

## LANFRANC'S MONASTIC CONSTITUTIONS.

WHEN I was asked to review *The Bosworth Psalter* by a too kindly editor, who knew that I was much interested in certain points which had been raised in this remarkable study,<sup>1</sup> I felt that though most of it lay beyond my range I might be able to call attention to some matters of detail, which I had had occasion to look into, as they happened to bear on the monastic history of Westminster. But I soon found that I could not do justice to the book, as I knew nothing of mediaeval psalters or hymnology. Abbot Gasquet must have suffered neglect at my hands; and to Mr Edmund Bishop, who has written by far the largest portion of the work, I should wish to remain in the position of a grateful disciple: indeed I could not review him without his own aid in the task. I had, however, pitched on a footnote of his, which I was inclined to dispute; and I had caught at a misprint in regard to Osbert of Clare, one of our priors, about whom I had found some new facts. In the issue the editor has commuted the half-promise of a review in favour of a somewhat elaborate note. If the form of it seems unduly personal, I can only plead in excuse the way in which it has grown up, and the difficulty of presenting the matter otherwise without seeming to speak with authority where I am only a keenly interested observer.

It has hitherto been generally held that Archbishop Lanfranc drew up a code of regulations for all the Benedictine monasteries of England. These regulations were printed by Reyner in his *Apostolatus Benedictinorum* (1626), with a prefatory letter from Lanfranc to Henry, the prior of his own cathedral monastery. In Reyner's edition they were entitled *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti*; and they were again printed in 1737, by Wilkins (*Concilia* i 328), with the heading *Constitutiones Lanfranci archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*. No one, so far as I am aware, has

<sup>1</sup> *The Bosworth Psalter*: an account of a manuscript formerly belonging to O. Turville-Petre, Esq., of Bosworth Hall, now Addit. MS 37517 at the British Museum: by Abbot Gasquet and Edmund Bishop. George Bell & Sons, 1908.

hitherto questioned the accuracy or the propriety of Reyner's title, even when attention has been called to the fact that the work was primarily addressed to the monks of Christ Church.<sup>1</sup> Mr Edmund Bishop, however, in one of his *obiter dicta* throws this title almost angrily away, as though it had imposed on the learned world too long. The matter may seem a small one, but it is of graver importance than would at first sight appear. For it concerns the whole spirit and method of the Norman reform of the English Church after the Conquest. But whether the point be large or small, it ought if possible to be settled; and it cannot be settled without a somewhat elaborate discussion of details.

First, then, let us hear Mr Edmund Bishop. In speaking of these regulations of Lanfranc, on p. 63, he describes them as 'the Constitutions which he drew up expressly for observance by his own community of the Canterbury cathedral monastery': and he appends the following note:

By a mischance these were printed by the first editor under the title 'Decreta Lanfranci pro Ordine S. Benedicti' (see Reyner's *Apostolatus Benedictinorum* part iii p. 211); and our antiquaries, etc. thus started on a wrong track have generally persevered therein until now (see e. g. the *Dictionary of National Biography* under 'Lanfranc'), although in the *Concilia* Wilkins pointed to the real state of the case which is indeed made clear in Lanfranc's own preface.

As I had myself quite recently spoken of 'the Constitutions drawn up for all Benedictine monasteries in England by Lanfranc at the end of the eleventh century',<sup>2</sup> and had not been brought to a better mind by the mere fact that Wilkins entitles them *Constitutiones Lanfranci archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*, or by his brief and inaccurate footnote,<sup>3</sup> I ventured to write to Mr Bishop

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Böhmer's elaborate work, *Kirche u. Staat in England u. in der Normandie im XI. u. XII. Jahrhundert* pp. 102, 110.

<sup>2</sup> *The MSS of Westminster Abbey* (Robinson and James, Camb. Univ. Press) p. 1: but see supplementary note on p. 104. As I am a *tiro* in these matters, I confess that I have since noticed with a certain feeling of satisfaction that Dr James himself in his *magnum opus* on the *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* speaks of them as 'promulgated for the use of English Benedictines in general' (p. xxix).

