‘Dead men tell no tales’, says the proverb, not entirely accurately. Dead men – and women – have plenty to say, although they need specialist help to say it. Even then, as pathologists and other forensic scientists will testify, they may be apt to mutter rather than to speak distinctly. Some of them tell lies. Catching them out in that act demands the sort of forensic skills peculiar to the medievalist, used as he is to retelling the story of the past from innumerable, ill-fitting, and frequently improbable fragments of it, often in the form of texts written in no-longer-living languages. It is easy to forget, or simply to overlook, the eloquence of the dead. As a prosopographer, constantly involved with the reconstruction of the minutiae of individual lives, my concern with my subjects is with their living, not with the fact that they are now long dead. On the face of it, a necrological record indicating the day of the year on which a subject died might be nothing more than the point at which to draw the line. In fact, the place, or even places, in which such records occur yields significant information about the subject’s life, rather than his death. For an obituary notice is every bit as much about and for the living as a record in a liber vitae, the only difference being that in the latter the subjects were often still alive at the moment when their names were recorded. Equally important, the fact that compilations of such records were kept by the same institution preserves information about groups as well as individuals, and about how these groups relate to the recording institution and even to other institutions. The potential of necrologies as witnesses to lost lives is almost limitless.1

I might never have discovered the importance of necrological evidence in its fullest sense if I had not begun eight years ago to work on a much-needed edition of the Cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel. The Cartulary is prefaced by a history of the abbey which has been the basis of all historiography for the past 900 years, although it

---

1 See Nicholas Huyghebaert, Les Documents nécrologiques (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidentale 4; Turnhout, 1972), pp. 63 ff. I should like to thank Professor Neithard Bulst and Dr Véronique Gazeau for their comments upon an earlier draft of this paper. Grateful thanks also to editor Professor David Rollason for his sterling work in making this paper more reader-friendly than it would otherwise have been.
is patently unsatisfactory. I started to dip into the necrologies in the hope of information concerning the period covered by the cartulary. The results far exceeded expectations. Mont-Saint-Michel is one of the most famous of all European monasteries. Its surviving collection of manuscripts, now at Avranches, has frequently been discussed by art historians. Relatively little work has been done on the texts which relate to the abbey’s liturgy or administration, though the surviving manuscripts provide considerable detail about most periods of the abbey’s history from 1050 onwards. In view of this and of the potential noted above, I am preparing editions of texts in two of these manuscripts, namely the Cartulary of the Mont from Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 210, and a necrology and a martyrology-necrology from Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 214. I shall attempt here to give at least a brief indication of the relationships between the Mont’s Cartulary and its necrologies, and how both might be used to establish a history of their community. Principally, however, this paper aims to examine the necrologies found in the Mont’s surviving Chapter Book and how they were used. A number of illustrative texts, taken from the Chapter Book and a later Ceremonial, have been edited in the Appendix.

The Cartulary in Avranches 210

Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 210 contains the only surviving cartulary of two known to have existed. Some of the texts it contains have been published; some are well-known, even notorious. But because, as is frequently the fate of cartularies, it has not been studied as a unique written work, its texts have been little explored and the whole is thoroughly misunderstood.

In an article published in 1999 I investigated two principal, interrelated, questions: at what date was the Cartulary written and why? Clear answers can be provided to both questions by combining codicological study of the manuscript with close analysis of the Cartulary’s texts. The Cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel, like any other cartulary of the early or central Middle Ages, is a unique literary work written in order to fulfil a purpose of great importance at a specific moment in the monastery’s history. A cartulary should be regarded as a unitary compilation, composed of a number of smaller texts deliberately arranged to form the whole. Material added after the cartulary has been completed may have changed the character of the original work and cannot be considered as part of it. This is very evident in the Cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel, where the addition of a Register of Abbot Robert of Torigny from fol. 112v marks a dramatic break with the genuine Cartulary, which occupies

---


3 All the issues raised in this and the following paragraph are fully discussed in my article, K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, ‘Bibliothèque municipale d’Avranches, 210: Cartulary of Mont-Saint-Michel’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 21 (1999), 95–112. References to items in the Cartulary are given here by the item number of my edition, currently in press.
fols. 5r–112r. Attentive study of the text soon reveals that an error by a nineteen-century librarian made Robert of Torigny responsible for the Cartulary, which was in fact produced in the brief abbacy of his predecessor Geoffrey (May 1149–December 1150). The purpose of the Cartulary was in part to produce a founders’ and benefactors’ memorial book, and in part to defend the rights of the monastic community to elect its own abbot in accordance with Chapter 64 of the Rule of Saint Benedict. This right became a major issue after 1009, when Abbot Mainard II was replaced by an abbot acceptable to Richard II of Normandy. From then until the time the Cartulary was written, c. 1150, the monks tried and mostly failed to maintain in post an elected abbot of their own choice. The Cartulary occupied an all-too-briefly brilliant place in the struggle since Abbot Geoffrey had been elected by his monks and it was he who obtained from Pope Eugenius III a bull that confirmed the monks’ Benedictine right to elect his successors. Geoffrey’s death before the bull arrived plunged the abbey into a period of near-catastrophic conflict with Henry of Anjou, lasting until the election of Robert of Torigny in 1154. As a result, work on the Cartulary was abandoned and never subsequently completed.

The Cartulary texts fall into three principal groups. The first contains the earliest known version of the Historia, an amalgam of two earlier texts which became henceforth the official version of the Mont’s history. The texts were the ninth-century Revelatio, used as a lectionary for the feast of the Dedication of St Michael’s Basilica (fols. 5r–10r), and the late-eleventh-century compilation known as Introductio monachorum (fols. 10r–19r). The second group presents the major charters of donation and benefaction, many of them from the late tenth and early eleventh centuries (mostly found between fols. 20r and 72v). The third group presents a series of charters of restitution extracted by the great Abbot Bernard in the period c. 1135 to 1149 (fols. 72v to 112r). Of the 115 individual charter texts, facsimiles or other versions of the originals survive in forty-six cases, ranging from the tenth to the twelfth century. Analysis shows that the copyist set out faithfully to record exactly what was in his exemplar, including the interpolations he found in the pseudo-originals of the charters of the Norman rulers. Although it was never finished, there is a satisfying balance of composition in the Cartulary text which reveals a literary design of considerable skill. The principal leitmotif of the work is the community’s identity as monks of St Benedict, subject only to their abbot and to God and not to temporal powers.

4 The librarian wrote on a flyleaf now numbered I: ‘Table des Matières contenues dans le grand cartulaire du Mont-Saint-Michel, rédigé par Robert du Mont, abbé au 12e siècle . . .’. His was a false assumption, based upon the register starting on fol. 112v, that passed unchecked into all subsequent accounts of the manuscript.


6 I am indebted to discussions with Professor Pierre Bouet, who is preparing new editions of these texts from all the surviving copies and has determined that the Introductio monachorum is a late eleventh-century compilation incorporating earlier material. A part of it, the Miracula, is not found in the Cartulary version of the Historia. The complete text was published in Les curieuses recherches des Mont Saint-Michel par Dom Thomas Le Roy, published by Eugène de Robillard de Beaurepaire (Extrait des Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie; 2 vols., Caen, 1878), I, 419ff.
The Necrology and Martyrology-Necrology in Avranches 214: distinction between them

The original, late twelfth- and thirteenth-century core of Avranches 214, to which later additions were made, consisted of the Rule of St Benedict (part II, pp. 1–72), a lectionary (part II, pp. 77–108), the Martyrology-Necrology (part I, pp. 1–196) and a much larger Necrology (part II, pp. 109–99). The earliest of these texts, the Martyrology-Necrology and the Rule, were copied during the reign of Abbot Jordan, between 1191 and 1212, obviously recompiling and reorganising older material that had become difficult to use. Undoubtedly these texts form the oldest surviving Chapter Book of Mont-Saint-Michel, in use from the early thirteenth century onward. Previously neglected, chapter books have been much studied in recent years, thanks mainly to Dom Jacques Dubois and Jean-Loup Lemaître, the leading experts on French martyrologies and necrologies. Rules for the conduct of chapter liturgy, held after the office of Prime, were established in Canon 69 of the Council of Aix in 816, which required the reading of the names of the saints of the day from a martyrology in addition to part of the Rule. By the end of the century it was customary also to read the names of the dead from a necrology. The model on which all subsequent chapter books were based was written at Saint-Germain des Prés c. 860 and contained the earliest copy of the monk Usuard’s Martyrology (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 13745). By the eleventh century a fusion known as a martyrology-necrology was common. In these texts the necrology was inserted into the available space around each item in the martyrology (normally a version of the Usuard Martyrology first written at St Germain c. 860), or, more rarely, intercalated in deliberately created spaces attached to each item. Long before the thirteenth century...
century martyrology-necrologies were normally being disaggregated into two separate texts.\textsuperscript{13} Even though creation of such a text in the early thirteenth century or later was unusual, the Mont monks not only chose to compile their Martyrology-Necrology in the thirteenth century, but also made additions to it throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, indicating that it continued in use in its fused form.

