CULTURAL EXPRESSIONS OF EPISCOPAL POWER, 1070 – *c*. 1150

by

CHARLOTTE LEWANDOWSKI

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHY

Department of Medieval History
College of Arts and Law
The University of Birmingham
September 2010

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

· Contents ·

Abbreviations

Introduction
Bishops: the measure of power 1

Part One: *In principio erat verbum*
From Charisma to Bureaucracy

Chapter One
The English Primacy Dispute: articulating episcopal power 31

Chapter Two
Excommunication: the power of words 67

Part Two: *Et verbum caro factum est*
Church/State Dichotomy

Chapter Three
Monks and Courtiers: episcopal power in performance 103

Chapter Four
New Masculinities: gendering episcopal power 143

Part Three: *Et habitavit in nobis*
The Norman Conquest

Chapter Five
New Cathedrals and Old Saints: negotiating episcopal power 185

Conclusion
Hactenus de episcopis 225

Bibliography 228

Abbreviations

ANS	*Anglo-Norman Studies: Proceedings of the Battle Conference* [Formerly known as, *Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies*] (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1983-).
Anselm, *Letters*	*Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia* (letters), Dom F. S. Schmitt (6 vols. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1938-61). Cited by epistle number. Available in translation as *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Walter Fröhlich (3 vols. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990-1994). A new critical edition is currently being compiled by Samu Niskanen at the University of Oxford.
Christina Markyate	*The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse,* ed. and trans. C. H. Talbot (Reprint, Oxford: OMT, 1987). A revised English translation (without the Latin text) which takes into account some corrections to Talbot's text is also available, *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, eds. Samuel Fanous and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).
Councils & Synods	*Councils & Synods: with other documents relating to the English Church. 1, A.D.871-1204*, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).
CUP	Cambridge University Press
Durham, *De Mir.*	*Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti, Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia Historia Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis*, 2 vols. ed. T. Arnold (London, 1882) I, 229-61; II, pp. 333-62. Cited by volume and page number.
EEA	*English Episcopal Acta* (Oxford: OUP, 1980-)
EHR	*English Historical Review*
GP	William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificium Anglorum*, 2 vols. ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M Thomson (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2007). Cited by chapter and section. An alternative translation (without the Latin text) is also available, William of Malmesbury, *The Deeds of the Bishops of England*, trans. David Preest (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002).
GS	*Gesta Stephani*, ed. and trans. K. R. Potter (London: OUP, 1976). Cited by page number.

Herbert, *Letters*	Herbert Losinga, *Letter Collection*, ed. Nicholas Karn (OMT, forthcoming). Cited by epistle number. An English translation of the letters is also available. *The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishops Herbert de Losinga*, eds. Edward M. Goulburn and Henry Symonds, 2 Vols. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1878)
Hugh the Chanter	Hugh the Chanter, *The History of the Church of York 1066-1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson, revised by M. Brett, C. N. L. Brooke, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: OMT, Clarendon Press, 1990). Cited by page number.
HH	Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996). Cited by page number.
HN	William of Malmesbury*, Historia Novella: the contemporary history*, ed. Edmund King, trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford: OMT, 1998). Cited by book and chapter.
HNA	Eadmer, *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule (London: RS, 1884). Cited by page number. The first four books are available in translation as *Eadmer's History of Recent Events in England*, trans. Geoffrey Bosanquet (London: The Cresset Press, 1964).
JEH	*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JW	*The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, III, *The annals from 1067 to 1140 with Gloucester interpolations and the continuation to 1411*, ed. and trans. P. McGurk (Oxford: OMT, 1998). Cited by page number.
Lanfranc, *Letters*	*The Letters of Archbishops Lanfranc*, eds. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979). Cited by epistle number.
LDE	Simeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*, ed. and trans. David Rollason (Oxford: OMT, 2000). Cited by chapter and verse.
LDE, Continuation	'Appendix B, Continuation beginning 'Tribus dehinc annis', *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*, ed. and trans. David Rollason (Oxford: OMT, 2000) 267-323. Cited by page number.

Liber Eliensis	*Liber Eliensis*, ed. E. O. Blake (London: Camden Third Series, Vol. XCII, 1962). Cited by chapter number. An English translation without the Latin text is available, *Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the seventh century to the twelfth compiled by a monk of Ely in the twelfth century*, trans. Janet Fairweather (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005).
Miracula S. Dunstani	Eadmer of Canterbury, *Miracula S. Dunstani*, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, eds. and trans. Andrew Turner and Bernard Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006) 158-211. Cited by chapter.
MSE	*Miracula sacnti Erkenwaldi* in *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed. and trans. E. Gordon Whateley (Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989) 100-165. Cited by *miraculum* and line.
OMT	Oxford Medieval Texts.
OUP	Oxford University Press.
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: OUP, 2004) Access via Internet: http://www.oxforddnb.com/athens/.
OV	*The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, (6 vols. Oxford: Oxford Medieval Texts, 1968-1980).
RS	Rolls Series.
Southern, *Saint Anselm*	Southern, R. W. *Saint Anselm and His Biographer: A study of monastic life and thought, 1059-c.*1103 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1963).
Southern, *Portrait*	Southern, R. W. *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990)
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
VA	Eadmer, *Vita Sancti Anselmi Archiepicopi Cantuariensis*, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962). Cited by page number.
VG	*The Life of Gundulf Bishop of Rochester*, ed. Rodney Thomson (Toronto: The Hunter Rose Company, 1977). Cited by chapter and line number. The Latin text has been translated by the nuns of Malling Abbey, *The life of the venerable man, Gundulf, bishop of Rochester* (New ed. St Mary's Abbey, Kent: Malling Abbey, 1984).

VR — Parkinson, B. J. 'The Life of Robert de Bethune by William de Wycombe: Translation with Introduction and Notes', B. Litt. Thesis (Unpublished Thesis, Oxford University, 1951). The text and translation are based on Lambeth MS 475, with variant readings from BL, MS Jul. D. X. Cited by page number.

VW — *Vita Wulfstani* in William of Malmesbury, *Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Idract*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002) 1-155. Cited by chapter and verse.

· Introduction ·

Bishops: the measure of power

A legatine council held at Winchester in April 1070 marked the beginning of a new era for the English church.[1] Until this point William the Conqueror had been reluctant to interfere directly with church affairs, preferring to wait for the papal legates.[2] The council oversaw the deposition of several churchmen, most notably Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury who held the bishopric of Winchester in plurality.[3] His replacement Lanfranc at Canterbury was quickly chosen. So ended the Anglo-Saxon church. From this point onwards the narrative of episcopal power is caught uncomfortably between two vast historiographical topics: the Norman Conquest and the papal reform movement.

In a recent volume dedicated to studies of episcopal power and culture in the central middle ages, the editors wrote that the central figure of the bishop has become 'a marginal entity in modern scholarship.'[4] Bishops are in the shadow of the *grand narrative* of medieval historiography: the triumph of the state. The historiography of

[1] *Councils and Synods,* pp. 563-76.

[2] Cardinal priests, John and Peter, along with Bishop Ermenfrid oversaw the council. H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Bishop Ermenfrid of Sion and the Penitential Ordinance following the Battle of Hastings', *JEH*, 20 (1969), pp. 225-242. It is worth noting that in the immediate aftermath of the battle at Hastings, William, perhaps craving some legitimacy, refrained from making significant changes to the ecclesiastical hierarchy in England. Even Stigand was retained as archbishop despite papal proclamations against his uncanonical position. Remigius was the only Norman candidate appointed before 1070 (consecrated by Stigand) to the vacant see at Dorchester (later to become Lincoln). H. R. Loyn, *The English Church* (Harlow, 2000), p. 67-8.

[3] Also deposed at the council, Leofwine, bishop of Lichfield, who was married, and Æthelmær of Elmham, the brother of Archbishop Stigand. See F. Barlow, *English Church, 1000-1066* (London, 1963), pp. 302-10, for an account of the spurious allegations against the bishops. Just weeks later, at Whitsun, another council was held at Windsor to confirm the deposition of Æthelric of Selsey. The grounds for Æthelric's deposition are unknown and although the process was not complete until 1076, his successor was appointed very shortly after the Whitsun council. *Council and Synods,* pp. 577-81.

[4] J. S. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones, 'Introduction', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. J. S. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007), p. 4.

the medieval church in the long twelfth century has been dominated by two related themes: the decline of Carolingian power and the expansion of new territorial lordships from the tenth century and the rise of the papacy, and papal-led reforms from the mid eleventh century, which aimed at increasing organisation and control. These narratives have not only framed the assessment of episcopal power during this period but have set the agenda in such a way that bishops are used as the measure of power.

Interpretations of power still make use of Max Weber's classic tripartite typology of legitimate authority (*legitime Herrschaft*): traditional, charismatic and legal rational.[5] Weber's lasting influence on the study of power, at least within the social sciences, has been to set the agenda for its study, concentrating on type and source. He regarded the dimension of power as present in all social situations and relationships. The social theorist who has taken the universality of power furthest has been Michel Foucault. His influence has done much to broaden the definition of power as something that is 'exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile relations'.[6] According to this view power is not acquired, seized, shared or lost.

> Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate

[5] M. Weber, 'The three pure types of legitimate rule', *The Essential Weber A Reader*, ed. Whimster (London, 2004), pp. 133-145. The originally article 'Die Drei Reinen Typen der Legitimen Herrschaft' was published posthumously in 1922 having been written sometime between 1917 and 1920. Max Weber distinguished between coercive power (*macht*) and *herrschaft*, translated variously as imperative control, rule, leadership, domination, authority and power. *Herrschaft*, 'is the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons.' M. Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, eds. G. Roth and C. Wittich (New York, 1968), p. 53, see n. 31 for an account of the problems of translating *Herrschaft*.

[6] M. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality: Volume One, The Will to Knowledge* (London, 1998), p. 94.

> between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power.[7]

While medieval historians have always been interested in power structures, particularly institutional power, it is only in the last few decades that they have begun to make use of this wider definition.[8] In a short article subtitled, 'the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', Timothy Reuter stated that 'the source and nature of political, social and cultural power is a subject which historians in general and medievalists in particular have instinctively tended to shy away from.'[9] Drawing 'tentatively' on sociological theories he posited a series of possible entry points to the complex problem of power. Reuter argued that the shift in emphasis from direct dominance to indirect dominance happened by means of social and cultural markers which expressed and actualised power, 'in particular the social markers of appearance, speech, food and rituals of social interaction.'[10] Reuter did not intend that historians become experts in anthropological or sociological techniques, however he insisted that historian should engage with the methodological problems they encountered.

In fact it is much more usual to speak of episcopal authority rather than power, the ability to influence or persuade rather than force or coerce. Historians have preferred to describe legitimising strategies for power distinguishing authority as the

[7] M. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon (New York, 1980), p. 98.

[8] Significant collections include *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. T. N. Bisson, (Philadelphia, 1995); *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. M. de Jong and F. Theuws with C. van Rhijn (Leiden, 2001); *The Experience of Power in Medieval Europe, 950-1350*, eds. R. Berkhofer, A. Cooper and A. J. Kosto (Aldershot, 2005); *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, eds. B. Bolton and C. Meek (Turhout, 2007).

[9] T. Reuter, 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111-26; originally published in *Nobles and Nobility in the Middle Ages*, ed. A. Duggan (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 85-98.

[10] T. Reuter, 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), p. 112.

justification for power as coercive force. In the introductory chapter to the volume *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, the editors write that '[a]uthority may be understood as the generally accepted justification for action and power as the practical ability to induce others to obey or follow a lead.' They continue, '[t]he relationship of power and authority was fundamental in the Middle Ages, since power without authority was little more than brute force, while claims to authority without the power to make them effective were in the long run unsustainable.'[11] This distinction underlies much of the study of ecclesiastical power; the church and its highest order, the bishops, are often perceived as possessing 'authority' the ability to bestow legitimacy on those who wielded real 'power'. Rees Davies pointed out the anachronism involved in the assumption that the church was not part of direct power but exercised *authority* by exerting influence and 'diplomatic' manipulation.

> In a world where the church was, in Richard Southern's phrase, "a compulsory society", the church was surely the best claimant to legitimacy and coercive control. It will simply not do to dismiss the power of the Pope as depending on moral authority and influence. After all, the fear of the hereafter is potentially the most potent form of coercive control! It is a very modern and secular argument to ask how many battalions the Pope has![12]

By using Foucault's description of power as force relations we can avoid this question altogether. Power must be assessed moment to moment. Power is not an object; it cannot be possessed. This thesis is concerned with the experience of power, the moment of power when force and resistance can be detected in a social interaction of two or more parties. Bishops can therefore be studied both as active and passive participants in context of power relations.

---

[11] B. Bolton and C. Meek, 'Introduction', *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, eds. B. Bolton and C. Meek (Turhout, 2007), pp. 1-2.
[12] R. Davies 'The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16: 2 (2003), pp. 280-300, at p. 291. R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1970), p. 17.

Bishops as a measure of European change: the emergence of the state

Weber's typology has helped underpin the *grand narrative* of medieval history, the emergence of the state. This has deeply influenced explanations of the central middle ages as an age of transition. The historical narrative describes how from the chaos that followed the disintegration of Carolingian public power there emerged new, recognisable *institutions* of government. R. W. Southern described it as '[t]he stabilisation of the boundaries of Europe, the slow recovery of political order, and the unprecedented acceleration of economic activity.'[13] In this story bishops were the measure of change.

Carolingian public power was based on sacerdotal kingship; the king was anointed, 'endowed by God with powers which combined important aspects of the powers of bishops and priests, as well as the sanctions of secular rule.'[14] Rosamond McKitterick emphasised the vital role of the episcopate in Carolingian society, where 'the church and the Christian faith provided an essential sense of cohesion, unity and ideological continuity... [and the] initiative and responsibility for social renewal devolved upon the episcopate.'[15] The stability of Carolingian rule rested upon the mutual interdependence of the king and the episcopate. This system placed great emphasis on the role of the bishops who, at least in theory, could claim spiritual superiority to kings during the moment of coronation. Kings ruled with the support of the bishops who legitimised royal power. However this was an immature system and from the ninth century public order and justice collapsed and new regimes of arbitrary lordship emerged as the result of the 'multiplication of fighting men, of castles and of

[13] R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London, 1953), p. 15.
[14] *Ibid*, p. 91.
[15] R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789-895* (London, 1977) pp. 207-8.

harsh new lordships of command based in castles.'[16] A transformation of power occurred; a new type of power based on violence and, according to many, in direct opposition to public order. In particular the *Past and Present* "feudal revolution" debates in the 1990s provided fertile ground for the discussion of power in the central middle ages.[17] From the ruins of Carolingian public power, characterised by routine and law and order, emerged a more vital and coercive power. Reuter defined the "feudal revolution" as 'conventional shorthand for the disappearance… of a 'centre' able to control localities, and the appropriation by those bent on local dominance of the shell of legitimate authority which this process left behind.'[18] Within this narrative the clergy were representative of the old public order, the guardians of legitimate authority.[19] The disintegration of Carolingian power forced the clerical hierarchy to renegotiate their position within the political structure.[20] Reuter identified episcopal solidarity and cooperation (namely, diocesan and provincial councils and letter exchange between bishops) as a form of European public order which survived beyond the Carolingian era.[21] Bishops were a measure of stability.

[16] T. N. Bisson, 'The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), pp. 6-42, at p. 12.
[17] T. N. Bisson, 'The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), pp. 6-42; D. Barthélemy and S. D. White, 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 152 (1996), pp. 196-223; T. Reuter and C. Wickham, 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 155 (1997), pp. 177-208.
[18] T. Reuter, 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 155 (1997), p. 177.
[19] Bisson argues that 'only by recognising the characteristic violence of lay seigneurial power can we see that the typical struggle of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was not that between lords and peasants but that opposing two levels of the seigneurial élites. Here if anywhere was quasi-ideological conflict: knights, retainers and servants struggling for respectability with their fragile claims to coercive patrimonial domination, bewildered princes and kings seeking to square their own seigneurial instincts with revived and clerically inspired notions of lawful public order.' T. N. Bisson, 'The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), pp. 40-1.
[20] This can be seen especially in the development of the Peace of God movements in the eleventh century when the clergy led attempts to place restrictions on excessive violence using rituals of reconciliation as instruments of social control. For a more detailed discussion see, *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. T. Head and R. A. Landes (Ithaca, NY, 1992).
[21] T. Reuter, 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 155 (1997), p. 185.

Elsewhere, in the east Frankish lands, the traditions of Carolingian kingship were 'revived' by Otto I (d.973) and his successors.[22] Here they established a *Reichkirchensystem*, or an 'imperial church system' which sought to counter the expanding power of the aristocracy. According to the traditional narrative, bishops, chosen and appointed by kings, were granted lands and royal rights, and became the principle instrument of imperial government. For their part, bishops were keen to ally themselves with royal power in order to protect themselves from predatory nobles. The courtier bishop, as described by Stephen Jaeger, was the embodiment of this deliberate policy. The Ottonian, and later Salian kings, used the episcopal office as, 'a buffer against the opposition of the feudal nobility.'[23] Accordingly, as royal servants, bishops would spend more time at the king's court than at their cathedral. Thus they were engaged in secular activities more than religious.[24] This implies that the role of the bishop was deeply connected to the operation of effective royal power.

Whatever the reality of the Carolingian compromise or the *Reichskirche*, the appearance of cooperation between royal and episcopal power was finally destroyed by the reforms, attributed largely to Pope Gregory VII, which undermined the notion of royal and episcopal cooperation, 'opening an ideological fissure between secular government and the church.'[25] Historians have long debated the precise achievements

[22] Barraclough writes candidly about the limitations of Ottonian government, stating that, 'in reviving Carolingian traditions of government, it was archaic and backward looking, a retarding influence, which introduced no new initiative, but simply drew upon the past for its strength and with the passage of time became more and more out of date. G. Barraclough, *The Crucible of Europe* (London, 1976), p. 118.

[23]C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', *Speculum*, 58 (1983), p. 291.

[24] Indeed by the twelfth century some bishops of large cities in Germany operated like secular lords, or prince-bishops, controlling the civic administration and possessing legal and financial independence. See B. Arnold, *Count and Bishop in Medieval Germany A Study of Regional Power, 1110-1350* (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 44-63, for an account of the secular progress of a 'middle-ranking' bishopric of Eichstätt in Bavaria.

[25] J. S. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones, 'Introduction', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. J. S. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007), p. 4.

of the eleventh-century ecclesiastical reforms, however, most accept G. Tellenbach's claim, made in the 1930s, that it was the 'culmination of medieval history', a great-turning point of medieval civilisation.[26] Norman Cantor, writing in 1958, described it as, the first world-revolution, proposing that 'the ultimate aim of the revolutionary ideologists [was] not the reform of the prevailing system, but rather its abolition and replacement by a new order.'[27] Conventionally 'reform' refers to three main aims: to strengthen and centralise the ecclesiastical hierarchy, to free the church from secular control, and to enforce clerical celibacy. The centralization of papal power has very often been seen as slowly eroding local traditions of episcopal autonomy and administration and as such bishops have been portrayed as resistant to reforms. In the clash between *regnum* and *sacerdotium* the position of the bishops was uncertain. It is too simplistic to label bishops as 'reformist' or 'Gregorian' as opposed to 'imperial'; it seems in most cases they blew with the wind. However by Lateran IV (1215) a new type of churchman dominated the medieval landscape.[28] As the religious-secular divide became wider, the historiographical church-state dichotomy appears, and new churchmen begin to assert their independence from royal authority preferring Rome instead. Yet the Gregorian reforms were much more than a matter of church history. Reuter claimed that they represented the 'dissolution of *all* second-order differences within hierarchies; a shift from custom to law and precedent; a shift from conduct legitimised by office to office legitimised by conduct.'[29] Thus, ironically, the papal reform movement is credited with heralding a new bureaucratic age of secular government. And bishops were vital to any such administration.

[26] G. Tellenbach, *Church, State and Christian Society at the time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940), p.162.
[27] N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, 1958), p. 7.
[28] R. I. Moore, *The First European Revolution c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000).
[29] T. Reuter, 'Leeds Paper: *Europe des diocèses*' (IMC Leeds, Typescript, 1995), pp. 5-6.

Bishops as the measure of English development: the post-Conquest state

Since the nineteenth century, in England as in Germany, our written history has been largely dominated by the desire to identify the origins of the nation state. F. W. Maitland wrote, 'the valuable thing that the Norman Conquest gives us is a strong kingship which makes for national unity.'[30] Here the *grand narrative* has been the early development of a centralised government: the Anglo-Saxon 'state'.[31] Royal authority and control in England never suffered from the sort of disintegration that occurred across the Channel. English bishops are understood to be less 'powerful', at least in a political sense, than their continental counterparts. The narrative of the Anglo-Norman church is a replay of the European post-Carolingian narrative: bishops as courtiers working with and legitimising royal power; general resistance to the incursions of papal authority; the demise of central authority (during Stephen's reign) when bishops became the guardians of legitimate authority and peacemakers, finally the emergence of a new-style of churchman (personified by Archbishop Becket) embracing independence. Unsurprisingly perhaps the Norman Conquest, not eleventh-century ecclesiastical reform, dominates the historiography of the Anglo-Norman church.[32] And so research is often centred on questions about continuity and change.

[30] F. W. Maitland, *The Constitutional History of England: a course of lectures delivered by F. W. Maitland*, ed. H. A. L. Fisher (Cambridge, 1919), p. 9.
[31] J. Campbell, *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London, 2000), esp. pp. 10-13. For a broad discussion of the notion of the 'state' in medieval historiography see R. Davies, 'The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16: 2 (2003), pp. 280-300; S. Reynolds, 'There were states in medieval Europe: A response to Rees Davies' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16: 4 (2003), pp. 550-555.
[32] Important surveys include R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225* (Oxford, 2000); M. Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford, 1986); J. Gillingham, *The English in the Twelfth Century: imperialism, national identity, and political values* (Woodbridge, 2000); B. Golding, *Conquest and Colonisation: The Normans in Britain, 1066-1100* (Basingstoke, 2001); J. Holt, *Colonial England 1066-1215* (1997); J. Le Patourel, *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet* (London, 1984). Surveys of individual reigns include F. Barlow, *William Rufus* (London, 1983); H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen, 1135-54* (London, 1970); D. Crouch *The Reign of King Stephen 1135-1154* (Harlow, 2000); R. H. C. Davis, *King Stephen* (London, 1967); D. C. Douglas,

Significantly there is little historical consensus about the quality of the pre-Conquest church.[33] Twelfth-century monastic sources were often highly critical of the Anglo-Saxon church. Modern historians have attempted some gentle revisionism. Martin Brett argued that the pre-Conquest church 'presented many idiosyncratic features', in particular the prominence of the monastic cathedral church and the absence of a structure for the ecclesiastical hierarchy, like that associated with post-Carolingian Gaul.[34] But idiosyncratic is not the same as inferior and Brett distances himself from the view that the Anglo-Saxon church was archaic and in need of reform. In the same way, Henry Loyn claimed that 'a more balanced view [of the church in the period immediately before 1066] would suggest that there was still much strength in the structure, in the administrative expertise developed in episcopal and monastic households, and in the traditions of homiletic teaching and instruction inherited from an earlier generation.'[35] Frank Barlow, who has produced the most detailed account of the pre-Conquest church to date, wrote that, 'the English church was irregular rather than criminal.'[36] According to this view its irregularities would have been forgiven if the Norman Conquest had not purged the hierarchy for mainly political motives.

William the Conqueror: the Norman Impact upon England (London, 1964); J. Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986); *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994). For titles specifically concentrating on the church see F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979); M. Brett, *The English Church under Henry I* (London, 1975); E. U. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England* (Cambridge, 1994); C. Harper-Bill, *Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (2nd ed. Cambridge, 1976); H. R. Loyn, *The English Church, 940-1154* (Harlow, 2000); J. R. H. Moorman, *A History of the Church in England* (3rd ed. London, 1973).

[33] Mary Frances Giandrea comments that '[h]istorians do not agree on some fairly basic aspects of late Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical history', in particular, the extent of the parish system in place before 1066 and practical impact of monastic reform. M. F. Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 1.

[34] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 6.

[35] H. Loyn, *The English Church* (Harlow, 2000), p. 65.

[36] F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1000-1066* (London, 1963), p. 115.

Some historians, such as Christopher Harper-Bill have claimed that the 'Normans used the church as an agent of colonisation.'[37] There is agreement that the English episcopate was quickly and thoroughly replaced through a process of exclusive foreign recruitment from 1070 onwards. Twenty years later only one of the sixteen English bishoprics was held by an Englishman and historians like R. H. C. Davis have interpreted this as evidence of the total domination of all aspects of Old English institutional life by the Normans.[38] However historians disagree about the extent to which the ecclesiastical hierarchy can be described as 'Normanised' and also about the significance of this change.[39] With a turn of phrase reminiscent of Jacob Burckhardt, R. Allen Brown emphasised the bishops' Norman origins (either by birth or training) and claimed that these 'new men brought especially their eclectic Norman genius for order and administration, and applying it under the direction of Lanfranc and the king to the reorganisation of the English church gave to that body a new unity

[37] C. Harper-Bill, *Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992), p. 13. Since the 1990s some studies have attempted to subvert the traditional historical debate about continuity and change by referring to post-Conquest England as a colony. J. C. Holt claimed that 'one effect [of using the term 'colonial'] is that the formal, somewhat artificial terms in which discussion of the Conquest has usually been set – continuity or change, English versus Norman influences, and so on – cease to matter very much… Instead the Conquest becomes a question of necessity and convenience.' J. C. Holt, *Colonial England 1066-1215* (London, 1997), p. xiii. This explanation hides the fact that Holt takes it for granted that the Conquest was a catastrophic event for the English population reminding his readers that 'whatever the most convincing and interesting link with the English past, there was a conquest, an overwhelming victory for the conquerors and a calamity for the vanquished.' *Ibid*, p. xiv. Holt only avoids the 'artificial' discussion about continuity and change by assuming, from the very first, that a great change did take place. Thus, 'colonisation' does not significantly reposition the traditional argument. In addition the terminology can be problematic. In order to be effective it requires absolute clarity about contemporary eleventh-century attitudes to the separateness (and compatibility) of Old English and Norman ethnicity and culture. In particular it invites ahistorical observations in order to avoid offending contemporary analysts of this difficult and emotive subject. And so when Brian Golding declares that, '*like most colonisers* [my italics], the Normans devalued the achievements of the culture they conquered' the reader is reminded of the world's more recent colonial past. B. Golding, *Conquest and Colonisation* (Rev. ed. Basingstoke, 2001), p. vii. For a full investigation of the terminology see D. Bates, 'Normandy and England after 1066', *EHR*, 104: 413 (1989), pp. 851-880; D. S. Spear, 'The Norman Empire and the Secular Clergy, 1066-1204', *The Journal of British Studies*, 21.2 (1982), pp. 1-10; F. J. West, 'The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest?' *History*, 84 (1999), pp. 219-236.