<sup>3</sup> In which he refers the Constitutions conjecturally to the third year of Lanfranc's primacy, as the year in which, according to William of Malmesbury, he curbed the insolence of the Canterbury monks. Unfortunately for this conjecture Henry the prior did not begin his rule before 1077.

and plead the following points in defence of the commonly accepted view :

1. The express statement in Reyner *Tractatus* 2 p. 117, regarding the manuscript from which the copy printed in his Appendix was drawn : 'in illo libro hic est titulus : *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti.*'

2. The use of the designation 'abbot' throughout the Constitutions, although Christ Church was under a prior—a use for which Lanfranc apologizes in his prefatory letter, and which seemed to indicate that he meant his work to have a wider circulation.

3. The fact that Paul, the nephew of Lanfranc, is stated to have introduced these constitutions at St Albans on becoming Abbot there.<sup>1</sup>

4. The great probability that they were in force at Rochester, where monks were introduced by Lanfranc himself.<sup>2</sup>

5. The fact that these Constitutions underlie the Westminster

<sup>1</sup> For St Albans our authority is Matthew Paris († 1259) in his *Vitae Abbatum*, which was embodied in the later *Gesta Abbatum* (Rolls ed. i). Of the *Vitae* there seems to be a shorter and a longer form, and the first of the passages cited below alone belongs to what appears to be the earlier draft. The *Vitae* have an earlier document underlying them, but we cannot trace it with sufficient distinctness to say whether the first passage is thence derived.

1. (i 52). Iste quoque Paulus abbas, vir religiosus et eleganter litteratus, et in observantia ordinis regularis rigidus et prudens, totius monasticae religionis normam (quam iam olim tam praelatorum quam subditorum remissioris vitae illecebrosa voluptas eliminaverat) caute et paulatim, ne repentina mutatio tumultum generaret, reformavit ; et facta est ecclesia sancti Albani quasi schola religionis et disciplinariae observantiae per totum regnum Angliae. attulerat namque secum consuetudines Lanfranci et statuta monastica a domino papa merito approbata conscripta : unde odor bonae famae huius ecclesiae Romanam curiam et remota regna illustrando pervolvit, etc.

2. (i 58). Ad cumulum autem laudis eius adiciendum est, quod consuetudines approbatas et approbandas, auctoritate Lanfranci quondam Beccensis ecclesiae monachi, in ecclesia sancti Albani, eliminatis antiquis reprobandis, constituit observari : unde bono odore famae haec ecclesia totam replevit regionem, et facta est schola aliarum magistralis.

3. (i 61). *Nota pro Consuetudinibus.* Hic quoque [sc. Anselmus archiepiscopus] consuetudines, quas transmisit scriptas Lanfrancus abbati Paulo, approbavit et conservari persuasit : quas qui videre desiderat in Consuetudinario (scilicet in fine, et in minori volumine quod additum est maiori) scriptas poterit invenire : et est libellus ille idem quem Lanfrancus scripsit et Anselmus legit et approbavit.

It is clear that the first and second of these passages were not intended to stand permanently in the same book : and it is evident from the third passage that Lanfranc's *Consuetudines* were quite obsolete when Matthew Paris wrote.

<sup>2</sup> For Rochester and other monasteries see *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls ed.) ii 5, 9, 12, 21.

Customary of Abbot Ware (end of s. xiii); so that it may fairly be assumed that they were introduced either by Abbot Vitalis whom Lanfranc had helped to bring from Bernay, or by Abbot Gilbert Crispin who had been Lanfranc's pupil at Bec.

6. The intrinsic probability that such a code of rules was intended to go with the new Norman abbots, whom the king at the archbishop's advice was sending to all parts of the country.<sup>1</sup>

7. The precedent for England of the *Concordia Regularis* of St Dunstan's days, which sought to introduce a uniform rule a hundred years before.