Although medieval terminology for books recording the names of the dead was variable, the term *martirologium/logum* was widespread and was the one in use at the Mont to refer to a range of texts (in addition to martyrologies as such),\textsuperscript{14} the typology of which has proved difficult to establish. The study by Nicholas Huyghebaert, published in 1972,\textsuperscript{15} rejected an earlier typology suggested by Charles Saraman.\textsuperscript{16} The typology followed here, which most accurately reflects the evolution of these texts during the Middle Ages, is the one elaborated by Jean-Loup Lemaître in 1980.\textsuperscript{17}

Memorials of the dead fall into three main groups: the necrology, the obituary and the simple list. Essentially, necrologies are liturgical texts found in chapter books of the early and central Middle Ages. The obituary is an administrative text that evolves out of the growing practice of endowing anniversary commemorations for specific individuals. Such texts belong to the later Middle Ages and are not found in chapter books. Nevertheless, the genesis of the obituary can clearly be seen in the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century additions to the necrologies in the chapter book, which reflect the changing trends in memorialisation of the dead. Each type is laid out as a complete 365-day calendar with spaces between each day for the insertion of the names of the dead. A list of the dead, however long, however detailed, is neither a necrology nor an obituary if it is not in a calendar. As regards necrologies and obituaries, there is also a difference in function. In a necrology the dead are intended to be remembered on the anniversary of the day of their deaths. In an obituary the dates relate to an annual commemoration of a deceased person which was not necessarily related to the day of his or her death. Moreover, the obituary records the endowment which had been made, usually in his lifetime by the person remembered, for the anniversary. There is normally no real distinction between the quality of persons who occur in the texts. Both necrologies and obituaries can contain the names of professed members of the community, including members *ad succurrendum* (normally postulants who died before or soon after taking their preliminary vows), as well as those attached to it by confraternity, both ecclesiastic and lay, relatives of the monks, familiaris and lay benefactors. However, necrologies normally maintain a formal distinction between


\textsuperscript{14} The word *martirologium* and its variant *martirologum* were used at Mont-Saint-Michel in the thirteenth century and later; MSS Avranches 214, part ii, fol. 197v (see Appendix), Avranches 215, fol. 174r. See Jean-Loup Lemaître, *Mourir à Saint-Martial: La commémoration des morts et les obituaires à Saint-Martial de Limoges du XIe au XIIe siècle* (Paris, 1989), ch. 3, pp. 87–103.

\textsuperscript{15} Note 1 above.


\textsuperscript{17} Lemaître, *Répertoire*, I, 15–26, and *Mourir à Saint-Martial*, pp. 87–97, pointing out that the terms necrology and obituary are post-medieval and were not used in medieval manuscripts. The most commonly used term in the Middle Ages was *martirologium*. The term derived from one of the constituent texts of a chapter book; in addition to its basic meaning referring to a martyrology (calendared account of individual martyrs) it could mean ‘necrology’, and even ‘chapter book’ (Lemaître, ‘Liber capituli’, p. 627); cf. Appendix, no. 5 below.
professed monks of the house and their confratres (that is those who were in confraternity with them).

Both the Martyrology-Necrology and the larger Necrology in Avranches 214 have been correctly described by Lemaître as necrologies. The larger of the two texts contains no details about the acts of remembrance or their endowment, and, so far as can be seen, it normally aims to record an actual day of death. This means that it is indeed a necrology, and hence a liturgical text from which names were intended to be read aloud on a daily basis, normally in the office of Chapter. Surviving Ordinaries and Ceremonials from the abbey show that there was a considerable emphasis on liturgy for the dead. With certain exceptions such as Easter and major feasts, an office of the dead followed Prime. The morning mass was usually pro defunctis.

The Martyrology-Necrology was copied in the time of Abbot Jordan in the early thirteenth century and remained in use as part of the Chapter liturgy until the fifteenth century, as the numerous additions to the spaces marked Obierunt show. There was an attempt at hierarchy in the order of the obits, but this was frequently compromised by the addition of names. The larger Necrology was produced up to twenty or thirty years later. It is very carefully written and beautifully laid out, observing a strict hierarchy among the dead, from bishops through to women. There are far fewer later additions to this text.

Additions to the Martyrology-Necrology were normally of the names of those who had made gifts or grants of pittances to the monks. Eventually they led to the production of a third text, the fifteenth-century Obituary, which survives as Avranches, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 215, fols. 159–75. This text contains the names of laypersons who granted a pittance—a supplement to the monks’ table—to be served on the anniversary of the grantor’s death, in return for acts of commemoration on the part of the community. Since most of the names had previously been added to the margins of the Martyrology-Necrology, the main value of this text is that it adds supplementary details about gifts mentioned in the older text. There is in addition one other Mont text relating to the dead: a simple list written into a Fleury manuscript in about 1000.

The Necrology and Martyrology-Necrology in Avranches 214 differ greatly in size and scope. Dom Laporte counted the names in the Necrology, including additions, and gave a total of 7,648, of which 4,687 were monks, including 225 abbots. The names of the dead recorded in the Martyrology-Necrology are probably less than a quarter as numerous as those in the Necrology, and are principally those of distinguished monks of the abbey, i.e., abbots, priors, monks who became abbots of other

18 Lemaître, Répertoire, I, 288–9.
21 The information from this text is collated with the readings of the Martyrology-Necrology in my edition. As is normal with such texts, it contains many fewer names than the old necrologies.
houses, and so on. Only the abbots are entered as a matter of course: the others were a select gathering of men whom their brethren chose to single out for remembrance, mostly for reasons now irrecoverable. These monks are often distinguished with the unambiguous phrase *monachus huius loci*. Two were described as *conuersus*. The Martyrology-Necrology also records the obits of the bishops of Avranches (and many of the archbishops of Rouen and Dol), the counts and countesses of Normandy and Brittany, the kings and queens of England up to Henry III, and thereafter of France. Several of the early counts and countesses of Normandy and Brittany were among the chief benefactors of the abbey, the founders of their principal priories, as celebrated in the Cartulary.

The Necrology, on the other hand, is mainly devoted to monks from other houses, though it also includes nuns and lay-persons. A handful of abbots of the Mont and Mont monks who became abbots of other houses are found here as well as in the Martyrology-Necrology; the same duplication is also apparent in a small number of obits of Mont monks found in the Martyrology-Necrology. There is no obvious pattern to such duplication, nor are the number of cases large enough to suggest liturgical significance. It is safest to assume that this limited duplication was a hazard of what must have been an extremely complex process of amalgamating several old necrological records into a new one. Awareness of fallibility and its consequences appears in a late addition to the Martyrology-Necrology where in the margin, against 26 February (p. 34), we read: ‘Commemoratio omnium fratrum et sororum atque parentum nostrorum qui per obliuionem vel per negligentiam in hoc libro non scribuntur.’ Overall it is clear that a small and select group of professed monks of the house were entered into the Martyrology-Necrology, with monks from other houses being entered into the Necrology. Occasionally the text of the obit identifies the subject as a monk of the house who left to become abbot elsewhere; occasionally the information can be supplied from external sources. The few cases that are left have

---

24 Laporte’s observation, ibid., p. 725, ‘Les notices jointes au martyrologe d’Usuard, . . . qui sont reserveres en principe aux abbés’, is misleading, though it was probably an error. There is no emphasis on abbots in the text, but rather on membership, by profession or by confraternity, of the Mont community. Only 46 of the original entries refer to abbots; 18 of them were abbots of Mont-Saint-Michel and 11 more can be shown to have been monks of the abbey before becoming abbots elsewhere. On p. 740 he correctly observes: ‘ceux des moines du Mont dont les noms avaient été conserves se trouvaient non dans l’Obituaire général [i.e. the Necrology], mais dans le Martyrologe’.

25 The later additions, which I ignore completely here, altered the character of the work by adding in the obits of lay persons who had given pittances.

