⁵⁰ The writ seems to have been found insufficient by Baldwin, and the Bury monks then produced by themselves something that has been described as the last Anglo-Saxon charter.⁵¹ The surviving single sheet is in both Latin and English; the English is considerably biased towards the Bury point of view, while the Latin is more neutral in tone. This charter contains an account of the debate, making it clear that it was because of the documents that Bury won; the bishop was unable to produce written records, and the Bury campaign of forgery paid off. It was presumably at this time that a dossier of documents relating to the dispute — including the genuine writ of William, the charter based on it written by the Bury monks, the embellished charter of Cnut, and the papal bull of Alexander II — were copied into the back (fols. 137v–141r) of a Bury gospel-book, now London, British Library, Harley 76.⁵² The dispute was still not entirely settled until the bishopric of East Anglia was moved to Norwich in 1094.

Baldwin also vigorously promoted the cult of St Edmund during his time as abbot. It was from the renown of St Edmund's holy death, his incorrupt body, and his subsequent miracles that the abbey derived much of its prestige. The *Passio* of St Edmund by Abbo of Fleury was an elegant promotion of his sanctity by a great monastic writer, with an unchallengeable authority in that it told the story of Edmund's death as related to Abbo by St Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, "with tears streaming down his face," as Dunstan himself had heard it as a young man at the court of King Æthelstan from Edmund's own standard-bearer. Abbo's *Passio* was soon translated into Old English by Ælfric of Eynsham, who included it as one of only four Lives of English saints in his important collection of homiletic *Lives of Saints*. Edmund's status as an incorrupt saint, whose body did not decay but instead gave off a pleasant "odor of sanctity" put him in a select group of great English saints along with Cuthbert at Durham and Æthelthryth at Ely.

However, Abbo's text is not ideal from a Bury St Edmunds point of view since it does not tell us where St Edmund's body is to be found, and it does not include many post-mortem miracles that would serve the purpose of honoring the abbey. Abbo writes of the pleasant part of England in which Edmund rests, but he does not identify the specific location, and he was probably referring to the wider area of East Anglia. Abbo spent a few years of exile at Ramsey Abbey, where he wrote the *Passio* of Edmund at the request of the Ramsey monks. The earliest manuscript of Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, the only one surviving from before the Norman Conquest, is London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. VII, the manuscript that is used as the basis for the modern edition of these texts. It specifies in the homily on Edmund that the saint rests at *Bedricesworth*, the old name for Bury St Edmunds, but since this manuscript was almost certainly written at Bury St Edmunds itself, it is impossible to tell whether this detail was in Ælfric's original text or whether it was interpolated by a Bury scribe.

Baldwin therefore needed to make more of the link between Bury St Edmunds and the renowned saint whose body it held. To do this he commissioned a work on the Miracles of St Edmund from a monk called Hermann.⁵³ This text, the *Miracula S. Eadmundi*, is written in a complex and witty Latin, and the absence of a modern edition or any translation has hindered its use by modern scholars.⁵⁴ It starts with the story of Edmund's incorrupt body in the times of the Danish invasions at the end of the tenth century and the early eleventh century, and then continues through the rest of the eleventh century with details of the miracles brought about by Edmund's relics. The text also gives information about Abbot Baldwin's activities. Since Edmund was incorrupt, his primary relics (that is, parts of his body) were not available to other houses, but secondary relics (such as nail clippings

and pieces of his clothes) could be taken away. Baldwin took these secondary relics abroad with him on his frequent travels and gave them to prominent houses in order to spread Edmund's cult. It was probably during Baldwin's time that a small manuscript, composed of just four quires, was made at Bury, containing Abbo's *Passio S. Eadmundi* and a neumed office for St Edmund (now lacking its end). This little book is now in the Kongelige Biblioteket in Copenhagen, where it is classed as G. K. S. 1588 4°. It has a medieval provenance of Saint-Denis, as shown by marks on the flyleaves, and it seems likely that it was made specifically to promote Edmund's cult at Baldwin's home abbey.⁵⁵

Hermann, although writing at Baldwin's instigation, probably did not finish his *Miracula* until after Baldwin's death. The only surviving manuscript of the full *Miracula* was probably written around 1100, and contains a reference to Baldwin as *felicis memoriae*. However, two early manuscripts survive of a shortened version of Hermann's *Miracula*; one is composed of a single quire with an added folio, and the other of two small quires. Both of these manuscripts left Bury St Edmunds soon after being written, probably around 1100, and it is likely that these too were used as pamphlets to promote Edmund's cult,⁵⁶ showing that the activities associated with Baldwin's lifetime were continued after his death.

Baldwin developed a sophisticated administrative system, producing records to manage the abbey's holdings and defend them against the deprivations of the Normans. His "Feudal Book" is one of the earliest surviving documents of complex monastic administration.⁵⁷ Baldwin also embarked on an ambitious and long-term campaign of building works at Bury. He started building a grand church, perhaps inspired by the Norman cathedral building taking place elsewhere in the country.⁵⁸ He was remembered for this in later centuries, and appears as a great builder in the surviving illustrated manuscript of Lydgate's Lives of Edmund and Fremund.⁵⁹ In 1095, before the works were finished, Abbot Baldwin translated the remains of St Edmund in a great festival. He also reorganized the town of Bury St Edmunds to encourage trade in the city, increasing the abbey's revenues.⁶⁰

Baldwin's Successors

Baldwin himself died at some point in the Christmas period of 1097/8, probably in late 1097. The monastery of Bury remained without an abbot until 1100, when Robert, an illegitimate son of Hugh d'Avranches, earl of Chester, was uncanonically made abbot. He was deposed in 1102, and Robert II was elected in his place. Robert II died in 1107, after which the abbey again suffered an interregnum until the appointment of Alebold of Jerusalem in 1114.⁶¹

Despite the disruption that this situation must have caused to the administration of the monastery, the works which Baldwin had set in train at Bury can be seen continuing after his death. The only manuscript of the *Miracula S. Eadmundi* was written shortly after Baldwin's death, probably *ca.* 1100, and copies of other hagiographical works were also made at this time. Pembroke 25 was probably written within fifteen years either way of 1100, and it may have been written after Baldwin's death; however it was certainly written during the period of his influence on the abbey's activities of self-improvement.