There is a kind of criticism by instinct—it is in reality the fruit of intimate and prolonged acquaintance with the details and surroundings of a subject—which defies obstacles and seems to the less experienced to fly in the face of facts. In the kindest possible way Mr Edmund Bishop recognized the force of the cumulative argument by which I had endeavoured to present a justification for the common view. But he persisted that to his mind there was an *a priori* improbability which condemned the title *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti*. He was good enough to explain at some length why, in his view, Lanfranc could not have taken such action in regard to the English monasteries generally as that title implied. He reasoned from the whole spirit of Benedictinism proper, from the character of the Norman development of Church life and thought, from the state of the English Church as it appeared to the Norman churchman when he suddenly found himself responsible for its welfare. He offered various alternative explanations of the statements which I had marshalled in argument—with the exception of the first. That title, he maintained, was *not* derived from the manuscript which the careful antiquary Baker had transcribed: it was a seventeenth-century title, and arose somehow in the curious process by which the book which bears Reyner's name came into being<sup>2</sup>: it savoured of the legal plea which dominated the composition of that work. In short, those who would maintain the title must produce the manuscript in which it stood.

<sup>1</sup> When Lanfranc died, 20 out of the 30 abbeys of his province (not reckoning the cathedral monasteries) had Norman abbots, 3 had English abbots still; of the other 7 we cannot speak certainly (*Böhmer Kirche u. Staat* p. 107).

<sup>2</sup> See the sketch of David Baker's life (Dom Augustine Baker) in Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses* (ed. Bliss) iii 7 ff, and Taunton *English Black Monks* ii 73.

He went on to indicate his own conception of Lanfranc's method of procedure. Lanfranc had been prior of Bec under Abbot Herlwin. Coming to Canterbury and finding his cathedral monastery in disorder, he introduced, when occasion offered, a pupil of his own as prior; and he redrafted for his guidance the customs of Bec, which he probably had himself helped to compile. The Bec customs naturally went with his nephew Paul to St Albans; and their intrinsic worth commended them to other monasteries. But many of the new abbots had been brought up in other Norman abbeys, and would have resented a demand to enforce the Bec customs. That these customs gradually made their way was the result of spontaneous acceptance, not of imposition by authority.

These general reflexions prepared the way for a further consideration of the literary history of the document in question; and it is only because some fresh facts have already emerged that I am writing on a subject from which my consciousness of ignorance and inexperience would otherwise have warned me off. The enquiry is even now only begun, and I write in the hope that others will contribute of their knowledge. In what follows I shall use freely the hints and indications which Mr Edmund Bishop has given me.

We must begin with the mediaeval catalogues of the libraries of Christ Church, Canterbury, and its daughter house of St Martin at Dover, which Dr James has made available for our purpose. The following volumes at Canterbury first attract our attention<sup>1</sup>:—

291 Martilogium uetus.

*In hoc uol. cont.:*

Regula beati Benedicti  
Consuetudines Ecclesie Beccensis.

292 Martilogium nouum.

*In hoc uol. cont.:*

Regula Sancti Benedicti  
Consuetudines Ecclesie Beccensis.

294 Martilogium paruum.

*In hoc uol. cont.:*

Regula beati Benedicti  
Constitutiones domini R. de Wynchelese Cant. Archiep.

<sup>1</sup> *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (1903) pp. 49 f.

Before we comment on the composition of these volumes, let us read a passage from the *Concordia Regularis*, which shews what the English monks had been instructed to do daily in their chapterhouse<sup>1</sup>:—

Facto signo a priore convenientes ad Capitulum, ipso praecedente, versa facie ad orientem saluent crucem, et caeteris undique fratribus se vultu inclinato humilient: cuius humiliationis ratio et in omni conventu custodienda est. tunc residentibus cunctis legatur Martyrologium: quo dicto surgentes omnes dicant versum, *Preciosa in conspectu domini*, &c., cum oratione ac versu, *Deus in adiutorium meum intende* . . . iterum autem residentibus legatur Regula, vel si dies festus fuerit Evangelium ipsius diei, de qua lectione a priore, prout dominus dederit, dicatur. . . .