26 For example, Abbot Fromund (of Saint-Taurin d’Evreux) occurs on 8 January in both the Necrology and the Martyrology-Necrology (on 11 January in the necrology of Saint-Taurin). In the same way, Abbot Heriward of Gembloux (d. 991) occurs in both texts on 3 May, as well as in the simple list of c. 1000 that went to Fleury. Much more difficult to distinguish are the names (to take just a few examples), of the monks Robert (6 January), Benedict (21 January), Robert (24 January), Walter (29 January) and Riculf (16 February), which occur in both Necrology and Martyrology-Necrology. These are common names and there may be no duplication involved. Given the starkness of the entries in these texts, it can be difficult to distinguish duplication from mere homonymy. The less commonly named Abbot Lescelin who occurs in the Mont Necrology on 8 January provides an example. Pontoise remembered its abbot Lescelin on 8 January, but the Mont was not in confraternity with Pontoise (*Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Martin de Pontoise*, ed. J. Depoin (2 vols., Pontoise, 1895–1901), I, 220). The abbot Lescelin remembered at the Mont occurs also in the necrology of Saint-Germain (see note 45 below) and is almost certainly identifiable with a disciple of William of Dijon who died as abbot of Saint-Faron de Meaux in 1065. Although this case may be simply resolved, most are not.

27 Compare entries for two eleventh-century abbots, *Touo, abbas S. Taurini et monachus*, 15 July (Avranches 214, p. 104), with one on 9 September (p. 136) for *Scollandus abbas sancti Augustini*. We
to be assumed to be monks from elsewhere whom the community had in some way accepted not merely as their own, but actually members of their own house (huius loci).

The Necrology and Martyrology-Necrology in Avranches 214: the rôle of confraternity

The distinction which was maintained between the two Mont necrologies is certainly very striking. It requires explanation, though the task is not simple.28 The names in the Martyrology-Necrology are overwhelmingly of professed monks of the Mont, with the clear implication of a similar status being enjoyed by the handful of monks otherwise closely associated with another monastery, such as William of Dol, abbot of Saint-Florent de Saumur.29 These exceptions cannot be explained simply in terms of confraternity, though probably all had been granted particular confraternity. A distinction between monks of the monastery and those from outside it is found in other necrologies, but usually within the same document, not two quite separate ones as at the Mont. Cluniac houses, for instance, maintained distinctions between professed monks of the monastery and its dependencies – ‘monachi nostre congregationis’ or ‘defunctorum nostrorum fratrum’ – and associated persons, both monks and lay – ‘amicis tantum in orationem suscepti’ or ‘peregrini monachi’ – by entering names in different columns in their necrologies, or even by maintaining separate entries on the recto and verso of each folio.30 Here a distinction is being maintained between monks who live in Cluniac houses (nostre congregationis) and those who, even though in confraternity with them, were not Cluniacs (peregrini). The term nostre congregationis was in general use to identify the professed monks of a monastery and its dependencies, and their brethren ad succurrendum.31 It was used by the monasteries associated with William of Dijon (discussed below), even though there was no formal link of any sort between them.32 Similar systems can be seen in other Norman necrologies such as those of Saint-Taurin d’Evreux, Jumièges, and Saint-Évroul.33 There is only limited evidence for Mont confraternities before the date of the necrologies in Avranches 214, that is before c.1220, and the evidence of

know from other sources, including the Mont monk and poet William de Saint-Pair, that Scolland was a monk of the abbey. The phrase et monachus added to the name of Tovo, abbot of Saint-Taurin d’Evreux, was intended to mark him as a professed monk of the house. Compare 14 October (p. 155), ‘Norgodus episcopus Abrincatensis et postea monachus huius loci’.

28 It was very unusual. Cf. Lemaitre, ‘Liber capituli’, p. 633.
29 Occurs in the Martyrology-Necrology on 30 May (he died in 1118). Both his predecessors occur in the Necrology, Sigo (d. 1070) on 12 June and Frederick (d. 1055) on 27 September. William was son of Rivallon I of Dol-Combour and, like his father and brothers, was a benefactor of Mont-Saint-Michel (Cartulary, nos. 18, 41, 44). Rivallon had obtained confraternity for himself, his wife and their children in an agreement with Abbot Suppo of c. 1050 (Cartulary, Appendix ii.4). Saint-Florent de Saumur had confraternity with the Mont (Appendix, no. 3, below).
32 E.g. the necrology of Saint-Germain (note 45 below).
33 Paris, BN, MS nov. acq. lat. 1899 (Saint-Taurin); Rouen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 1226 (U 50) (Jumièges), and Paris, BN, MS lat. 10062 (Saint-Évroul). These are among the necrologies collated with the Mont necrologies in my edition.
subsequent confraternities is of limited help in explaining even the later additions to these texts. The Martyrology-Necrology principally contains the names of monks of the Mont, but like the Necrology it too contains the names of monks from houses certainly associated with the Mont in confraternity after 1220 and probably, in many cases, before.34

The calendars of both texts contain general commemorations for quite different confraternities. The Martyrology-Necrology and the Necrology are therefore not interchangeable and were in use at the same time. In the case of the Martyrology-Necrology many entries are specified as _abbas/prior/monachus huius loci_, and the start of each day’s entry is marked _huius loci_ throughout. These entries are the equivalent of the entries marked _monachi nostre congregationis_ in other necrologies; all had at some time in their lives enjoyed an intimacy with the community of Mont-Saint-Michel that distinguished them from others. The Necrology, on the other hand, is clearly intended to contain the name of _confratres_ and _familiares_, reflecting the _peregrini monachi_ of the Cluniacs. This can be determined in two ways. First, in several entries relating to monks who died after the mid-twelfth century the name is followed by a toponym indicating the monastery to which he had belonged. Since these were all houses known to have been in confraternity with the Mont, the effect was to identify these monks as having a particular confraternity as members of a particular community, in addition to their general confraternity as individuals, with the Mont. Secondly, there is a series of mostly later additions to the text as written by the first hand which specify the entries as _nostre congregationis monachi_,35 or in the case of lay-persons, the phrases _frater noster_ and _soror nostra_. The clarity of the distinction between the two necrologies remains undimmed, despite the fact that it was in each case compromised by the additions made from the fourteenth century onward.

Analysis of the cartulary texts produces a list of donors who made gifts on becoming monks of the abbey, or who made gifts when they requested confraternity and mortuary prayers. It is not easy to determine whether the names of these donors were listed in the Martyrology-Necrology or Necrology, because they unfortunately had very common names like Ranulf or William, which is unhelpful when searching necrologies where a person is normally reduced to his or her first name and deprived of any other distinguishing mark, except perhaps a note of lay status. There are only five cases where the first name is sufficiently unusual to permit the observation that that name is found only in the Necrology, in two cases only once, including the name of Gelduin _laicus_ which occurs on 10 August.36 Only one of the Cartulary charters contained a request to be entered into a necrology as well as for confraternity.37

34 See Appendix, no. 3.
35 Not to be confused with the normal use of this phrase, which was the equivalent of the phrase _monachus huius loci_ used in the Mont’s Martyrology-Necrology.
36 The following charters demand fraternity or burial rights: nos. 29, 34, 41, 44, 51, 66, 73–4, 86–7, 110. Those with unusual names match only entries in the necrology, viz: Theoderic _laicus_ 11 November, Restald _monachus_ 12 August, 11 October and 7 November, Balduin _laicus_ 1 March, 21 May, 19 July, 10 September, Gelduin _laicus_ 10 August, Hersendis _femina_ 25 July, 26 December.
37 ‘... quod quando hominem exiero et dies obitus mei euenerit, supradicti monachi sancti Michaelis me ad Montem deferent. et sic ut fratrem suum honestissime et honorifice me sepelient atque tumulabunt. et in Kalendario inter suos familiares propter memoriam anniusarissi mei nomen meum scribent’, _Cartulary_, no. 87.
1141 or 1142, Gelduin fitz Odo of Aucej made his gift on condition that when he should die, the monks would take him to the Mont for burial and write his name among their *familares* in their necrology (*Kalendariurn*) for annual remembrance. This tends to corroborate Lemaître’s conclusion that the necrologies of Saint-Martial de Limoges rarely contain the names of persons who had requested remembrance in the monks’ necrologies, the original record being deemed to have served that function for all time, in the same way as the annual blanket commemorations for ‘our brothers’, ‘our benefactors’, and so on.38

Although there is plenty of evidence indicating the solemnity with which the death of a brother was treated by his own community as well as by those of his confraternities,39 it is far from evident that a dead brother’s name was automatically entered into the necrology of his community’s chapter book. Even allowing for the dropping of some names each time a fresh necrology was copied, it is clear that more monks lived and died than were commemorated in the surviving necrologies of their communities or their confraternities. Notices of death were often circulated in the form of *breves*, scraps of writing which in theory were kept at the monasteries to which they were sent, but of which in practice none survives.40 For many monks, the preservation of their memory as named individuals was as ephemeral as the *brevis* which announced their deaths to their *confratres*. As with the Martyrology-Necrology, a place among those whose names would be read aloud from the Necrology had to be earned by a life of special merit, which could include the grant of a major benefaction to the community. Somewhat ironically, far from being an impersonal mass of names from which most distinguishing features have been stripped, necrologies are as much as anything a celebration of the lives of exceptional individuals.