The Bury St Edmunds Library and the Significance of Pembroke 25

Pembroke 25 and Other Script Specimens from Bury St Edmunds

The library of Bury St Edmunds is unusually well documented: a detailed late twelfth-century catalogue survives,⁶² as well as two short booklists from the eleventh century.⁶³ The aforementioned systematic activities of Henry of Kirkested in the mid-fourteenth century, in adding *ex libris* inscriptions, classmarks, and contents-lists to Bury books, permit the secure attribution of a late-medieval Bury provenance to numerous manuscripts.⁶⁴ Consequently it is not surprising that the library has received much attention from modern scholars. M. R. James, the great cataloguer, seems to have been the first to have noticed the distinctive classmarks in Bury St Edmunds books, and published his findings in two studies written at the beginning and towards the end of his career.⁶⁵ Rod Thomson has written widely on the Bury library and archives, including a detailed study of the contents, sources, and cultural implications of Bury's book collection in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁶⁶ Richard Sharpe has edited the Bury booklists and has reconstructed the library from surviving classmarks.⁶⁷ A survey concentrating on how Bury acquired books in the eleventh and twelfth centuries has been written by Teresa Webber,⁶⁸ and a catalogue of Bury manuscripts now in Cambridge (a large proportion of those surviving) has been written by Antonia Gransden.⁶⁹ The work done on establishing the library of Bury St Edmunds makes it possible to identify a large number of books with definite Bury provenance, and examination of their script allows identification of many of these as Bury products.

Palaeographical examination of Bury books has been less common than work on art-history and book-ownership at Bury, and has focused in great detail upon the twelfth century. Elizabeth Parker McLachlan has published a survey of the manuscripts produced at Bury in the twelfth century combining palaeographical and art-historical evidence, particularly in the third and fourth decades, showing that there was highly organized production at this time by stable personnel.⁷⁰ The script of Bury scribes has also been treated in passing by several of the great palaeographers, notably Neil Ker and T. A. M. Bishop, in surveys dealing with much broader subjects. In his *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest*, Ker notes that Bury St Edmunds was one of those places where English script continued to be written with little Norman influence after the Conquest,⁷¹ while Bishop examined the script of a late eleventh-century Bury gospel book and some Bury writs.⁷²

Scribal Comparanda and Book Production

In 1953 T. A. M. Bishop suggested that one of the hands of Pembroke 25 could also be seen at work in Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 2. 33 (1200), fols. i, ii, vi, and vii, and in Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 6 (S.C. 3567); unfortunately he did not specify to which of the two hands of Pembroke 25 he was referring.⁷³

The main part of Cambridge, University Library, Ff. 2. 33 is a thirteenth-century Bury St Edmunds cartulary. Among its flyleaves are two bifolia, one at each end of the manuscript, containing the *Concilium Africanum* of A.D. 424;⁷⁴ these are labelled fols. i–ii and vi–vii respectively. They are written in an elegant, smallish, and quite dense Anglo-Caroline minuscule, with a slight forward slant. Palaeographical dating would suggest that they came from a manuscript written in the late eleventh century or perhaps the early twelfth. Since they were used in the binding of the thirteenth-century cartulary, the original manuscript was probably dismantled at Bury St Edmunds by this date and was probably also written there.⁷⁵

Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 6 contains Augustine's *In Evangelium Iohannis* and part of Possidius's *Vita S. Augustini*.⁷⁶ This manuscript is similar in format to the flyleaves of CUL Ff. 2. 33: both are laid out in two long columns densely written on large pages. Bodleian e Mus. 6 was given the classmark A.8 by Henry of Kirkestede in the mid-fourteenth century and is probably to be identified as the volume called "Augustinus super Iohannem" in the late twelfth-century Bury library catalogue.⁷⁷

CUL Ff. 2. 33 and Bodleian e Mus. 6 appear to be the work of the same scribe, working at Bury St Edmunds at the end of the eleventh or very start of the twelfth century. However, neither of the hands of Pembroke 25 has the small neatness of the hand of the flyleaves in CUL Ff. 2. 33; the Pembroke 25 hands are mostly larger, thicker, and somewhat dishevelled. The characteristic aspect shared by Bodleian e Mus. 6 and the flyleaves of CUL Ff. 2. 33 is not found in Pembroke 25, and consequently I do not think that the hand found in Bodleian e Mus. 6 and the flyleaves of CUL Ff. 2. 33 recurs in Pembroke 25.

English-Style Script at Bury

Although Bishop's scribal identification is difficult to substantiate, CUL Ff. 2. 33 and Bodleian e Mus. 6 do provide excellent comparanda for the script of Pembroke 25. Other manuscripts from Bury at this time also show similar features. The habits of a copy of Abbo's *Passio S. Eadmundi* now in Copenhagen are similar, including the **r+a** ligature with descending **r** and "cc-a."⁷⁸ The script of a mid-eleventh-century gospel book known as the Bury Gospels shows a similar slightly dishevelled aspect and many similar habits.⁷⁹ Fragments of a copy of Solinus were written by a related Bury scribe.⁸⁰

English script continued to be written in Bury long after the Norman Conquest and was never entirely abandoned in so far as it was one of the influences on the typical twelfth-century script. Bury script of the late eleventh century tends to be quite large and densely spaced on the page, with the possibility that ascenders and descenders could share the same area.⁸¹ Backward-looking script-forms were common, with a round, striking, and exaggerated aspect. English-style script was standard at Bury St Edmunds in the late eleventh and early twelfth century, until an organized scriptorium was set up at Bury St Edmunds in the 1120s and 1130s, producing high-quality strictly disciplined work in the round proto-Gothic script typical of twelfth-century English manuscripts.⁸²

Importation of Books from France

In the second half of the eleventh century the Bury St Edmunds abbey library was augmented in a variety of ways. Books were certainly written there, but they were also imported from the Continent.