In these Canterbury books we see the combination of the Martyrology, from which the saints and benefactors commemorated each day were read out, with the Rule of St Benedict and certain supplementary Customs or Constitutions.<sup>2</sup> We may suppose that the 'old' Martyrology (no. 291) had done service for many a long year, and was at length set aside in favour of a 'new' copy (no. 292), which in turn had to give way to a copy (no. 294) in which a fresh set of Constitutions marked the change which had passed over Benedictine life by the close of the thirteenth century. We shall find Martyrologies which contained more than is indicated in this Canterbury list, but we need not assume that these manuscripts are exhaustively described therein. It is plain at any rate, that in the chapterhouse of Christ Church, Canterbury, certain 'Bec Customs' held a place of honour from very early days, until they had come to be obsolete and ultimately were supplanted by a later code of regulations.

The catalogue of St Martin's, Dover, was drawn up in 1389. It contains a volume thus described<sup>3</sup>:—

276 Constituciones Lanfranci archiepiscopi, fol. 82<sup>a</sup> Lanfrancus indignus

Martirologium vetus, fol. 4<sup>a</sup> kalende mensis ianuar'

Regula beati benedicti ad monachos, fol. 53<sup>a</sup> auscultat o fili.

The displacement of the items in this description is due to the fact that, in the summary list which precedes the detailed descrip-

<sup>1</sup> Reyner *Apostolatus* append. p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> The Gospel lections will attract our attention later.      <sup>3</sup> James, l. c. p. 472.

tions, this volume had been entered simply as *Constitutiones Lanfranci*. When we look at the items in the proper order, we see that the book corresponds exactly to nos. 291 and 292 of the mother-house; save only that, whereas there we have the 'Bec Customs', here we have 'Lanfranc's Constitutions'. It is no hazardous conjecture to say that the difference is a difference only of name.<sup>1</sup> For a century these Customs had been superseded, and were now no more than a literary curiosity. So they were even in the time of Matthew Paris, at St Albans: for he tells his readers where to find them, if they want to see them.<sup>2</sup> The writer of the Dover list has lost the very tradition of their earlier designation, and describes them simply by their author's name.

We shall return to Canterbury later. Meanwhile let us go as far north as Durham. Here Bishop William of St Calais brought in the monks in 1083. We know that he acted in this matter in concert with Lanfranc,<sup>3</sup> and there is reason to think that he may have been assisted by Abbot Vitalis of Westminster.<sup>4</sup>

The ancient book-lists of Durham are brought together in vol. vii of the Surtees Society's publications. There we find (p. 118) among Bishop William's books given to the monastery *Martyrologium et Regula*. But what is more important, we have an inventory of certain books handed over by one custodian to another on Feb. 2, 139½. These were books kept in 'Le Spendement', a treasure house in the undercroft beneath the dormitory: perhaps some were too precious to be in the open library, and others were stored as out of date. At any rate the following entries on p. 107 are of direct interest to us:

(1) Martilogium, Consuetudines Dorbornensis (*sic edit.*) ecclesiae, Regula sancti Benedicti in Latino, et eadem Regula in Anglico. ii fo., *Psalterium Petri*.

(2) Consuetudines Dorbornensis ecclesiae. ii fo. *usque ad septuagesimam*.

<sup>1</sup> This was pointed out to me by Mr Edmund Bishop; and it was this that set me on the further investigations which here follow.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 377, note.

<sup>3</sup> Simeon of Durham (Rolls ed.) i 119-122.

<sup>4</sup> In the Durham 'Liber Vitae' (Brit. Mus. *Domit. A.* vii f. 52) there is a convention between Vitalis and Bishop William of Durham: and Vitalis attests this bishop's Durham charter in 1082, and its confirmation by the Conqueror in 1084 (Raine *Scriptores Tres* pp. v, vi).