Orléans, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 127 (105) is a sacramentary written at Ramsey abbey (Huntingdonshire, England) by a former monk of Winchcombe (Gloucestershire, England), for use at Fleury-sur-Loire.41 On its way to Fleury it stopped at the Mont where the names of forty monks who had died before c. 1000, and those of fifty then still-living members of the community, were written into it.42 Since this list belongs to a period before the abbey was swamped by Normans with a very limited range of personal names, the names in it, which are almost all Frankish, have relatively few duplicates. Of names of those who died before about 1000 two are instantly recognisable as Abbot Mainard I of the Mont and Heriward, a Mont monk who became abbot of Gembloux, both of whom died in 991.43 The names of all the dead monks who died before 1000 were later copied into the Martyrology-Necrology. Amongst the names of monks living when the list was made, the identities of those with distinctive names can for the most part also be established from their subsequent obits in the Martyrology-Necrology. They include three future abbots of the Mont,

---

39 He was always awarded a trental (Avranches 214, part II, p. 259); see Appendix, nos. 1 and 4, below.
41 Anselme Davril, *The Winchcombe Sacramentary* (Henry Bradshaw Society 109; London, 1990). The circumstances in which the list was written are discussed in Gremont and Donnat, ‘Fleury, le Mont Saint-Michel et l’Angleterre à la fin du X et au début du XI siècle à propos du manuscrit d’Orléans, no. 127 (105)’, *Mill. mon.*, I, 751–93. The list of monks is reproduced there, on Plate XIV, opposite p. 737.
42 According to J. J. G. Alexander, the scribe was Heriward, the copyist of an initial in the Corbie Psalter: ‘Une copie moitonne d’*initiale romane*’, *Mill. mon.*, II, 239–44.
viz. Hildebert I, Hildebert II and Almod, and a well-known Mont scribe of the late tenth century who shared the forename of the man who was no doubt his relative, Abbot Hериward of Gembloux. The scribe in question was the Hериward who copied the list into the Fleury manuscript.44

The necrology of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris contains seven names of monks from Mont-Saint-Michel, marked *nostre congregations*.55 All of them are found in the Mont Martyrology-Necrology.56 As was first established by Niethard Bulst, these names date from the era of William of Dijon, abbot of Fécamp, and his pupils and successors in other monasteries, including Mont-Saint-Michel.47 Andrea Decker-Hauer considers these entries in the Mont Martyrology-Necrology to be associated with the entries in the Saint-Germain necrology of three monks of Jumièges and suggests that all should in turn be associated with the entry of the name of Theoderic (d. 1027), a pupil of William of Dijon who became prior of Fécamp and abbot of both Jumièges and Mont-Saint-Michel.48 Many of the entries in the Mont’s Necrology relate to this network of Fécampois monks of the first half of the eleventh century.49 They can be identified by comparison with necrologies from Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Saint-Bénigne de Dijon, Saint-Martial de Limoges, San Savino in Piacenza and Saint-Arnoul of Metz, among others. It is striking that the Fécampois circle established by William of Dijon and accepted during his lifetime (and to some extent that of John, his successor at Fécamp) as *nostre congregationis* by its member-monasteries was subject to strict distinctions at Mont-Saint-Michel, where the names of the non-Mont monks – such as the three Jumièges monks just mentioned – were written into the precursor of the Necrology, rather than the precursor of the Martyrology-Necrology. Even in the Cluniac necrologies, like that of Saint-Martial, these monks occur among those listed as *nostre congregationis* (i.e. the equivalent of the monachi huius loci of the Mont Martyrology-Necrology). At Mont-Saint-Michel an exception was made for William of Dijon himself, and his immediate successor at Fécamp, John, who both occur in the Martyrology-Necrology. The names from this time are especially interesting because the forcible introduction of monks from the circle of William of Dijon into the community of the Mont led to deep divisions there.50 The first of them was Thierry, abbot of Jumièges who was appointed abbot of the Mont in 1023 and who died only four years later, in 1027, at Jumièges. An attempt to replace him with a senior monk of their own community, Almod, was eventually thwarted when he was dismissed by Richard II of Normandy and another of William of Dijon’s pupils, the Italian Suppo, was appointed in 1033. He was driven out, in 1048, by a faction of the monks, though his remaining supporters considered his

---

46 Robert, Joseph and Dodo on 6, 18 and 20 January respectively, Andreas on 2 February, Richard on 4 April, Litbran on 8 August, and David on 1 November.
49 See above, n. 38. An important re-evaluation of William of Dijon (also known as de Volpiano) by Véronique Gazeau, ‘Guillaume de Volpiano en Normandie – état de question’, has been published in *Tabularia* [www.unicaen.fr/mrsh/crahm/revue/tabularia].
successor Ralph as a simoniac because Suppo lived until 1061, evidently without having resigned his abbacy. Despite the factionalism and bitterness of these years, William’s reform left a lasting legacy in the form of a transformation of the liturgy after the mid-eleventh century.\(^{51}\) An entry in the Martyrology-Necrology shows that the links between the monks of William’s several communities were more than the mere exchange of breves at the time of a brother’s death. The obit of Anschitillus on 19 October was also recorded at Saint-Bénigne, where it was noted that Ansquetil had been buried there.\(^{52}\)

Avranches 214 contains a list, written about 1400, of the abbeys with which the Mont had formed associations or confraternities both during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and much earlier (part I, p. 197). These were general confraternities, that is they embraced all members, present and future, of each reciprocating community, by means of an accord established by the abbots. Particular confraternity was limited to a single individual, negotiated by the abbot with the consent of the chapter, since a confrater gained the right to become a full member of the community.\(^{53}\) Confraternity is of central importance to the study of necrologies because its most basic function was to confer the benefits of prayers for the dead upon its members.\(^{54}\) Originally, this was all that confraternity conferred, but there evolved further possibilities, such as the right of confratres to enter each other’s choir and chapter. Several of the abbeys listed had very ancient links with the Mont, though not necessarily through confraternity per se. Cluny and Marmoutier, for example, both of which appear in the later confraternity lists, figure in a charter preserved in the Cartulary by which Maiol, then abbot of both houses, granted in about 982 a vineyard at Mortiers, near Tours, at the request of the Mont’s abbot Mainard I. The gift was symbolic of the Benedictine ‘brotherhood’ between the three monasteries.\(^{55}\) Cluny is first on the list of abbeys in Avranches 214, where the scribe introduced a number of section headers to indicate that he is representing the situation as best he can, following the destruction by fire of the deeds of confraternity.\(^{56}\) The list has been compiled from various sources, including old necrologies (per antiquos martirologos) and a new necrology (novo martirologio), which included Cerne and Abbotsbury (built for monks of Cerne in 1044) in Dorset, England. None of these sources can be securely identified with either the Martyrology-Necrology or the Necrology in Avranches 214. Some of the links with other abbeys were formed some while after the date at which the Necrology was copied and are therefore not particularly helpful as clues identifying individuals


\(^{52}\) ‘Ansetillus de Monte Sancti Michaelis, hic sepultus’ (B. Schamper, Saint-Bénigne de Dijon: Untersuchungen zum Necrolog der Handschrift Bibl. mun. de Dijon, ms 634 (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 63; Munich, 1979) p. 78); Avranches 214, part II, p. 157.


\(^{54}\) See Appendix, no. 1, below.


\(^{56}\) Avranches 214, part I, p. 197; see below, Appendix, no. 3. Much the same, though a shorter, list occurs in a fourteenth-century entry in MS Avranches 211, fol. 137v. The first five abbots on the earlier list are Cluny, Fleury, Saint-Pierre-de-la-Couture, Saint-Jouin de Marnes and St Peter’s, Bath. The later list begins with Fleury and Saint-Florent de Saumur.
named in it. Moreover, there was clearly considerable variation from monastery to monastery as to how, or even whether, the names of individuals belonging to communities in confraternity with it were entered into its necrologies. Indeed, it is not uncommon for monastic necrologies and obituaries to contain few entries for individual members of such confraternities,\(^57\) which benefited from the sort of blanket commemoration for their members that we have seen in the Martrology-Necrology. Entries for individuals from these communities were only made to indicate the grant to those individuals of an additional, particular confraternity.