Ninth-Century French Manuscripts

The ninth century, a period that saw an almost complete collapse of Anglo-Saxon literary culture, was a golden age of manuscript production in France. A group of manuscripts written in ninth-century Francia was probably imported to Bury St Edmunds at this time. They survive as Cambridge, Pembroke College 17, 46 (fols. 82 and 83 only), 81, 83, 88, 91, and 108.⁸³ These

manuscripts are summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Ninth-Century French Manuscripts Imported to Bury

<i>MS</i>	<i>date and place of origin</i>	<i>classmark</i>	<i>catalogue entry</i>	<i>further Bury connection</i>
Pembroke College 17	s. ix med., Tours area	J.6	Ieronimus super Ysaïam	s. xiii in. Bury ownership-inscription
Pembroke College 46, fols. 82 & 83	s. ix/x, N. France	[A.222]	[fragments of sacramentary, in use as flyleaves]	
Pembroke College 81	s. ix 2/3, prob. S. France	B.282	Beda de templo et XXX questiones eiusdem in libro Regum	s. xiii in. Bury ownership-inscription
Pembroke College 83	s. ix med., Saint-Denis, Paris	B.287	Beda super Lucam	s. xi ex. added document about an Anglo-Scandinavian funeral-feast
Pembroke College 88	s. ix/x, Saint-Denis, Paris, or possibly England ⁸⁴	G.18	[not included; Laidcenn, excerpts from Gregory the Great, <i>Moralia in Job</i>]	s. xi ex. note on food rents probably written at Bury
Pembroke College 91	s. ix 1/3, N. France	J.3	Ieronimus super Psalterium	
Pembroke College 108	s. ix 2/3, East France	Fol.12	Edictum piissimi imperatoris Iustiniani	

Another manuscript probably imported to Bury at around this time survives only as fols. 3–4 of London, British Library, Royal 8. F. XIV. This is an early eleventh-century copy of Vergil's *Aeneid* with scholia, probably written in France. These two folios were in use as flyleaves by the time of Henry of Kirkestede, who gave the manuscript the classmark G.15. An entry in the late twelfth-century Bury catalogue reads *Virgilius .ij.*, and the Royal 8. F. XIV flyleaves could be the remnant of one of these two copies of Vergil.⁸⁵

Pembroke 23 and 24

Cambridge, Pembroke College 23 and 24 comprise a two-volume set of homilies written in France, perhaps at Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris, in the mid-eleventh century.⁸⁶ The manuscripts were labeled O.52 and O.54 by Henry of Kirkestede.⁸⁷ Both contain an early thirteenth-century Bury St Edmunds ownership inscription.⁸⁸ They are probably to be identified with the entries *Omeliarium estiuale* and *Lectioarium sanctorum* in the late twelfth-century Bury library catalogue,⁸⁹ and they both contain an early thirteenth-century Bury St Edmunds ownership inscription.⁹⁰ Since together they cover only half the year, and since Kirkestede's classmarks are not numerically sequential, it is possible that there were once another two volumes to cover the other six months of the year, perhaps labelled O.51 and O.53.

Pembroke 24 contains an added sermon, probably written at Saint-Denis, relating to the anniversary in 1050 of the viewing of the relics of St Dionysius, the eponymous saint of that house.⁹¹ A further addition on fols. 374va–375va, a homily on the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, is written in black ink, contrasting strongly with the light brown ink used in the main parts of these two volumes. The hand is round, neat, and quite large, on drypoint rulings in two columns of twenty-seven lines each. (These rulings were probably made by the scribe of the previous material, and the size of the script was to some extent dictated by them.) The script of this added Assumption homily suggests that it was written at Bury St Edmunds at the end of the eleventh century. These two additions show that the manuscript moved from Saint-Denis to Bury St Edmunds in the second half of the eleventh century; it was presumably brought by Abbot Baldwin, perhaps at the same time that he imported the other French, predominantly ninth-century, manuscripts which moved to Bury at this time.

Links between Pembroke 23 and 24 and Pembroke 25

Pembroke 23 and 24 are roughly the same size as Pembroke 25. They have a very similar writing area, although Pembroke 23 and 24 are written in two columns, whereas Pembroke 25 is written in a single text-block on each page. These similarities in format and content suggest that Pembroke 25 may have been written as an addition to a multi-volume set of homilies which had been imported from France by Baldwin.⁹²

It is clear that the Homiliary of Saint-Père de Chartres (the homiliary of which Pembroke 25 is the best surviving representative) was used widely by Anglo-Saxon homiliarists before the Norman Conquest.⁹³ However, the circumstances of the production of Pembroke 25, during or soon after the abbacy of Baldwin, in the atmosphere of intellectual renaissance resulting from his activities, and probably to be added to a pre-existing multi-volume French set of homilies, raises the possibility that the text it contains represents a reimportation of this particular homiliary to England, rather than being a textual descendant of the pre-Conquest English manuscripts.