The words 'usque ad septuagesimam', which begin the second leaf of (2), are found twenty-six lines from the beginning of Lanfranc's prefatory letter in Reyner's edition: and the first words of that letter are 'Lanfrancus indignus sanctae Dorobornensis ecclesiae antistes'. The larger codex (1) is thus described in Bernard's Catalogue<sup>1</sup>:

213. 148. Catalogus vetus Librorum in quodam Armario olim existentium, p. 1.  
 Officia quaedam pro Monachis huius et aliarum Ecclesiarum post eorum funera obeunda, p. 5.  
 Kalendarium, p. 6.  
 Martyrologium per Anni circulum, p. 12.  
 Evangelia in Capitulo pronuncianda Vigiliis Festisque diebus per Anni circulum, p. 39.  
 Constitutiones Lanfranci Archiepisc. Cantuar. p. 47.  
 Regulae S. Benedicti, Lat. p. 75. Eaedem Sermone Saxonico, p. 98.  
 Guilielmi Episc. Dunelm. Epistola Coenobitis Dunelmensibus, p. 74.  
 Anselmi Archiepisc. Cantuar. Epistola Antonio Sub-Priori, p. 95; & Guilielmo Beccensi Abbati caeterisque Cantuariensis Ecclesiae Ministris, p. 96.  
 S. Bernardi Epistola ad Priorem et Conventum Dunelm. p. 96. 4<sup>to</sup>.

This MS still survives: its class-mark is B. iv. 24; and it is the source from which Wilkins printed his *Constitutiones Lanfranci Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*.<sup>2</sup> We note in passing two of its items with special interest: (1) the Gospels to be read in Chapter on holy days (see above, p. 380); and (2) the Letter of Bishop William, the refounder of the monastery, which Simeon of Durham quotes (i 126), and which contains the request: 'litteras istas unaquaque septimana semel in capitulo recitate.'

But our chief concern is with Lanfranc's Constitutions. At Durham they were called *Consuetudines Dorobornenses*, 'the Canterbury Customs,' just as at Canterbury they were called

<sup>1</sup> *Catalogi Librorum manuseriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (1697) ii 8.

<sup>2</sup> This is their present heading in the MS. But the Dean of Durham has kindly looked into the matter for me, and tells me that the words are written by a late hand, perhaps of the seventeenth century, and that originally there was no title at all.

'the Bec Customs'. In fact we begin to suspect that they started out on their career with no proper title at all. Let us pursue this suggestion a little.

In the University Library at Cambridge there is a volume (Mm. i 19) which contains four items:

1. Sermons of Peter Comestor.
2. Extracts from Etymol. Isidori.
3. Regula monachorum: 5 fol. in a minute hand: *inc.* Congruum videtur . . . *expl.* feliciter perveniamus.
4. *Inc.* Lanfrancus indignus, &c. Mittimus vobis . . . *expl.* fieri solent.

The first three items are said to be in a thirteenth-century hand: the fourth to be late twelfth-century. The first fly-leaf shews, as the librarian kindly tells me, that the different parts of the volume have been together since an early date: for on it the fourth item is entitled, 'Lanfrancus de Officio Monachorum,' in a thirteenth to fourteenth-century hand. Here, then, is a new name for the book: but it is to be noted that the twelfth-century scribe gives it no title of any kind. Before we leave this codex we may note that according to the Catalogue (iv 115) its fly-leaves contain 'notes of the *Redditus* of the Church of Worcester'.

Another title comes to us from Hereford, whatever its antiquity or worth may be. For in Bernard's *Catalogi* (ii 44) we read under Hereford Cathedral:

1725. 133. Divini Cultus Consuetudines Monachales, &c. Lanfranci Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis.<sup>1</sup>

Once again, Boston of Bury in the fourteenth century recorded under Lanfranc's name these two entries<sup>2</sup>:

Item Regulam secundum quosdam [8]  
 Librum Consuetudinarium [81]

In this extract Battle Abbey is indicated by the number 8, and Ipswich St Peter by the number 81.