Seven confraternities are evidenced in the Necrology by the blanket commemorations of their monks assigned to certain days in the calendar. Three of the monasteries were in England, and two in Angers, in addition to Saint-Bénigne de Dijon and Saint-Médard de Soissons. The English abbeys included Gloucester, Bath, and Colchester but not St Mary’s, York, which is not listed in any of the confraternity lists, despite the fact that Janet Burton has demonstrated conclusively that a confraternity with the Mont existed during the twelfth century.\(^58\) Also absent is Hyde Abbey in Winchester, where the monks are also known to have prayed for those of Mont-Saint-Michel.\(^59\) As with Gloucester, this association went back to the Norman Conquest, when four monks from the Mont became abbots in England: the prior Rivallon became abbot of Hyde, the treasurer and scribe Scolland, abbot of St Augustine’s, Canterbury, Serlo, a former canon of Avranches, abbot of Gloucester, and William d’Agon, abbot of Cerne.\(^60\)

All these abbeys occur on the late twelfth-century confraternity list of St Mary’s, York.\(^61\) Could it be that one or more monks from Mont-Saint-Michel joined the community at York at the time of its refoundation in the 1080s? St Mary’s abbey was refounded after the Norman Conquest on the site of an earlier church dedicated to the martyred King Olaf of Norway.\(^62\) Though the cult of Olaf was strong in Norway and Britain, it was virtually unheard of in France, despite his alleged baptism at Rouen. The fact that Mont-Saint-Michel was long the possessor of a relic of him is most easily explained as material evidence of the confraternity between its monks and those of St Mary, York.\(^63\) The prime movers and principal patrons of the latter monastery were the early lords of Richmond, the king’s cousins Counts Alan and Stephen. A charter for the abbey given by Count Stephen was attested by Roland, archbishop of Dol, Stephen, the first abbot of St Mary and Hamo ‘Sancti Michaelis monachi’, in whom, given the association with Roland of Dol, we are entitled to see a monk of Mont-Saint-Michel.\(^64\) Around 1160 Stephen’s grandson, Conan IV of Brittany, confirmed for the soul of his father the grants his ancestors had made to St Michael in

---


\(^{58}\) Janet Burton, ‘A Confraternity List from St Mary’s, York’, *Revue bénédictine* 89 (1989), 325–33; and below, pp. 223–4. I am very grateful to Dr Burton for copies of both these papers.

\(^{59}\) LVII Birch, p. 52.

\(^{60}\) Avranches 213, fol. 178r (printed PL 202, col. 1326B).


Peril of the Sea of the church of Wath (Yorkshire, North Riding, England).\(^65\) His father, Alan III the Black of Richmond, had made a grant to the Mont priory at St Michael’s Mount in Cornwall for the soul of his uncle Count Brien.\(^66\) Counts Brien and Conan and Archbishop Roland occur in the Mont’s necrologies.\(^67\) It is perhaps significant that it was in the time of Abbot Stephen of York (c. 1080–1112) that twelve monks and Prior Hugh went from St Mary’s, York, to settle the newly founded monastery of St John at Colchester.\(^68\) This abbey enjoyed a privileged position at St Mary’s, York, where its monks were regarded as *nostre congregations* and given the same rights as professed monks of St Mary.\(^69\) Mont-Saint-Michel lost its property and influence in Yorkshire in the first half of the thirteenth century, but perhaps its earlier confraternity with St Mary’s was still reflected in its confraternity with St John’s, Colchester.\(^70\)

The confraternity list of St Mary’s, York, affords a number of insights into the Martyrology-Necrology and Necrology of Avranches 214. As we have seen, there were degrees of confraternity, from a basic promise of mortuary prayers up to the admission of an individual or a whole community to the rights of a professed monk of the admitting community. Records were kept of anniversaries in the obituary of the monastery which had granted the petition of confraternity. Such records could also be recorded in deeds, *littera*, like those destroyed by fire at the Mont.\(^71\) St Mary’s, York, held a general anniversary, including the Mont, for all those in confraternity with it, but it had also granted a particular confraternity conferring the rights of a professed monk to Prior Hugh of Mont-Saint-Michel.\(^72\) He may have been the prior of that name who appears in charters of Abbot Bernard in the period 1142 to 1149 preserved in the Cartulary.\(^73\) *Hugo prior* occurs on 28 August and on 17 December in the Martyrology-Necrology.

Aside from St Mary’s, York, evidence survives for another confraternity, this one a four-way affair. In the Martyrology-Necrology of the Mont the following commemoration is noted in the margin against 10 May: ‘Commemoratio fratrum nostrorum Vezeliensium et Cluniacensium et Clunicensium pro una quaque harum congregationum debentur dari elemosine .xxx. panes videlicet .iiiixx. et x panes annuatim ad istam diem.’ An entry in Robert of Torigny’s Chronicle for 1172 explains this arrangement as the result of an assembly of Norman and Breton bishops and papal legates who convened at the Mont for the reconciliation of Henry II with the Church, following the murder of Thomas Becket.\(^74\) Among the visitors brought to the abbey
were Stephen, abbot of Cluny, and Benedict, abbot of La Cluse (San Michele della Chiusa, Piedmont, Italy). Confraternity agreements were made between the three abbeys, and Stephen and Benedict took letters of fraternity away with them.\(^75\) Robert goes on to say that such an arrangement was also made in the chapter at Vézelay by Abbot William, so that Mont monks held direct brotherhood with the monks of all three abbeys, an arrangement as pleasing to them as to Robert and his monks. Much more, surely, lies behind these confraternity arrangements than is immediately apparent. There were intimate links between these houses. Links between Mont-Saint-Michel and Cluny went back at least as early as 982, to the charter of Abbot Maiol, and probably earlier. La Cluse was a cell of Cluny which had been founded by a count of Auvergne, grandfather of Maurice II de Montboissier, two of whose numerous sons were Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny (1122–56), and Pons, abbot of Vézelay (1138–61), the latter a former monk of La Cluse. Vézelay, another Burgundian house, first founded by Gérard de Roussillon in the ninth century, had had a chequered history which included a much resented and resisted form of submission to Cluny and a protracted rivalry with the bishops of Autun. By 1166 Abbot William of Vézelay had the upper hand and finally obtained freedom from Cluny as a result of his friendship with Pope Alexander III, whom he loyally supported in the schism that had followed the pope’s election in September 1159. The Vézelay Chronicle shows that Abbot Stephen of Cluny loathed Abbot William and refused to meet him in 1166 during a visit to Vézelay that had been intended to draw a line under the affair.\(^76\) The curious entry in Robert of Torigny’s chronicle strongly suggests that Robert and his monks offered confraternity agreements as part of an attempt at reconciliation between the other abbeys. The agreement with Vézelay, as suggested by the order in the *commemoratio*, was the first in the series, since William, described by Torigny as *pie memorie*, died in 1171 and was replaced by Gérard.\(^77\) All three abbeys occur (separately) in the defective fraternity list written in 1326 and preserved in Avranches 211.\(^78\)

The Necrology and Martyrology-Necrology in Avranches 214: how they were used

Now that the distinction maintained between the Martyrology-Necrology and the Necrology in Avranches 214 has been explored, it remains to discover how they were used. As we have seen, the Martyrology-Necrology remembered monks of Mont-Saint-Michel, those monks regarded as *huius loci*, and certain key lay benefactors

---

\(^{75}\) See Appendix, no. 1, below.


\(^{77}\) William occurs in the Mont Necrology on 14 February. Neither Stephen of Cluny nor Benedict of La Cluse occurs in either of the Mont necropolises.