The Added Notes and the Pre-Conquest Past at Bury

A Note on fol. 181v concerning the Expulsion of Clerics from Bury St Edmunds

In his catalogue entry for Pembroke 25, M. R. James transcribed what he could see of a partly illegible note added on fol. 181v. By adjusting the color spectra of a digital image of this page, it has been possible to expand his transcription somewhat. An improved transcription reads:

- 1 Anno ab incarnatione domini millesimo uicesimo a passione glor
- 2 iosi regis et martiris aedmundi centesimo quinquagesimo
- 3 regnante chnutone piissimo [...] olizantur monachi aput
- 4 scm aedmundum [...]atis clericis preficitur abbas Uuius
- 5 uir prudens et modestus.

From its script, a Caroline minuscule of post-Conquest aspect but with a number of English features, this note cannot have been added long after the manuscript itself was written, in the early

twelfth century at the latest. The note talks about the foundation of Bury St Edmunds. A similar short note is found in an annal produced at the time of Abbot Baldwin, which is found as an addition in several important Bury manuscripts (see p. 13 above).

The Added Note on fol. 1r concerning King Henry II

Another interesting chronological note is added on fol. 1r (*image*) which reads:

Ab origine uero mundi *secundum* ebraicam ueritatem . ũ . c^o . vi^o .
 Anno uerbi incarnati . m^o . c^o . l^o . iiii^o .
 Passionis uero ipsius ; m^o . c^o . xx^o .
 A passione *sanc̄h* eadmundi ; cc^o . lxxx^o iiii^o .
 A translatione ipsius ; lx^o .
 Capte Anglie ; lxxx^o v^o iiii^o .
 Regnauit *Willelmus* rex annos .xxi.
Willelmus secundus annos .xiii.
 Henricus rex annos .xxx. v .
 Stephanus rex annos . x^o viiii^o .

This note is written in a very thick black script, a heavy Gothic Quadrata with initial letters of each line written in red ink. (The initial of the second *William* at the beginning of line 8 is the exception to this general pattern; the line is slightly indented and the **W** is black picked out in red, which suggests that this part of the note was meant to be read as a continuation of the line above about William Rufus's father.) The script suggests a date in the second half of the twelfth century, though a later date is not impossible. The date to which the note refers is 1154.

This note is followed, after a few blank lines, by a deed in a twelfth-century documentary hand, a very much smaller and lower-grade script. This deals with the agreement made between King Stephen and his nephew Henry, son of the Empress Matilda, to the effect that Henry should succeed him on the throne after his death, rather than Stephen's son William. The agreement was made in late 1153, and held sufficiently that Henry succeeded as Henry II in December 1154. Although these two notes are written in very different hands (not necessarily by different scribes), their disposal on the page together and their linked contents suggest that they should be viewed as one campaign of addition.

The East of England and the Anglo-Saxon House of Wessex

The theme of these notes is clearly the celebration of the accession of Henry II to the throne of England. This is an interesting thing to see in the context of Bury St Edmunds, as it suggests a particular attitude to the Anglo-Saxon past. Henry II was the son of the Empress Matilda, and through her mother Edith/Matilda he was descended from St Margaret of Scotland, wife of Malcolm called Canmore, who was the daughter of Edward the Exile, son of King Edmund Ironside, son of Æthelred the Unready. At the Norman Conquest, Edgar the Ætheling, the only surviving son of Edward the Exile and sister of Margaret, was the last descendant in the male line of Alfred the Great, Edgar the Peacemaker, and the other great English kings of the house of Wessex. He was briefly declared King of England after Harold's death at Hastings — the new abbot of

Peterborough came to Edgar the Ætheling to have his appointment confirmed at this time. However, by Christmas he was no longer seen as a viable alternative to the Conqueror, and his chief supporter, Ealdred, archbishop of York, had switched his backing to William. Edgar was only about fourteen years old, and William pensioned him off rather than treating him as a continuing threat. It was when the family fled to Scotland a few years later that Margaret became the unwilling bride of King Malcolm, and it was through their six sons and two daughters that the Anglo-Saxon line was kept alive. William the Conqueror died in 1088, leaving the throne to his second son, William Rufus. On the unexpected death of the latter in 1100, Henry I acted quickly to seize the English throne, while his eldest brother, Robert Curthose, was away on crusade. Henry was the only one of William the Conqueror's sons born in England after his father's coronation, and at his coronation he swore to uphold the laws of Edward the Confessor against the depredations made by his brother William Rufus. Within a few months of his accession he had married Edith/Matilda of Scotland, the eldest daughter of Margaret and Malcolm called Canmore.⁹⁴ In recording this event, the *Peterborough Chronicle* refers to the bride as *of þan rihtan anglelandes kyne kynne* ("of the rightful royal family of England"). The marriage was certainly a pro-English move on Henry's part. The Norman nobles of his court certainly interpreted it this way, and mocked them by calling them "Godric and Godgifu," implying that they had gone native. Their only son was known as William Ætheling, combining a Norman name with an English title. He was seen as fulfilling the prophecy which Edward the Confessor made on his deathbed, that a green branch would be split three furlongs from its root before they were rejoined; the three furlongs were interpreted as the three Norman kings William I, William II, and Henry I. However, William Ætheling's death in the wreck of the White Ship in 1120 destroyed these hopes. Henry I extracted from his nobles an oath of loyalty to his remaining legitimate daughter, Matilda, but after his death in 1135 his nephew Stephen was crowned instead, and the country was split by civil war. (Stephen's wife's mother was another of Margaret's daughters.) The eventual agreement that Matilda's son would inherit instead of Stephen's represented the end of the Anarchy. Ailred of Rievaulx, who had grown up at the court of David I of Scotland, Margaret's youngest son, wrote a history for Henry II on his accession, detailing Henry's Anglo-Saxon ancestry. The three furlongs' removal of the green branch from its root could now be interpreted as the three generations of William the Conqueror, Henry I, and Matilda, rather than as three kings.