Let us sum up our results thus far. We have been enquiring into the value which is to be assigned to the title *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti*. We have not as yet

<sup>1</sup> The Dean of Hereford tells me that this is in a later hand, and that the twelfth-century scribe gives no title. It is possible that this is a St Guthlac MS coming originally from Gloucester.

<sup>2</sup> See Tanner *Notitia* p. xxxiv.

discovered any authority for it earlier than the seventeenth century, apart from the express statement that it stood in the manuscript from which the text of the document was printed in Reyner's *Apostolatus*. The titles we have found are the following:

Consuetudines ecclesiae Beccensis (Ch. Ch. Cant. traditional title at the time of Prior Eastry's Catalogue, 1285-1331).

Consuetudines Dorobornensis ecclesiae (Durham, traditional title in 1392: no title in codex of cent. xi-xii).

Consuetudines Lanfranci (St. Albans: Math. Par., †1259).

Constitutiones Lanfranci archiepiscopi (St. Martin's, Dover, 1389).

Lanfrancus de Officio Monachorum (Camb. Univ. Libr. Mm. i 19: fly-leaf, xiii-xiv cent.: but the twelfth-century text bears no title: from Worcester).

Divini Cultus Consuetudines Monachales, &c. Lanfranci archiepiscopi Cantuariensis (Hereford: ? from Gloucester: cent. xii, early: no original title).

[Lanfranci] Regula secundum quosdam (? = 'as some say': Battle Abbey; from Boston of Bury, c. 1400).

[Lanfranci] Liber Consuetudinarius (Ipswich, St Peter: also from Boston of Bury).<sup>1</sup>

We may now return to Canterbury; and we shall endeavour to prove: (1) that one of the Christ Church books described by Prior Eastry still exists, (2) that from this copy the transcript was made which is published by Reyner, (3) that this copy offers no warrant for the questionable title.

1. Dr M. R. James (l. c. p. 508) makes the following identifications: No. 291 = ? Brit. Mus. Royal 7 E. vi.

No. 292 = Brit. Mus. Cotton Nero C. ix.

Also on p. 525 he notes (in a list of MSS not entered in the ancient catalogues) as a Christ Church book:

Brit. Mus. Cotton Claud. C. vi. The first part Notitia Regionum, &c. in a foreign hand. Part II Consuetudines Lanfranci, &c. 2 fo. clementer *or* absoluat.

<sup>1</sup> I may add here from Bernard's *Catalogi*: Corpus Chr. Camb. 19 'statuta Lanfranci', and 178 'constitutiones Lanfranci'. I would also call attention to a note affixed to the name of Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's, Canterbury, on p. 10 of Reyner's *Tractatus* 1: 'Huius Scotlandi constitutiones manuscriptas habemus: omnino cum Lanfranci legibus convenientes.' Can this mean that Abbot Scotland, who was on terms of close friendship with Lanfranc, introduced the Constitutions in his own name?

Let us confine our attention at present to the two MSS, Royal 7 E. vi and Claud. C. vi. The second of these, as Dr James has indicated, is composite. It is the latter part of it which interests us, Claud. C. vi, ff. 170-203.

f. 170 *b*. 'Obiit Willelmus rex Anglorum. Hic reddidit ecclesie Christi' etc.

171 f. Monasteries in alliance for obits. More obits.

173. An inserted leaf of larger size. 'Obiit pater noster Lanfrancus' etc.

174. End of a book of lections:  $\frac{3}{4}$  of first column only; the rest blank. The page begins, 'incalescat. IN DEDICATIONE ECCLESIE. In illo tempore Ingressus IHS' etc. The last lection is 'IN OCT. DEDICATIONIS ECCLESIE . . . dedicationis templi'.

174 *b*. 'Lanfrancus indignus', etc.

Turning now to Royal 7 E. vi, we find that also to be composite. The latter part is a fragment of a New Testament (Luke-Hebr.) in a wholly different hand, ff. 104-133. It is the former part which here interests us.

ff. 1-73. Martyrology (with the ancient press-mark D. vii. G. xiii).