[38] R. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and their Myth* (London, 1976), p. 103.

[39] Frank Barlow calculates that by 1073 there were one Italian, two English, four Lotharingian, and eight Norman bishops. By the time of William I's death in 1087 the number of Normans had increased to eleven, whilst the English and Lotharingian bishops had been reduced to one and two respectively. F. Barlow, *The English Church* (London, 1979), p. 57.

which contributed also to the unity of the state.'[40] Leaving aside the notion of ethnic genius, it seems that Brown is attributing political unity to the ethnic makeup of the immediate post-Conquest episcopate. Martin Brett argues that the reign of Henry I 'saw the working out of a process which much diminished the colonial quality of the episcopate', as the number of bishops known to have previously held Norman office declined against those with experience in the English church.[41] Anglo-Norman identity, like all medieval concepts of ethnicity and race, was uncertain and fluid.[42] R. H. C. Davis argued that, 'the paradox of the Normans is that though it was in England that they reached their acme and fulfilled themselves as Normans, yet in the long run the conquest of England turned them into Englishmen.'[43] Interestingly he dates this transition to c.1130s; the decade when English-born bishops were appointed again.[44]

Robert Bartlett emphasises continuity of practice over episcopal appointments during the reign of the first three Norman kings, when the 'episcopal bench had a definite pro-monarchical tinge.'[45] Bartlett suggests that bishops were recruited from three main groups: clerks in royal administration, clerks in ecclesiastical administration, and monks. Nearly half of those appointed between 1066 and 1154

---

[40] R. A. Brown, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (2nd ed. Woodbridge, 1985), p. 218.
[41] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 7. Brett contends that whilst 'the higher clergy in England were mostly Norman by birth, they seem to have spent much the greater part of their apprenticeship in England, rather than Normandy.' *Ibid*, p. 10.
[42] R. Bartlett, 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31:1 (2001), pp. 39-56; I. Short, '*Tam angli quam franci*: Self-definition in Anglo-Norman England', *ANS*, XVIII (1996), pp. 153-175.
[43] R. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and their Myth* (London, 1976), p. 122. Davis points out that the 'English cathedrals and abbeys… even when they were ruled by Norman bishops and abbots, could only defend their property effectively if they made full use of their Anglo-Saxon charters, and it was often necessary to explain the significance of these by setting them in their historical context.' *Ibid*, p. 130.
[44] Bartlett states that it was not until the 1130s that Englishmen were appointed to bishoprics. He suggests that Aethelwulf, who was appointed to the newly created see of Carlisle in 1133, was probably English given his name and his possession of nearby Yorkshire lands. The next appointment was in 1136; Robert, Flemish by descent but born in England, was appointed to Bath and Wells. R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford, 2000), p. 400.
[45] *Ibid*, p. 398.

were royal clerks.[46] During the reign of Stephen, Christopher Holdsworth draws attention to a significant reduction in the number of bishops who had served in the royal household compared with those who had not.[47] Whether this is a reflection of weakened royal power or the increase in ecclesiastical power through the influence of reform is not fully understood. However increasingly historians of this period have sought to downplay any analysis of royal involvement in episcopal appointments and detected greater subtlety in recruitment practices.

Whilst Anglo-Norman kings undoubtedly continued to reward royal service, Barlow suggests that Henry I, possibly experiencing a spiritual crisis after the death of his only legitimate son in 1120, began to appoint many more episcopal clerks and members of the religious orders.[48] Almost imperceptibly, according to Bartlett, this change in royal policy meant that the appointees owed their promotion to men other than the king.[49] A similar argument is used for Stephen's reign. In fact David Crouch argues that, 'it is very difficult to talk of Stephen losing influence over the church in the context of appointments, for he never aspired to much in the way of influence'.[50] Stephen tended *not* to reward his royal clerks with bishoprics and in this vacuum, magnates, cathedral chapters, papal legates and the papacy, operated as active nominators as well. As H. A. Cronne puts it, 'it is not always remembered that,

[46] Bartlett calculates that of the seventy-five bishops appointed during the period 1066-1154, thirty-three were royal clerks, fifteen were ecclesiastical clerks, and twenty-two were monks. Five bishops are of unknown background. Bartlett accepts that there is some crossover between the groups; in particular talented clerks might move between royal and ecclesiastical service (e.g. royal clerks might be rewarded with an archdeaconry before being raised to the episcopate). However he claims that in general it is possible to distinguish between royal administrators and those without significant royal involvement. *Ibid*, p. 396.
[47] Holdsworth calculates that there were a total of thirty-four bishops in post during Stephen's reign and he divides them into three main groups: canons regular (3), monks (12), and secular clerks (19). He subdivided the group of secular clerks to distinguish between those who had served in the royal household in some capacity (6) and those who had pursued a clerical career (13). C. Holdsworth, 'The Church', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford, 1994), p. 212.
[48] F. Barlow, *The English Church* (London, 1979), p. 84.
[49] '[T]he new type of episcopal appointees: relatives and clerks of bishops, or relatives of important figures at court, archdeacons, with a smattering of those chosen for scholarly or other ecclesiastical prominence.' *Ibid*, p. 400.
[50] D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen* (Harlow, 2000), p. 304.

besides the king, many other individuals and bodies, both lay and ecclesiastical, also interfered with the freedom of the church in countless ways, not necessarily out of malice.'[51] Whilst the episcopate undoubtedly formed a deposit of royal patronage, in most cases it seems the king did not act arbitrarily or without consultation. As Martin Brett has ventured, 'behind the façade of autocracy [lies] a more complex reality.'[52]

In fact the 'Norman effect' on the English church may have merely coincided with the papal-led reforms that were revolutionising the contemporary European church. Frank Barlow wrote that, 'it is doubtful whether the English church would have evolved all that much differently had Harold won the battle of Hastings and the Anglo-Danish dynasty remained on the throne.'[53] Brian Golding has argued that by introducing bishops and abbots from Normandy, 'William may have accelerated the pace of change, but [he] did not alter its direction.'[54] Not all historians have agreed with this interpretation.[55] Marjorie Chibnall argued that church reform in Normandy owed its impetus to Duke William, who summoned and presided over provincial councils, and who also promulgated and to some extent enforced the Truce of God. In England, William encountered the notorious pluralist Stigand at the head of the church and acting as a barrier to reform and 'so it fell to William to initiate a new

---

[51] H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen* (London, 1970), p. 116.
[52] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 105. According to Brett an example of this occurred in 1123 when the king apparently having no candidate in mind for the vacancy at Canterbury allowed the bishops led by Roger of Salisbury to nominate a short-list from which the Christ Church community could choose. Brett explains that the election at Canterbury was symptomatic of a wider European conflict between the monks and the regular clergy. Canterbury may have been regarded as a special case for appointment where a consensus was required. However, 'the bishops appear to exercise an increasingly decisive voice in the consensus.' *Ibid*, p. 74.
[53] F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), p. 6.
[54] B. Golding, *Conquest and Colonisation* (Rev. ed. Basingstoke, 2001), p. 146.
[55] For an alternative view see R. Allen Brown whose sophistic argument appears to rest largely upon the assertion that the influence of the Norman Conquest predated the influence of the papal reform movement: 'It may well be that the wind of change blowing from the papacy, with whom English relations were traditionally close, would in due course have brought to this country the new reforming spirit and organisation from the continent, but in the event, *as a matter of historical fact* [my italics], reform was to come as the direct result of the Norman Conquest.' R. A. Brown, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (2nd ed. Woodbridge, 1995), p. 218.

phase of church reform in England no less than Normandy.'[56] In other words there was a coordinated (and deliberate) reform programme directed by royal will and inspired by earlier Norman changes.[57] Other historians have noted with irony that the Normans were in some ways deeply influenced by Anglo-Saxon tradition.[58] The monastic cathedral chapters, at Canterbury, Winchester and Worcester, were a peculiar feature of the pre-Conquest church which was extended, so that by 1133 ten of the seventeen English dioceses used this system.[59] Minor disagreements aside, the current consensus is that while both Norman and English ecclesiastical institutions were permanently altered after the Conquest, neither formed the template for the changes to the other.

Brett alleges that, 'the history of the English Church under Henry I is in general that of an essentially Anglo-Saxon institution moving slowly towards a later Latin norm.'[60] Indeed the influence of the papal reform movement is thought to have seeped slowly into England.[61] But according to Z. N. Brooke by the thirteenth century the English Church viewed the pope as its master in contrast to the view in 1066 when

[56] M. Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England* (Oxford, 1986), p. 193.
[57] Self-confessed Norman sympathiser, R. Allen Brown, claims that there was a coherent attempt to impose a Norman model of diocesan hierarchy on the post-Conquest English church. He described the Anglo-Saxon church as old-fashioned and suffering from the general neglect of its diocesan organisation and suggested that Lanfranc's policy of ecclesiastical councils was designed not only to allow for reforming legislation but also to serve 'as a means of ending the loose autonomy of pre-Conquest diocesan bishops.' R. A. Brown, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (2nd ed. Woodbridge, 1995), p. 219. However this view is discredited by David Bates who argued that 'the likelihood is that most of the Norman cathedrals before 1066 were served by a small number of canons, holding their property in common'; a long way from the organised Norman model implied by Brown. D. Bates, *Normandy before 1066* (London, 1982), p. 216.
[58] R. H. C. Davis, *The Normans and their Myth* (London, 1976), p. 122.
[59] Bartlett calculates that by 1133, ten of England's seventeen dioceses had monastic cathedral chapters. In addition to Canterbury, Winchester and Worcester, Rochester, Durham and Norwich were transformed from secular to monastic communities, Bath/Wells and Coventry/Lichfield adopted second monastic sees in addition to their inherited centres served by canons, finally the newly created sees at Ely and Carlisle were monastic (Carlisle was unusual in that it was the only Augustinian community). R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford, 2000), p. 398.
[60] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 7.
[61] Classic accounts of Anglo-Norman papal relations include, C. N. L. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Reprint, Cambridge, 1989); N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England* (Princeton, 1958).

William was the main authority.[62] In explaining this transformation historians have assumed that levels of papal interference in England corresponded inversely to the extent of royal power; this crude equation is illustrated most obviously by Stephen's reign.[63] However, as shown by Z. N. Brooke, 'while the attitudes of both pope and king were clear and consistent throughout, the attitude of the bishops soon became clouded and confused.'[64] The growth of papal jurisdiction undermined episcopal (and in particular archiepiscopal) authority. Historians have viewed the frequent squabbles over metropolitan and primacy status, particularly the Canterbury-York dispute, as evidence that Gregorian reforms, on occasion, ran counter to the interests of the English bishops.[65] The English episcopate rejected Gregory VII's view that the 'function of the bishop was to be the local mouthpiece of the papacy.'[66] Essentially, as Geoffrey Koziol articulates, the episcopate's perception of the political world was fundamentally different to the papacy's. Prelates in England were concerned by local incursions upon their authority not by the actions of the distant emperor; so 'the old

[62] C. N. L. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 29.
[63] David Crouch supposed that King Stephen's relationship with the papacy was much more involved than that of his uncle and predecessor, King Henry I, not least because he had to deal with a papal legate for a large part of his reign. Henry I had to only occasionally to deal with the presence of a papal legate, most notable John of Crema (1125-6). During Stephen's reign there were five papal legates: Archbishop William de Corbeil of Canterbury held a legateship until his death in 1136; Alberic, bishop of Ostia and Cluniac cardinal was in England (and Scotland) 1138-9; Bishop Henry of Winchester was appointed to the office in 1139 until 1143; Cardinal Imar of Tusculum was present for brief but active period in 1145; Archbishop Theobald held the legateship after 1150 until his own death in 1161. D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen* (Harlow, 2000), p. 308. Christopher Harper-Bill claimed that the 'Anglo-Norman rulers were most certainly determined to resist papal jurisdictional claims when these presented a threat to their ancient rights… A far weaker king, Stephen, unsuccessfully forbade Archbishop Theobald to attend the papal council of Rheims in 1148.' C. Harper-Bill, *Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992), p. 35.
[64] C. N. L. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (Reprint, Cambridge, 1989), p. 119.
[65] Archbishop Anselm is considered to have been a papal sympathiser, particularly in comparison to his predecessor, Lanfranc. And yet he continued Lanfranc's policy of attempting to secure Canterbury's primacy. Geoffrey Koziol makes reference to the Anselm's staunch opposition to legatine commissions in England. G. Koziol, 'Problem of Sacrality in Twelfth-Century Ritual', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. T. N. Bisson (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 127.
[66] I. S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: the polemical literature of the late eleventh century* (Whitstable, 1978), p.164.

ideal of cooperation between kingship and priesthood remained eminently serviceable.'[67]

The key point for English history, according to Henry Loyn, is that the Carolingian model survived (or was revived) under the Normans, with 'the king and archbishop working in close accord to bring elements of advanced moral and organisational reform to an old-fashioned Christian kingdom where the king still effectively controlled appointment to key offices in the church.'[68] Anglo-Saxon government was perceived as being at its most successful when combining royal and episcopal authority; the archetypal relationship being Edgar and Dunstan.[69] Historians have presented the relationship between William I and Lanfranc as the Anglo-Norman successor to this ideal. Historical analysis presents Lanfranc as more Carolingian than Gregorian, in the sense that he valued his partnership with the king, and harboured a much more ambivalent attitude to papal authority. This, as Christopher Harper-Bill has explained, was 'based on the realities of power', not necessarily on any innate aversion to reform.[70] In other words royal power was more effective than papal power, at least within the confines of the early Anglo-Norman church. The contrast between Lanfranc and his successor Anselm has been cited as evidence of the breakdown of the old political order as reforming ideas seeped into England. Yet the historiography still emphasises that during this period the English king retained the support of most of his bishops. Norman Cantor estimated that between the years 1089

[67] G. Koziol, 'Sacrality in Twelfth-Century Ritual', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. T. N. Bisson, (Philadelphia, 1995), p. 127.
[68] H. Loyn, *The English Church* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 97-8.
[69] For a discussion of how twelfth-century authors idealized tenth-century predecessors see M. F. Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 31-4
[70] C. Harper-Bill, *Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992), p. 5. Cf. N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1958), p. 31, who speculated that Lanfranc became increasingly hostile to papal zealots and their revolutionary doctrines, arguing that, 'from a cautious pre-Gregorian position Lanfranc was advancing, in the closing years of his pontificate, towards an openly anti-Gregorian stand.'

and 1109 only two bishops were appointed who had not previously served in the royal administration; such close contact with royal power apparently explains a muted response to Gregorian reforms.[71] Similarly Harper-Bill notes that, 'the majority of bishops… were drawn by background and circumspection towards the royal interpretation of the correct relationship between the secular power and the church.'[72] In fact the consensus of historical opinion seems to be that the English church only really achieved independence during Stephen's reign.[73] The final break with the 'old order' came after Stephen arrested Roger, bishop of Salisbury and his nephews, Alexander of Lincoln and Nigel of Ely, which symbolised, for many historians, the beginning of the Anarchy.[74] Whatever the short-term outcome of the arrest of the bishops it damaged Stephen's reputation; he had arrested and imprisoned consecrated bishops. It is thought likely that Stephen avoided serious ecclesiastical sanctions because of his family connection with Henry of Winchester, who headed the subsequent legatine council.[75] Martin Brett writes that it was during this period of insecurity that 'one can speak for the first time of something like a real conflict between church and state, if one means by this issues that divided the king and his supporters from the bulk of the episcopate.'[76]

[71] Cantor argues that because the majority of the English episcopate had spent their early careers in close contact with the person of royal majesty, '[i]t was only to be expected that Gregorian reform ideas would be coldly received and even strongly opposed by them.' *Ibid*, p. 33.
[72] C. Harper-Bill, *Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992), p. 33.
[73] 'There is general agreement that the period of 'anarchy' was one of rapid change and significant development in the assertion of ecclesiastical discipline, not only in the use of the machinery of papal jurisdiction, but also in recourse to the authority of the archbishop and the study of canon law.' M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 4.
[74] Historians since William Stubbs have argued that the arrest of the bishops marked the beginning of the anarchy of Stephen's reign. David Crouch summarises this view alleging that 'Anglo-Norman bishops were alleged to have abandoned the court, and aristocratic suspicion is said to have driven the kingdom into instability.' D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen* (Harlow, 2000), p. 97. For an alternative view see K. Yoshitake 'The Arrest of the Bishops in 1139 and its Consequences', *The Journal of Medieval History*, 14 (1988), pp. 97-114.
[75] See H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen* (London, 1970), pp. 124-31, who also remarks on the weakness of papal authority during this time, due to hostilities with Roger of Sicily. This view has been modified by D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen* (Harlow, 2000), p. 297.
[76] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 91.

A new study of episcopal power

In his most recent book, Thomas Bisson declared that the proponents of new histories (that is, social and cultural history) have neglected government. By reacting against the preoccupation with elites they have (re)produced a partial history.

> Working on consultation and fiscal administration, I was repeatedly brought to reflect that, whatever the broadly conceptual limitations of traditional institutional history, its practitioners often persuaded me better than the 'new historians.' They wrote better (I thought), or at least more cogently. They seemed to draw strength from knowing something of what is undoubtedly universal in political nature; not content to mine one or another special seam, they were familiar with medieval records in their generality. Above all they had the advantage of working on what most interested medieval people themselves, as it most interests most people: namely, power. It came to seem worth asking how people experienced and exercised power in those generations when, as Southern and Strayer well showed, something collectively new and potentially transforming had its origins. And when the question was put in this way, the twelfth century appeared to me in a new light: as a time of strain and crisis.[77]

Bisson's critique resonated sharply with my own concerns about historical study using only narrative histories, the source material most suited to cultural studies. It seems to me that there is a need to strike a balance with the methodological approach and the material used in order to produce an authentic and well-rounded interpretation of power. This thesis had made use of a variety of source material, each with its own specific advantages and problems. The episcopal *acta* and letters demonstrate power in operation. The narrative histories and hagiographies are also vital for providing a description of bishops in action. Only when these sources are used in combination can we most accurately gauge the operation of power.

[77] T. N. Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth-Century* (Woodstock, 2009), p. viii.

Stephen Jaeger formulated a model of the courtier bishop using the characteristics from the opening chapters of *vitae* of German bishops from the Ottonian and Salian periods. He identified a typical pattern for the early career of bishops who were called to royal service and later appointed to the episcopate by virtue of their appearance, character and virtues.[78] In order to show how particular virtues were cultivated in order to aid the bishop at court Jaeger analysed incidents from the *vitae* as a 'sociological reality'.[79] Jaeger made a theoretical leap from representation to reality by distinguishing between episcopal *vitae* and traditional hagiography: the former are a secularized form of Christian biography, 'one could characterize their style as generally realistic, the perspective of the biographer as relatively objective.'[80] By reclassifying his source material Jaeger used this biographical material to describe the role of the bishop at court. In fact more and more historians have made use of an anthropological approach to narrative sources, particularly hagiography, to evaluate the 'practical realities of the episcopal office.'[81] The close connection between social reality and its textual representation invites methodological speculation.

Anthropology has transformed (and revitalised) medieval history. Historians have eagerly embraced the social science models in order to interpret medieval culture. This has been particularly influential in the study of medieval power.[82] One consequence has been extensive work concerning 'ritual'. Accounts of medieval rituals, contained within the contemporary narratives, have been studied closely as

[78] For a detailed discussion of this text see, Chapter 3.
[79] C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', *Speculum*, 58 (1983), pp. 291-325, at p. 310. For an interesting discussion of Jaeger's use of anthropological theory, particularly Clifford Geertz, see Mark Chinca's review, *Arbitrium*, 20:1 (2002), pp. 13-9.
[80] C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop', *Speculum* , 58 (1983), p. 296.
[81] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity* (London, 2005), p. 19.
[82] *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. T. N. Bisson, (Philadelphia, 1995); *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. M. de Jong and F. Theuws with C. van Rhijn (Leiden, 2001).

instruments of social control and political order. This has allowed historians to move from the traditions of institutional history and to show greater concern for individual agency in the exercise of power. Geoffrey Koziol claimed that 'theoretically sophisticated' historians assume 'such a broad definition of 'rituals' that rituals themselves have almost entirely disappeared… These authors are not really interested in rituals at all. They are interested in power, in the construction of collectivities, and in the dynamic between individuals and collectivity.'[83] For Koziol the terminology might be problematic but the demonstrative act, the 'public interaction of power holders' provided a way to understand power and social coherence.[84] This method has proved to be fertile but controversial. In particular Philippe Buc has criticised a number of prominent historians (including Koziol) for their uncritical use of ethnological models.[85]

Buc argued that the textual rendition of ritual had more political impact than its performance: 'Texts and their authors, in different ways, but just as much as people who engaged in symbolic action, were active forces in political culture.'[86] Buc exposed the methodological danger of an uncritical use of social theory outside the context of the text. Rituals, trapped within the text, were literary conventions, or

[83] G. Koziol, 'The Dangers of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study?', *Early Medieval Europe*, 11 (2002), pp. 367-88, at 387. Other significant contribution by this author to the study of ritual include, G. Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favour: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, 1992); *idem*, 'England, France and the Problem of Sacrality in Twelfth-century Ritual', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status and Process in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia, 1995). Another important contributor to this field has been Gerd Althoff, who wrote that, 'we talk about rituals when actions, or certain chains of actions, of a complex nature are repeated by actors in certain circumstances in the same or similar ways, and, if this happens deliberately, with the conscious goal of familiarity.' G. Althoff, 'The Variability of Rituals in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* eds. G. Althoff, J. Fried, P. J. Geary (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 71-87, at p. 71.

[84] In her recent article Christian Pössel comments that 'conceptual fuzziness' attached to ritual has meant that 'it has, in some cases, become little more than an in-itself symbolic and demonstrative label indicating the presence of anthropologically and theoretically informed approaches.' C. Pössel, 'The magic of early medieval ritual', *Early Medieval Europe*, 17:2 (2009), pp. 111-25, at p. 114.

[85] P. Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: between early medieval texts and social scientific theory* (Princeton, 2001); *idem*, 'Ritual and interpretation: the early medieval case', *Early Medieval Europe*, 9:2 (2000), pp. 183-210.

[86] P. Buc, 'The monster and the critics: a ritual reply', *Early Medieval Europe*, 15: 4 (2007), p. 441.

rhetorical techniques used by clerical polemicists to support their specific corporate identity. Buc believed that historians were privileging anthropological theories at the expense of authorial intent and historical contextualization. Buc's criticisms reflect the broader 'linguistic turn' in the study of history.[87] The consequences of this anxiety about methodological approaches to the study of texts caused serious problems for the notion of historical reality and the practice of history. This has left many cultural historians with deeply uncertain feelings about the relationship between text and social reality and the possibility of valuable historical work. Janet Nelson acknowledged the possibility that in studying medieval texts it may not be possible to go beyond 'exercises in monastically inspired rhetoric'; however this is an unsatisfactory position for a historian, as Nelson acknowledged: 'I want to go on, to suggest that these texts give access to real men... men who once really lived.'[88] It is essential that historians engage with methodological practice if they want to produce something more substantial than a study of 'intertextuality'.

In fact it was a sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, who offered an alternative to what he perceived to be the rigid structuralism of anthropological studies through the use of the notion of *habitus*: 'a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment or as classificatory principles as well as being the organising principles of action meant constituting the social agent in his

[87] For a discussion of the issues surrounding this and some tentative solutions, see, G. Spiegel, 'History, Historicism and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 65 (1990), pp. 59-86. It would be impossible to write a truly post-modern history, the 'linguistic turn' if taken to its extreme means that history cannot exist as there can be no truth beyond the text. As Gabrielle Spiegel and Lawrence Stone have pointed out when reality is conceived *purely* as language, when there is nothing beyond the text, 'then history collapses altogether, and fact and fiction become indistinguishable.' G. Spiegel and L. Stone, 'History and Post-Modernism', *Past and Present*, 135 (1992), pp. 189-208, at p. 190.

[88] J. L. Nelson, 'Monks, Secular Men and Masculinity, *c*. 900', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London, 1999) pp. 121-142, at p. 138.

true role as the practical operator of the construction of objects.'[89] Bourdieu revived the notion of individual agency within existing power relations. Such relations possessed no internal coherence. The diversity of these relations allowed room for conscious strategy or 'play'.

> Social agents, in archaic societies as well as in ours, are not automata regulated like clocks, in accordance with laws which they do not understand. In the most complex games... [like] ritual practices, they put into action the incorporated principles of a generative habitus... *dispositions acquired through experience*, thus variable from place to place and time to time. This 'feel for the game', as we call it, is what enables an infinite number of moves to be made, adapted to the infinite number of possible situations which no rule, however complex, can foresee.[90]

Pauline Stafford has written that, it is the special task of the historian, 'to reconstruct the range of what is possible, choosable, and to grasp the ambiguities within which individuals make their choices and act.'[91] This provides a way of using anthropological theory within the constraints of the narrative form. It is important that historical studies adopt a varied methodological approach in order to reflect the medieval concept and reality of power.