The East of England was strongly associated with loyalty to the Anglo-Saxon royal family in the post-Conquest period. The regional revolts in the late 1060s, the activities of Hereward the Wake at Peterborough and Ely, and the bride-ale rebellion of 1075 helped make the East one of the hardest places for William to subdue. Bury St Edmunds was relatively unaffected by the martial aspects of these activities, but there are reasons to believe that it was still culturally very much attached to the Anglo-Saxon past. Christina, daughter of Edward the Exile and sister of Margaret and Edgar the Ætheling, and Margaret's son Edgar, king of Scotland, were both commemorated in obits added to the Bury Psalter, now Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 12. (These commemorations parallel the obits of the family of Edmund Ironside which were written into the calendar of the Crowland Psalter when it was made, probably in the late 1050s or early 1060s.⁹⁵) Bury certainly valued its Anglo-Saxon past when laying claim to lands and religious prestige (see the discussion above). The note on fol. 1r talks of time since the *captae anglie*, the capture or seizure of England, and breaks this time down into the reigns of the individual kings; this language has a pejorative implication. The addition of this material celebrating the accession of Henry II involved an alteration to the physical structure of Pembroke 25 by adding at least one extra folio, which would probably have necessitated its disbinding. The impulse to add this material to a holy book suggests a

desire to celebrate the return of a king descended from the Anglo-Saxon royal line, and so connected with their own great patron St Edmund king and martyr, suggesting that a sense of Anglo-Saxon nationalism survived well into the second half of the twelfth century at Bury St Edmunds.

¹Notes

Richard H. Rouse and Mary A. Rouse, eds., *Henry of Kirkstede. Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocryphis*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 11 (London, 2004), pp. xliii–xliv, list Pembroke College 17, 18, 24 (Latin homilies), 25, 26, 47, 49, 59, 84, and 88, and Oxford, Bodleian Library, e Mus. 31, to which can be added Pembroke College 23 (Latin homilies) and 81, London, British Library, Cotton Julius E. VII (Old English homilies), and no doubt many others.

² Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkstede*.

³ Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkstede*, pp. xliii–li, esp. xliv.

⁴ Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkstede*, p. xliv.

⁵ Richard Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey: The Lost Catalogue of Henry of Kirkstead,” in *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture, Archaeology and Economy*, ed. Antonia Gransden, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 20 (London, 1998), pp. 204–18.

⁶ Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library,” pp. 206–7.

⁷ Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library,” p. 213.

⁸ John Blatchly, *The Town Library of Ipswich Provided for the Use of the Town Preachers in 1599: A History and Catalogue* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 1–8.

⁹ Blatchly, *The Town Library of Ipswich*.

¹⁰ Matthew Wren’s List of Benefactors to Pembroke College, 1617, north locked case; see M. R. James and E. H. Minns, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge, with a Hand List of the Printed Books to the Year 1500* (Cambridge, 1905), p. 280.

¹¹ James and Minns, *Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. viii–xi.

¹² Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. Dáibhí Ó Cróinin and David Ganz (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 112–27.

¹³ On English Caroline minuscule, see T. A. M. Bishop, “Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts Part III: MSS. Connected with Exeter,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2 (1954–58), 192–99; Bishop, “Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts Part VII: The Early Minuscule of Christ Church Canterbury,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 3 (1959–63), 413–23; Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule* (Oxford, 1971); D. N. Dumville, *English Caroline Script and Monastic History: Studies in Benedictinism, A.D. 950–1030* (Woodbridge, 1993); and Rebecca Rushforth, “English Caroline Minuscule before the Norman Conquest,” in *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Volume I: c.600–1100*, ed. Richard Gameson (Cambridge, forthcoming).

¹⁴ Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, p. 138.

¹⁵ On Eadwig Basan, see Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule*; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*; T. A. Heslop, “The Production of *de luxe* Manuscripts and the Patronage of King Cnut and Queen Emma,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 19 (1990), 151–95; Richard Pfaff, “Eadui Basan: Scriptorum Princeps?,” in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Carola Hicks (Stamford, 1992), pp. 267–83; Richard Gameson, “The Colophon of the Eadwig Gospels,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2002), 201–22; Richard Gameson, *The Scribe Speaks? Colophons in Early English Manuscripts*, H. M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 12 (Cambridge, 2002); Susan Rankin, “An Early Eleventh-Century Missal Fragment Copied by Eadwig Basan: Bodleian Library, MS. Lat. liturg. d. 3, fols. 4–5,” *Bodleian Library Record* 18 (2004), 220–52; Rebecca Rushforth, “The Prodigal Fragment: Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College 734/782a,” *Anglo-Saxon*

England 30 (2001), 137–44; and Rushforth, “English Caroline Minuscule.”

¹⁶ On the Exeter scriptorium, 1050–1072, see E. M. Drage, “Bishop Leofric and the Exeter Cathedral Chapter, 1050–1072: A Reassessment of the Manuscript Evidence” (unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford, 1978); and Elaine Treharne, “Producing a Library in Late Anglo-Saxon England: Exeter, 1050–1072,” *Review of English Studies* n.s. 54 (2003), 155–72.

¹⁷ While Neil Ker referred to this form as “tall **a**,” David Dumville has used the term “tall **a**” to refer to the **a** which is simply higher than minim-height; to avoid confusion I prefer to use a term which draws attention to the characteristic aspect of this form, given by the emphatic top-stroke which is particularly dense on the right-hand side while leaning out to the left of the letter.

¹⁸ N. R. Ker, “The Beginnings of Salisbury Cathedral Library,” in *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to Richard William Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson (Oxford, 1976), pp. 23–49, at 28.