74-93. St Benet's Rule.

94-103. 'IN VIGILIA NATIVITATIS DOMINI. In illo tempore Cum esset desponsata', etc.: ending on f. 103 *b* 'quatinus exemplo visibilium se ad invisibilia rapiat; et per ea que usu didicit, quasi confriatus'.

If we read Royal 7 E. vi, f. 103 *b* together with Claud. C. vi, f. 174, we complete this broken sentence: 'quasi confriatus<sup>1</sup> incalescat.' We see therefore that the original MS was torn asunder at this point; and each part, bound up with foreign matter, got into a different collection, to arrive at last happily at the British Museum, where it can be set side by side with its fellow.<sup>2</sup> We may therefore with some confidence delete Dr James's note of query from his identification of No. 291 with Royal 7 E. vi, and add Claud. C. vi as completing the ancient volume, which

<sup>1</sup> We make the correction from the longer lesson in the Roman Breviary, *Commem. non. Virg. III Noct.*, from a Homily of Pope Gregory. For these short Chapter lessons see the Durham MS, as above, p. 382.

<sup>2</sup> Something has been lost between f. 93 and f. 94. St Benet's Rule is in a similar hand to what follows, but the illumination is more elaborate.

Dr Warner tells me may be assigned to the second quarter of the twelfth century.<sup>1</sup>

2. Was this the codex from which the text printed by Reyner<sup>2</sup> was copied? Let us look at the end of the text as there printed. After the words 'defuncto fieri solet', with which the treatise as given elsewhere closes, we find:

PRO CELLERARIO.

Pater noster . . . . Iesum Christum.

These words occur in the same position on f. 202 of Claud. C. vi, in a contemporary hand. The *verso* of f. 202 is left blank: but f. 203 begins thus:

<sup>1</sup> Dr James's identification of No. 292 with Nero C. ix is disappointing as regards our present quest: but it introduces us to a very interesting fragment of three leaves from a Kalendar of Obits of the end of the eleventh century. The volume as at present composed begins with a later Kalendar of Obits, and Cotton's signature is on the first leaf of this (f. 3): four months (May–Aug.) are missing. It is followed on f. 19 by the last half of Aug. and the first half of Sept. from the more ancient Kalendar: then on f. 20 by the last half of Oct. and the first half of Nov., and *on this leaf*, which is much discoloured from exposure, stands in a fourteenth-century hand:

Martilogium nouum. D. vii. G. ii  
cum regula s̄i Benedicti.

Then f. 23 gives the last half of Nov. and the first half of Dec. But there is no Martyrology and no Rule. The volume contains a monastic register, &c., all of later dates. There are but few entries in this interesting Kalendar; and no Norman name seems to occur, except in this one entry on f. 19 b:

G v ID. Obiit Willelmus (*sic*) rex anglorum et Scotlandus abbas et Eadricus sacerdos et monachus.

The middle leaf of the three may have been used as the cover of a 'New' Martyrology, which was already out of date in the fourteenth century: but it cannot have gone with the codex 'Royal 7 E. vi + Claud. C. vi', for that had its own press-mark, viz. D. vii. G. xiii. The name of Abbot Scotland may perhaps suggest that these leaves originally were written, not at Christ Church, but at St Augustine's: but it is to be noted that, while Sept. 9 is the right date for William the Conqueror, Abbot Scotland is said by Thorne and others to have died on the third of that month.

<sup>2</sup> Of this two inconsistent accounts are given. At the head of the text (App. p. 211) we have: 'Ex Antiquo manuscripto ecclesiae Christi Cantuariae, quod habetur in palatio Dunelmensi Londini': i. e. from a Ch. Ch. MS which was at Durham House in the Strand, where Laud lived for some time, while he was a prebendary of Westminster, under the patronage of Bp Neile who had been Dean of Westminster. At this house we might easily find Baker, or Dom Leander, Laud's old college friend. But in *Tract. 2*, at p. 117, the codex is misdescribed as 'manuscriptum registrum coenobii Dunelmensis, ex quo describi curauimus totam observantiam Lanfrancianam, nempe leges et ordinationes ipsius, quarum in illo libro hic est titulus: *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti*'.