Much of the content of this thesis was inspired by Reuter's article, 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', in which he offered some suggestions for new areas of study, including speech and language, dress, space and food.[92] These categories provided a starting point for my research and I have returned to some familiar twelfth-century sources with these

[89] P. Bourdieu, 'Fieldwork in Philosophy' *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*, trans. Adamson (Oxford, 1990), pp. 3-33, at p. 13.
[90] *Ibid*, p. 9.
[91] P. Stafford, 'Writing Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens' *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 99-109, at p. 109.
[92] T. Reuter, 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111-126.

categories in mind. Inspired by the opening verses of St John's Gospel, this thesis considers episcopal power through three distinct areas of cultural practice: language, the body and space. This has provided the opportunity to look at three distinct historiographical problems: the Weberian transition from charisma to routine; the church-state dichotomy; and, finally, the impact of the Normans in England. This is an ambitious plan however it should speak to a variety of historical interests and as such it speaks to a wider audience than just those concerned with English ecclesiastical history.

Part One provides a new constitutional history of the topic and examines the development of the English episcopate as an institution with formal powers conceived in a hierarchical structure. It examines the use of written material throughout this period and considers the evidence for a developing episcopal bureaucracy. Chapter One focuses on the Canterbury-York dispute and the accompanying demands for written professions of obedience and clarification of precedence. From 1070 all of the English archbishops and many of their suffragans became involved in this dispute. In the first years of the twelfth century this dispute ran in parallel to the investiture controversy in England, but even beyond this the papacy and monarchy were deeply involved throughout. Through the use of letters, *acta* and commissioned works I will show that Anglo-Norman bishops were adept at using documents to create precedent for authority and that many, if not all, were concerned not only with the realities of their own power but with the development of the office of bishop. This interpretation challenges the traditional reading of the twelfth century as the beginning of an age of bureaucratic management characterised by the division of bishop and chapter, and seeks to prove that bishops were deeply involved with the practices which sought to confirm and stabilise their power: forgery, polemics, 'lost' documents. Chapter Two

investigates the particular power of excommunication and its depiction in contemporary narratives from the Anarchy in England. During the mid-twelfth century the *sanctio* clause in episcopal *acta* was frequently used although this quickly went out of fashion. A comparison of these sources allows for a broader consideration of excommunication as an act of power. It was principally used as a negotiating strategy by bishops rather than a singular act. This aptly demonstrates episcopal flexibility of practice.

Part Two makes use of the anthropological studies and examines the nature of episcopal power from the perspective of the body. In particular Chapter 3 uses contemporary depictions of episcopal performance and display from general histories to show that bishops drew upon a common typology of episcopal behaviour which demonstrated their power in terms of force and resistance. Criticism of bishops who exhibited worldly behaviour is found throughout the sources. Yet there is also a good deal of evidence which shows that bishops, irrespective of their institutional background, made use of ascetic practices in their public role especially when their position was under threat. They drew attention to their special position as 'holy persons' through ascetic performance. This undermines the traditional religious-secular dichotomy which influences so much of the historiography of episcopal power. In addition to this Chapter Four looks specifically at the notion of the manly bishop which has been associated with the post-Gregorian period. This chapter takes issue with the dominance of sexuality in the analysis of hegemonic masculinity. Bishops were deeply involved with sexual control at this time. However their own behaviour was subject to less stringent investigation than a cursory reading of the monastic sources might suggest.

Finally in Part Three, I have considered special practice and power. The final chapter focuses particularly on the cathedral and how bishops negotiated power in this contested space. The Normans are best remembered for their extensive and destructive building programmes which resulted in the loss not only of many ancient churches but also the movement of episcopal sees to new sites. The Normans were certainly not fearful of change however it is startling how far they were influenced by Anglo-Saxon heritage and the extent to which the symbols of past sanctity were appropriated to help provide legitimacy for new innovations. Many Norman bishops became patrons of old Anglo-Saxon saints. Most revealing is the choice of burial site for a bishop and how quickly or extensively he himself became part of the identity of the bishopric and diocese.

This thesis is deliberately eclectic in both methodology and source material. It is hoped that this will help to provide a more rounded view of episcopal power during this period. And offer some broader commentary on the experience of medieval power more generally.

Part One

In principio erat Verbum

R. I. Moore described the construction of a new repressive social order in the high middle ages. He argued that 'if any single aspect of the twelfth-century revolution in government was of decisive importance for the future it was the capacity developed by both secular and ecclesiastical power to penetrate communities of every kind vigorously and ruthlessly, overriding the restraints of custom, and enlisting, or destroying, men of local standing and influence in the name of order, orthodoxy and reform.'[1] This concept supposes the development of a centralised power through the operations of administration. The separation of the powers supported the idea of the office and caused a process of bureaucratisation. In 1929 Frank Stenton wrote an article calling for the study of episcopal *acta*, arguing that, 'the records of routine administration fill a place which no other source of information can supply.'[2] Bishops were, he argued, 'men of routine'. C. R. Cheney echoed these claims in the preface to the British Academy's series of *English Episcopal Acta*.

> Acta prove routine and organisation. They offer an insight into the role of the episcopate in the spread of canon law in England, the interrelation of royal and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the steady permeation of episcopal entourages by men styled *magistri* who had the basis of some academic training. From the later half of the twelfth century many of the acta trace the process of separation between the bishop and cathedral chapter.[3]

---

[1] R. I. Moore, *The First European Revolution, ca. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000), p. 172.
[2]F. Stenton, 'Acta Episcoporum', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 3:1 (1929), pp. 1-14, at pp.13-4.
[3] *EEA, Lincoln 1067-1185,* i. See also, C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries, 1100-1250* (Manchester, 1950).

The twelfth century was characterised by the development of bureaucratic power, where written documents were used for day-to-day purposes rather than for exceptional solemn occasions. Episcopal chapters and chanceries were at this time producing vast numbers of *acta* which are nearly all available in modern published editions. Although the move to bureaucratic systems was slow it is generally accepted that episcopal *acta* demonstrate, perhaps even caused, the move from personal, charismatic rule to an administrative system surrounding the office of the bishop. By their very nature episcopal acta seem to prove organisation. However up until the middle of the twelfth century there was little indication of the sort of comprehensive routinisation evident a century later. As David Smith has pointed out that there is great variety and form within the episcopal *acta* from this period, 'a remarkable lack of uniformity', where one charter resembles the ancient solemn diplomata, another the terse form of royal writ and a third distinctively reveal papal chancery influences in its elaborate formulae.[4] Similarly, explaining the relatively few *acta* from York for this period, Janet Burton has written that in 'the late-eleventh and early twelfth centuries it may not have been common practice to secure a written confirmation of a grant.'[5] During this period the question should not be, 'how and when was episcopal power routinised?' but, rather, 'how did episcopal power operate?'

The history of the written word is intrinsically linked with the study of power. Evidence for the origin and early development of English government is marked by the production and retention of written records.[6] This led to the creation of a legal language of rulership and power. Bureaucracy has been neglected by the linguistic (and anthropological) turn in history. Part of the anthropological criticism of constitutional history is that it was teleological, rationalistic and narrowly legal. Yet

[4] *EEA, Lincoln 1067-1185*, p. li.
[5] *EEA, York, 1070-1154*, p. xxxvii.
[6] See particularly M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record, 1066-1307* (2nd ed. Oxford, 1993).

when used in conjunction with other sources it offers a vital counterweight to a strictly 'intertextual' account.

Geoffrey Koziol has argued that twelfth-century kingship was *transitional* in the sense that it 'was moving toward the sophisticated administrative apparatuses of the later medieval state while still publicly avowing the political morality of the Carolingians.'[7] This follows the Weberian narrative of charisma to routine. The following chapters examine the position of the bishop in the development of routinised power. This 'apparent' transition fundamentally affected the interpretation of power structures in England at this time. The main evidence used to examine this move has been the episcopal *acta*, collected and published over the past fifteen years by a number of eminent historians. Yet the use of the *acta* is problematic for the period before 1150. The role of the church hierarchy in the control of information is crucial to our understanding of the foundations of a newly emerging bureaucratic power based on administrative systems of control. This chapter looks at how bishops used the written word and challenges the assumption that twelfth-century bishops were leading the way from oral to written mechanisms of control.

At the end of the nineteenth century F. W. Maitland commented that 'the doctrine that our remote forefathers being simple folk had simple law dies hard.'

> Too often we allow ourselves to suppose that, could we but get back to the beginning, we should find that all was intelligible and should then be able to watch the process whereby simple ideas were smothered under subtleties and technicalities. But it is not so. Simplicity is the outcome of technical subtlety; it is the goal not the starting point. As we go backwards the familiar outlines become blurred; the ideas become fluid, and instead of the simple we find the indefinite.[8]

---

[7] G. Koziol, 'England, France and the Problem of Sacrality in Twelfth-Century Ritual', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in twelfth-century Europe*, ed. T. N. Bisson (Philadelphia, 1995), pp. 124-48, at p. 124.

[8] F. W. Maitland, *Domesday Book and Beyond: Three essays in the early history of England* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 9.

The *acta* and letters are not part of a progression towards correct usage. The evidence suggests that bishops relied on ambiguity of language and practice. They were constantly renegotiating their position and while written material was used frequently there is little evidence to suggest that this was either comprehensive or standardised.

· Chapter One ·

The English Primacy Dispute: Articulating episcopal power

The English primacy dispute began in 1070 when Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury required a 'written profession of obedience fortified by an oath of loyalty (*scriptam de oboedientia sua cum adiectione iurisiurandi professionem*)' before he would consent to consecrate Thomas, canon of Bayeux, as archbishop of York.[1] As a metropolitan Canterbury had a long tradition of exacting, and preserving, written professions from its suffragan bishops, although it is unlikely that this had ever extended to the other English metropolitan, York.[2] Thomas objected to Lanfranc's demands and so for a time he remained unconsecrated. It is this essential detail, the demand for obedience and the corresponding resistance to authority, upon which the primacy dispute is based.

Frank Barlow interpreted Lanfranc's requirement of a written submission from all his suffragan bishops and also, as primate, from the archbishop of York as producing a 'sort of "feudal" pyramid' for bishops.[3] At its most fundamental then, Barlow believed the dispute to be an attempt to formalise the ecclesiastical power structure using the traditions and conceptual framework of secular feudalism.[4] It mirrored the secular power structure. R. W. Southern took this even further, writing that 'both Lanfranc and [his successor] Anselm were living in a time when the ancient consensus of local testimony, which had sufficed in the past for most matters of faith and practice, was being subordinated to more formal legal and

[1] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3.15-16.
[2] M. Richter, *Canterbury Professions* (London, 1973), esp. pp. lvii-lxxiv. See also N. P. Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (London, 1984), pp. 164-7.
[3] F. Barlow, *The English Church* (London, 1979), p. 33.
[4] Historians have long debated the Norman Conquest as the beginning of feudalism in England. Important contributions include Hollister, 'The Norman Conquest and the Genesis of English Feudalism', *The American Historical Review*, 66:3 (1961), pp. 641-663; J. O. Prestwich, 'Anglo-Norman Feudalism and the Problem of Continuity', *Past and Present*, 26 (1963), pp. 39-57. For the classic discussion of the terminology see, E. A. R. Brown, 'The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe', *The American Historical Review*, 79:4 (1974), pp. 1063-1088.

rational procedures.'[5] Southern's interpretation fits neatly into the traditional narrative of the long twelfth century as an age of new bureaucratic power structures. It was part of the transition from custom to law. Yet it was Charles Johnson who best articulated the basis for these historical analyses, when he wrote that, the 'contest for the primacy may seem a petty matter against the background of general history, but incidents in the story illustrate the nature of *more important* [my italics] events.'[6] Therefore, when it has been considered, the primacy dispute has been rationalised within a broader historical narrative, far beyond the actual participants themselves.

In fact most historians have categorised the primacy dispute as a 'non-event' in terms of the everyday mechanisms of power.[7] Attempts by Canterbury to assume the position of primate over the entire British Isles have been interpreted as essentially about status and reputation, offering little in the way of additional practical power; that is to say, the ability to force others to act according to the will of the archbishop of Canterbury. In fact Brian Golding asserts simply that, 'the primacy was, above all, a matter of prestige', because it was only a theoretical endorsement of what in all practical matters Canterbury had long enjoyed.[8] Undoubtedly the focus of the primacy claim was mainly about attempts to subdue York.[9] In essence it was a dispute concerning one archbishop's attempts to assert authority over another and historical opinion has often assessed its result to be to periodically disrupt the workings

---

[5] Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 331.
[6] Hugh the Chanter, *The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson (London, 1961), p. vii.
[7] The primacy dispute features in almost all historical surveys of the post-Conquest English church. Selected articles and chapters include, D. Bethell, 'William of Corbeil and the Canterbury-York Dispute', *JEH*, 19:2 (1968), pp. 145-159; H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 87-104; M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 116-31; M. Richter, 'Canterbury's Primacy in Wales and the first stage of Bishop Bernard's Opposition', *JEH*, 22:3 (1971), pp. 177-89; *idem*, *Canterbury Professions*, (Torquay, 1973), pp. lix-lxviii; R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 330-64. See also a short study published in German (without translation) M. Dueball, *Der Suprematstreit zwischen den Erzdiözesen Canterbury und York 1070-1126* (Berlin: E. Ebering, 1929).
[8] B. Golding, *Conquest and Colonisation: the Normans in Britain, 1066-1100* (Rev. ed., Basingstoke, 2001), pp. 151-2.
[9] Frank Barlow has pointed out that Canterbury's claim to primacy was directed almost exclusively to its attempt to subdue York; but since it came to be based on texts from Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, took the form of a primacy over the whole of Britain, and so could be used against Wales, Scotland and Ireland. F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), p. 31.

of the Anglo-Norman church and in doing so alienate the archbishops from both the king and the pope, and perhaps ultimately damage the dignity of the archiepiscopal office. As such, for most historians the Canterbury-York dispute is an example of the petty infighting that characterised medieval ecclesiastical politics. Robert Bartlett described it as the 'most time-consuming and dreary of these contests.'[10] His frustration stems from a sense that not only did very little change in actual terms, but that the minutiae of this 'literary dispute', articulated the worst excesses of medieval pedantry. As Michael Richter has put it, 'the idea of Canterbury's primacy... clashed more and more with actual events.'[11] It was a dispute of words rather than deeds; it manifested itself in the production and distribution of documents. Alongside the main narratives produced by Eadmer at Canterbury and Hugh the Chanter at York, the contest was founded upon a mass of other documents, many of which were forged, misrepresented, 'lost' or destroyed. Yet by re-examining the Canterbury-York debates as a literary dispute, and by repositioning the bishops at the centre of the struggle, the primacy contest demonstrates how bishops interacted with one another in a conflict of their own creation. It is principally an example of how the institutional church functioned. It reveals to what extent there was a common understanding of structure, office and law.

The Canterbury-York struggle produced two contending polemical narratives: Eadmer's *Historia Novorum in Anglia* (*HNA*) and Hugh the Chanter's *The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127*.[12] Eadmer, a monk at Christ Church, Canterbury, began writing the *HNA* shortly after the death of Archbishop Anselm in 1109 and had completed the first four books by 1115. Within just a few years he began a continuation to the work.[13] He was a

[10] R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford, 2000), p. 394.
[11] M. Richter, 'Canterbury's Primacy in Wales and the first stage of Bishop Bernard's Opposition', *JEH*, 22:3 (1971), pp. 177-89, at p. 177.
[12] Eadmer's *HNA* is published in the Rolls Series (1884). The most recent edition of Hugh the Chanter's *The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127* has been published by OMT (1990).
[13] There is no copy of the original work before the addition of the continuation. However it is clear from the text that Eadmer started to compose the additional books in 1119. Southern asserts that it was unlikely that Eadmer carried out any substantial revisions to his original text; the preface was never altered to comprehend the new

close companion of Anselm following the archbishop's arrival at Canterbury in 1093 and as a member of the archiepiscopal household he witnessed many of the events he described. He also accompanied Archbishop Ralph, Anselm's successor, abroad for a period of nearly three years.[14] Hugh the Chanter, a canon of York composed a history of the cathedral church which documented the period from the conquest until 1127. Most historians agree that events described before 1114 are confused, although after this date he was probably writing as an eyewitness.[15] Neither text was known much beyond the confines of their own community.[16] Yet they show a remarkable number of similarities, (unintentionally) providing the mirror image of one another: one defending, the other resisting Canterbury's demands for primatial status.[17]

After the traumatic circumstances of the Norman Conquest, both cathedral communities at Canterbury and York suffered devastating fires which destroyed many records of rights and privileges.[18] Both Eadmer and Hugh intended their written histories to be a new record of their rights and to testify to future generations. In the preface to his work Eadmer notes that the 'scarcity of written documents... has resulted in the events being all to quickly buried in oblivion,' he explains that he hoped his history would, 'render some slight

---

material. R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 298-313, at 229. For additional information about the composition of the *HNA* see, S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*: a reinterpretation', *ANS*, X (1987), pp. 259-89.

[14] For an account of Eadmer's life see, R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 229-40.

[15] Hugh Sottovagina or Sottewaine was a canon at York from the time of Archbishop Thomas II (1109-1114) later rising to precentor and archdeacon. For a more detailed account of his life see, Hugh the Chanter, xix-xxx; J. Burton, 'Hugh the Chanter (d. c.1140)', *ODNB* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48308 , accessed 4 March 2010].

[16] Only two medieval manuscripts of the *HNA* survive: one (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS, 452) is a copy of the first half of the twelfth century, from Christ Church, Canterbury. Although it was clearly intended primarily for the Christ Church community (*HNA*, 1, 215) the text was used by the chroniclers at Worcester and Durham and by William of Malmesbury. Hugh's text survives in only one manuscript copy from the early fourteenth century, *Magnum registrum album* (MS L2/1) held at York Minster library.

[17] The editors of the revised OMT edition of Hugh the Chanter's work claim that although it is impossible to prove that Hugh was inspired by Eadmer's work, or even that he knew it, 'in some sense it is an answer to Eadmer, and it is much easier to understand its form if Hugh had read Eadmer's book.' Hugh the Chanter, p. xv.

[18] Eadmer claims that in the fire which had destroyed the cathedral church in 1067, 'the ancient grants of privilege of that church (*antiqua ipsius ecclesiae priuilegia*) had been almost wholly lost.' *HNA*, p. 16. Hugh began his work by describing the misfortunes which befell the city and church of York after the conquest of England, chief among these was the destruction of York cathedral by fire and the loss of its ornaments, charters and privileges (*carte et priuilegia*). Hugh the Chanter, pp. 2-3

service to the researches of those who come after me if they should chance to find themselves involved in any crisis in which the events which I record can in any respect afford a helpful precedent.'[19] In the same way Hugh summarised his purpose, so that 'future bishops and clergy of our church may forgive those in these parts who... gave way and for a time consented to this profession, and not angrily reproach the dead, but imitate and praise those who resisted.'[20] Both authors copied documents into their main narrative. This demonstrates an awareness of the value of copying material verbatim to corroborate their claims.[21] However, unlike Eadmer, Hugh cites no sources from earlier than his own lifetime.[22] The strategies developed by these authors were designed to produce an official history by preserving only those documents which supported their respective claim. The selection process determined what version of the past would be available to future generations. At least until the 1120s the English primacy dispute focused largely on written professions of obedience usually demanded at the moment of consecration. These were supplemented by royal and papal privileges obtained by archbishops to support their cause. These documents offer an insight into the development of episcopal bureaucracy characterised by the production and retention of records and demonstrate the ways in which bishops used documents to resolve their disputes.

The Canterbury-York contest throws light on the internal structure and development of the episcopal church in England during a period of escalating bureaucracy when the status and privileges of ancient institutions were subject to increasingly rigid definition. From the

[19] *Nec tamen ad hoc pro uoto posse pertingere, quoniam scriptorum inopia fugax ea deleuit obliuio… Cum ut amicorum meorum me ad id obnixe incitantium uoluntati morem geram, tum ut posterorum industriae si forte quid inter eos emerserit quod horum exemplo aliquot modo iuuari queat, parum quid muneris impendam. HNA*, p. 1.

[20] *Hec autem iccirco scripta esse decreuimus, ut posteri ecclesie nostre pontifices et clerici his qui de partibus nostris professioni huic consenciendo, uel consilii seduccione uel pacis amore uel potestatis terrore et exilii formidine ad tempus cesserunt, quasi ueniam dantes, ne defunctis succensendo improperent, eos uero qui restiterunt imitentur et laudent.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 220-3.

[21] This was not a post-Conquest innovation. Bede frequently copied letters into this text. For an account of Eadmer's use of documents, see, A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), pp. 139-42.

[22] Hugh cites only one document from before 1100, a bull of Urban II from 1093/4.

mid-eleventh to the mid-twelfth century the church hierarchy underwent a monumental change during which time it sought to rationalise and centralise. This was a time when the church was decisively transformed. At the heart of the Canterbury-York debates are two distinct conflicts which reveal much about the way English archbishops operated in the first half of the long twelfth century. The first was a 'literary dispute' where written documents, particularly letters, take on vital significance. This was articulated in the language of obedience and resistance to authority, and side-by-side analysis of the polemics reveals a shared contemporary terminology of ecclesiastical power. The second was a political struggle between the archbishops, their episcopal colleagues and their own cathedral chapters. Analysis of bishops in action, as portrayed in the polemics of the time, demonstrates the development of the office of the bishop through an acute sensitivity to episcopal authority transmitted from one bishop to the next. The bishop was the personification of an unbroken tradition of spiritual authority. Yet bishops were highly conscious of their own personal legacy. Ironically the twelfth-century perception of episcopal office was totally dependent on the notion of personal rulership: power passed from one bishop to his successor. By analysing the level of episcopal involvement in the preservation and creation of written documents it is possible to gain an insight into the contemporary conception of the episcopal office and the concerns and anxieties which occupied bishops during this period.

Attempts to assume primatial status for the archbishopric of Canterbury began at the very moment that Lanfranc demanded a 'written profession of obedience fortified by an oath of loyalty (*scriptam de oboedientia sua cum adiectione iurisiurandi professionem*)' from

Thomas, archbishop-elect of York.[23] The narrative sources agree that after some initial reluctance Lanfranc was able to persuade King William to support his demands for profession from York. Accordingly, Thomas was required by the king's edict (*regio edicto*) to return to Canterbury, 'write a profession, read out what he had written and present to Lanfranc what he had read (*professionem scribere, scriptam legere, lectam… Lanfranco porrigere*).'[24] Hugh the Chanter's account differs slightly; he claims that under duress Thomas made profession of obedience to Lanfranc, but 'when asked to read the charter of profession written by the Canterbury scribes (*cartam professionis a Cantuariensibus scriptam*) and deliver it to the archbishop, [Thomas] neither read it nor delivered it (*nec legit nec tradidit*).'[25] Although there is no record of this first profession, both Canterbury and York traditions agree that Thomas promised obedience to Lanfranc but *not* to his successors.[26] Both archbishops travelled to Rome in 1071 but returned without a papal decree on the primacy issue.[27] The following year, after negotiations which began at Easter and were completed at the Whitsun court at Windsor, Thomas was obliged to make a further written profession to Lanfranc *and* his successors.[28] This privilege was confirmed with the royal seal. Hugh the Chanter refutes the existence of the second profession of obedience claiming it was

[23] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3.15-16. Although it is not certain that this text was written by Lanfranc it is likely it was composed under his supervision between April 1073 and August 1075. For a discussion of the dates of authorship see, *Councils & Synods*, pp. 586-97; Lanfranc, *Letters*, pp. 10-13; H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (Oxford, 2003), p. 87. For a twelfth-century account of Lanfranc's authorship of the document see *HNA*, p. 13.

[24] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3.37-40.

[25] *Cumque rogaretur ut cartam professionis a Cantuariensibus scriptam legeret, et archiepiscopo traderet, ille nec legit nec tradidit.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 6-7.

[26] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3, i.40-46; Hugh the Chanter, pp. 6-7. Eadmer is very vague about the details of this first profession, omitting any suggestion of a dispute, stating simply that Thomas had been consecrated by Lanfranc at Canterbury, 'after first receiving his canonical profession of submission.' *HNA*, p. 10.

[27] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3, ii.69-72. Pope Alexander II (1061-1073) declared that the issue should be resolved by a national council in England. According to Eadmer Thomas was officially deposed by the pope during this visit because he was the son of a priest. However Lanfranc intervened on his behalf and reinvested the archbishop of York with this staff. *HNA*, p. 11. Hugh the Chanter omits any mention of the visit to Rome.

[28] The full text of the profession was inserted into the Canterbury memorandum and preserved in the Christ Church archives. *Propterea ego Thomas, ordinatus iam Eboracensis ecclesie metropolitanus antistes, auditis cognitisque rationibus, absolutam tibi, Lanfrance, Dorobernensis archiepiscope, tuisque successoribus de canonica obedientia professionem facio, et quicquid a te uel ab eis iuste et canonice iniunctum michi fuerit, seuaturum me esse promitto.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3, iii.83-96; *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), no. 34; cf. *Councils & Synods*, pp. 601-4. See also the *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, i, nos. 64-5 (27 May, Whitsun, 1072).

the result of an elaborate forgery perpetrated by the Canterbury monks.[29] To make matters worse, at least for York, Hugh writes that the monks sent several copies of this charter to churches and monasteries 'to be preserved in their archives (*in armariis conseruarentur*).'[30]

In 1070 Lanfranc asked for both a written profession and an oath of loyalty. According to Hugh, Archbishop Thomas gave a verbal profession, performed under duress, but refused to read a script prepared by the Canterbury scribes and declined to hand it over to Lanfranc. In 1072, according to the Canterbury account, Lanfranc, 'out of love for the king… waived the oath (*sacramentum relaxauit*) for Archbishop Thomas of York and accepted a written profession only (*scriptamque tantum professionem recepit*).'[31] In both accounts the written profession represented a vital proof; its absence in 1070 minimised York's association with the conventional model of profession whilst its existence in 1072 formed the basis for subsequent Canterbury claims albeit denied strenuously by York. Certainly Hugh understood the significance of the written document, lamenting the deceit by Canterbury monks, who, having obtained the royal seal, legitimised their fraud further by distributing copies to be preserved in the archives of churches throughout England. Although historians, including the editors of the most recent critical edition of Hugh the Chanter's narrative, have dismissed the York claims that the 1072 profession was a forgery, the accusation reveals a great deal about twelfth-century attitudes towards written documentation. Hugh recognised that written documents might quickly become accepted truths. To challenge this literary 'truth' the York version provided living 'oral' witnesses. Some years later, in 1086, according to Hugh, King William discovered the fraud perpetrated by the Canterbury monks and promised, in the presence of witnesses that when he returned from Normandy he would adjust the question of

[29] Hugh claims that the monks 'wrote a charter and sealed it with the king's seal which they obtained by fraud (*cartam scripserunt, et regis sigillo surrepcione et dolo acquisito sigillaverunt*)'. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 8-9; the same accusation is repeated later in the text, pp. 40-3.
[30] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 8-9.
[31] Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3.124-26. For a discussion of the significance of the oath of loyalty see, H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, (Oxford, 2003), pp. 92-3; *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), pp. ixx-xxii.

the primacy lawfully and canonically (*inter duos archiepiscopos rem iuste et canonice disponeret*).[32] Hugh named two churchmen, Ranulf Flambard and Gilbert Crispin, who could confirm this royal promise.