¹⁹ D. N. Dumville, “A Note on the Post-Conquest Additions,” in *An Eleventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Illustrated Miscellany: British Library Cotton Tiberius B. V, Part I, together with Leaves from British Library Cotton Nero D. II*, ed. P. McGurk, D. N. Dumville, M. R. Godden, and A. Knock, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 21 (Copenhagen, 1983), pp. 104–6, at 105.

²⁰ See Rebecca Rushforth, “The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 2002).

²¹ Paul Saenger, *Space between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading* (Stanford, 1997), pp. 57–58.

²² See Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England. I: c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1996), pp. 380–403. The poet John Lydgate was also a Bury monk; see David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1948–59), II, 273–75.

²³ In addition to controlling large estates, the abbot of Bury sat in parliament: see Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, II, 281–82 and 304. For Abbot Samson, friend of Hubert Walter, the influential archbishop of Canterbury during the reigns of Richard I and John, see *The Chronicle of Jocelin of Brakelond, Concerning the Acts of Samson, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Edmund*, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler (London, 1949).

²⁴ Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, II, 350.

²⁵ Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, II, 270–72, and III, 415.

²⁶ The will of Ealdorman Ælfgar, datable 946 × 951, leaves land *into Beodricheswrthe to seynt Eadmundes stowe*: see P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks (London, 1968), no. 1483; *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Whitelock (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 6–9 and 103–8 (no. 2). The will of Bishop Theodred, also datable 946 × 951, refers to *sancte Eadmundes kirke*, although it does not specify where that church is located: Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 1526; *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, ed. and trans. Whitelock, pp. 2–5 and 99–103 (no. 1).

²⁷ Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 1213; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, p. 35 n. 132; *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, ed. J. M. Kemble, 6 vols. (London, 1839–48), II, 379–80 (no. 491). The Bury St Edmunds archive of Anglo-Saxon charters is in the process of being edited by Katherine Lowe and Sarah Foot for the British Academy series of Anglo-Saxon Charters; in the interim I have taken this text, and the date of 963 rather than 962, from London, British Library, Additional 45951, fols. 1v–2r, which although written in the fifteenth century seems to have been taken from an authentic now-lost single sheet.

²⁸ Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 507; *Codex Diplomaticus*, ed. Kemble, II, 258–59 (no. 404); Cyril Hart, *The Early Charters of Eastern England* (Leicester, 1966), pp. 54–58 (no. 74); Dorothy Whitelock, review of Hart, *The Early Charters of Eastern England*, in *English Historical Review* 84 (1969), 112–15, at 113; Hart, *The Early Charters of Northern England and the North Midlands* (Leicester, 1975), p. 385; Hart, “The East Anglian Chronicle,” *Journal of Medieval History* 7 (1981), 249–82, at 277; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, pp. 35–36.

- ²⁹ Though see note 27; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 1213, seems to survive in a copy in imitative script taken directly from a now-lost tenth-century original.
- ³⁰ Ælfric's *Life of Edmund*, ed. and trans. W. W. Skeat, *Ælfric's Lives of Saints*, 2 vols., EETS o.s. 76, 82, 94, 114 (Oxford, 1881–1900), I, 314–35, written in the late tenth century, is on the whole a direct translation of Abbo's *Passio*, and his comments on Edmund's resting-place cannot therefore be interpreted as implying disapproval for the community there, as has been suggested (oddly enough, in a volume about the importance of source-study for understanding texts): see Patrizia Lendinara, "Abbo of Fleury," in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture. Volume One: Abbo of Fleury, Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, and Acta Sanctorum*, ed. Frederick M. Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, Paul E. Szarmach, and E. Gordon Whatley (Kalamazoo, 2001), p. 4.
- ³¹ Bury St Edmunds is mentioned in the E-version of the *Chronicle* (from Peterborough) under the year 1046 (*Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Charles Plummer, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1892–99), I, 166), but this manuscript is written in one hand down to the annal for 1121.
- ³² "De sanctis," ed. Felix Liebermann, *Die Heiligen Englands: Angelsächsisch und Lateinisch* (Hannover, 1889), pp. 13–14.
- ³³ *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Plummer, I, 162. See Pauline Stafford, *Queen Emma and Queen Edith: Queenship and Women's Power in Eleventh-Century England* (Oxford, 1997), pp. 248–53.
- ³⁴ *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, ed. and trans. F. E. Harmer (Manchester, 1952), pp. 154–55 (no. 9). See R. H. C. Davis, "The Liberties of Bury St Edmunds," *English Historical Review* 24 (1909), 417–31.
- ³⁵ *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, ed. and trans. A. J. Robertson, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 192–201 and 440–47 (no. 104). See below, pp. 14–19.
- ³⁶ This Leofstan is not the abbot, since a Leofstan is said earlier in this document to have given the same donation to the house as abbot Leofstan, except for ten cheeses.
- ³⁷ R. H. C. Davis, "The Monks of St Edmund 1021–1148," *History* 40 (1955), 227–39.
- ³⁸ On Baldwin and his time at Bury, see Antonia Gransden, "Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065–1097," *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies* 4 (1981), 65–76 and 187–95; Gransden, "The Legends and Traditions concerning the Origins of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds," *English Historical Review* 100 (1985), 1–24; Gransden, "The Alleged Incorruption of the Body of St Edmund, King and Martyr," *Antiquaries Journal* 74 (1995), 135–68; and Gransden, "The Composition and Authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi* attributed to 'Hermann the Archdeacon,'" *Journal of Medieval Latin* 5 (1995), 1–52.
- ³⁹ Simon Keynes, "Regenbald the Chancellor," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 10 (1987), 185–222, and "Giso, Bishop of Wells," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 19 (1996), 203–71.
- ⁴⁰ Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 297 (S.C. 2468), p. 370; edited by R. R. Darlington *et al.*, *Chronicle of John of Worcester*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1995–), II, 616–53, at 646.
- ⁴¹ Keynes, "Regenbald the Chancellor" and "Giso, Bishop of Wells."
- ⁴² Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, nos. 1105 and 1028 respectively.
- ⁴³ Simon Keynes, *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, Anglo-Saxon Charters Supplementary Series 1 (London, 1991), no. 20; *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, ed. and trans. Harmer, no. 55.
- ⁴⁴ Keynes, *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 21; see *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, ed. and trans. Harmer, pp. 538–39.
- ⁴⁵ See Susan J. Ridyard, "Condigna Veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 9 (1986), 179–206.
- ⁴⁶ See Dumville, *English Caroline Minuscule*, p. 38 n. 156; and Rushforth, "The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-

Century Manuscripts,” pp. 119–121 and 178–84.