[O]biit lodovicus Rex francorum piissi  
 mus fr̄ et bñfactor n̄r qui devocionis  
 obtentu //////////////// visitans.

Here there is the usual erasure of the mention of St Thomas. In Reyner's print the words are supplied (with no indication that they are conjectural) thus: 'ad Sanctum Thomam.' But a reference to Brit. Mus. Arundel 68 ff. 39 *b*, where the same document has escaped mutilation, shews that they should be: 'bñ Thomam.' A similar erasure after 'tumbam' in the next line should be supplied by 'ipsius m̄ris', and part of this can still be traced; Reyner, however, gives us 'S. Thomæ'. In the second column there is a longer erasure between 'plenius esse concessimus' and 'insuper adiecimus'. Here marks of omission are placed in Reyner's text: the true supplement is: 'Obtentu eciam beati thomē m̄ris quem tanto in terris prevenistis honore.' This last erasure is needlessly long: in another MS it is quite possible that only the three words 'beati thome m̄ris' would have been erased. The probability, therefore, that this is the codex from which the printed text comes is a very high one, if it does not amount to a certainty.

But there is more than this to be said. Other items of an obituary character are given in Reyner's edition as following the text of Lanfranc. Now all of these are in Claud. C. vi; only they precede, instead of following, Lanfranc. We have indicated them already as on ff. 170-173. In our reconstruction of the ancient volume these have in any case to be removed from their present position; and quite possibly they were at the end of the volume when the transcript used by Reyner was made; or we may venture to suppose that the statement that they 'followed' is a mere error, and that they 'followed' only in Baker's copy as it reached the editor's hand. As, however, it is important to prove identification with as much certainty as is possible, we may note that in one of these items on p. 253 a partial lacuna is left in Reyner's print. The name of a certain monastery is thus given: 'Sanctae Mariae . . . . sensis ecclesiae.' On looking at Claud. C. vi we find what appears to be 'Cras' at the end of one line, and 'sensis' quite plainly at the beginning of the next. But a good scholar might pause, and leave a blank in his copy, on account of the difficulty of reading the first part of the word;

especially if he did not happen to know that 'Crassensis' stood for Notre-Dame de la Grasse, a Benedictine monastery in the diocese of Carcassonne.

I think, therefore, that we may speak with security of Claud. C. vi as being the MS from which Baker copied the text printed in Reyner's *Apostolatus*.

3. What then is the title of the document in Claud. C. vi? There is no title at all: just as there is no contemporary title in the great Durham codex (c. xi-xii), and in the Cambridge codex (c. xii). It is, however, interesting to observe that by the side of the great capital L there is room for a title, and that the writing of the second column begins three lines higher up than the writing of the first.

We must therefore accuse the statement, which we have quoted from Reyner, *Tractatus* 2 p. 117 ('in illo libro hic est titulus: *Decreta D. Lanfranci pro ordine S. Benedicti*') of entire falsity: and we must recognize our obligation to Mr Edmund Bishop for having refused to allow us to acquiesce in it. The title was doubtless a convenient one affixed to the document by one of the persons concerned in the compilation of the treatise which bears Reyner's name. No one who is not thoroughly acquainted with the controversy which called forth this treatise can venture to indicate what the title carried with it in the mind of the person who framed it. By what Mr Edmund Bishop calls 'a mischance' it came to stand at the head of Lanfranc's regulations, and then it was expressly attributed to the ancient codex from which they had been copied. It has done a great deal of ill service since, and we may be thankful to be rid of it now. Much trouble would have been saved, if the name suggested in the colophon of Reyner's print (p. 253: FINIS STATVTORVM D. LANFRANCI) had been chosen to stand at the head of the tract: for though it rests on no manuscript authority, it carries no false implication.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.