> Both these told many other people of it, and were prepared to swear, if any one doubted, that the charter had been thus [i.e. fraudulently] confirmed, and that the king had made answer as aforesaid. Also, that the king had ordered Gilbert Crispin, a nobly born monk, to bear this testimony to the church of York, whatever might happen to himself.[33]

The king of course never returned to England and was unable to resolve the matter in favour of York or otherwise. But the passage quoted above makes an interesting distinction between the 'forged' written charter of the Canterbury monks and the 'truthful' oral testimony of Ranulf, 'who is still living (*qui nunc usque superest*)' as bishop of Durham, and Gilbert Crispin, monk under Lanfranc and later appointed abbot of Westminster. The real concern shown by the authors to authenticate their account with reference to living witnesses adds a further oral context to this written document. It is tempting to try to ascribe individual value to oral and written testimony concluding that each form was fulfilling a different role; the spoken words were immediate, while the written document acted as a record for posterity. In the words of Gregory the Great, '*Quod loquimur transit, quod scribimus permanet*.'[34] Yet in Hugh's narrative the living witnesses and their verbal testimony are claimed for posterity and the authority of the written word is considered to be transient. As Matthew Innes pointed out, albeit in relation to an earlier period, 'both literate and oral tradition were informed by, and worked within, the same cultural parameters of vocality and commemoration. These two

---

[32] Hugh the Chanter, 10-11.

[33] *...qui ambo coram multis edixerunt, et, si quis dubitaret, iurare parati cartam sic confirmatam fuisse, et regem, sicut predictum est, inde respondisse; et quod ipse rex Gilleberto Crispino, nobili genere monacho, preceperat, ut hoc testimonium Eboracensi ecclesie perhiberet, quicquid de ipso contingeret*. Hugh the Chanter, 10-11.

[34] Cited in Geary, 'Oblivion Between Orality and Textuality in the Tenth Century', *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* eds., Althoff, Fried and Geary (Cambridge, 2002) 111-122, at112.

central practices defined a cultural order and symbiosis between oral and literate.'[35] Yet both accounts recognise the profession of obedience had to be written, read and presented. It was a complete process, to understand it, as a dual event is a very modern, literary notion. The danger is that historians continue to interpret the requirement of a written document as evidence of a developing bureaucratic concept of power.

Intriguingly the 'lost' profession from 1070 may have been deliberately destroyed rather than merely mislaid in the archives. Michael Richter speculates that, once Thomas of York had submitted to the more binding second profession in 1072, it was an 'intentional policy' by Lanfranc to destroy the earlier document, which could 'serve as a dangerous precedent to encourage more determined ambitions of independence by *future* [my italics] archbishops of York.'[36] In other words Lanfranc was attempting to define the power structures of the contemporary episcopal church through the coordinated selection of written material preserved in the archives. This shows a very flexible attitude towards the routinisation of episcopal power. This same strategy had been used by Lanfranc when he sought renewed professions from English bishops already in position in 1070.[37] Thus Remigius, bishop of Dorchester (Lincoln), offered two professions of obedience, the first to Archbishop Stigand when the former was originally consecrated in 1067, and the second to Lanfranc in 1070. Only the latter survives.[38] The extant profession demonstrates that Lanfranc wanted to erase Stigand, his irregular predecessor from the line of legitimate archiepiscopal authority; Remigius' profession, addressed directly to Lanfranc, stated, 'that he was not your predecessor and that you were not his successor (*nec eum antecessorem tuum*

[35] M. Innes, 'Memory, Orality and Literacy in an Early Medieval Society', *Past and Present*, 158 (1998), pp. 3-36, at p. 36.
[36] *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), p. lx.
[37] Three 'renewed' professions have survived from bishops Wulfstan of Worcester, Remigius of Dorchester (Lincoln) and Herfast of Elham (Norwich). *Ibid,* p. lxi, nos. 31-3.
[38] The only evidence of Remigius' earlier profession is contained within the subsequent profession offered to Lanfranc, in which he claims to have made profession to Stigand at his consecration in 1067, although he does not specify whether or not this was a written or oral undertaking. Michael Richter concludes that 'it cannot be finally decided whether the written and elaborate profession of obedience was re-introduced into the English church by Lanfranc himself or was already customary before his accession.', *Ibid*, p. lxi, no. 32.

fuisse nec te successorem eius existere).[39] Not only did Lanfranc not regard himself as Stigand's successor but there are suggestions that he supposed his own appointment to mark a new beginning for the English church.[40] Using written professions, Lanfranc set out to 'restructure' the English church. Margaret Gibson wrote that with a 'little strip of parchment' Lanfranc was establishing precedents for the future, 'asserting jurisdiction rather than dignity, and claiming power rather than honour.'[41]

Bishops were deeply conscious of the role of precedent when exercising episcopal power. When Thomas at his consecration was forced to profess obedience he answered with 'sighs and tears (*flens et suspirans*)', submitting to Lanfranc but *not* to his successors.[42] Thomas's tears symbolised his fear that his actions would become a precedent for future archbishops of York. In the more complete profession of 1072, in which Thomas offered obedience to Lanfranc *and* his successors, he performed this personally, in order to exempt future archbishops of York. Later one of his successors, ironically his nephew and namesake, Thomas II, explicitly denied any notion of precedent; accused of being 'no better than his uncle', Thomas II responded, "Whatever wrong he wilfully or unwillingly did is not my inheritance."[43] The primacy dispute illustrates the bishop's role as trustee, as the guardian of his see; on his death this would be the measure of his success or failure. It was essential that

[39] *Cognoscens igitur ex auctoritate predicti pape nec eum antecessorem tuum fuisse nec te successorem eius existere, tibi quidem de obedientia mea scriptam promissionem porrigo, meque tuis omniumque qui tibi successuri sunt iussionibus obtemperaturum esse promitto. Ibid*, no. 32. See also M. Richter, 'Archbishop Lanfranc and the Canterbury Primacy – Some Suggestions', *The Downside Review*, 90 (1972), p. 112. For a brief overview of Stigand's archiepiscopate see, H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 79-82, in particular Cowdrey notes that Lanfranc's attempts to remove Stigand from the list of archbishops did not win lasting support at Canterbury.

[40] Lanfranc's attitude towards the pre-Conquest English church has long been the subject of historical speculation, in particular his unsympathetic view of Anglo-Saxon saints. For a traditional view see R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 310-5. Margaret Gibson described Lanfranc's deep scepticism in M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 70-3, although she later revised her views, noting Lanfranc's particular regard for St Dunstan, in her essay for *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, eds. P. Collinson, M. Ramsay, and N. Sparks (Oxford, 1995), pp. 38-68, esp. pp.43-4. For a fuller discussion and brief overview of the historiography see J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum*, 74.2 (1999), pp. 279-309.

[41] M. Gibson, 'Normans and Angevins, 1070-1220', *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, eds. P. Collinson, M. Ramsay, and N. Sparks (Oxford, 1995), pp. 40.

[42] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 6-7.

[43] *Si quid sponte uel inuitus perperam fecisset, nichil ab eo hereditate possideo.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 36-7.

bishops were seen to retain the rights of their churches, and *not* to endanger the future with their actions. Lanfranc's successor, Anselm, expressed his deep concern about this matter in a letter to Hugh, archbishop of Lyon. Anselm explained that King William II had threatened to take lands belonging to the church of Canterbury, and previously held by Lanfranc until his death. Anselm wrote

> I am certain that the archbishopric will be given to no one after me except in the way I hold it on the day of my death... If therefore, I hold the archbishopric thus diminished until the day of my death, in this way the church will lose through me... Now since the king is the advocate of the church and I am its guardian (*et ego custos*), what will be said in future except that, because the king did it and the archbishop by upholding it confirmed it, it should be ratified?[44]

According to this view, Anselm's sense of the episcopal office was intrinsically connected to his personal rule. Episcopal power was accumulated and bequeathed. The bishop possessed the authority held by his predecessors at the moment of their death. Hugh the Chanter also reports the words of Thomas II's successor at York, Archbishop Thurstan, 'I will not be a *precedent* for my successors; I will not make a profession to the church or to the person (*nec ecclesie nec persone*), unless the question is settled by canonical judgement.'[45] Thurstan distinguished between *ecclesia* and *persona*. However his distinction did not apply to his own position.

At the heart of each tangled confrontation between Canterbury and York lies the question of the *extent* of obedience promised: to the person or to the institution. The use of professions forced Anglo-Norman bishops to confront the practicalities of the division between office and holder. Richter claims that when Lanfranc demanded personal professions

[44] *Certus autem sum quia archiepiscopatus iste nulli dabitur post me, nisi quemadmodum ego illum in die obitus mei tenebo... Si ergo ita tenuero archiepiscopatum imminutum usque ad obitum meum, hoc modo perdet ecclesia per me... Nunc autem, cum et ipse rex advocatus eius sit et ego custos: quid dicetur in futuro nisi, quia rex fecit et archiepiscopus sustinendo confirmavit, ratum esse debet?* Anselm, *Letters*, 176. Sally Vaughn has asserted that Anselm's letters demonstrate a 'quasi-legal' conception of precedent, noting that, 'in Anselm's view, abbatial or archiepiscopal actions also acquired the force of law, which to him was custom or precedent.' S. N. Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia Novorum*: a reinterpretation', *ANS*, X (1987), p. 262.

[45] *Successoribus nostris exemplum non ero, quia nec ecclesie nec persone profitebor nisi canonico iudicio fuerit terminatum.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 130-3.

he put obedience to himself before obedience to his see.[46] R. W. Southern argued that 'Lanfranc's personal success in 1072 contained and concealed the roots of a permanent failure' because it did not bind Thomas' successors.[47] In this sense, the primacy dispute exposed the weakness of relying on personal power relations in order to establish permanent change: the record of 1072 was of little value beyond the lifetime of the main participants.[48] It was left to Lanfranc's successor, Anselm, to obtain written approval of the primacy from Rome, where papal authority could be traced back to St Peter. However by this point the issue had become entangled with the conflict over investitures, and as Southern put it, 'since the pope was in the process of letting Anselm down on the major issue, the least he could do was to satisfy him as far as possible in minor matters.'[49] In the summer of 1102 when papal messengers arrived with conflicting reports on the pope's attitude to investitures, they brought as well confirmation of the primacy to Anselm *personally* as his predecessors had held it.[50] When Anselm arrived in Rome in November 1103, having gone into exile over the issue of lay investiture, the papal privilege was extended to include his successors.[51] Anselm at once sent this to Canterbury to be copied and carefully preserved (*ad transcribendum et diligenter custodiendum*).[52] Yet this document did not end the dispute. It confirmed only such privileges as Anselm's predecessors had enjoyed; it remained for Canterbury to prove what they had once held.

---

[46] M. Richter, 'Archbishop Lanfranc and the Canterbury Primacy – Some Suggestions', *Downside Review*, Vol. 90, No. 229 (1972), p. 112.
[47] R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 340. Southern's particular concern in respect of the Canterbury primacy was to show that Anselm inherited a weak position from Lanfranc. For a discussion of Lanfranc's attempts to secure papal approval see, H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 101-2.
[48] Lanfranc recognised this problem when wrote to Alexander II claiming that 'while the king lives we have peace of mind, but after his death we expect to have neither peace nor any other benefit (*post mortem uero eius nec aliquod bonum nos habituros speramus*).' Lanfranc, *Letters*, 1.72-4
[49] R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 136. For a discussion of the investiture contest in England at this time see, N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1958).
[50] *HNA*, pp. 135-6; Anselm, *Letters*, 222
[51] *HNA*, pp. 154-5; Anselm, *Letters*, 303
[52] *Privilegium quod dominus papa mihi dedit, vobis mitto ad transcribendum et diligenter custodiendum.* Anselm, *Letters*, 307

Anselm clearly hoped that by obtaining papal documentation the primacy dispute would be settled permanently in favour of Canterbury. Previously, in 1071, when both archbishops were present in Rome the pope refused to decide upon the primacy issue and stated that the matter should be resolved by a national council. This pattern of papal ambivalence and delay was repeated numerous times, and in general the papacy appears to have responded to both parties with deliberate delaying tactics, shying away from any permanent decision. The Gregorian conception of bishops envisaged them as instruments of reform; the function of the bishop was to be 'the local mouthpiece of the papacy'.[53] Rome, under the authority of Pope Gregory VII, was extremely critical of attempts by local metropolitans to exercise judgement in what he perceived to be papal matters. Robinson points out that, 'Gregory VII informed the pastors of 'the other churches' that their rights could be guaranteed only by the *providentia* and the *auctoritas* of the Roman Church.'[54] Yet even at the height of the Gregorian conception of a Roman primacy, papal attitudes to the extension of episcopal rights were unclear and inconsistent. Alongside the growing movement for the exemption of bishoprics from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan and their immediate subjection to Rome were the attempts by archbishops to affirm or extend their metropolitan status.[55] In fact in the broadest sense primatial claims were 'in harmony' with the hierarchical principles of the eleventh-century papal reform movement.[56]

Papal recognition was often cited as the principal requirement for Canterbury's claims to primatial authority and York's resistance to it. Archbishops from both sides sought to obtain papal authorisation, insisting that the issue would be resolved only once this had been established by formal decree. Hugh the Chanter records the undertaking given by Thomas I at

[53] I. S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Whitstable, 1978), pp. 164.
[54] *Ibid*, p. 21.
[55] One notable and successful attempt to secure an archiepiscopal primacy, approved by Rome, was when Gregory VII confirmed the primacy of the church of Lyons over the archbishoprics of Rouen, Tours and Sens. See *Ibid*, p. 60.
[56] F. Delivré, 'The Foundations of Primatial Claims in the Western Church', *JEH*, 59: 3 (2008), pp. 383-406, at pp. 385-88.

his consecration, to be subject to Lanfranc, but not his successors, 'unless the pope shall so judge (*nisi iudicante summo pontifice*).'[57] This is the heart of the York defence, that 'only archbishops, and when they receive it, those who enjoy the pallium, swear obedience and fealty to the supreme pontiff by the custom of the church of Rome.'[58] Throughout his entire text Hugh emphasises York's relationship with Rome, calling particular attention to apostolic authority derived from St Peter. He records the words spoken by representatives of Thomas II to the legate Odalric who lament the fact that the elect was not able to travel *ad beatum Petrum uel ad dominum papam* and 'casts himself humbly and tearfully at your feet, as though at those of St Peter and the pope (*beati Petri uel domini pape*)'.[59] The central moment of the York narrative, the consecration of Thurstan, is described with particular reference to Peter, stating that *electus noster* was consecrated 'by the hands of the pope, as representing St Peter (*domini pape saltem tanquam beati Petri manibus*).'[60] Hugh takes this connection one stage further by emphasising the particular links between the St Peter's in Rome and the St Peter's Cathedral in York. He repeatedly refers to the *ecclesia sancti Petri* at York.[61] The association between York and St Peter is emphasised further when Hugh describes how Thurstan made the same connection while in exile from his see, binding his fate closer to the authority of Rome: 'Encouraged by the pope and the cardinals, Thurstan began to cast his exile, now real and obvious upon God and St Peter, *out of whose church he had been expelled and with whom he took refuge*.' [62] And again when Thurstan was eventually allowed to return

[57] *Tibi subiectus ero quamdiu uixeris, successoribus tuis minime, nisi iudicante summo pontifice*. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 6-7.
[58] *Soli summon pontifici, ex consuetudine Romane ecclesie, metropolite et qui palleis utuntur, quando ipsa suscipiunt, obedienciam et fidelitatem iurant.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 8-9. The editors of Hugh's text note that the oath sworn by an archbishop on receiving his pallium is first recorded from the time of Alexander II in 1070, though one may well have been exacted earlier. See also R. L. Benson, *The Bishop-Elect* (Princeton, 1968), pp. 169-70, who examines Paschal II's attempts to define the significance of the pallium.
[59] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 44-5.
[60] *Electus noster, astantibus et assencientibus et coadiuuantibus tot et tantis personis, domini pape saltem tanquam beati Petri manibus, archiepiscopus consecratus est*. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 120-1.
[61] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 52-3. Twice mentioned.
[62] *Confortatus a papa et cardinalibus exilium suum, tunc demum et manifestum et uerum, Deo et sancto Petro, de cuius ecclesia eiectus ad ipsum refugiebat, committere cepit.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 134-5.

to York as a consecrated bishop, Hugh describes how the archbishop, 'enthroned once more in his chair… celebrated the feast called 'St Peter's Chair' in St Peter's own church.[63] This connection makes a neat literary link, which even when not directly emphasised would surely not have gone unnoticed by his principal audience: the York cathedral chapter. Yet this is more than just a literary device for the amusement of the canons; Petrine authority was central to the primacy dispute, just as it was central to the notion of papal authority in the post-Gregorian period.[64] Eadmer also makes use of the Petrine link by describing how even Anselm's enemies recognised that his reasoning rested on the words of God 'and the authority of St Peter (*et auctoritate Beati Petri*).'[65] Eadmer also reports Anselm's words over the issue of recognising the pope.

> Just as we accept these words as spoken first to St Peter and through him to all the rest of the apostles, so we hold the same words as spoken first to the vicar of St Peter and through him to the rest of the bishops who are the successors of the Apostles not spoken to any emperor, nor to any king, or duke or earl.[66]

This suggests a simple hierarchical view of the episcopal church based on the notion of apostolic authority. Janet Nelson has noted that, after Gregory VII, 'over the bishops watched an increasingly centralised and proactive church government, reconnecting "Rome" with "canon law" in the minds of Western Christians.'[67] In this sense the primacy dispute is a measure of papal intervention in the English church; a measure of how bishops understood their relationship to the ultimate hierarchical authority, Rome. From the time of the Norman

[63] *In cathedra respositus, tercia ie sollempnitatem beati Petri, que Cathedra eius appellatur, in ecclesia ipsius beati Petri festiue celebrauit.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 166-7. The feast of St Peter's Chair was held on 22 February.
[64] The authority of St Peter is frequently invoked in papal letters recorded in both texts and to this extent Petrine authority is the most significant authority quoted in the primacy polemics. This echoes the explicit association developed by Gregory VII in his letters at the height of the investiture controversy with Henry IV in which he repeatedly identified himself with his apostolic predecessor. I. S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Whitstable, 1978), pp. 19.
[65] *HNA*, pp. 62.
[66] *Haec, sicut principaliter Beato Petro et in ipso caeteris apostolis dicta accipimus, ita principaliter vicario Beati Petri et per ipsum caeteris episcopis qui vices agnut apostolorum eadem dicta tenemus; non cuilibet imperatori, non alicui regi, non duci, non comiti. HNA*, pp. 57.
[67] J. L. Nelson, 'Law and its applications', *Early Medieval Christianities, c.600-c.1100*, eds. T. F. X. Noble, J. M. H. Smith and R. A. Baranowski (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 299-326.

Conquest papal influence in England increased. Charles Duggan wrote that, 'the overall trend is one of gradual extension and ramification of papal influence in England, with many setbacks and against frequent opposition'.[68]

It is not clear what inspired Lanfranc to demand a written profession of obedience from Thomas, archbishop-elect of York. Historians have offered a variety of interpretations which reinforce the division between holder and office: did the new archbishop intend to organise the English church by clearly defining the power structure or was he merely inspired by personal ambition? H. E. J. Cowdrey claimed that the 'disorganised state of the English church in 1070 created a pressing need for Lanfranc at once to claim an effective primacy for Canterbury.'[69] Other historians, including Frank Barlow have speculated that Lanfranc was inspired by personal rivalry with Bishop Odo of Bayeux, patron to Thomas of York.[70] According to the contemporary accounts King William was initially irritated by the disruption it caused to the church.[71] Hugh the Chanter claimed that the king was eventually persuaded to support the Canterbury cause following Lanfranc's timely political argument that, 'it was expedient for the union and solidarity of the kingdom that all Britain should be subject to one man as primate (*utile esse ad regni integritatem et firmitatem conseruandam ut Britannia tota uni quasi primati subderetur*)', suggesting that otherwise an invader from the north, 'might be made king by the archbishop of York... and the kingdom disturbed and divided.'[72] According to this account the archbishop envisaged a single primatial church to

[68] C. Duggan, 'From the Conquest to the Death of John', *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, ed. C. H. Lawrence (London, 1965), p. 77.
[69] H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (Oxford, 2003), p. 88.
[70] F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), p. 35. See also B. Golding, *Conquest and Colonisation* (Rev. ed. Basingstoke, 2001), p. 151.
[71]Hugh the Chanter, pp. 4-5. The Canterbury account recalls that the king was 'very displeased because he thought that Lanfranc was trying to get more than his due and was relying more on worldly learning than on reason and truth (*Quod rex audiens grauiter accepit, existimans Lanfrancum iniusta petere et scientia litterarum magis quam ratione et ueritate confidere*).' Lanfranc, *Letters*, 3.27-9
[72] *Porro utile esse ad regni integritatem et firmitatem conseruandam ut Britannia tota uni quasi primati subderetur; alioquin contingere posse, uel suo uel successorum suorum tempore, ut de Dacis seu Norensibus siue Scotis, qui Eboracam nauigio uenientes regnum infestare solebant, unus ab Eboracensi archiepiscopo et a prouincie illius indigenis mobilibus et perfidis rex crearetur, et sic regnum turbatum scinderetur.* Hugh the

complement the political (secular) power structure.[73] In other words the English episcopate was deliberately structured to best suit the requirements of stable royal power. This is what Frank Barlow meant when he described a 'sort of "feudal" pyramid' for bishops; according to this view Lanfranc attempted to formalise the ecclesiastical power structure using the strategies of secular feudalism.[74] However Lanfranc could not innovate without appealing to the authority of the past.

Lanfranc possessed an abridged version of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, a collection of canon law from the ninth century, which mentioned primates as the equivalent of patriarchs and placed them between the pope and metropolitan bishops in church hierarchy.[75] The *Collectio Lanfranci* seems to have been widely disseminated in England.[76] Historians have frequently debated the influence of canon law on the development of English constitutional history.[77] Increasingly however the historical consensus imagines the English church much closer to the traditions of Rome. As such it is possible to interpret Lanfranc's demand for an English primacy as part of a programme to improve the quality of the episcopate by encouraging knowledge of ecclesiastical law, especially among his suffragan

---

Chanter, pp. 4-5. For an overview of the Normans in the north of England see, W. E. Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North: the region and its transformation, 1000-1135* (London, 1979).

[73] Margaret Gibson wrote that Lanfranc's 'fundamental virtue in public life was an unquestioned loyalty to William the Conqueror and a readiness to commend such loyalty to wavering magnates.' This is a reflection of the contemporary accounts of the relationship between Lanfranc and the Conqueror. Lanfranc, *Letters*, p.5.

[74] F. Barlow, *The English Church* (London, 1979), pp. 33.

[75] For a discussion of the influence of the decretals on Lanfranc's thought and an account of his involvement in the compilation see M. Brett, 'The *Collectio Lanfranci* and its Competitors', *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays presented to Margaret Gibson*, eds., L. M. Smith and B. Ward (London, 1992), pp. 157-74; idem, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 64; M. Philpott, 'Lanfranc's Canonical Collection and the Law of the Church', *Lanfranco di Pavia et l'Europa del secolo XI*, ed., G. D'Onofrio (Roma, 1993); M. Richter, 'Archbishop Lanfranc and the Canterbury Primacy – Some Suggestions', *Downside Review*, Vol. 90, No. 229 (1972), pp. 110-18; *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M Richter (London, 1973), p. lxvi.

[76] For a detailed list of the manuscript copies see 'Collectio Lanfranci', *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400-1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature*, ed. L. Kery (Washington, D.C., 1999), pp. 239-243; R. Gameson, *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066-1130)* (Oxford, 1999).

[77] Although many of his conclusions have been substantially modified it is still worth consulting Z. N. Brooke's account of 'Lanfranc's Collection' first published in 1931, if only for his characterisation of Lanfranc. Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1989), esp. pp. 57-83. See also F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England: six essays* (London, 1898) which focuses on a later period but succinctly addresses some of the particular prejudices of nineteenth-century historiography towards papal involvement in England.

bishops. Yet Lanfranc's relationship with the papacy was often strained, particularly during the pontificate of Gregory VII. William I limited the interference of the pope in England.[78] Appeals to Rome were considered a reversal of good order, challenging royal and episcopal power. In particular the primacy dispute became deeply entangled with the investiture controversy. Hugh the Chanter was dismissive of the issue, writing that Henry I gave up investitures, 'a concession which cost him little or nothing, a little, perhaps of his royal dignity, but nothing at all of his power to enthrone anyone he pleased (*nichil prorsus potestatis quem uellet intronizandi*).'[79] Hugh cited the views of Ivo of Chartres, suggesting that it did not matter how investiture was given so long as the church retained canonical election and free consecration. Hugh continued, offering his own opinion.

> But the church, if we may be permitted to say so, still has men in it who... strain out the gnat and swallow the camel (Matt. 23:23-4); who rage against investitures by [lay] hands, and are silent about election and free consecration.