⁴⁷ Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 980, surviving as a purported original from the last third of the eleventh century, now King’s Lynn, Corporation Manuscripts, KL/C2/61; reproduced by Keynes, *Facsimiles of Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 33, and by Lord Francis Hervey, *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi: The Garland of Saint Edmund, King and Martyr* (New York, 1907), opposite p. 596.

⁴⁸ Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters*, no. 995, surviving as a purported original from the late eleventh century, now King’s Lynn, Corporation Manuscripts, Ae. 35; reproduced in Hervey, *Corolla Sancti Eadmundi*, opposite p. 598.

⁴⁹ *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab Condita Ecclesia ad Annum post Christum Natum MCXCVIII*, ed. Ph. Jaffé, 2nd ed., rev. Wilhelm Wattenbach *et al.*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885–88), I, 587 (no. 4692 [3462]).

⁵⁰ *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acta of William I*, ed. David Bates (Oxford, 1998), p. 210 (no. 40); *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, ed. and trans. Harmer, p. 142.

⁵¹ London, British Library, Cotton Augustus II. 25. See *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, ed. Bates, pp. 201–9; and Richard Sharpe, “The Use of Writs in the Eleventh Century,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2003), 247–91.

⁵² Helmut Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 241 (Tempe, Ariz., 2001), no. 413; Elzbieta Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts, 900–1066*, A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles 2 (London, 1976), no. 75; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, pp. 33–34 n. 117; R. M. Thomson, “The Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” *Speculum* 47 (1972), 617–45, at 625 n. 39; Elizabeth Parker McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds in the Twelfth Century* (New York, 1986), p. 30; Thomas Ohlgren, *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration: Photographs of Sixteen Manuscripts with Descriptions and Index* (Kalamazoo, 1992), pll. 10.1–10.15 (no. 10); Rushforth, “The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts,” pp. 24–30.

⁵³ Hermann, *Liber de miraculis S. Edmundi*, ed. Thomas Arnold, *Memorials of St Edmund’s Abbey*, 3 vols. (London, 1890–96) I, 26–92. See the discussion by Gransden, “The Composition and Authorship of the *De miraculis Sancti Eadmundi*.”

⁵⁴ I am extremely grateful to Dr Tom Licence, who has generously discussed with me his forthcoming edition and translation of this text; his work looks set to open this very interesting material to a much wider scholarly audience.

⁵⁵ See also Pamela Z. Blum, “The Saint Edmund Cycle in the Crypt at Saint-Denis,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 57–68.

⁵⁶ These manuscripts are now Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, latin 2621, fols. 84–92; and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Digby 39 (S.C. 1640), fols. 24–39. They have both survived by being bound into larger hagiographical collections. The Paris manuscript has no more specific provenance than France, but Digby 39 seems to have been at Abingdon in the Middle Ages.

⁵⁷ D. C. Douglas, ed., *Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds*, British Academy Records of Social and Economic History 8 (London, 1932).

⁵⁸ See E. C. Fernie, “The Romanesque Church of Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 1–15; and Stephen Heywood, “Aspects of the Romanesque Church of Bury St Edmunds Abbey in Their Regional Context,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 16–21.

⁵⁹ London, British Library, Harley 2278, fol. 115v.

⁶⁰ Fernie, “The Romanesque Church”; Bernard Gauthiez, “The Planning of the Town of Bury St

Edmunds: A Probable Norman Origin,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 81–97.

⁶¹ David Knowles, Christopher Nugent, Lawrence Brooke, and Vera C. M. London, *The Heads of Religious Houses, England and Wales. I. 940–1216*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 2001), p. 32.

⁶² In Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 197, fol. 107 (Michael Lapidge, “Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England,” in *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Basic Readings*, ed. Mary P. Richards (New York, 1994), pp. 87–167, at 123–24 (no. VII)); and in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D. 2. 14 (S.C. 2698), fol. 173r (Lapidge, “Surviving Booklists,” pp. 146–49 (no. XII)).

⁶³ R. H. Rouse, “Bostonus Buriensis and the Author of the *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiae*,” *Speculum* 41 (1966), 471–99; Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library.”

⁶⁴ Rouse, “Bostonus Buriensis”; Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library.”

⁶⁵ M. R. James, *On the Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury* (Cambridge, 1895), and “Bury St. Edmunds Manuscripts,” *English Historical Review* 41 (1926), 251–60. See also N. R. Ker, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, 2nd ed., Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 3 (London, 1964), pp. xviii–xix and 16–22.

⁶⁶ R. M. Thomson, “Bury St Edmunds Manuscripts: A Descriptive Bibliography” (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1969), “The Library and Archives of Bury St Edmunds Abbey” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Sydney, 1974), “The Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” and *The Bury Bible* (Woodbridge, 2001).

⁶⁷ Richard Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library,” and *English Benedictine Libraries: The Shorter Catalogues*, Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 4 (London, 1996), pp. 43–98.