\(^{78}\) Fol. 137v, also described as based upon defective records. See also Appendix, no. 3, below.
such as the early counts of Brittany and Normandy, and the later kings and queens of France, many of the former being the founders of the priories celebrated in the Cartulary. The Necrology contained the names of all those nostre congregationis held in confraternity, general and particular. The daily reading aloud of the names of the dead happened in the office of Chapter, which normally followed Prime. The office began with a reading from the Martyrology, followed by a chapter from the Rule of St Benedict, or from the Gospels, depending upon the calendar, and concluded with the reading of the names of the dead.\textsuperscript{79} The development of the Chapter Book in general, and of the Martyrology-Necrology in particular, is easy to understand, since it made juggling with the various texts in a confined space much easier for the reader. It was not just the question of space that tried the skill of the reader; he was obliged to read the names in a strict hierarchical order, starting with popes and ending with laywomen.\textsuperscript{80} This would have presented a challenge in most necrologies, since the frequent addition of names meant that the hierarchical order had continually to be reconstructed. In the case of Mont-Saint-Michel, there were not one but two compilations (the Martyrology-Necrology and the Necrology), together containing the same information as was found together in the necrologies of other houses, even where these maintained a distinction between professed monks and confratres or familiares. The combined entries from each compilation did not in fact yield an impossibly large number of names; it was somewhere between thirty and forty for most days. This is comparable to the figure for Saint-Martial, but a far cry from the 120 names found on some days in the necrology of Saint-Martin-des-Champs.\textsuperscript{81} The number of names in the Martyrology-Necrology, even after it began to be swamped with later additions, was on average about a quarter as large as those for the same day in the Necrology. This was a marked contrast to the necrologies of Saint-Martial, where monachi nostri were in the overwhelming majority over peregrini monachi.\textsuperscript{82} Confraternity was therefore of considerable importance to the Mont monks, so important that an unusually ‘particular’ form of individual confraternity seems to have been extended to some persons. They were recorded among the monachi huius loci in the Martyrology-Necrology rather than among the confratres in the Necrology. Neither the Martyrology-Necrology nor the Necrology displays signs of wear arising from manipulation, such as would have been inevitable if the unfortunate reader had been expected to flip from one to the other and back again as he tried to recreate the hierarchy of the day’s dead. In view of everything we have learned so far, it is as inconceivable that only one of them was drawn upon for the daily commemoration of Chapter, as it is that the lector could have handled both texts simultaneously. Just how, then, were these texts used?

Fortunately, the question can be answered from another of the texts now bound in with these Chapter Book texts in Avranches 214, namely the Ceremonial (p. 201). This text was written in the early fifteenth century, but the liturgical practice it describes went back essentially to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. There are two passages of particular interest, both of them edited in the appendix below. The first

\textsuperscript{80} Cf. Lemaître, Mourir à Saint-Martial, pp. 312–14.
\textsuperscript{81} Cited by Jean-Loup Lemaître in discussion of a paper in L’Église et la mémoire, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{82} Lemaître, Mourir à Saint-Martial, pp. 293–311.
describes the offices of Prime and then of Chapter. The second describes the duties of the different members of the community. The section on the office of Chapter shows that the names of the dead were indeed read aloud in Chapter, by a novice (*iuvenis*) who had earlier been assigned the task by the *cantor*. This differs from the Customary of Cluny of the time of Abbot Odilon (994–1049), in which the reader was designated as a child: ‘Ad capitulum sic pronuntietur infans . . .’ At the Mont it was obviously a novice already advanced in monastic life who performed the task: ‘et iuvenis faciens tabulam accepta benedictione a illo magistro ordinis legat kalendam, scilicet de festis sanctorum de sequentie die [. . .] et post legat ille frater mortuos de die sequenti sicut scriptum est in martirologo’. The word *tabula* occurs not infrequently in the Ceremonial, and has more than one meaning based upon the idea of listing rotation or alternation. Essentially it refers to a duty roster; here the phrase ‘*iuvenis faciens tabulam*’ means ‘the novice on duty, whose turn it is’. It also refers to written lists. A key passage in the Ceremonial shows that lists were prepared for the daily commemoration of dead persons, whose names were recorded in a strict hierarchy: ‘Parvi ebdomadarii faciunt tabulas mortuorum . . . scribendo in una tabula primo illos de quibus habemus pictanciam qui erunt in illis diebus scripti in martirologo uel collectariis, ponendo et primo reges – si qui fuerint – et reginas et episcopos et abbates, fratres, et post clericos, laicos et feminas, et post illos de congregacione ponendo similiter per ordinem.’ Note that this information is gathered from at least two sources (*martirologo vel collectariis*) and then ordered into two distinct, hierarchically arranged groups contained in a single list. There is no doubt, therefore, that the information maintained before the late thirteenth century distinguishing those remembered as *huius loci* in the Martyrology-Necrology from those remembered as *de congregatione* (i.e. *confratres*) in the Necrology, was collated in a strictly ordered list (*tabula mortuorum*) for daily use in the office of Chapter. This is very important information about the community, and it is a precious addition to the limited knowledge we have so far of the organisation of Chapter liturgy in general.

**Names in the Martyrology-Necrology and Necrology in Avranches**

Although the number of persons identifiable in the necrologies is just a small percentage of the total, it is not insignificant. The entries easiest to identify are those of abbots, for whom there may well be datable obits (records of death) in places other than mortuary records, such as chronicles. Analysis of the identity of the abbots recorded in the Necrology is typically revealing. There are no abbots from Norman monasteries earlier than the eleventh century. Overwhelmingly the most important link is with the abbey of Redon in Brittany, a link that can also be seen in other types of documents. Many of the abbots of Redon from Conwoion onwards are named in the Mont necrologies. Conwoion, who died on 1 May 868, occurs in the Necrology, but three others, Almod, Ivo, and Silvester, also occur in the Martyrology-Necrology, indicating their status *de nostris* among the monks of Mont-Saint-Michel. Redon

---

83 Lemaître, ibid., p. 312.
84 See in full Appendix, no. 6.
85 See further Appendix, no. 5.
86 Almod (d. 1083) occurs on 5 September, Ivo (d. post 1157) on 18 November, and Silvester (d. 1169) on 23 June.
occurs as *Abbatia Sancti Saluatoris* in one of the (defective) confraternity lists of Mont-Saint-Michel.\(^87\) According to a set of annals from the abbey of Redon, preserved in a fifteenth-century manuscript of Mont-Saint-Michel, the Mont’s abbot Mainard II, who was deposed in 1009 by Richard II of Normandy, was simultaneously abbot of Redon, where he later died.\(^88\) Another house of special importance was Fleury, with two eleventh-century abbots occurring in the Martyrology-Necrology, reserved for monks of the Mont.\(^90\) So too was Marmoutier, several eleventh- and twelfth-century abbots of which were remembered in the Necrology.\(^90\) Among the most prominent named monasteries from the late tenth or early eleventh century were Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Saint-Aubin d’Angers, and La Couture in Le Mans.

The presence or absence in the Martyrology-Necrology and the Necrology of the names of abbots from the great monasteries in the region later known as Normandy is a particularly striking instance of how these compilations can offer insight into the development of the Mont’s community. The Mont can be shown to have had close links with the abbey of Saint-Ouen de Rouen from at least the 980s and probably before, but its earliest recorded obit of an abbot from Normandy is that for Roderic, abbot of Jumièges (d. 1000), who was not widely remembered.\(^91\) Indeed, none of the Mont’s records relating to the dead of Norman monasteries predates the era when the Mont was forced unwillingly into the Fécamp-Jumièges orbit formed by William of Dijon. William had stipulated that all of the monasteries attached to him and his followers should circulate and record necrological information. As Niethard Bulst has shown, however, with the death of the last Fécampois abbot, Ralph, in the 1050s, all the monasteries involved, including the Mont, abruptly ceased to collect from or contribute material to these Fécampois necrologies.\(^92\) The most noticeable gaps in the Mont Necrology are in its obits of abbots from Fécamp, Jumièges, and Saint-Bénigne de Dijon from the mid-eleventh to the mid-twelfth century.

Writing before the abdication of Richard II of Normandy in 1025, Dudo of St-Quentin had alleged that Richard I of Normandy raised buildings for the monks of

---

\(^{87}\) Avranches, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 211, fol. 137v.


\(^{89}\) Gauzlin (d. 1030), occurs on 16 June, and Josceran (d. 1095) on 7 April.

\(^{90}\) It is easier to be sceptical of Laporte’s identification (‘les Obituaires’, p. 736) of the abbots Vivian and Hubert, named together on 5 September, with the lay abbots of Marmoutier who died in 851 and 864 respectively, than to propose alternative identifications.


Mont-Saint-Michel, who were compelled to follow strict observance of the Rule. In
the mid-eleventh century a monk of the abbey greatly elaborated this story by alleging
the removal of canons from the Mont by Richard I of Normandy and their replace-
ment by monks in 965/6. The text, which is known as Introductio monachorum, was
the product of a moment of crisis and aimed at a Norman duke. It has no other docu-
mentary support from Mont-Saint-Michel, and the earliest annals of the abbey,
produced at a similar date, fail completely to mention any involvement of Richard I
with the monastery, though they do mention the aid of Richard II in the rebuilding
programme initiated by Abbot Hildebert II, who died in 1023. The same lack of
Norman involvement with the abbey in the tenth century, evidenced in the necrolo-
gies and the earliest annals, is also clearly revealed in the charters copied into the
Cartulary of 1149. The enduring belief in the Introductio’s account of Richard I’s
alleged reform is principally due to the decision of the cartularist to incorporate it into
the prefatory Historia.