C. Warren Hollister has argued that Hugh had Anselm in mind when he wrote this passage. Quite unfairly, according to Hollister, Hugh was criticising Anselm's failure to introduce a 'policy of immaculately constitutional free ecclesiastical elections.'[80] Yet Hugh's reference to Ivo of Chartres suggests that this was also a veiled commentary on York's view of the primatial claims. Ivo had undertaken a stringent defence against the primacy of Lyon.[81] According to this view the principle of the primacy was not only uncanonical but also unprecedented. Hugh was positioning the York defence at the forefront of reforming ideas;

---

[78] *HNA*, pp. 10. See also William of Malmesbury's criticisms of the Conqueror's dominance over the English church. *GP*, i.42.6*β*2-3.
[79] *Dimissione quidem qua nichil aut parum amisit, parum quidem regie dignitatis, nichil prorsus potestatis quem uellet intronizandi.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 22-3.
[80] C. W. Hollister, 'St Anselm on Lay Investiture', *ANS*, X (1987), pp. 145-58.
[81] In 1097 Ivo denounced primatial status as unprecedented and unjustified when Archbishop Hugh of Lyon demanded a profession of obedience from Daimbert, archbishop-elect of Sens. Hugh the Chanter, pp. xxxiii, n.4.

associating it closely with the principal of free election and the newly developing ideas of canon law.[82]

Yet it is likely that Lanfranc's monastic background was the principal inspiration for his vision of a strictly hierarchical church. Obedience was a fundamental part of the hierarchical structure of the medieval church. It lay at the heart of Benedictine monasticism and there can be little doubt that for monk-bishops, such as the first three post-Conquest appointments to Canterbury, this tradition was acutely felt.[83] Lanfranc frequently referred to the Benedictine *Rule* in his letters concerning obedience.[84] Yet there was an essential difference in the meaning of 'professions of obedience' as used by monks and bishops. In the monastic profession the vow of obedience was all encompassing, however for bishops it related only to their relationship with their ecclesiastical superior; in this sense, obedience referred to a strict hierarchical vision of the church.[85] According to Conrad Leyser, the 'masterstroke' of the Benedictine *Rule* was the principle of superiority; 'he who arrives at the first hour to join the community is senior to the man who comes at the second.'[86] The same principle lay behind Honorius's judgement concerned with the primacy. Lanfranc and Anselm were attempting to subvert the Benedictine programme by instituting an unauthorised hierarchy. But this is precisely because they conceived of episcopal power in a totally different way. The language of obedience enabled episcopal power to be articulated pragmatically. It is not possible to dismiss the use of terms of obedience as a topos. It reveals

[82] L. K. Barker, 'Ivo of Chartres and the Anglo-Norman Cultural Tradition', *ANS*, XIII (1990), pp. 16-33.

[83] For an account of Lanfranc's vision of monastic obedience and its influence on his archiepiscopal career see M. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1978); for Anselm see R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 259-76. A complete Latin text of the Rule of St Benedict is available online http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/benedict.html. For a general introduction to this vast topic see C. H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (3rd ed. Harlow, 2001).

[84] For example Lanfranc, *Letters*, 17.

[85] For an account of the precise meaning of obedience within the Benedictine Rule see C. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 117-22.

[86] *Ibid,* p. 118. The relevant passage from the Rule reads: *Ergo, excepto hos quos, ut diximus, altiori consilio abbas prætulerit vel degradaverit certis ex causis, reliqui omnes ut convertuntur ita sint ut verbi gratia qui secunda hora diei venerit in monasterio iuniorem se noverit illius esse qui prima hora venit diei, cuiuslibet ætatis aut dignitatis sit. Pueris per omnia ab omnibus disciplina conservata.* Rule of St Benedict, 63.

the conditions in which bishops understood and articulated their position in the web of power relations. Obedience was central to the 'rhetoric' of episcopal power. Lanfranc's vision of obedience is highly personal. This was in contrast to the Benedictine notion of obedience.

The written professions offered to Lanfranc were intended to clarify the role of the archbishop and his expectations of those 'beneath' him. With only one exception all the Canterbury professions from this time begin with a short discourse on the virtue of obedience.[87] Central to the concept of obedience expressed in these documents is that prelates who demand obedience from their subjects must be prepared to show obedience to their superiors in return. Hugh, bishop of London, read, 'just as he strives to obtain from subjects due honour and corresponding reverence, so he ought not to disdain reverently showing the due obedience to his superiors (*maioribus*).'[88] Similarly Robert Losinga, elect of Hereford read, 'whoever demands obedience to his subjects ought himself to show it to his prelates.'[89] These statements envisage the bishop within an ecclesiastical power structure; that is to say, occupying a particular level in the hierarchy of power. However they also reflect a much older tradition of pastoral care.

I. S. Robinson identified a 'preoccupation with ideas of obedience to authority and rebellion against authority' in the polemical literature of the late eleventh-century investiture controversy.[90] These themes are used with deliberate and determined meaning by both Eadmer and Hugh to explain and justify the actions of their archbishops. Eadmer uses the occasion of Anselm's promotion to Canterbury to explore the complicated interaction of

[87] The exception is Donatus, elect of Dublin, no. 42, which offers only a simple promise of obedience. The more complex form associated with Lanfranc was briefly revived by Archbishop Theobald (1138-61) for three professions: Robert de Chesney (Lincoln, no. 92), David fitzGerald (St David's, no. 93), and John of Pagham (Worcester, no. 96). For a discussion of the significance of this addition to the standard pattern of profession see *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), pp. lxxvi-lxxvii.

[88] *Et sicut a subditis honorem debitum et congruam reuerentiam expetit obtinere, ita maioribus suis debitam obedientiam non dedignetur reuerenter exhibere*. *Ibid*, no. 37.

[89] *Quisquis obedientiam exigit a suis subiectis, debet ipse etiam sui seam exhibere prelatis. Ibid*, no. 41.

[90] The letters of Gregory VII are dominated by the concept of *obedientia* owed to the pope, while the letters of Henry IV are full of reminders of the evils of resistance to the divinely ordained power of the *regnum*. I. S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest* (Whitstable, 1978), p. 8.

obedience and resistance to episcopal authority. Following the death of Lanfranc, King William II allowed the archbishopric to remain vacant, collecting the fees for himself.[91] At that time Anselm was abbot of Bec in Normandy; then, as now, the circumstances under which he travelled to England and was invested with the archbishopric were the subject of close scrutiny.[92] Eadmer states that Anselm was reluctant to go to England, despite having business there, for fear that it would seem like he was seeking promotion. Eventually he went, having received a letter from his monks commanding that unless he wished 'to be branded with the sin of disobedience' he was to travel to England and attend to the abbey's business.[93] He remained in England for some months during which time the king fell desperately ill, and fearing that he might die, agreed to fill the vacancy at Canterbury. Anselm was borne off to the king's bedside to be invested with the royal staff, 'he resisted with all his might (*toto conamine restitit*)' and declared that there were many reasons which made this impossible.[94]

> I am an abbot of a monastery in another kingdom and as such *have an archbishop to whom I owe obedience*, an earthly prince to whom I owe submission, and monks to whom I owe the services of my counsel and my help. To all these I am so bound that I can neither forsake my monks without their consent, nor cast off my allegiance to my prince without his permission, *nor at the peril of my soul evade the obedience due to my archbishop except he absolve me from it*.[95]

[91] For a fuller discussion of the role of episcopal vacancies in the Anglo-Norman period, and particularly during the reign of William II see L. H. Jared, 'English Ecclesiastical Vacancies during the Reigns of William II and Henry I', *JEH*, 42:3 (1991), pp. 362-393.

[92] For a discussion of Anselm's collusion in his appointment to Canterbury see S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), pp. 116-22; for an alternative view see R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 186-94. These issues are dealt with specifically in the *Albion* debates see R. W. Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An Examination of the Foundations' and S. N. Vaughn, 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (1988), pp. 181-220.

[93] *HNA*, pp. 29. Sally Vaughn argues that the message urging Anselm to go to England, for which there is no independent evidence, may have been a 'figment of Eadmer's imagination.' In particular it does not seem likely that the monks would act contrary to the interests of the Bec community especially as some subsequently attempted to prevent Anselm from accepting the archbishopric. S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), pp. 124; see also Anselm*, Letters*, 155.

[94] *Cumque raperetur ad regem, ut per virgam pastoralem investituram archiepiscopatus de manu eius susciperet, toto conamine restitit, idque multis obsistentibus causis nullatenus fieri posse asseruit. HNA*, pp. 32. Eadmer's account of Anselm's investiture is highly coloured by the subsequent events relating to the investiture dispute in England; although the king tried to invest Anselm, he eventually received the staff from the bishops.

[95] *Abbas sum monasterii alterius regni, archiepiscopum habens cui obedientiam, terrenum principem cui subiectionem, monachos quibus debeo consilii atque auxilii sumministrationem. His omnibus ita sum astrictus,*

The topos of episcopal reluctance is clearly being used here but beyond this Eadmer leaves his readers in no doubt to whom Anselm owes obedience; he might owe submission to his prince and have a duty to his monks but neither came before the requirement of obedience to his archbishop. In a neat narrative trick Eadmer then reverses the order of the persons listed; in order to avoid the consequences of disobedience he must obtain the consent of his monks and his lord, but to be disobedient to his archbishop would be to endanger his immortal soul. The archbishop in question, Maurilius of Rouen, played a vital role in Anselm's ecclesiastical career; on three occasions he imposed his authority on Anselm, twice compelling him to accept promotion.[96] Eadmer was surely writing with the circumstances of the Canterbury primacy in his mind. Here, he articulates the submission due to hierarchical superiors in the church, whilst demonstrating the duty and responsibility of a metropolitan bishop to command obedience. It also illustrates that Anselm himself was once subject to authority and positions him within the ecclesiastical power structure.

Towards the end of Hugh's narrative he explains his purpose for writing, so that 'future bishops and clergy of our church may forgive those in these parts who by bad advice, for love of peace, for fear of higher power (*potestatis terrore*), or dread of exile, gave way and for a time consented to this profession, and not angrily reproach the dead, but imitate and praise those who resisted (*eos uero qui restiterunt imitentur et laudent*).'[97] Yet elsewhere Hugh barely mentions resistance in the context of Thurstan's behaviour. This complex relationship is used by Hugh to present Thurstan's resistance to Canterbury's demands in a particular light. In fact Donald Nicholl asserts that Thurstan pursued a deliberate policy of

---

ut nec monachos deserere possim sine illorum concessione, nec me a dominatu principis mei ualeam exuere sine eius permissione, nec obedientiam pontificis me subterfugere queam cum salute animae meae absque ipsius absolutione. HNA, pp. 33.

[96] *VA*, pp. 44.

[97] *Hec autem iccirco scripta esse decreuimus, ut posteri ecclesie nostre pontifices et clerici his qui de partibus nostris professioni huic consenciendo, uel consilii seduccione uel pacis amore uel potestatis terrore et exilii formidine ad tempus cesserunt, quasi ueniam dantes, ne defunctis succensendo improperent, eos uero qui restiterunt imitentur et laudent*. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 220-3.

'conciliation'.[98] Hugh conveys this impression by emphasising Ralph's disobedience to Rome. He reports that Ralph had openly stated that he would defy a papal order to consecrate Thurstan without profession: *de hoc minime obedirem*.[99] Hugh even directly contrasts the two men when describing their reception in Rome in 1119, during the peace negotiations led by Calixtus and intended to end the fighting between France and England.

> The pope and cardinals and most of those present praised [Thurstan's] wisdom, uprightness, modesty, and love of his lord. They abused the archbishop of Canterbury, because the church of York had been so long deprived of its shepherd owing to his demand for a profession not due to him. Further, he had shown no obediency to the late Popes Paschal and Gelasius nor to the commands of Calixtus in the matter of the consecration of the elect of York; he had been called to the council [of Reims] and had not come, and had not sent anyone to act for him, or a canonical excuse.[100]

Obedience is so deeply ingrained into the conceptual framework of how the episcopate should operate that it saturates the York narrative. The heavy emphasis on Thurstan's obedience in all other matters save the demand for obedience from Canterbury is testament to a particular vision of episcopal behaviour. Disobedience can quickly turn to rebellion. This is demonstrated amply by Lanfranc's professions which frequently warned of the dangers of rebellion. The profession of Robert Losinga, elect of Hereford, reads, 'for he acquires a just damnation who is disobedient and rebellious to the pastor ordering spiritual matters.'[101] Osmund, elect of Salisbury reads, 'it is not fitting that he should wish to be arrogantly disobedient and rebellious to him whom the authority of prelacy compels to obey humbly and to submit justly.'[102] The first episode of resistance described by Hugh the

[98] D. Nicholl, *Thurstan Archbishop of York (1114-1140)* (York, 1964), p. 73.
[99] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 64.
[100] *Papa et cardinales et plurimi qui aderant satis illum laudabant, de sapiencia, honestate, modestia, de amore erga dominum suum. Inuehebantur in Cantuariensem quod Eboracensis ecclesia tamdiu fuerat pro non sibi debite professionis exaccione pastoris regimine desolata, nec reuerende memorie pape Paschali et Gelasio nec preceptis illius in consecracione electi illius quicquam obediencie exhibuit, nec ad consilium uocatus uenit, nec qui uices eius agere deberent misit, nec canonicam excusacionem mandauit*. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 128-9.
[101] *Ille enim iustam sibi damnationem adquirit, qui spirituali pastori spiritualia iubenti inobediens et rebellis existit. Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), no. 41.
[102] *Nec decet ut arroganter inobediens ac rebellis ei existere uelit, quem prelationis auctoritas humiliter obedire iusteque subiacere compellit. Ibid*, no. 40.

Chanter describes the elect's refusal (*refugit*) to accept ordination even as a priest from Archbishop Ralph or any of his suffragans, 'lest the former should be able to claim more right over him on that account (*ne ideo plus iuris in eo posset reclamare*).'[103] Hugh the Chanter uses his narrative to portray Thurstan as holding back from outright resistance. He very often seeks compromise with the king.[104] In 1116 when Archbishop Ralph was given permission by Henry I to go to Rome, Thurstan was forced to wait with the king. When he said that he would wait no longer but would go to consult the pope, 'the king, in the face of his steadfast and prolonged refusal and resistance (*negante et renitente*), only just succeeded, by prayers, coaxing, and promises, in persuading him to stay till the archbishop should return'.[105] Hugh explains that Ralph continued to put pressure on the king asking him to force Thurstan to return to England; and 'though the king made every effort, Thurstan replied that he would not return before Easter (*istud uero summopere conanti ante Pascha se non regressurum respondit*)'.[106] Often Thurstan's resistance manifested itself in the refusal to act.

The extent to which a bishop owed obedience to his metropolitan is not elaborated, and clearly this was not always thought necessary. Hugh records a brief exchange between Thurstan and Archbishop Ralph at the royal council in 1115, after the archbishop-elect of York 'humbly begged (*suppliciter requisiuit*)' to be consecrated by the latter.[107]

Archbishop Ralph:	Willingly, if you will do what you ought. *Libenter faciam si feceritis quod debetis*
Elect Thurstan:	I demand to be consecrated by you according to the right of our churches, whose archbishops ought each to consecrate the other. If then you can show anything to be due to yourself by canon law, I do not refuse

[103] Thurstan was a subdeacon, ordained deacon December 1114 by William Giffard, bishop of Winchester. Thurstan had previously succeeded William Giffard in his stall at St Paul's. Cf. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 56-7, n.3. However, Thurstan refused to accept any further advancement from Archbishop Ralph or his suffragans.

[104] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 184-5.

[105] *Rex uero, isto constanter et diu negante et renitente, precibus, blandiciis, promissis uix optinere potuit ut remaneret quousque archiepiscopus redisset,* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 80-1.

[106] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 108-9. Thurstan explained that he did not wish to return to York because he would not be able to consecrate the chrism or celebrate Easter as archbishop.

[107] Hugh claims the council was held '*circa festum sancti Michaelis*', identified by the OMT editors as opening on 16 September 1115. See also, *Councils and Synods*, pp. 709-10.

to perform it (*exhibere non recuso*). [108]

This exchange, even if we suppose it to be pure invention, was deliberately constructed in order to avoid open refusal. Both men state that they are willing to comply with the request of the other, disguising their deadlock, but also so that each might present himself as humble and obedient in comparison with the other. Hugh then records the words of Geoffrey, archbishop of Rouen, who interrupts the exchange by stating, 'it does not become persons of such dignity to be ambiguous (*duplicitate uerborum*). Let each openly state what he demands of, or refuses to, the other.'[109] This quotation demonstrates impatience and frustration with the ambiguity of language. Geoffrey calls for an explicit statement of what was *demanded (exigere)* and *refused (denegare)*. That is to say, what was forced and resisted.

In order to articulate power it was essential that the language used was precise and meaningful.[110] Yet bishops at this time relied on the ambiguity of language. Historians often interpret this as the absence of administrative clarification as a sign of disorganisation. Michael Richter, writing specifically about episcopal professions, argued that issues not clarified by canon law were dealt with pragmatically, concluding that, 'improvisation prevented any systematic thought.'[111] In fact ambiguous language was deliberately cultivated in order to allow for improvisation. It allowed power relations to work effectively. It explains why the popes refused to clarify the matter, why the king acted in such a fickle manner, and also why the language of obedience and authority was so crucial to the articulation of episcopal operations.

In fact Anselm's papal confirmation was superseded by a further decree issued by Pope Calixtus II to Thurstan, archbishop of York. After Thurstan's election in 1114,

---

[108] Hugh the Chanter, pp. 62-3.

[109] *Non est tantarum personarum uti duplicitate uerborum. Quid ab alterutro exigat, uel alterutro deneget, aperte uterque denunciet.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 62-3. Geoffrey Brito, formerly dean of Le Mans, archbishop of Rouen 1111-28. Cf. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 136-7.

[110] For a fuller discussion of the development of technical terms used by Gratian to describe the functions and powers of episcopal office see W. Telfer, *The Office of a Bishop* (London, 1962), esp. pp. 45-55.

[111] *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter (London, 1973), p. lxxi.

Anselm's successor, Ralph, refused to perform the consecration without written profession of obedience. Five years later Thurstan was consecrated by Calixtus, apparently in defiance of the king's wishes.[112] For a time Thurstan was unable to return to England and so he remained in exile accompanying the pope around Europe. On 11 March 1120 as the two men were parting the pope gave Thurstan a papal bull which exempted York from primatial claims, by forbidding the archbishop or any of his successors from ever making profession to Canterbury.[113] Eventually Thurstan was returned to the king's favour and allowed to return to York. Yet despite his newly obtained privilege, Thurstan continued to have problems in England. In 1121 at the Michaelmas council the king acting on behalf of Ralph who was too ill to attend, again demanded that Thurstan make *personal* profession, 'for the peace of the churches and his affection for the king.'[114] Thurstan refused, claiming he risked a papal anathema and when he was invited by the king to discuss the situation he arrived with the papal bull of privilege in his hand (*contrascriptum privilegii sui in manu sua*).[115] The king, who according to Hugh the Chanter was filled with regret for his treatment of Thurstan, advised the archbishop to arrange for the privilege to be read to the bishops who were at court.

> But when [Thurstan's men], without the archbishop, would have read it in the king's presence, or offered it to be read, the bishops would neither read it nor hear it. But one of them gave vent to a disgraceful

[112] The circumstances which led up to Thurstan's consecration at the start of the council of Reims 1119 are unclear. York sources deny that Thurstan gave any undertaking to the king before he left for Reims, Hugh the Chanter, 112-5, Eadmer on the other hand states that Thurstan promised King Henry that he would refuse consecration from the pope, *HNA*, pp. 255-6.

[113] The document itself was not reproduced in Hugh the Chanter's text. This is a striking omission as the papal privilege was a key victory in the York case. However the modern editors of Hugh's text have decided to insert the privilege into the text, believing it to have been an oversight and 'in the confident belief that Hugh intended it to be there, and wrote on the assumption that his readers would have it before them.' Hugh the Chanter, p. lix and pp. 168-73. For a discussion of the authenticity of this document see M. Cheney, 'Some Observations on a Papal Privilege of 1120 for the Archbishops of York' *JEH*, Vol. 31, No. 4 (1980), pp. 429–39. There are several other letters reproduced by Hugh which are based on the privilege, including two from Calixtus given to Thurstan on the same day; one to King Henry I explaining Thurstan's newly obtained exemption, and the other addressed to the clergy and people of York forbidding all divine services until Thurstan was allowed to return. Hugh the Chanter, pp. 175-7.

[114] *Rex Cantuariensi agens per episcopos et proceres archiepiscopo nostro mandauit quatinus Radulpho archiepiscopo pro pace ecclesiarum, pro amore suo personaliter profiteretur.* Hugh the Chanter, p. 179.

[115] Hugh the Chanter, p. 180-1.

> speech (for it was neither true nor well meant), namely that the pope had never seen that privilege nor ordered it to be written.[116]

Thurstan is depicted as bringing the papal bull into his meeting with the king. In this way the archbishop was challenging royal authority, using the papal letter as a physical reminder of the pope's support for his cause. This is a very material way of understanding the power of a written document. Later the bishops dismissed the document as a forgery; this was the only way they could avoid confronting the division between royal and papal power.

Accusations of forgery were just as prevalent as forgery itself. Hugh's indignation over the accusation of forgery in 1121 did not prevent him questioning the authenticity of Lanfranc's royal privilege from 1072. Richard Southern successfully refuted earlier claims that Lanfranc was responsible for the infamous Canterbury forgeries by arguing that they were produced in the spring of 1120 in response to the York privilege. However Southern accepted that

> In arguing his case at Winchester in 1072 he used arguments which certainly distorted the facts of history, but not more than is inevitable when legal claims are based on distant and uncertain events. In his report to the pope he confused the issue by a parade of evidence which amounted to less than he wished to suggest, but he did not support his primatial claims with forged documents. He used a forged papal privilege to maintain the monastic community in Canterbury Cathedral; but in this he may himself have been imposed upon like everyone else until modern times.[117]

The extent of episcopal involvement in this type of deception is important in characterising how far bishops were 'men of routine'. At this time bishops were not concerned with creating an administrative system to record their day-to-day business but with preserving their rights and privileges for their successors. As Michael Clanchy has remarked, medieval forgers 're-

[116] *Quod cum illi, archiepiscopo remoto, coram rege legere, uel ad legendum prebere uoluissent, episcopi nec legere nec audire uoluerunt, set unus ex illis eructuvit uerbum non bonum, quia neque uerum, nec pro bono eiaculatum, scilicet quod apostolicus priuilegium illud neque unquam uiderat, neque fieri iusserat.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 180-1.

[117] R. W. Southern, 'The Canterbury Forgeries', *EHR*, 73:287 (1958), pp. 193-226, at p. 226.

created the past in an acceptable literate form.'[118] Documents may have been written later than they purported however they may well have been based on earlier authentic documents or oral traditions. The purpose of a forgery was not always to achieve some crude fraud. It was part of a desire to use the past to confirm right order. Thus according to Clanchy, '[forgers] are best understood not as occasional deviants on the peripheries of legal practice, but as experts entrenched at the centre of literary and intellectual culture in the twelfth century.'[119] For most historians the significance of forgeries is the danger they pose to historical chronology. As Julia Barrow points out in her critical examination of the 1092 Worcester synodal agreement, 'it is essential to put the validity of [the document] to the test, because it has been used for so many arguments about ecclesiastical organisation.'[120] The prevalence of forgery suggests that it was an accepted part of administration. The main issue however is how far bishops were directing this process. As David Smith has noted with regard to the Lincoln episcopal *acta*, 'it is naturally very difficult to establish whether a particular charter issued in the bishop's name was the product of his own household clerks or was drawn up by the beneficiary and presented for authentication.'[121] Even where a charter uses known formulae or is written by a recognised hand it may not necessarily confirm that the charter is authentic.[122] Forgery, and the accompanying accusations, should not be considered in opposition to administrative and routine organisation. Yet it demonstrates that the document was not sacrosanct. Truth existed independently of the written word.

---

[118] M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record, 1066-1307* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1993), p. 319.
[119] *Ibid*, p. 319.
[120] J. Barrow, 'How the Twelfth-Century Monks at Worcester Perceived their Past', *The Perception of the Past in the Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. P. Magdalino (London, 1992), pp. 53-74, at 69. Barrow claims that the underlying reasons for monastic forgery during this period can be 'boiled down to two essential motives, the need to show continuity of property and traditions between the pre- and post-Conquest periods, and the need to stand up to a newly strengthened diocesan authority.' Barrow concludes that the 1092 synodal document was a forgery produced in the late 1140s or early 1150s. Cf. *Councils and Synods*, pp. 636-9.
[121] *EEA*, *Lincoln 1067-1185*, p. lii.
[122] Significantly many of the editors of the individual *acta* have had problems establishing patterns for the earlier post-Conquest documents, relatively few survive as originals and it is difficult to confirm general patterns where so few originals are extant. For example see *EEA, Hereford 1079-1234*, p. xiii, where Julia Barrow argues that there is no real attempt at standardisation and, although most were probably drafted by episcopal clerks, a significant proportion were composed by the beneficiaries.

The technique of ignoring or questioning the authenticity of documents was used frequently within the context of episcopal power relations. According to Eadmer, Anselm and Henry I argued fiercely over the publication and use of papal letters. When Henry I realised that the pope had offered no concessions over lay investiture he refused to reveal the contents of the letter, although 'the more carefully it was then kept secret, the more widely it was published abroad a few days later.'[123] Not only this, but when Anselm allowed his papal letter to be read, the bishops who had brought it back from Rome claimed that the pope had given them verbal instructions which differed from the letter which they had brought for the king.[124] They explained that the pope had been unwilling to provide Henry with a written document for fear that it would cause other princes to demand the same concessions. A huge row ensued between the bishops and Anselm's representative Baldwin who accused them of lying.