⁶⁸ Teresa Webber, “The Provision of Books for Bury St Edmunds Abbey in the 11th and 12th Centuries,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 186–93.

⁶⁹ Antonia Gransden, “Some Manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey: Exhibition Catalogue,” in *Bury St Edmunds*, ed. Gransden, pp. 228–85.

⁷⁰ Elizabeth Parker McLachlan, “The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds in the Third and Fourth Decades of the Twelfth Century: Books in Three Related Hands and Their Decoration,” *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978), 328–48, and *The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds*.

⁷¹ N. R. Ker, *English Manuscripts in the Century after the Norman Conquest* (Oxford, 1960), pp. 22 and 35, and *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1957), p. xxvi.

⁷² T. A. M. Bishop, “Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts Part II,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 2 (1954–58), 185–92, at 185–87, and *English Caroline Minuscule*, pp. xi–xxiv; and T. A. M. Bishop and Pierre Chaplais, eds., *Facsimiles of English Royal Writs to A.D. 1100, Presented to Vivian Hunter Galbraith* (Oxford, 1957), p. xvii (nos. 1 and 2).

⁷³ T. A. M. Bishop, “Notes on Cambridge Manuscripts Part I,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 1 (1949–53), 432–41, at 434.

⁷⁴ Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 5; Richard Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066–1130)* (Oxford, 1998), no. 21.

⁷⁵ This manuscript is no longer in its original binding, so it is possible that these flyleaves were bound with the main part of the manuscript at a later date.

⁷⁶ Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 618; Gameson, *The Manuscripts*, no. 717.

⁷⁷ Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library,” pp. 208 and 213, and *English Benedictine Libraries*, p. 79 (B13.188).

⁷⁸ Copenhagen, Kongelige Biblioteket, G. K. S. 1588 4°.

⁷⁹ London, British Library, Harley 76. Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 413; Temple, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*, no. 75; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, pp. 33–34 n. 117; Thomson, “The Library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” p. 625 n. 39; McLachlan, *The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds*, p. 30; Ohlgren, *Anglo-Saxon Textual Illustration*, pl. 10.1–10.15 (no. 10).

⁸⁰ See J. A. Guy, “A Lost Manuscript of Solinus: Five Fragments from Bury St Edmunds in the Library of Clare College, Cambridge,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 6 (1972–76), 65–67.

⁸¹ See Rebecca Rushforth and Nicholas Orchard, “A Lost Eleventh-Century Missal from Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” *Bodleian Library Record* 18 (2005), 565–76.

⁸² McLachlan, “The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds,” and *The Scriptorium of Bury St Edmunds*.

⁸³ Although Cambridge, Pembroke College, 308, a late ninth-century Rheims copy of Hrabanus Maurus’s commentary on the Pauline epistles, is not from Bury as it has certain late medieval provenance at Ely: see James and Minns, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 275–76. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 (S.C. 14853) was also written in ninth-century Francia but seems to have travelled there via Wessex: Simon Keynes, “King Æthelstan’s Books,” in *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies Presented to Peter Clemoes on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Helmut Gneuss (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 143–201, at 144 and pl. I. See also F. A. Rella, “Continental Manuscripts Acquired for English Centers in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries: A Preliminary Checklist,” *Anglia* 98 (1980), 107–16.

⁸⁴ Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 135; Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen*, Vol. I (Wiesbaden, 1998), p. 183. Cf. Bishop, *English Caroline Minuscule*, pp. xii, xxv, 5, and 18; Dumville, *English Caroline Script*, p. 78; N. R. Ker, “The English Manuscripts of the *Moralia* of Gregory the Great,” in *Kunsthistorische Forschungen Otto Pächt zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, ed. A. Rosenauer and G. Weber (Salzburg, 1972), pp. 77–89, at 77 n. 4; and H. A. McKee, “St Augustine’s Abbey, Canterbury: Book-Production in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries” (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1997), pp. 96–109 and 120–22.

⁸⁵ Sharpe, *English Benedictine Libraries*, p. 70 (B13.107). The other copy might be represented by palimpsested flyleaves now in London, College of Arms, Arundel 30; see Gneuss, *Handlist*, no. 503.

⁸⁶ Webber, “The Provision of Books for Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” p. 188; James and Minns, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 20–25; Gransden, “Some Manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” p. 254 and pl. XLVA; Gneuss, *Handlist*, nos. 129–30. For plates showing eleventh-century script from Saint-Germain-des-Prés, see Yves Deslandres, “Les manuscrits décorés au XI^e siècle à Saint-Germain-des-Prés par Ingelard,” *Scriptorium* 9 (1955), 3–16; and A. W. Robertson, *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis: Images of Ritual and Music in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1991).

⁸⁷ Sharpe, “Reconstructing the Medieval Library,” p. 213. Kirkestede also added contents lists; see Rouse, “*Bostonus Buriensis*,” p. 490.

⁸⁸ James and Minns, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 20 and 22.

⁸⁹ Sharpe, *English Benedictine Libraries*, p. 70 (B13.115 and 114).

⁹⁰ James and Minns, *A Descriptive Catalogue*, pp. 20 and 22.

⁹¹ Gransden, “Some Manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey,” p. 254.

⁹² See, however, D. N. Dumville, “On the Dating of Some Late Anglo-Saxon Liturgical Manuscripts,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 10 (1991–95), 40–57, at 41.

⁹³ See James E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary Used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King’s College London Medieval Studies (London, 1987).

⁹⁴ See Rebecca Rushforth, *St Margaret's Gospel-book: The Favourite Book of an Eleventh-Century Queen of Scots* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 15–25 and 85–106.

⁹⁵ Simon Keynes, “The Crowland Psalter and the Sons of King Edmund Ironside,” *Bodleian Library Record* 11 (1982–85), 359–70.