The problem cannot be pursued here, but a considerable question mark must be
raised over the received history of the abbey, which the evidence of the Martyrology-
Necrology and the Necrology does much to undermine. Such evidence is extremely
important as the nearest thing we have to an objective record, because the information
was transmitted down the centuries and, although omissions may have occurred,
deliberate falsification did not. Currently woefully under-used, necrologies are ripe
for systematic exploitation in the investigation not only of individual monasteries, but
also of whole monastic networks, over considerable periods of time. The necrologies
are full of the living dead clamouring to tell their story. The question is: are we
listening?

Appendix: Texts showing how the dead were remembered at
Mont-Saint-Michel, through confraternity agreements and through liturgy

1. Letter of Robert of Torigny, abbot of Mont-Saint-Michel, recording the act of
confraternity agreed between his monks and those of Cluny on the occasion of a visit
to the Mont by Abbot Stephen of Cluny and Abbot Benedict of La Cluse in 1172;
printed Torigni, ed. Delisle, II, no. XXX, pp. 294–5

Ut oblivionis incommodum caveatur, ego Robertus abbas et conventus Sancti
Michaelis de periculo maris utile duximus mandare litteris et confirmare sigillo quod,
cum dominus Stephanus abbas Cluniacensis de suo adventu ad locum nostrum nos
admodum laetificasset, ab ipso et nobis, presente etiam reverentissimo abbate
Clusino gratia Benedicto et nomine, in nostro capitulo est constitutum et attentius
confirmatum, ut monasterium Cluniacense et nostrum subscripto societatis vinculo
deinceps in perpetuum astringantur. Igitur si de alterutro monasteriorum frates ad

93 Dudo, De moribus, Liber Tertius, ed. J. Lait (Caen, 1865), p. 290. Cf. Dudo of St Quentin: History of
94 Cf. a slightly later version printed from another manuscript, in Delisle, Torigni II, 235–6.
95 The tenth-century charters in the Cartulary concerned the Touraine, Brittany and Maine (Cartulary,
nos. 22, 27, 28, 30, 32).
alterum venerint, sicut ejusdem loci monachi suscipiuntur et in ordine erunt, si moram
ibidem, seu voluntate, seu necessitate, aliquandiu sunt facturi. Pro abbatibus autem
Cluniacensisbus defunctis sicut pro nostris faciemus; ab ipsis vero pro nostris sicut
pro abbatibus qui ad ipsos pertinent est agendum. Pro fratribus autem, quotiens
alicujus obitus audietur, officium et missa celebrabitur in conventu, cantabuntque pro eo
singuli sacerdotes, et ceteri psalmos dicit. Et quia defuncti brevem cito ferri via
longior non permittit, statutum est ut annuatim in octavis sancti Michaelis pro
utriusque loci defunctus utrique officium et missa solenniter ac deinde tricenarium
celebretur. Hujus autem fraterne conventionis scripturam vobis, o dilectissimi et
omni honore digni sancte Cluniacensis ecclesie fratres universi, transmisimus,
quatins apud vos ob memoriam, si vestre sanctitati placuerit, habeatur.

2. *Grant of particular confraternity to laymen, 1249; Avranches 214, part II, p. 73*
(*recto facing end of Regula sci. Benedicti*)

Anno ab incarnatione Domini MCCXL nono sacra die Pasche recepimus in Capitulo
nostro, presente abbate nostro Donno Ricardo, uenerabilem uirum dominum
Radulfum Filgeriarum in fraternitate nostra, Dominum Guillelum Senbric, Iuhellum de Ardena, Stephanum Gelin, Stephanum de Laritour et milites eiusdem.
Concessimus eisdem benigne ut a modo participes sint omnium bonorum que fuerint
et fient in ecclesia nostra in ieiunis, vigiliis, elemosiniis, orationibus, et aliis bonis,
dictis, factis, et exemplis que poterunt fieri a nobis et a posteris usque in sempiternum.
Audita vero morte ipsorum, habebunt missam in conventu cum uigilia; ab uno quoque
sacerdote missam priuatam. Ab illis uero qui non fuerint presbiteri, quod statutum est
pro uno de fratribus nostris, promissimus etiam Domino R. Filgeriarum et domino G.
Senbric quod singulis diebus orationem pro eis specialem in capitulo nostro faciemus.

3. *List of abbeys in confraternity with Mont-Saint-Michel, written c.1400; Avranches
214, part I, p. 198*

In two columns. *First headed:* Date literarum.
Second headed: Secuntur nomina societatum huius monasterii de quibus post
combustione ipsius literas inueniems

Sine data Abbacia Cluniacensis
   Abbatia Sancti Benedicti Floriacensis
   Abbatia Sancti Petri de Cultura
   Abbatia Sancti Iouini de Marnes
   Abbatia Sancti Petri Bathoniensis
MCCXIII Abbatia Sancti Wandregisili
MCCXXII Abbacia Sancti Iuliani Turonensis
MCCL Abbatia de Fonte Danielis
MCCL Abbatia Sancti Florentii Salumur
MCCLI Ecclesia Maclouiensis
MCCLXVII Abbatia Sancti Stephani Cadomensis
MCCXXXIX Abbatia de Ebronio
MCCXLV Abbatia Sancti Melanii Redonensis
MCCLXIX Abbatia de Exaquio
MCCLXXXXVI Abbatia Sancti Meuenii de Gael
MCCCIII Abbatia Sancte Marie de La Real
MCCCXIX Abbatia Savigniacensis
MCCCCXXXIX Abbatia de Gemetico
MCCCLX Abbatia Sancti Petri de Burgolio
MCCCCLXXXIII Abbatia Sancte Marie de Monte Burgi
MCCCCLXIX Abbatia de Monte Morelli
sine data Abbatia Cluniensis [Abbatia Sancti Michaelis Clusensis] Abbatia Sancti
Vigoris de Serasio [added later]

De subsequentibus non inueniems literas licet in nouo martirologio nostro registr’
Abbatia Maiori Monasterii Turonensis
Abbatia Sancti Benignii Divionensis
Abbatis de Fiscanno
Abbatia Sancti Stephani Fonten’
Abbatia de Dono regio
Abbatia Sancte Marie de Becco
Abbatia Sancte Katerine Rothomagensis
Abbatia Sancti Audoeni Rothomagensis
Abbatia Sancti Nicholai Andegauensis
Abbatia Sancti Germani de Pratis
Per relationem breuigeri nostri habuimus notitiam de subscriptibus post
combustionem.
Abbatia sancti Dionisii in Francia
Prioratus Sancti Martini de Campis
Abbatia Sancti Mauri de Fossatis
Abbatia de Trouarno
Abbatia Beati Michaelis de Vltoriori Portu
Abbatia Sancti Eburphi Lexouiensis
Abbatia Sancti Martini Sagiensis
Abbatia Sancti Petri Carnotensis
Abbatia Sancti Memini primi episcopi Cathalaun’
Abbatia Beate Marie de Cormell’
Abbatia Sancti Iacuti de Insula
Abbatia Sancti Sergii et Bachi prope Andegauensem
Per antiquos martirologos nostros notitiam habemus de ultimis istis.
Abbatia Sancti Salvators
Abbatia Sancti Taurini Ebroicensis
Abbatis Sancti Petri Diuensis
Abbatia Sancti Michaelis Clusensis
Abbatia Sancti Petri Cerneliensis
Abbatia Glost’iensis
Abbatia Abesderie
Abbatia Sancte Marie Micariensis
Abbatia de Sancto Iouino
Abbatia Sancti Vincentii Cenomanensis
Abbatia de Tyron
Abbatia Colecestrie
in a much later hand Abbatia Vizeliacensis, Abbatia Sancti Georgii de Bauquieuilla
Rothom'

4. Avranches 214, part I, p. 50, extract from the Martyrology-Necrology for 2 April
Ob. Rogerius abbas huius loci. 96 [later additions: Osbernus. Hac die anno dni.
MCCCCXV recepimus in isto monasterio locale preciosum ponderis lxxvi
marchatum arg’ . . . ad ymaginem Beatissimi Michaelis fabricatum, nobis et dicto
monasterio per illustrissimum principem dominum comitem de Harcuria, pro sua
suorumque predecessorum ac successorum salute, liberaliter donatum, tali cum pacto
quo ad perpetuum sue donationis memoriae teneamur, illud absque alienatione pro
quorumque necessitate in eodem monasterio perpetuo conservare, super quod habuit
literas nostras. Hac die nobis dedit M. Matheus prior huius loci xii marchas argenti in
xii ciphis et uno . . .]