> One side sought to maintain that, as against the uncertainly of mere words, the written documents authenticated by the pope's seal and the words of the monks should be unhesitatingly believed; the other side on the contrary that credence should be given to three bishops rather than what was just a sheepskin marked with black ink and weighted with a little lump of lead...[125]

Clanchy concluded that this account was evidence of a document being treated as a physical object rather than for its contents.[126] However it is also compatible with contemporary episcopal negotiating strategies. In fact within Eadmer's narrative this is part of a

[123] *HNA*, p. 138.
[124] According to the bishops the pope had guaranteed that he would deal leniently with Henry over the issue of investiture and would not impose the sentence of excommunication. *HNA*, 138. Eadmer claims that the king sent three bishops to Rome to obtain a decision on the issue of investitures: Archbishop Gerard of York, recently translated from the see of Hereford, Herbert of Thetford and Robert of Chester. Anselm also sent two envoys: Baldwin of Bec and Alexander of Canterbury.
[125] *Hi etenim astruere nitebantur, semoto uerbisque monachicis omnino credendum; illi econtra trium potius episcoporum assertionibus quam ueruecum pellibus atramento denigrates plumbique massula oneratis fore cedendum… HNA*, p. 138.
[126] M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record, 1066-1307* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1993) p. 262.

confrontation between the monks and the bishops, both of whom are providing alternative testimony.

Episcopal letters demonstrate how the primacy functioned.[127] They show how bishops interacted with other bishops and their chapters. After the settlement of 1072 the letters between Lanfranc and Thomas reflect the primatial authority of Canterbury. Thomas often wrote to seek advice and guidance from Lanfranc concerning his own position, 'among these remote and barbarous peoples (*longe et inter barbaras nationes*).'[128] Some time before February 1073 Thomas wrote to Lanfranc requesting that he send two bishops to assist him in the consecration of the bishop to the Orkneys. Lanfranc responded by sending a letter to Bishops Wulfstan of Worcester and Peter of Chester asking the Canterbury suffragans to assist Thomas of York in the consecration of cleric to the bishopric of the Orkney Isles. Lanfranc's letter was intended to quell any concerns they may have had in that their assistance would allow York to claim jurisdiction over their churches.

> And in case you are apprehensive that either the archbishop or his successors may try to use this as a pretext at some time or another to seize jurisdiction over your churches, with an eye to the future, my brothers, I have made a point of sending you the letter which the archbishop himself sent to me. I advise you to keep both that and the letter I send you now in the archives of your churches as a record for your successors.[129]

Indeed Thomas had himself reassured Lanfranc that he was not seeking to renew his claim to metropolitan jurisdiction over the diocese of Dorchester and Worcester.

> The suspicion that our brother and fellow bishop Remigius entertained not long ago can be utterly dismissed: that on this precedent I shall from now on seek jurisdiction over the bishop of

[127] There are several important letters collections from that survive from this period: Anselm, Lanfranc, Herbert Losinga, Gilbert Folio and John of Salisbury.
[128] Letters, *Lanfranc*, 12.10-11.
[129] *Et ne forte solliciti sitis, putantes quod uel ipse successores eius hac occasione super aecclesias uestras ius prelationis quandoque conentur arripere, litteras quas ipse michi transmisit fraternitati uestrae sollicitudinem de futuro gerens curaui transmittere. Quas et has quas uobis transmitto in archiuis aecclesiarum uestarum ob memoriam futurorum seruatum iri praecipio.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 13.19-22.

> Dorcester or the bishop of Worcester. God is my witness that I shall never do this (*Dico enim coram Deo me nunquam hoc facturum.*).[130]

In fact Thomas's oath to God was not sufficient as we have seen. His written words were to be the witness to his promise. Because Lanfranc chose to ask Peter of Chester, not Remigius, suggests that he was not convinced that the dispute was fully resolved.[131] Yet despite Lanfranc's words to Peter there is evidence in another letter that the bishop did not always react kindly to Lanfranc's words. Also in Lanfranc's letter collection there is a letter to Peter, bishop of Chester, where the archbishop makes mention of the disrespectful manner in which Peter had treated earlier correspondence. Lanfranc begins, 'I wrote to you a few days ago: you were unwilling to accept my letter, scorned to read it and very disdainfully (as I am told) threw it onto a bench.'[132] In another letter Lanfranc wrote to Herfast, bishop of Thetford, with a list of Herbert's failings. In the letter to Herfast, Lanfranc explicitly refers to the primacy claim.[133] He began the letter by describing how Herfast had treated an earlier letter from the archbishop.

> Abbot Baldwin's clerk and servant Berard brought you our letter about his affairs. As he himself affirmed to be later, you made a coarse joke about it; you uttered cheap and unworthy remarks about me in the hearing of many (*satis uilia multumque indigna de me multis audientibus protulisti*); and you declared with many an oath that you would give me no assistance in the matter. There will be another time and another place to speak of these things (*De his alio tempore atque alio loco sermo erit*).[134]

---

[130] *Illa autem procul arceatur suspicio quam nuperrime nobis noster frater et coepiscopus subintulit Remigius, me scilicet in posterum quaesiturum Dorcacestrensis uel Wigornensis episcopi hac de causa subiectionem. Dico enim coram Deo me nunquam hoc facturum.* Lanfranc, *Letters,* 12.19-23.

[131] Remigius was involved in a dispute with York over control of Lindsey and Leicester.

[132] *Litteras ante paucos dies tibi transmisi, et eas uix susceptas legere despexisti, et cum magna indignatione sicut michi dictum est supra quoddam sedile eas proiecisti.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 27:3-5.

[133] *Per misericordiam Dei totam hanc quam uocant Britannicam insulam unam unius nostrae aecclesiae constet esse parrochiam.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 47:43-4. Cf. C. N. L. Brooke, *English Church* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 130-1.

[134] *Berardus abbatis Balduini clericus et famulus nostras de negotio suo litteras tibi detulit. Quas ut ipse postea michi testatus est procaciter irrisisti, satis uilia multumque indigna de me multis audientibus protulisti, pro me de eadem re nichil te facturum plurimis contestationibus affirmasti. De his alio tempore atque alio loco sermo erit.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 47:4-9.

The relationship between Lanfranc and Herfast had always been fraught.[135] This letter shows graphically the way in which an unwelcome letter might be received. In both cases the archbishop was dealing with bishops that had been attempting to extend their own jurisdiction and exercise authority over powerful abbeys within their diocese.[136] Lanfranc himself reports having been told of the bishop's negative reception and is writing in response. Clearly the letter was a symbol of archiepiscopal authority. Yet these accounts demonstrate the frustration felt by bishops at the frequent letter writing by Lanfranc: the arrival of his letters meant another criticism, clearly they were unwelcome. The image of Peter of Chester throwing the letter onto a bench, or Herfast uttering some rude remark about the interfering archbishop, helps provide an alternative vision to the intellectual exchange of letters favoured by the twelfth-century renaissance narrative. It also makes clear that the letters were received in a relatively public event. Clearly in the case of Peter, Lanfranc notes that he had not even read the letter.

Following his meeting with Pope Paschal, Anselm sent a series of letters from Lyon in late 1103 concerning the investiture dispute. These indicate a level of complexity and secrecy. Anselm is trying to control the spread of information. He writes to Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, who was overseeing Canterbury during Anselm's exile, sending him his seal and a letter for King Henry. He sends specific instructions that his seal must not be shown to the king before William Warelwast returns to England. The letter must remain secret, with the exception of Gundulf, William Warelwast and Ernulf, prior of Canterbury, until the king has received it. After this, Gundulf is charged with informing 'the bishops and the others' about it.[137] He sent a copy of his letter to Ernulf of Canterbury and urged him to keep it secret until the king's reply was known. After this, Anselm writes, 'I would consider it a good thing

[135] William of Malmesbury provides an account of Lanfranc's first meeting with Herfast when he ridiculed him. *GP* ii.74.12.
[136] Bury St Edmunds and Coventry respectively.
[137] Anselm, *Letters*, 306.

for the copy I am sending you to be made known publicly.'[138] In a letter to William, archdeacon of Canterbury, he wrote that he was unable to confirm the decrees from the Council of Westminster, held at Michaelmas 1102. He hoped to obtain confirmation from all the bishops when they next meet at Christmas. Anselm stated that he would dictate them and first show them to the bishops, 'before they are sent out, written and published, throughout the churches of England.'[139] This letter seems to fulfil the criteria of a letter of administration.

A central theme from both texts is the role of the chapter in providing legitimacy to the authority of the archbishop. Hugh describes in some detail the role of the York chapter in directing the actions of both Thomas II and Thurstan. According to Hugh the archbishop must seek the advice and the consent of his chapter in order that his decisions and actions could be understood as legitimate. The main policy pursued by Thomas seems to have been avoidance and delay. The York chapter takes on the role of direct resistance to Canterbury by demanding obedience from their elect, allowing Thomas to refuse Anselm by appealing to the topos of obedience. Thomas II sent 'his monk (*monachum suum*)' Stephen[140] to Anselm with a letter explaining his absence. In it the archbishop elect wrote describing the demands made by the chapter.

> They forbade me, in the name of God and St Peter, and by the authority of the holy Roman church, improperly to subject the church committed to me to that of Canterbury.' *Contradixerunt autem michi ex parte Dei et sancti Petri, et ex auctoritate sancta Romane ecclesie, ne ecclesiam michi commissam Cantuariensi indebite subicerem.*[141]

Thomas went on to claim that the chapter threatened to withdraw obedience from him and to report him to the papacy if he undertook obedience.[142] Hugh's description of the chapter's relations with Thurstan contrast with Thomas II. Unlike his predecessor, Thurstan was not familiar with the York community. Hugh describes how, soon after his enthronement, the

---

138 Anselm, *Letters*, 307.
139 Anselm, *Letters,* 257. See also 254 and 256.
140 Identified provisionally as the abbot of St Mary's, York.
141 Hugh the Chanter, pp. 32-3.
142 Hugh the Chanter, p. 33.

archbishop-elect asked the chapter's advice about the profession which he believed would be required from him.

> We retired to discuss the matter among ourselves, and decided to give him no advice whether to make his profession or not. We knew from experience that one course meant opposing the king and almost all England; the other was contrary to the decree of St Gregory and the custom of the church.[143]

From Hugh's account it seems that the chapter deliberately avoided advising the archbishop whereas under Thomas they had sought to insert themselves between the elect and Anselm in order to in some way protect the elect and allow him to claim obedience to them. This had clearly been unsuccessful, at least in the minds of the majority of the chapter, who wanted to avoid the wrath of the king and all England.

> To his much-loved brother and friend Thomas, archbishop of York, Lanfranc his brother sends prayers for his eternal welfare.
>
> ... Let us both endeavour to grow in brotherly love for each other, to pray for each other and each to consider the other's needs his own, so that it may be plainly seen in the sight of God and man that the worldly emulation which inflames men's minds has no power over us (*quod carnalis zelus quo animae uruntur uindicare in nobis nichil preualeat*).[144]

Centuries before Lanfranc wrote to these words to his archiepiscopal colleague Thomas, Gregory the Great had articulated the concept of pastoral rule, writing, 'when the mind thinks to seize on the highest post of humility for its own elation, it inwardly changes what it

[143] *Habito inter nos seorsum consilio contulimus, et uisum est nobis nos illi profitendi uel minime nullum dare consilium. Alterum experti eramus esse contra regem et fere totam Angliam; alterum erat contra decretum beati Gregorii et consuetudinem ecclesiasticam.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 58-9.

[144] *Studeamus ergo fraterno inuicem amore proficere, pro inuicem orare, alterius necessitatem propriam deputare, quatinus in conspectu Dei atque hominum euidenter appareat quod carnalis zelus quo animae uruntur uindicare in nobis nichil preualeat.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 23.7-11. The date of this letter is uncertain although, as Margaret Gibson has pointed out, it can hardly have been written before the council of Windsor in 1072. The official dating is June 1072-May 1089.

outwardly desires.[145] Bishops were not supposed to care about precedence and honour. Such trivial concerns undermined their power as bestowed by God. And yet despite Lanfranc's protestations, this was the essential detail of the primacy dispute: the demand for obedience and the corresponding refusal to submit. It was the struggle for order and hierarchy within the episcopate and it reflects a deep concern on the part of the bishops to formalise the 'rules' of power using both ritual and written records. In this sense the Canterbury-York dispute was much more than a provincial dispute between the English archbishops. It was part of the wider religious changes which swept over Europe from the late eleventh century onward. The English primacy dispute formed part of a network of similar disputes taking place throughout Europe from 1100. These contests often pitted bishops against monasteries or their chapters. The episcopate led the way in attempting to formalise the operation of power not only through the development of new bureaucratic arrangements but also by engaging with the theory of power-relations. Bishops quickly recognised that a written document was worth very little if they had not been able to establish and maintain a network of personal power-relations in order to enforce their will. The use of deliberately ambiguous language and the numerous and varied participants in each power skirmish which took place under the banner of the primacy dispute shows how bishops nominally sought to establish the "rules of the game" whilst cultivating a highly flexible system of power. This process was repeated for specific episcopal powers through the development of the operation of excommunication.

[145] Gregory the Great*, Pastoral Care*, trans. H. Davis (London, 1950), esp. c.8. For a discussion of Gregory the Great's conception of pastoral rule see R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 17-33; C. Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 131-59, esp. pp. 140-3.

· Chapter Two ·

Excommunication: the power of words

Among the letter collection of Herbert Losinga, bishop of Norwich, there is an unusual writ of excommunication. Evidence for such things is relatively scarce in England, but as Nicholas Karn the most recent editor of the collection has indicated this document is notable for its extravagance as much as its rarity. Herbert begins his text by reminding his readers of the spiritual union between the bishop and his flock (*inter episcopum et populum suum*), comparing it to the union between a bridegroom and his bride.[1] Great are the bonds of love (*magna sunt caritatis uincula*) which link the bishop to his people. And yet this relationship had come under attack. Herbert explains that sometime during the previous week certain evil men (*quidam mali homines*) had broken into his episcopal estate at Homersfield and killed the only deer, leaving the head, feet and intestines as evidence of their theft. His response was to excommunicate the unnamed perpetrators in a letter.

> Meanwhile I excommunicate those (*excommunico eos*) who have broken into my park and killed my deer with that anathema which God in his anger punished the wicked (*anathemate quo Deus iratus percutit animas impiorum*). I interdict (*interdico*) them from entrance into the church, from partaking of the body and blood of Christ, and from fellowship in the whole circle of Christian offices. May the curse and the excommunication (*maledicti et excommunicati*) rest upon them in their homes, in the ways and in the fields, in the woods and in the waters and in all the places wherever they shall be found… May the flesh of those who have devoured my stag rot, as the flesh of Herod rotted... Let them have anathema maranatha, unless they quickly recover their senses and do me satisfaction (*nisi cito resipuerint et fecerint mihi satisfactionem*). Let it be done, let it be done, let it be done (*Fiat, fiat, fiat*). This excommunication I pronouce (*hanc excommunicationem… facio*), much loved brethren, not because a single deer is of any great importance to me, but because I wish that those evil [men] should repent, and come to confession and afterwards receive correction for so great a theft. Those who know about the theft or consented to it, or who carried them away, shall be condemned by the same anathema (*eodem damnabuntur anathemate*). To all such let not our words seem a light matter (*non sit leue quod*

[1] Herbert, *Letters*, 35.

> *dicimus*), since what we bind is bound also by the judgement of God, and what we loose is loosed by him; thus with truth spoken to Peter the first of the bishops (*primo episcoporum Petro*); 'Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'[2]

This short letter is an example of how one bishop used the rhetoric of excommunication in the operation of episcopal power. Herbert used a varied terminology giving the impression of an imprecise or general proclamation rather than a legal document: curse (*maledictum*), excommunication (*excommunicatum*) and *anathema marantha*. This seems to reflect an earlier 'confused' tradition of Benedictine curses dating back to the tenth century; *sint maledicti et excommunicati et anathematizati*.[3] Herbert had been a monk at Fécamp and this may well explain his use of this unusual formula within an English context.[4] Indeed the excommunication formula from the *Textus Roffensis*, an early twelfth-century compendium of documents relating to the church of Rochester which was compiled during the pontificate of Bishop Ernulf (1114-1124), shows many similarities to an earlier text from Fécamp.[5] In fact Herbert's letter mirrors some parts of the Rochester formula, which reads, '*maledictus sit ubicunque fuerit, siue in domo, siue in agro, siue in via, siue in semita, siue in silua, siue in*

[2] *Ego interim excommunico eos qui parcum meum fregerunt et ceruum meum interfecerunt eo anathemate quo Deus iratus percutit animas impiorum. Interdico eis ingressum ecclesie, et corpus et sanguinem Christi, et communionem totius Chrsitianitatis. Maledicti et excommunicati sint in domibus, in uiis et in agris, in siluis et in aquis, et in omnibus locis quibus inuenti fuerint. Computrescat caro eorum qui carnem cerui mei deuorarunt, sicut computruit caro Herodis… Habeant anathema maranatha, nisi cito resipuerint et fecerint mihi satisfactionem. Fiat, fiat, fiat. Hanc excommunicationem, dilectissimi fratres, facio, non quia mihi sit multum de uno ceruo, sed quia uolo eos penitere et ad confessionem uenire et deinceps corrigi a tali furto. Qui sciunt uel consentiunt uel eos deportant, eodem damnabuntur anathemate. Quibus non sit leue quod dicimus, quoniam apud Deum quod ligamus, ligatum est, et quod soluimus, solutum est; ueritate ita dicente primo episcoporum Petro: 'quodcumque ligaueris super terram, erit ligatum et in celis, et quodcumque solueris super terram, erit solutum et in celis.'* Herbert, *Letters*, 35.

[3]B. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), p. 31. This quotation is taken from the late tenth-century Saint-Martial clamor. *Ibid*, Appendix C, text 7.

[4] Lester Little concluded that this type of material was almost exclusively French in origin having found no comparative evidence from Anglo-Saxon England, and therefore attributing later examples to the influence of Norman churchmen. He does not specifically mention Herbert's letter or give any indication that he was aware of it. For a more detailed account of Herbert's background and career see J. W. Alexander, 'Herbert of Norwich, 1091-1119', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 6 (1969), pp. 119-232.

[5] L. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY, 1993) 7-9. The formula from Fécamp only survives in an early eighteenth-century publication, Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus libri tres* (Venetiis, 1783) 2:911-2.

aqua'.[6] Yet even if Herbert was following a particular formula he felt able to adapt this to the particular circumstances of his slaughtered deer: may the flesh of those who have devoured my stag (*qui carnem cerui mei deuorarunt*) rot, as the flesh of Herod rotted. This reinforces the impression that this was a personal response to what was clearly seen as a personal attack. His verbs, *excommunico* and *interdico*, are delivered in the first-person. However Herbert was also at pains to justify his response. In fact it seems that Herbert worried that his sentence might seem disproportionately severe. To be excommunicated was to be separated from the saving power of Christ. And so, as the text makes clear, this extreme sentence was provoked not because of the loss of a single deer but in order to bring the culprits to penance and confession. In this way Herbert categorises the act of excommunication as a pastoral duty; by pronouncing this sentence he hoped to bring evil men back to the saving power of the church. Yet Herbert clearly felt that he had to justify his use of such powerful words. After vividly describing the terms of his sentence, he invokes apostolic authority reminding his audience that his power was derived from Peter, the first of the bishops (*primo episcoporum Petro*). He deliberately and explicitly links his power to excommunicate offenders with his pastoral role as bishop derived from the words of Christ from Matthew's Gospel.

> But if thy brother shall offend against thee, go, and rebuke him between thee and him alone... And if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more: that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand. And if he will not hear them: tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican. Amen I say to you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.[7]

[6] *Textus Roffensis*, ed. T. Herane (Oxford, 1720), pp. 55-9, at p. 57. This formula also includes a detailed list of curses against the body including a curse for the eyes and teeth (*in oculis et in dentibus*).

[7] *Si autem peccaverit in te frater tuus vade et corripe eum inter te et ipsum solum... Si autem non te audierit adhibe tecum adhuc unum vel duos ut in ore duorum testium vel trium stet omne verbum. Quod si non audierit eos dic ecclesiae si autem et ecclesiam non audierit sit tibi sicut ethnicus et publicanus. Amen dico vobis quaecumque alligaveritis super terram erunt ligata et in caelo et quaecumque solveritis super terram erunt soluta et in caelo.* Matt. 18:15-18.

Herbert was unable to name the excommunicants so he restated his vision of the contract between the bishop and his flock. In other words he articulated the duties and responsibilities of the episcopal office. From this account Herbert regarded excommunication both in general and in personal terms. It was an act of institutional power in the sense that is was derived from biblical and apostolic precedents but it operated specifically at a personal level. The living incumbent proclaimed the sentence. Herbert envisaged a legal procedure through a charismatic mechanism. When the episcopal patrimony was attacked it represented a personal attack on the bishop. Such a public act of defiance was a direct challenge to his power. It therefore necessitated a public response.

Herbert's sentence of excommunication extended to all those who associated with the culprits.[8] But even beyond this the letter provides a 'contractual conclusion' (*fiat, fiat, fiat*) which suggests the involvement of all those who heard the curse.[9] The letter was addressed to *R. uicecomiti et cunctis parochianis Dei et suis de Norfulche et Sutfulche*; it was intended to be delivered to both the representative of secular power and read to the public at large.[10] Herbert was using his words on a public stage in order to compel others into action. It is likely that it was read aloud at parishes across the diocese. Herbert wrote, 'I entreat and implore the lord sheriff (*dominum uicecomitem*), and all God's faithful Christians... that if they should hear anything of the matter... they would inform me and with praiseworthy zeal give up my concealed foes.'[11] He continued, '*Ego interim excommunico...*' The text of the

---

[8] *Qui sciunt uel consentiunt uel eos deportant, eodem damnabuntur anathemate.* Herbert, *Letters*, 35.

[9] In general terms Little has suggested that the use of "amen" or "so be it", repeated in an excommunication formula operated as a 'contractual conclusion', so that all those who were present to hear the proceedings could join in and signify their acquiescence. L. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), p. 117.

[10] Nicholas Karn suggests that Robert fitz Walter, sheriff of Suffolk *c.*1108-1129 and sheriff of Norfolk *c.*1115-1129, is the most likely recipient of the letter, as he was the only man to hold and exercise both offices personally. See J. Green, *English Sheriffs to 1154*, (London, 1990), p. 61, 77. For an account of the relationship between the sheriff and the bishop see J. Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 119; S. Marritt, 'King Stephen and the Bishops', *ANS*, XXIV (2001), pp. 129-144, at p. 136.

[11] *Ego et dominum uicecomitem, et omnes fideles et Christianos Dei horum comitatuum suppliciter exoro, ut si quid inde audieruint uel presentire potuerint, mihi indicent, et occultos aduersarios laudabiliter prodant.* Herbert, *Letters*, p. 35.

letter suggests that the bishop intended his personal act of excommunication to be part of the wider operation of power. His pronouncement was made in conjunction with other measures. Yet Herbert warned his audience that his words should not been taken lightly suggesting that there was some anxiety about how the proclamation of the sentence would be received. Herbert had not issued a threat but undertaken an act of power. Yet significantly the sentence was not intended to be a final or irreversible act. He bestowed *anathema marantha* only until such time that the offenders made reparations to him (*fecerint mihi satisfactionem*).[12] Excommunication was an immediate act of power using words but it was also a vital tool for negotiating power relations.

Analysis of Herbert's writ of excommunication reveals the (potential) power of words within the context of local episcopal power relations; bishops, more than any other elite group, made use of words in this way.[13] Lester K. Little has considered the connections between John Austin's 'speech acts' or 'performative utterances' and the process of liturgical cursing in Romanesque France. He pointed out that, since a curse is simultaneously a verbal utterance and a deed performed, it qualifies as a speech act.[14] Using this theoretical approach Little supposed that it would be possible to add to our understanding of the function of curses and he concluded that, 'whether [the subject] knows about the curse or acknowledges it once he does hear about it has no effect upon the fact of his having been cursed. No matter how he reacts, something deeply significant has happened.'[15] Excommunication was the most serious sanction which the Church could use against those who disobeyed or challenged its authority.

---

[12] A similar clause is also found in the Rochester formula. *Maledicat illum Christus filius dei uiui toto suae maiestatis imperio et insurgat aduersus eum coelum cum omnibus uirtutibus quae in eo mouentur, ad damnandum eum nisi penituerit, et ad satisfactionem uenerit. Textus Roffensis*, ed. T. Herane (Oxford, 1720), p. 58.

[13] For an account of violent and coercive speech associated with aristocratic power see, M. Toch, 'Asking the Way and Telling the Law: Speech in Medieval Germany', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 16:4 (1986), pp. 667-82

[14] J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words: the William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1976). See also P. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 105-62; J. Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York, 1997), pp. 43-69.

[15] L. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), p. 115.