5. Extract from a fifteenth-century Ceremonial, suffrages of the dead; Avranches 214,
part II, p. 256–59
p. 256 Et una alia processio que sit die huic de defunctis ante missam matutinalem,
nisi fuerit festum duodecim lectionum; et si fuerit festum, transfertur ad terciam
feriam uel ad quartam et non plus transferetur. [257] Et sic fit eundo cum aqua
benedicta duobus candelabris et una cruce ad porticum supra cimiterium fratrum et
dicuntur sub media uoce isti psalmi: Verba mea. et cetera; et post cantor incipiet
Liber me. cum uersibus cantando Kyriel. Pater noster. Et ne nos uersus et orationes
sub media uoce. Requiescant in pace. cantetur; deinde incipient vii psalmos
penitentiales sub media uoce, sine Gloria in fine. Requiem. Kyriel. Pater noster. Et ne
nos. uersus A porta. oratio. Absolue.
Ista processio non sit infra octauas Pasche, Penthecostes, Sacramenti et a die Natalis
Domini usque post Epiphaniam, quia in istis diebus non facimus de defunctis.
Parui ebdomadarii faciunt tabulas mortuorum sic pro diebus precedentibus et primo
pro Pasca a die Mercurii post Dominam Palmarum usque post octauam Pasche,
scribendo in una tabula primo illos de quibus habemus pict’ qui erunt in illis diebus
scripti in martirologio uel collectanis,97 ponendo et primo reges – si qui fuerint – et
reginas et episcopos et abbates, fratres, et post clericos, laicos et feminas, et post illos
degregatione ponendo similiter per ordinem; et fiet de istis ante d’ die Mercurii
ante Pascha. Similiter a die Veneris ante Penthecostam usque post octauam eiusdem,
fiet tabula de mortuis scriptis pro illis diebus in collectariis et martirologis, et fiet
tabula sicut dictum est fiet de eis in die Veneris ante Penthecosten.

96 Roger II, monk of Jumièges, appointed by the duke. Resigned on 16 October 1123, he returned to
Jumièges where he died on 2 April 1124. Avranches 215, fol. 163r.
97 Perhaps here martirologum stands for the Chapter Book (which contained the Usuard Martyrology),
and collectarius for compilations or anthologies of obit materials external to it, e.g. an obituary such as
the one in Avranches 215. On the uses of the word martirologum, cf. Lemaitre, ‘Liber capituli’, p. 627:
‘En règle générale, le volume (i.e. the Liber capituli) était désigné par l’un des deux textes le
composant, regula ou martyrolgium, parfois les deux à la fois.’
258 Similiter a die Mercurii in Vigilia Sacramenti usque post octauam eiusdem festi, fiet tabulam sicut dictum est de mortuis scriptis in martirologi et collectanis in illis diebus, et fiet de illis etiam Vigilia Sacramenti nisi fuerit festum duodecim lectionum, quia si esset festum fietur in feria precedente. Et similiter de die Veneris ante Pentecostam et de die Mercurii ante Pascha si esset festum duodecim lectionum. Similiter a Vigilia Natalis Domini usque post Epiphaniam fiet tabula sicut dictum est de mortuis scriptis in collectanis et martirologis in illis diebus, et fiet de illis pridie Vigilia Natalis Domini nisi fuerit festum duodecim lectionum, et si esset festum faceremus in feria precedente nisi impeditata.

Nota quod facimus tres lectiones de defunctis in diebus octuvarum Sancti Stephani, Innocentium et in uigilia Epyphanie et dicitur tamen quod non facimus de defunctis.

In die Sancti Columbani que est vicesima prima die mensis Nouembris datur elemosina communis de delardo vel de alectibus cum pane uel argentu et in illa die facimus obitum solennem et hoc est pro secundo Ricardo duce Normannie. Et ad prandium reficien’ pauperes in refrectorio et debet elemosinarius eos seruire de celario et coquina.

In die Iouis in Parasceue datur etiam elemosina communis de fabis cum pane et alectibus et argento et reficiendi pauperes in refrectorio. Et similiter reficiendi in die Cinerum et in die obitus fratrum similiter reficiendi pauperes in refrectorio.

259 Pro uno fratre mortuo fit obitus solennis et commendatio et dicimus quinquaginta psalmi psalterii. Et per xxx dies continuos in qualibet die dicitur una missa. Et per illos dies xxx accipiet elemosinarius liberacionem pro illo fratre sicut si frater adhuc uiueret et debit pauperibus. Et quilibet fratrum presbiterorum tenetur dicere pro suo sicut mortuo ix missas et iuuenes debent dicere tria psalteria. Pro rege et regina Francie, pro duce et ducissa Normannie, pro duce et ducissa Britannie, et pro filiiis et filiabus predictorum pro episcopis Abrincensis pro patribus et matribus fratrum religiosorum huius monasterii debemus facere post obitum eorum obitum solennem.

6. The offices of Prime and Chapter, according to the Ceremonial, Avranches 214, part II, pp. 216–20

216 Mane facto in duodecim lectionibus ad horam vii horarum ordo pulset campanam de dormitorio et postea ad ecclesiam, et pulset modicum primam campanam ad euocandum clericum ecclesie qui cito debet uenire et pulsare illam campanam usque dum factum fuerit signum ab ordine. Et fratern surrentes sub silencio cant in choro et, stantes in locis suis ultus versus altare, dicant orationes ad eorum deuotions usque ad dimidiam horam; qua pulsata ordo faciat signum et tunc dicant fratres sub silencio psalmum Miserere mei Deus; et pulsetur a clerico una

98 Actually Richard I; Avranches 214, part ii, p. 345: ‘Anno dominii millesimo ducentesimo lix. In die obitus comitis Ricardi fundatoris nostri constituit domnus Ricardus abbass noster cum consentu et uoluntate consentent que illa die cantor.’

99 Normally the abbot, or in his absence the prior, the subprior or the presbyter missae (hebdomadarius): Avranches 214, part ii, p. 202: ‘In absenta abbas et prioris suprior obediatur et punit et corrigat sicut predicti. In absenta omnium predictorum presbitero misse obediatur et preter punire et corrigere in capitulio si capitulum teneret. Et quia predictorum potestas procedit per ordinem ideo ululat in isto monasterio ipsos ordo appelamus.’
In duodecim lectionibus ad nonam horas, si non fuerit ieiunium, et si fuerit ieiunium ad decem horas, ordo faciat signum cum prima campana, deinde iuuenis faciens tabulam et pulsans campanam, omnes fratres ibi stantes in cellis suis ululus uersus altare dicentes orationes, ordo faciat signum ad modum Oremus et precedens, et post eum iuuenes primi eant in capitulo dicendo sub silencio Miserere mei Deus, et iuuenis faciens tabulam accepta benedictione a illo magistro ordinis legat kalendam, scilicet de festis sanctorum de sequentie die; post kalendam dicantur uersus et orationes scilicet Pretiosa est et cetera. Et post ea legatur in duodecim lectionibus de expositione Euangeli illius diei, et in tribus lectionibus de Regula sancti Benedicti. Post Tu autem leget tabulam pro die sequenti de lectionibus et responsor[ibus] mat[utinalibus], et post legat ille frater mortuos de die sequenti sicut scriptum est in martirologuo, et in fine dicet Et omnis alii familiares nostri; postea dicat ordo Pro illis. Anime omnium fidelium et cetera. Pater noster et Benedicite sine benedictione jiuuenis qui faciet tabulam sub correctione, cantor statuet quis dicet missam de sancta Maria in die sequenti et dicet fratres qui fuerunt de custodia noctis. Et ibi notum quod omnes fratres debent facere custodiam noctis, scilicet circumueundo domum et muros duo in qualibet nocte cum duobus clericis ecclesie . . .

p. 220 In isto Capitulo si fuerint aliquae correctiones faciende fiant. Et si fuerit aliquid ad ordinandum uel statuendum pro bono monasterii ibi fiat; et est principale capitulum septimane in die sabbati eo quod si minus bene fuerit factum uel correctum ibi statuetur et ordinetur. Ad exitum capituli incipiet ordo psalmus Verba mea et cetera sicut in fine Matutine et dicantur decem psalmos sub media uoce eundo ad ecclesiam. Pro toto anno est principale Capitulum in festo Sancti Auberti, et ibi priores debent declarare status suorum prioratum, et officiarii et receptores debent rededere compota.
Post Capitulum in duodecim lectionibus dicitur missa matutinalis et post missam matutinalem . . .