Gratian's *Decretum*, the mid twelfth-century collection of canon law, described it as 'handing a person over to the devil'.[16] According to canon law, sentences of excommunication could only be delivered by a proper official, normally the bishop of the diocese.[17] Yet Richard H. Helmholz has argued that twelfth-century English sources demonstrate two quite different conceptions of excommunication: powerful curse and judicial sanction. The bishop's curse dates from an older tradition but by the thirteenth century 'the sanction had very largely been "tamed" by acceptance of the emerging canon law's requirements.'[18] This fits neatly into the Weberian *grand narrative*, tracing the move from charisma to bureaucracy. According to Helmholz, 'lawyers were seizing the initiative from the saints.'[19] Separating the institutional procedure from the personal curse also supports the underlying presumption of earlier confessional historians, such as Henry Charles Lea, who envisaged cursing as a primitive power standing in opposition to the judicial process of the institutional church.[20]

The English sources emphasise the power of the bishop or deemphasise it depending on the overall narrative construction. All of these men were writing during a period of great uncertainty in England, not least for ecclesiastical institutions. The narratives are often critical of the perceived weakness of leadership of the church at this time. These narratives crave the full power of excommunication. Some episcopal letters also deal with the process of excommunication though Bishop Herbert's letter is a unique survival. In addition to this the episcopal *acta* often contain *sanctio* clauses which are often associated with gifts of lands particularly to monastic institutions. The *sanctio* clause is a particular feature of the first half

[16] *Et dicuntur homines tradi Satanae, cum a tota ecclesia separantur*. Quoted in S. Hamilton, 'Curse or procedure? Excommunication in practice, 900-1050', (IMC Leeds, 2007), p. 1, n1. For a discussion of the influence of the decretals in the latter half of the twelfth century see, Duggan, *Decretals and the creation of "new law" in the twelfth century: judges, judgements, equity and law* (Aldershot, 1998); *idem, Twelfth-Century Decretal Collections and their importance in English History* (London, 1963).
[17] For a historical overview see E. Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986), esp. pp. 21-43.
[18] R. H. Helmholz, 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 11: 1 (1994-5), pp. 235-53, at p. 242.
[19] *Ibid*, p. 241.
[20] H. C. Lea, *Studies in church history: the rise of the temporal power; benefit of clergy; excommunication* (Philadelphia and London, 1869), pp. 223-487.

of the twelfth century and usually the more elaborate clauses are found in earlier documents. Helmholz argues that English sources reveal an 'extra-judicial' use of the sanction of excommunication, by which he means that there seems to have been no judicial process involved; he concludes that, 'excommunication was serving as a weapon rather than a legal sanction'.[21] According to this view the disappearance of 'terrible anathemas' from the episcopal *acta* (and monastic charters) from the late twelfth century onward was a direct consequence of the move towards a legal concept of power. This is confirmed by Little's view that the disappearance of ritual cursing from the late twelfth century was a result of the increased role of legal experts in dispute settlement, but also as a consequence of the growing authority of the French monarchy.

> In a social setting where the law is generally acknowledged and the authority of those charged with executing it generally respected, a sentence can be delivered by the appropriate authority in a most simple form; a bishop could, for example, say: "I excommunicate you." But where there are attempts to heighten the drama of the encounter, as with liturgical robes and candles, and to pile up multiple curses... more than likely there is a social setting in which the authority is both weak and insecure.[22]

The violent curses of an earlier period were replaced by bureaucratic memoranda. The rhetoric of excommunication began to reflect a more impersonal conception of power; 'rhetoric exalting the superiority of spiritual over secular authority was now compressed into cryptic glosses on the minutiae of legal procedure.'[23] This has been interpreted as evidence of the development of the episcopal office as a separate and distinct concept from the holder. However Sarah Hamilton has shown that, in fact from the tenth century written formulae of excommunication indicate that it was conceived as a judicial process, not least by bishops, concerned to follow divine law. As Hamilton explains, Helmholz's twelfth-century shift may amount to little more than 'a trick of the evidential light'; authors of episcopal *vitae* sought to

[21] R. H. Helmholz, 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 11:1 (1994-5), p. 242.
[22] L. Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY, 1993), p. 117.
[23] For a historical overview see E. Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986), p. 35

emphasise their subject's charisma by showing the immediate effects of their sentence of excommunication, whilst critics of the sentence were just as likely to accuse bishops of not following due process.[24] Thus, this critique allows the evidence relating to excommunication and cursing to be repositioned outside of the Weberian narrative and to refocus attention onto the practice of using language as act of episcopal power.

Canon law was concerned with legal practice; with ensuring that the right of excommunication was justly implemented. The canonists of the later twelfth century were concerned with procedure. But excommunication was more than just a legal device. Bishops made use of this 'act' to negotiate with others. Having studied the process of reconciliation Sarah Hamilton has shown 'while excommunication was always presented as a weapon of last resort, because it entailed, theoretically, exclusion from both the church and society, in the next life as well as this, it was not intended to be permanent but rather to resolve a dispute, forcing the excommunicant to repent and acknowledge the bishop's authority.'[25] Excommunication was a process of negotiation.[26] The narratives seem to present excommunication as a 'weak' power because the results appear ineffective. However contemporaries did not envisage excommunication as a substitute for coercive power. Often when clerical authors depicted unsuccessful excommunication it is within the context of a broader anxiety about the unstable and chaotic nature of contemporary political power. It seems significant that the *sanctio* clause in episcopal *acta* is most prevalent in the mid twelfth century. The assumption is that earlier examples of excommunication or anathema which operate outside the procedure of canon law are merely leftovers from an earlier age. Yet the elaborate rhetoric should not be interpreted in opposition to later 'legal' methods but rather as

[24] S. Hamilton, 'Curse or procedure? Excommunication in practice, 900-1050', (IMC Leeds, 2007), p. 10.
[25] S. Hamilton, '*Absoluimus uos uice beati petri apostolorum principis:* episcopal authority and the reconciliation of excommunicants in England and Francia *c*.900-*c*.1150', *Frankland: Essays in honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, eds. P. Fouracre and D. Ganz (Manchester, 2008), pp. 209-241, at p. 209.
[26] Cf. T. Reuter, 'Contextualising Canossa: excommunication, penance, surrender, reconciliation', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 147-166.

the legitimate forerunner of the latter. Bishops were highly attuned to the value of words. Their power was rooted in powerful words. But more importantly it relied on the discretion of the bishop. The canons from two legatine councils held during this period indicate a concern with protecting the clergy and their possessions.[27]

The Anarchy of King's Stephen reign was the result of a succession crisis between the supporters of Stephen and Matilda, daughter to Henry I. Historians have largely considered the church as an effective wing of royal government which continued to operate despite the sporadic violence. When historians have considered the role of the episcopate it has been to assess their role in the dynastic conflict; and usually to confirm their weakness in the face of 'real' power. H. A. Cronne posed the question, 'why were the bishops still so ready to give their allegiance to the crown and so very unwilling to support any firm archiepiscopal or papal line in opposition to the king?'[28] Stephen retained the support of the episcopate even after he had arrested Bishop Roger of Salisbury and his nephews, Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, and Nigel, bishop of Ely.[29] Christopher Holdsworth has argued that the 'same basic attitude', a pattern of episcopal support, was repeated late in 1148 when Gilbert Foliot, having been consecrated by Archbishop Theobald in Flanders, on condition that he offer fealty to Duke Henry and not to King Stephen, returned to England and sought approval from the king.[30] However more recently historians have emphasised the constructive relations between the bishops and the king.[31] There is a good deal of evidence for institutional life

[27] In 1138, the legate, Alberic, cardinal bishop of Ostia, presided over council at Westminster to confirm the election of the new archbishop of Canterbury, Theobald. Several canons dealt with the issue of protecting the clergy and their possessions. These were extended in 1143, under the authority of Bishop Henry of Winchester, the subsequent legate. *Councils and Synods*, pp. 776-7, 800-4.
[28] H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen, 1135-54* (London, 1970), p. 134.
[29] K. Yoshitake, 'The arrest of the bishops in 1139 and its consequences', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14:2 (1988), pp. 97-114.
[30] C. Holdsworth, 'The Church', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 207-229, at p. 215.
[31] S. Marritt, 'King Stephen and the Bishops', *ANS*, 24 (2002), pp. 129-44.

continuing, even expanding. In particular Paul Dalton has shown that some bishops were committed to peacekeeping.[32] Yet their role as bishops at a local level has sometimes been overlooked. As Stephen Marritt has pointed out, 'their traditional local political power has been considered as much reduced, and their dependence on central authorities as significantly increased'.[33] This has been reflected more broadly in the work of Thomas Bisson who argued that, 'once the subject [of Stephen's reign] is approached by way of continental European history, it can be seen that the 'anarchy'... differs from disorders elsewhere chiefly in the abundance of its contemporary testimonies.'[34] According to this view the dynastic succession crisis was not the only, nor even the main cause of violent disorder in England; the troubled experience of power was a 'generic phenomenon' in the early twelfth century. In this sense the contemporary narratives were not specifically recording the ebb and flow of royal power; they offer a particular insight into the experience of power, 'when England experienced what Europeans had suffered elsewhere.'[35]

The Chronicle of John of Worcester (JW) begins with the creation of the world and ends in 1140, although there is a short continuation which covers part of 1141.[36] Until 1121 the Worcester chronicle was mainly a compilation of well-known authorities including Bede, Asser and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. However after this date the text is 'a first-hand contemporary account of events written up at intervals.'[37] There has been a great deal of historical discussion about the author of the chronicle although the consensus among most

---

[32] P. Dalton, 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign', *Viator*, 31 (2000), pp. 79-119.
[33] S. Marritt, 'Reeds Shaken by the Wind? Bishops in Local and Regional Politics in King Stephen's Reign', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, eds. P. Dalton and G. J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 115-138, at p. 116.
[34] T. N. Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton, New Jersey, 2009), p. 270.
[35] *Ibid*, p. 278.
[36] The most recent edition of this text containing the annals for 1067 to 1140 was published by the OMT (1998). This edition includes the continuation contained in one extant manuscript (G) which covers events of 1141. For a full account of the development stages of the chronicle and the extant manuscripts see JW, p. xv-l.
[37] A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), p. 146. It is likely that the material relating to the reign of Henry I was revised after the king's death.

historians is that the extant text is the work of a Worcester monk named John writing from about 1124 to 1140.[38] John describes the duties of a bishop during the civil war.

> After a discussion in a council it was decided that all towns, castles, and fortified places throughout England where secular business was conducted should submit to the jurisdiction of the king and his barons; and that churchmen, that is bishops, or as I would call them, holy watchdogs, should not stop barking for the safety and defence of their flocks (*in salutem et in defensionem ouium suarum latrare non cessent*) and should be ever watchful lest the unseen wolf, their malevolent enemy, should seize and scatter the sheep. In the spiritual fight let them bring help to the king of kings, which will bring them rewards after victory.[39]

Using a biblical allusion from the Old Testament John implies that the English bishops were unable to fulfil their role as holy watchdogs; they were blind and ignorant, dumb dogs not able to bark, seeing vain things, sleeping and loving dreams.[40] This view is reinforced in other contemporary texts. The *Historia Novella* (*HN*) was the last known work of the monk and historian, William of Malmesbury.[41] The narrative describes King Stephen's promises to the church. William transcribes the Charter of Liberties, signed at Oxford in 1136, which reassured the episcopate that the king would support and defend church properties.[42] Yet, according to William of Malmesbury, Stephen quickly broke his promises, and everything

[38] For an account of John's work in the context of wider historical developments see M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and his contemporaries'*, The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C. Davis, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, R. J. A. I. Catto and M. H. Keen (Oxford, 1981), pp. 101-126. For a discussion of the problems concerning the authorship see A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), pp. 143-5.

[39] *Habito postmodum consilio, statutum est ut omnia per Angliam oppida, castella, munitions queque in quibus secularia solent exerceri negotia, regis et baronum suorum iuri cedant; ecclesiastici uero urir, uidelicet episcopi, canes, inquam diuini, in salutem et in defensionem ouium suarum latrare non cessent, ne lupus inuisibilis, malignus scilicet hostis, rapiat et dispergat oues, omnino caueant, in spirituali pugna auxilium Regi regum prebeant remunerationes illis quando post uictoriam.* JW, pp. 268-9.

[40] *Speculatores eius caeci omnes nescierunt universi canes muti non valentes latrare videntes vana dormientes et amantes somnia* (Isaiah, 56:10).

[41] The most recent edition of this text was published by OMT (1998). For an account of William's life and work see, Farmer, 'William of Malmesbury's Life and Works', *JEH*, 13:1 (1962) 39-54; Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Rev. ed., Woodbridge, 2003). See also A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), pp. 166-85.

[42] William of Malmesbury provides a complete copy of the text in *HN*, i.18. However he omits a vital sentence which reserves royal rights: *hec uero omnia concedo et confirmo salua regia et iusta dignitate mea*. Cf. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum*, iii, no. 271 (early April 1136, at Oxford). For an alternative account from the contemporary narratives see HH, pp. 704-5.

changed for the worse.[43] This was further intensified by the outbreak of civil war. William of Malmesbury describes the descent into anarchy.

> There were many castles all over England, each defending its own district or, to be more truthful, plundering it. The knights from the castles carried off both herds and flocks, sparing neither churches nor graveyards... And indeed, by the earl's wish, the legate, with the bishops, many times excommunicated all who broke into graveyards and outraged churches, and who laid hands on men of a holy or religious order or their servants, but he accomplished hardly anything by these efforts (*sed nichil propemodum hac profecit industria*).[44]

Thus according to William of Malmesbury the act of excommunication was frequently invoked but it was ineffective. This was true even with the support of Earl Robert of Gloucester, the representative of 'legitimate' secular authority (at least within William's narrative). The *HN* was commissioned by Robert, earl of Gloucester, the illegitimate son of Henry I and principal supporter of Matilda, his half-sister.[45] Yet William of Malmesbury remained close to Henry, bishop of Winchester, papal legate, and brother to King Stephen.[46] The text itself covers the period from 1126, when Matilda returned to England following her husband's death, until December 1142. William began writing the *HN* not earlier than 1140 and stopped recording events sometime in early 1143.[47] It seems likely that John of Worcester and William drew on each other's work.[48]

---

[43] *Itaque sub eo aliquarum aecclesiarum thesauri direpti, possessiones terrarium laicis datae; aecclesiae clericorum alienis uenditae; episcopi capti et res suas abalienare coacti; abbatiae uel amicorum gratia uel relaxione debitorum indignis concessae. HN*, i.19. William attributes many of these injustices to royal counsellors rather than to the king directly.

[44] *Castella erant crebra per totam Angliam, quaeque suas partes defendentia, immo ut uerius dicam, depopulantia. Milites castellorum abducebant ad agris et pecudes, nec aecclesiis nec cimiteriis parcentes... Et quidem, ex uoluntate comitis, legatus cum episcopis omnes effractores cimiteriorum et uiolatores aecclesiarum, et qui sacri uel religiosi ordinis hominibus uel eorum famulis manus iniecissent, multotiens excommunicauit; sed nichil propemodum hac profecit industria. HN*, ii.36

[45] *HN*, prol.

[46] According to Edmund King, it was primarily through his association with Henry that William of Malmesbury had access to the secrets of the court, and his account 'gives us the clearest picture of a prelate in perpetual motion.' *HN*, p. xxiv. William of Malmesbury attended two legatine councils at Winchester in 1139 and 1141. For an account of Henry of Blois see H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen, 1135-54* (London, 1970), pp. 118-24.

[47] For a full account of the likely composition dates see, *HN*, pp. xxix-xxxiii.

[48] M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and his contemporaries', *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C. Davis, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, R. J. A. I. Catto and M. H. Keen (Oxford, 1981), pp. 113-7.

Thus according to William of Malmesbury's account episcopal attempts to bring sanctions against those who plundered the churches were fruitless. It is clear that William of Malmesbury believed that the bishops were impotent in the face of violence initiated by knights, or in Bisson's terminology 'bad' lords. Excommunication was a spiritual power which operated at the behest of 'good' rulers. However it was weak in the face of coercive force and violence. Words were not sufficient to counter swords.

Probably the most notorious act of royal oppression against the English Church during the period covered by this study was the arrest of the bishops. Roger, bishop of Salisbury, Nigel of Ely and Alexander of Lincoln. Henry, bishop of Winchester, convened a council (August 1139) to challenge the king's action. The king did not attend but sent his representatives. With them, he sent a message, a mixture of advice and threat (*partim minando mandasset*) warning against a papal appeal and causing the bishops to think it unwise to harass (*exercere*) him further; they maintained that, 'it was rash to excommunicate a prince without the pope's cognizance (*seu quia principem excommunicare sine apostolica conscientia temerarium esset*),' and that they may fall victim to violence as some claimed to have heard, others to have seen, 'swords being drawn around them (*gladios circa se nudari*).'[49] William of Malmesbury describes the bishops' collective hesitancy, their unwillingness to act, when confronted with direct royal power. The king's words, read aloud, were authenticated by the threat of violence. William's assertion that the assembly of English bishops were unwilling to act *sine apostolica conscientia* is a transparent excuse intended to reveal episcopal impotence.

Another important source for Stephen's reign is the *Gesta Stephani*, a contemporary history probably written by a secular clerk.[50] The author of the *GS* provides a vivid

[49] *HN*, ii.30
[50] This incomplete text has posed significant problems for historical analysis, particularly concerning the identity of the author. For the most recent account of scholarship related to this see E. King 'The *Gesta Stephani*', *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates,

description of Bishop Henry of Winchester excommunicating Earl Patrick of Shrewsbury after he had captured the castle of Downton belonging to Winchester cathedral.

> So the bishop boldly taking up the weapons of the church's warfare (*arma ecclesiasticae militiae uiriliter arripens*), smote those brutal plunderers of his possessions with the adamantine sword of excommunication (*anathematis perculit gladio*).[51]

In this account the author makes use of the language of warfare to describe the function of excommunication. Yet despite the powerful words, the author notes that the sanction was ineffective for the men did not 'turn from evil (*ab incepta militia reflecterentur*)' and the bishop had to call upon his nephew, Hugh de Puiset, to put siege to the castle and force the usurpers to surrender.[52] These contemporary accounts seem to confirm the view that excommunication was a relatively weak power. Yet both William of Malmesbury and the author of the *GS* closely associate the process with secular, military support. William in particular is keen to associate Robert of Gloucester with the decision to excommunicate those who disrupted the peace of the church. Historians have traditionally interpreted this as a sign of weakness within the clergy, whose sanctions were ineffective in the face of coercive power. Christopher Holdsworth writes, 'all the evidence suggests that they had little effect, almost certainly because [the bishops'] only sanction was excommunication.'[53] Yet these accounts are highly complex. They demonstrate 'good' order and institutional attempts to restrain anarchy. They confirm that the church and 'good' nobles were working actively to restrain the actions of 'bad' lords. Rather than this demonstrating impotence it is intended to reveal the strains on the operation of local episcopal power. William suggests that the earl actively wanted the bishop to employ the power of excommunication. In this sense it was a

---

J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 195-206. This text is more dealt with more comprehensively in Chapter 3.

[51] *Episcopus itaque, arma ecclesiasticae militiae uiriliter arripens, infestos rerum suarum epilatores rigidissimo anathematis perculit gladio. GS*, pp. 214-5.

[52] The text actually refers to a nephew named Henry but in this notes to the modern edition R. H. C. Davis suspects this was a scribal error. The text claims that the nephew was later appointed to the bishopric of Durham and this supports the identification of Hugh de Puiset, appointed to Durham in 1153.

[53] C. Holdsworth, 'The Church', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. King (Oxford, 1994), p. 214.

supporting and justifying power for the actions of force. In this way bishops were required to invoke their words of power (excommunication malediction and curse) in response to violence and force, but also as a prelude to violence and force. The author of the *GS* confirms that Henry of Winchester sent for his nephew and 'opened his treasury for him, and gave him most urgent instructions to make every effort to suppress [Earl Patrick and his men] since he himself was summoned to Rome.'[54] The image of the bishop wielding a weapon was completely in tune with the subsequent events. It is important to recognise that the descriptions of excommunication were framed within the narrative of violence.

According to the *GS* the excommunication of Reginald, earl of Cornwall (1140-75) and another illegitimate son of Henry I, took place against a backdrop of violence. According to the narrative, the earl had frequently despoiled the Church's property and as such he was punished.

> Wherefore we saw him, not long afterwards, caught by the richly deserved lash of divine vengeance (*divinae ultionis uerbere*), because the Bishop of Exeter struck him with the sword of excommunication (*gladio anathematis*) and removed him from the threshold of the church.[55]

Envisaging excommunication or anathema as a weapon is a frequent allusion used in the sources; it was 'literally a weapon to be unsheathed and wielded against one's enemies.'[56] In this way it is presented as an act rather than *merely* words. It was surely in the interests of clerical authors to describe excommunication as a realistic and effective penalty. Yet the Bishop of Exeter's curse hardly impacted upon Reginald, who seems to have lived out his life and been restored to the Church. Yet the account of Reginald's excommunication is much more complex. Reginald had married the daughter of William fitz Richard and

---

[54] *Aduocato Henrico nepote suo (quem episcopum Duralmensem postea uidimus), thesauros suos ei aperuit, et ut ad eos grauandos omnimode desudaret, quia et ipse Romam uocabatur, intentissime praecepit. GS*, pp. 214-5.

[55] *Quapropter iustissimo non multum post divinae ultionis uerbere uidimus circumuentum, quia episcopus Esoniensis gladio eum anathematis perculsum ab ecclesiae limine semouit. GS*, c. 48.

[56] R. H. Helmholz, 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England' in *Journal of Law and Religion*, 11: 1 (1994-5), p. 238.

received the earldom of Cornwall in a political union bringing William over to the empress.[57] As such Reginald began to fortify castles against the king and in doing so he plundered many churches. It was for this reason that he was excommunicated. The author describes the penalties which he suffered, in particular noting that his wife was driven mad. Again the act of excommunication is a prelude to violence within the text. The king quickly recovered his lost castles and placed the county in the hands of Earl Alan, 'a man of the greatest cruelty and craft (*uiro summae crudelitatis et doli*)' ordering him to wage continual warfare against Reginald.[58] The sentence of excommunication has to be understood as part of a counter campaign in response to William fitz Richard's treachery. Thus within the sources excommunication was a weapon used in conjunction with political power and as a prelude to violence. The narratives, by emphasising the weakness of episcopal excommunication, demonstrate the terrible and violent conditions of their own time.

The significant point here is that some bishops were part of the proliferation of castles which characterised the anarchy. In the *GS* the author confirms the view that bishops were impotent in defending the church from the disasters of the anarchy.

> But they, cowering in most dastardly fear, bent like a reed shaken by the wind, and since their salt had no savour they did not rise up to resist (*non ascendebant ex aduerso*) or set themselves as a wall before the house of Israel. For they should have met men wise in the flesh with the sword of God's word, which devours flesh... On the contrary, while plunderers, as has many times been revealed, were everywhere pillaging the property of the churches, some bishops, made sluggish and abject by fear of them, either gave way or lukewarmly and feebly passed a sentence of excommunication that was soon to be revoked (*aut succumbebant aut tepide et remisse separationis sententiam non diu permansuram inferebant*).[59]

[57] For an account of William fitz Richard's rebellion against Stephen and subsequent alliance with Reginald see D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (Harlow, 2000), pp. 115-6. It is not clear that William fitz Richard was known by the title earl of Cornwall. He was a sub-tenant of King Stephen, the principal landholder in Cornwall as Count of Mortain.

[58] *GS*, pp. 102-3. Alan de Dinan, Count of Brittany.

[59] *Sed illi timore uilissime depressi, ut arundo uento agitata inflectebantur, habentesque sal infatuatum, non ascendebant ex aduerso, nec se murum pro domo Israel opponebant. Deberent namquam gladio uerbi Dei, qui deuorat carnes... Episcopi autem e contrario, praedonibus ecclesiarum possessiones ubique, ut saepius propalatum est, diripientibus, alii metu illorum inerter depressi, aut succumbebant aut tepide et remisse separationis sententiam non diu permansuram inferebant. GS*, pp. 154-7.

However the author continues his account by describing the behaviour of other bishops who 'showed themselves always more cruel and more merciless than those very evildoers in oppressing their neighbours and plundering their goods.'[60] He described how many 'girt with swords and magnificent armour (*ferro accincti, armis decentissimis instructi*)' took part in the violence.[61] Bishops were not always impotent according to this narrative. However the concept of excommunication as an episcopal sanction was fatally undermined. The author states that the bishop should have countered the violence with the sword of God's word (*gladio uerbi Dei*). Clearly for this author the act of excommunication was a powerful weapon. Yet the bishops were not wielding it correctly. He lamented the impotence of the bishops; their willingness to revoke the sentence too easily. According to this narrative in the context of the anarchy, bishops were unable to employ their particular power.

In fact the author of the *GS* claims that the only bishop who maintained his episcopal authority and dignity during this period was Robert of Hereford who would immediately strike the impious 'with the sword of excommunication (*gladio anathematis*)'.[62] The author describes how Robert excommunicated Miles, earl of Hereford, and his men.[63] In addition Robert imposed an interdict to the whole region surrounding Hereford, making it unlawful to celebrate Mass, to bury a body or even move it from the place where they had died.[64] According to the *GS*, Miles, despite his repentance, was killed in a hunting accident later that

[60] *GS*, pp. 156-7
[61] The author specifically mentions Henry of Winchester, along with Alexander of Lincoln and Roger of Chester.
[62] *Quamobrem aut a nefaria praesumptione se et suos arceret, aut gladio anathematis se et suos incunctanter percelleret. GS*, c. 79.
[63] *Episcopus igitur... metuendam ecclesiasticae percussionis sententiam in Milonem suaeque temeritatis astipulatores dictauit. GS*, c. 80.
[64] An interdict is a censure, or prohibition, excluding the faithful from participation in divine offices. Local interdicts, like personal interdicts, may be general or particular. A general local interdict is one affecting a whole territory, and this was the ordinary interdict of the Middle Ages. Interdict differs from excommunication, in that it does not cut one off from the communion of the faithful or from Christian society, though the acts of religion forbidden in both cases are almost identical. For a historical overview see E. Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1986). See also 'Inderdict', Catholic Encyclopedia [http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08073a.htm, accessed 12 December 2010].

year; an accident ascribed to divine wrath. This caused some rich men to fear attacking church lands and 'made the rest of the bishops in England bolder in their subsequent resistance to the abandoned recklessness of the rich (*et reliquos per Angliam episcopos ad obsistendum deinceps temerariae diuitum praesumptioni audaciores effecit*).'[65] This explanation reinforces the notion of a charismatic power. Robert of Hereford was a bishop renowned for his sanctity and well-loved by clerical authors reliant on the sanctity and holiness of the bishop imposing the sentence. The bishop was praised specifically for his willingness to impose excommunication and interdict and not to back down. The key issue however was not Robert's charismatic power but the severity of his sentence. It was his refusal to compromise which impressed the contemporary narrator. The death of Earl Miles clearly lent support to the notion of Robert's personal power. Yet the author of the *GS* was explicit that Robert's success gave succour to the rest of the episcopate and encouraged their own attempts to defend their churches. This however is in contrast to John of Worcester, who omits any mention of the interdict. The narrative merely claims that when Geoffrey Talbot, an ally of Earl Miles, attacked Hereford and used the cathedral as his stronghold, even housing his horses there, 'Robert, the church's venerable bishop, all the clergy, and also the king were distressed by this (*Hinc eisdem ecclesie pontifex uenerabilis turbatur Robertus, turbatur et clerus uniuersus, turbatur quoque rex*).'[66] This hardly tallies with the *GS*. In this way excommunication was used a prelude to actual violence. Or perhaps more accurately it was used in conjunction with physical force. In the *GP* William of Malmesbury includes a story of how Wulfstan of Worcester cursed the army of Roger of Montgomery who was rebelling against William II. Wulfstan 'hurled the thunderbolt of his curse at rebels who were failing to keep faith with their lord (*maledictionis fulmen iaculatus in perfidos, qui domino*

[65] *GS*, c. 80.
[66] JW, pp. 276-7.

suo fidem non seruarent).'[67] And having also dispatched the king's troops who were guarding the city, he protected Worcester from attack. The curse and the physical defence of the city are combined. This is a rather pragmatic way of describing the bishop's power to use his words as a weapon. However it is churlish to disregard the power of excommunication by searching for physical force behind the words. Bishops need not have considered it necessary to use their power without support. The central point made by William of Malmesbury is that the bishops are afraid to act.

In fact most narrative accounts of (successful) episcopal excommunication and cursing are contextualised in an earlier period. According to William of Malmesbury Ealdred, archbishop of York at the time of the Conquest, following initially cordial relations with William I became enraged by the king's tax demands. When Ealdred's envoys were snubbed by the king, 'the archbishop lost no time in launching the weapon of his curse (*maledictionis telum*) against him and his whole offspring; prefacing it with the remark that he was right to curse (*maledictionem*) seeing that he had been wrong to bless.'[68] Having examined the post-Conquest portrayal of Ealdred, Mary Frances Giandrea has argued convincingly that he posed a particular thematic problem for twelfth-century historians. They sought to explain the Norman invasion with reference to the corruption of the Anglo-Saxon church, but they recognised that 'there was no getting around the fact that [Ealdred] had crowned William the Conqueror.'[69] In the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (*GP*) the archbishop's curse, ostensibly delivered in response to a diplomatic slight, only lightly concealed his supposed regret over the coronation. The account then claims that the king, having heard about the bishop's words, initially had to be calmed by his advisers (*amicorum ammonitione*

[67] *GP*, iv.144.1.

[68] *…non moratus ille maledictionis telum in illum et omnem eius uibrauit progeniem, prefatus posse se maledictionem dare merito, qui benedictionem dedisset immerito*. *GP*, iii.115.20 Although John of Worcester also mentions the king's heavy tax demands, only William of Malmesbury mentions the curse.

[69] M. F. Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 22.

delinitus) but he then tried to win the bishop over.[70] Ealdred, however, died before the royal messengers arrived. And, although the account does not explicitly state it, the end result was that the archbishop and the king were never reconciled. The circumstances of this account suggest that the royal advisors, alert to the archbishop's influence, recognised that it would be politically inexpedient for the king to alienate him permanently. This interpretation supports the notion of personal, charismatic power, demonstrated by a curse. William of Malmesbury's narrative continues with another example of Ealdred's curse. The Worcester monks appealed to the archbishop, then guardian of their see, against Urse, sheriff of Worcester, who had encroached upon their cemetery lands during the building his castle. When the bishop saw the sheriff, he confronted him saying, 'Hattest þu Urs, haue þu Godes kurs'. Ostensibly William of Malmesbury includes this neat Old English verse in order to maintain the play on words.[71] However it is also another way of associating Ealdred with the pre-Conquest regime. By including these words within his careful Latin constructions William evokes the sound of an older authority which had been effectively silenced. It seems clear in both these cases that Ealdred is not appealing to the judicial sanctions of canon law. His curse is spontaneous and direct. As Helmholz has put it, 'it was excommunication commonly issued without judicial citation or other formality, and dependent for its efficacy upon the spiritual power of the person who issued it, as well as upon the justice of his cause.'[72] This is typical of charismatic authority; it is largely dependent on the individual.

Yet in both cases the description of Ealdred's curse is trapped within the narrative of Norman Conquest. Ealdred, as a figure within the text, is a symbol of Anglo-Saxon rule. In both cases his curse is directed at the criminality and corruption of the new Norman rulers. In

[70] *Quod cum relatum regi esset, amicorum ammonitione delinitus misit qui episcopum exorarent. GP*, iii.115.20.
[71] He provides an extended translation which also targets the sheriff's heirs. (*Vrsus*, *habeas Dei maledictionem et meam et omnium consecratorum capitum, nisi castellum hinc amoueris. Et scias profecto quod progenies tua non diu de terra sancte Mariae hereditabitur*). *GP*, iii.115.21-2.
[72] R. H. Helmholz, 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England' in *Journal of Law and Religion*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (1994-5), pp. 237-8

this way, according to the *GP* Ealdred was using his curse in defence of native Anglo-Saxons. Yet William of Malmesbury is writing more than fifty years after Ealdred's death. Significantly given the date of composition, William of Malmesbury claims that the second curse was finally fulfilled when Roger, son of Urse, was driven from his lands by Henry I; he neglects however to mention that Urse himself continued his predatory ways until his death in 1108.[73] Nor does William make any further comment on Ealdred's curse against the Conqueror and his successors, although in all likelihood it would have been inadvisable to do so directly. The point here is that contemporary readers would have made up their own mind about the efficacy of Ealdred's curse. The curse only really exists within the narrative, where it might lie dormant, but threaten to find fulfilment at a later time. By committing the words to parchment, William was preserving the curse, awaiting its final result. In this context undoubtedly the bishop's curse appears the result of a charismatic authority rather than the institutional authority of the Church. However in one sense it was never Ealdred's curse, it belonged to the written narrative of the *GP*.

However it was also a negotiating strategy and one that could be used by bishops to assert their support for others. The Worcester chronicle describes Henry of Blois use of the sanction of excommunication during his temporary alliance with Matilda, against his brother Stephen. Having entered the city of Winchester, 'the crown of the English kingdom was given to her rule (*datur eius dominio corona regni Anglie*).'[74]

> The legate [Henry of Winchester] cursed all who cursed her, blessed those who blessed her, excommunicated those who were against her, and absolved those who submitted to her.[75]

---

[73] Urse d'Abetot was the subject of a royal writ in 1108 stipulating that the sheriff was not to summon shire and hundred courts unless ordered to do so. Judith Green suggests that Urse had been summoning courts on other than customary occasions and presumably fining those who did not attend. Samson, bishop of Worcester is likely to have brought this matter to the king's attention. J. Green, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (2006), pp. 115-6

[74] JW, pp. 294-5.

[75] *Ab ipso legato maledicuntur qui maledicunt ei, benedicuntur qui benedicunt ei, excommunicantur contradicentes, absoluuntur eius iussioni parentes.* JW, pp. 294-5.

Using the terminology of excommunication the bishop was able to indicate his new allegiance. Following her retreat from London, the empress found the tide of opinion turning against her. Henry at this point began to contemplate how to free his brother, the king. The empress returned to Winchester unexpectedly and the bishop was forced to leave by another gate.[76]

> This was not enough to assuage the bishop's rage, for urged on by his fury, and in order to strike terror and fear into the citizens, he decided to set fire to Winchester and raze it to the ground.[77]

And so the city was attacked and many buildings were destroyed. The siege lasted several weeks. The empress escaped the city before the final assault. The Worcester chronicle states that the empress could find no safe resting place because of fear of the bishop (*propter metum episcopi*).[78]

R. W. Southern describes the lengthy and difficult process begun by Anselm to excommunicate Henry I over the confiscation of Canterbury lands and revenues.[79] According to Southern this was 'the most positive action' that Anselm had yet taken in his conflicts with the king.[80] The situation was further complicated by the involvement of the papacy and its dispute with Henry over the issue of homage and investiture. The papacy, although willing to pass sentence on Robert of Meulan and other royal counsellors, delayed excommunicating the king. Despite this, Anselm proceeded; and Henry, planning his final attack on Normandy, and not wishing to add excommunication to his other problems, agreed to return the Canterbury revenues. Sarah Hamilton has pointed out that excommunication was not

[76] JW, pp. 298-99; *GS*, pp. 1267.
[77] *Nec hoc solum pontificis ire potuit sufficere quin insuper ob terrorem siue horrorem illis incutiendum, immisso igne urbem conburere, furore cogente decreuit.* JW, pp. 298-99.
[78] JW, pp. 300-1.
[79] Anselm's began the process of excommunication in December 1103. He first issued a warning, then three summonses and three refusals were required before the sentence could finally be imposed. Henry I attempted to delay the process further by sending numerous messengers and letters to the papacy. By the summer of 1105, eighteen months after the process had begun Anselm was ready to pronounce excommunication. He met with the king at Laigle on 22 July and dropped the threat of excommunication once the Canterbury revenues were returned to him. R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 298-302.
[80] R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 298.

intended to be permanent but to resolve a dispute and therefore to some extent 'lifting the sentence of excommunication was almost as significant an act of power as imposing it.'[81] In the case of Henry and Anselm the threat was enough although until the process had reached its end, Henry was willing to force minor delays and avoidances. Eadmer describes the king's relief that the excommunication had been avoided. He writes that throughout England France and Normandy, 'a rumour had gone abroad that the king was on the point of being excommunicated by Anselm and accordingly for him, as for a sovereign not too well loved, many mischiefs were being prepared which it was thought would be brought to bear on him more effectually if he were excommunicated by a man of such eminence.'[82] Again Eadmer seems to be reinforcing the view that power of excommunication lay in the person of the bishop not in the institutional process. However we can clearly detect the procedure Anselm was acting upon a European stage and was concerned to get papal support. Yet he does act independently of the papacy to protect the local rights of Canterbury; however the investiture issue becomes closely associated with his actions. Hugh the Chanter of York claims that Henry I eventually gave up his right to investitures because of the prohibition and anathema of the church imposed by Anselm.[83]

Elsewhere in the *GS* the author is particularly critical of Henry I's restriction on the right of anathema claiming that those who sought to defend ecclesiastical possessions 'with the anathema of the church (*commentis ecclesiastico rigore*),' were intimidated by the king and persecuted by his agents until they had oiled the king's palm.[84] The penalties available to the Church are limited by the king. This might imply that that excommunication was a feared

---

[81] S. Hamilton, '*Absoluimus uos uice beati petri apostolorum principis:* episcopal authority and the reconciliation of excommunicants in England and Francia *c*.900-*c*.1150', *Frankland: Essays in honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, eds. P. Fouracre and D. Ganz (2008), pp. 209-10.

[82] *HNA*, p. 166

[83] Hugh the Chanter, p. 13. Hugh is quite dismissive about the significance of the Investiture dispute in England, claiming that whatever victory Anselm might have obtained was relatively worthless in reducing the power of the monarch to appoint bishops of their choice.

[84] *GS*, p. 26-7. This claim was amongst the charges brought by the clergy at the Council of London in 1136. J. Green, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (2006), p. 115.

weapon, but it seems just as likely that the king resented independent ecclesiastical action against his subjects. It is also worth noting that the excommunication described seems to refer to a written penalty. This may well be more in line with the judicial function intended by canon law and would therefore concern royal administration more than a bishop's curse.

The events of 1148 also reveal much about the process of excommunication. The relationship between the king and the archbishop of Canterbury could be unstable. Stephen tried to prevent Theobald from attending the council of Reims, summoned by Eugenius, the first Cistercian pope.[85] Despite royal attempts to prevent Theobald from leaving England the archbishop defied Stephen and departed secretly for Reims.[86] The archbishop fled Canterbury and attended.

> On the last day of the council the pope rose to excommunicate the king… The candles had been lighted and, and the prelates and the leading men who were assembled there to promise that the king could obtain no more delays for negotiations, when my lord [Theobald] of Canterbury most movingly begged for mercy.[87]

John of Salisbury claimed that Theobald's presence at the papal court was to the king's advantage. In fact the pope conceded to the archbishop of Canterbury, who had won great favour in his sight, that he might absolve all the guilty bishops and abbots of England, or leave them under sentence as he thought fit.[88] The pope suspended those English bishops who ignored his summons and, with the exception of Henry of Winchester, was given the authority to absolve them. This is reminiscent of Lanfranc at Rome in 1070.

---

[85] Stephen nominated three bishops to attend the council as representatives of the English church: Hilary of Chichester, Robert of Hereford and William Tube of Norwich. Relations between Pope Eugenius and Henry, bishop Winchester were at a low ebb and Stephen may have refused permission for Theobald to attend in order to prevent the archbishop from developing close papal ties at Henry's expense. However Saltman has argued that it is more likely that Stephen 'at last felt himself strong enough to return to the policy of restricting contacts between the English church and the papacy.' A. Saltman, *Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1956), p. 25.

[86] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. M. Chibnall (London, 1956), p. 7

[87] *Cum enim dominus papa nouissimo die concilii surrexisset iam candelis accensis ob causas superiores regem excommunicaturus, et a partibus et a magnis uiris qui conuenerant et satisfactionem promittebant faciende condicionis dilatio non posset impetrari, dominus Cantuariensis affectuosissime supplicauit ut parceret. Ibid*, p. 7.

[88] *Ibid*, p. 11.

After Lanfranc's death in 1089 William of Malmesbury describes how churches were plundered, lands confiscated and Canterbury was handed over to the king's treasury. And '[a]mid all this there was a profound silence (*grande silentium*) on the part of the bishops; there were no dogs able to bark. Grief found no voice (*nulla uox credebatur dolori*), thought was suppressed: all for fear of one man.'[89] Yet William had earlier revealed that William the Conqueror had severely restricted the power of excommunication.

The distinction between curse and process is relatively unhelpful because it is based on a concern to establish the legitimacy of episcopal action, and to identify the source of episcopal authority, rather than to analyse the particular experience of power. According to Helmholz's view the 'judicialisation' of excommunication was symptomatic of a move away from the personal power displayed by bishops of an earlier period. Among Lanfranc's letter collection there is a letter addressed to Herfast, bishop of Thetford, concerning the dispute between the bishop and the monks of Bury St Edmunds following Herfast's attempts to exert jurisdiction over the abbey. The archbishop overrules the sentence of excommunication imposed by his suffragan. Lanfranc explains that he will soon be travelling to that part of the country where he will hear the case himself.

> I therefore request and require that you lift the excommunication that I hear you have laid on the clergy concerned, and that you send them away unconditionally, without their having to pay a fine.[90]

The relationship between Lanfranc and Herfast was already strained and other letters testify to the archbishop's low opinion of the bishop.[91] Yet what is significant about this letter, for

---

[89] *Inter haec apud episcopos grande silentium, nec erant canes qui latrare ualerent. Nulla uox credebatur dolori, intra conscientiam strangulabatur iuditium, ob unius hominis metum. GP*, i.47.3-4 (Isa. 56:10).

[90] *…uolo et rogo quatinus predictos clericos quos a uobis excommunicatos didici absoluatis, et quietos ab omni inuectione atque exactione ad presens dimittatis.* Lanfranc, *Letters*, 42:8-10.

[91] See above for a discussion of other correspondence. Lanfranc, *Letters*, 42, 43, 47.

the purposes of this study, is that Herfast was using the power of excommunication in order to further his own authority. Lanfranc considered this to be inappropriate. Excommunication was always an institutional power in the sense that it was subject to the checks of other churchmen. In addition the episcopal *acta* demonstrate a particular trend in the mid twelfth century. It seems that the *sanctio* clause was a particular feature of diplomatic from this period; one, which admittedly disappeared as time went on. However the *acta* can only reflect the rhetoric of the time. When bishops no longer made use of the *sanctio* clauses it implies that they were no longer effective. The rhetoric used was a reflection on the circumstances of the period. As Marritt has argued 'the significance of bishops at this time was due as much to the pre-existing and well-established nature of their office as to anything resulting from the extraordinary circumstances of Stephen's reign.'[92] The rhetoric might change but they continued to operate with words. Despite the appearance within the narratives there was no golden age of cursing. Bishops used words in specific ways and were highly conscious of the power of words. By involving the secular powers so closely bishops were forced to define and justify their office. Bishops were more than just peacemakers. They did things with words. Excommunication was a political tool. It was an episcopal weapon. It was up to the individual bishop to decide how sharp he needed his sword to be.

Archbishop Anselm, according to his R. W. Southern, undertook a 'violent defence of the primacy', and this was made particularly evident towards the end of his life by his determination to ensure that Thomas II submitted to Canterbury before he received episcopal consecration.[93] In his last letter before he died, and the last in his letter collection, Anselm suspended Thomas II, archbishop-elect of York, from his priestly office and forbade him from performing any pastoral duties, and forbidding all the bishops of Britain, 'under the curse of perpetual anathema', to promote him to the episcopate without him first making

[92] S. Marritt, 'Reeds Shaken by the Wind? Bishops in Local and Regional Politics in King Stephen's Reign', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, eds. P. Dalton and G. J. White (Woodbridge, 2008), p. 116.
[93] R. W. Southern, *Portrait*, p. 328.

profession to Canterbury.[94] Anselm had already sent three letters to Thomas at York instructing him to come to Canterbury to be consecrated and to make profession of obedience.[95] Southern and other historians have interpreted this as a sign that Anselm was following the process of formal excommunication according to canon law. However it was not until after his death that the force of his threat persuaded King Henry and the rest of the English episcopate to insist that Thomas make profession to Canterbury before his consecration. When the letter threatening anathema was read during the Whitsuntide festival in London (1109), the bishops accepted it, despite the initial objections of Robert of Meulan. And according to Eadmer, the king also agreed to the demands in the letter saying, he had no wish at all to bring upon himself the excommunication of Father Anselm.[96] However Hugh the Chanter of York adopted a different view. He claimed that the monks of Christ Church had falsely claimed that, before his death, Anselm excommunicated Thomas II for his failure to make profession to Canterbury.

> If he did so, misled by evil counsel (*maligno consilio seductus*), it was an outrage, and they ought to have concealed it (*occultasse debuerant*). But if, which is nearer the truth, he never meant to do anything of the kind, to have published such a charge against their father in God amongst men, is disgraceful in God's eyes.[97]

Hugh was careful to avoid direct condemnation of Anselm preferring instead to blame the Canterbury community. He argues that as guardians of the letter the monks were ultimately responsible for the subsequent events. In this way Hugh adopts a dual approach to his defence of the York position. If genuine, the letter ought to have been concealed because clearly Anselm had been misled, and if the letter was a forgery, as Hugh suspected, then clearly it should have been concealed. Hugh's argument hinges on his claims that the Canterbury

[94] Anselm, *Letters,* 472. A copy of this letter was sent to all the bishops of England.
[95] Anselm, *Letters*, 443, 445, 455
[96] *HNA*, p. 209.
[97] *Quod si, maligno consilio seductus, gravit.ler excendens fecisset, occultasse debuerant. Sin autem, quod verius est, nec unquam in cor eius ascendit, patri suo sacerdoti tantum crimen imposuisse apud homines, ignomia est apud deum.* Hugh the Chanter, p. 23-4.

monks were responsible for damaging Anselm's reputation. They were ultimately responsible for Anselm's words. This cleverly countered Eadmer's claim that the archbishop was directing the process of excommunication. Both authors accept that this was an act of power, when the words were read aloud Thomas was forced to submit. The words of a dead bishop read aloud undoubtedly possessed significant power. Yet the irony was that Anselm's success was dependent on his death, the king would never have supported his demands for obedience while he was still alive. Later Hugh the Chanter repeats his dual argument when reporting the shock felt by York after the king, on the basis of Anselm's curse, sided with Canterbury and commanded that the archbishop-elect make profession of obedience.

> 'It was a lie, that Anselm had made that interdict or anathema (*interdictum, seu anathema*); and one that it was better to suppress than to publish (*et magis tacendum quam eloquendum*). And if it were true, the curse could hurt nobody, because it was unreasonable (*nemini nocivum, quia irracionabiliter factum*).'[98]

For Hugh and the chapter at York the anathema held no effect because it was unreasonable. This implies that they were appealing to the formula of canon law to undermine the efficacy of the excommunication. Unsurprisingly Eadmer and Hugh the Chanter offer drastically different interpretations of Anselm's attempted use of excommunication during the primacy contest. Of Anselm, Hugh writes, 'I cannot wonder enough that a man with such a reputation for sanctity should so obstinately pursue a thing for which the fathers have left no written authority, and which is not the custom of the church; since he must, I suppose, well have remembered how Thomas the first behaved at his consecration.'[99]

This gives an insight into the possibilities of excommunication and how, irrespective of the personal authority of the bishop, a curse might be considered ineffective if unjustified. In the case of Ealdred's curse and Anselm's excommunication it may seem possible to detect

---

[98] *Istud vero interdictum, seu anathema, Anselmum archiepiscopum fecisse ficticium erat, et magis tacendum quam eloquendum. Quod si verum, nemini nocivum, quia irracionabiliter factum.* Hugh the Chanter, p. 26.

[99] *Mirari satis nequeo tam sancte opinionis virum si[c] obstinate petere quod nec sancti patres scriptum reliquerunt, nec ecclesiastica consuetudo tenet, cum et ipse, ut credo, bene meminerit qualiter T[homas] primus eum consecrando egerit.* Hugh the Chanter, p. 21.

the changing nature of episcopal authority from charisma and curse to the beginnings of routinised administrative behaviour. Yet in both cases the construct of the curse or the excommunication exists far beyond the person of the bishop. In both cases it exists within a text. The memory of the archbishops lends authority to those that control their words. Clearly therefore operate most effectively as threats rather than acts of power.

Writing about the primacy issues with regard to Thomas II's consecration by Anselm, William of Malmesbury notes that the bishops were not keen to disobey Anselm's demands and consecrate Thomas II without him having made profession of obedience to Canterbury. In the chapter (120) that deals with this William uses the terms power and authority in specific contexts. A letter conveying Anselm's ban was read and the bishops wanted to accept it although the count of Meulan 'had endeavoured to represent acceptance of it as evincing contempt for the power of the king (*regalis potentie*).'[100] Henry I also chose to support Anselm claiming that there was a 'firm basis for the authority of the church of Canterbury (*auctoritas Cantuariensis aeccleiae*).'[101] Finally William claims that 'Thomas yielded, not to reason but to naked power (*cessit ille non rationi sed potentiae*)'.[102] In the next chapter, William describes how, because Anselm had died, the 'whole dispute was settled by the king's authority (*sedata ergo omni per potestatem regis controuersia*)'[103]

This same theme is reinforce in the *LDE* where the author is at pains to describe William of St Calais' contact with the church at Durham.

> When he was present he took pains to do this by word of mouth, when absent by sending frequent letters of pious admonition which are preserved in this church in memory of him (*Hoc presens uerbo, hoc absens missis sepius ad eos litteris agree curabat. Hanc illius diligentiam, hoc stadium testantur etiam ille que in illius memoriam seruantur in hac ecclesia sacre admonitionis littere*), and which he

[100] *GP*, iii.120.1.
[101] *GP*, iii.120.2.
[102] *GP*, iii.120.3.
[103] *GP*, iii.121.1.

> sent to them when he was prevented by the king's affairs from coming himself.[104]

The author of the *LDE* then includes a letter in this narrative in which the bishop advises the monks on correct behaviour, noting, 'Because I am not able to say to you what I should were I present, read out this letter once a week in the chapter, so that you may adhere more firmly to these precepts, and in listening to me speaking in this letter you may commend yourself to God more diligently. (*Et quia presens uobis que deberem dicere non ualeo, litteras istas unaquaque septimana semel in capitulo recitate, ut et hec firmius teneatis, et me in his litteris loquentem audiendo, Deo diligentius commendetis.*)'[105] These types of contact are part of a broader programme of episcopal power using written language.

This chapter concerns the use of excommunication as a particular tool in the operation of episcopal power relations based on the use of language. Yet as the evidence indicates the power of excommunication lay not in the formal process but in the ability of a bishop to make himself heard. It is for this reason that the narratives from the period of the Anarchy frequently criticise bishops who were silent in the face of violence. Historians should not interpret this as a weakness of the ecclesiastical sanction of excommunication but rather as a contemporary commentary about the importance of language and communication in the construction of power. In the mid-twelfth century John of Salisbury wrote in his work, *Metalogicon*, that, '[f]undamentally letters are shapes indicating voices. Hence they represent things which they bring to mind through the windows of the eyes. Frequently they speak voicelessly the utterances of the absent.'[106] Evidence from before 1150 indicates that bishops

---

[104] *LDE*, iv.5.
[105] *LDE*, iv.6.
[106] *Littere autem, id est figure, primo vocum indices sunt; deinde rerum, quas anime per oculorum fenestras opponunt, et frequenter absentium dicta sine voce loquuentur*. Cited in M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record, 1066-1307* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1993), p. 253.

did not adhere strictly to the technical terminology of excommunication. Neither did they seek to develop a formal system of rules of practice. Their principal concern was to make themselves heard and in order to do this they combined oral and written traditions in inventive ways. Thus Bishop Herbert was able to formulate a specific proclamation of excommunication against unnamed transgressors which could be delivered by a variety of different means. The arrangement of the words was not as important as the process by which they were delivered. However, during the reign of King Stephen the language of excommunication became increasingly elaborate in order to reflect the limited transmission of such documents in a violent and uncertain political environment. This speaks to broader questions about the validity of the grand narrative of bureaucratisation. It also indicates that bishops were becoming more aware of their own role in the act of power at the level of performance.

Part Two

Et verbum caro factum est

To some degree the 'body' has always been significant in the historiography of medieval power. Over half a century ago Ernst H. Kantorowicz produced his seminal work, *The King's Two Bodies*, which investigated medieval political theology as 'an abstract physiological fiction': the natural body and the body politic. According to Kantorowicz the 'man-made irreality' of the king's two bodies sought to bring into agreement the personal and the official concepts of government.[1] In this way Kantorowicz clearly understood his work as part of a tradition of constitutional history stretching back to Maitland, addressing fundamental questions about the development of legal and rational power.[2] Yet it was the work of anthropologists like Mary Douglas, dating back to the mid 1960s, that provided the theoretical foundation for more recent investigations of the historical body. Douglas wrote about two bodies: the physical and the social. She described a continual exchange of meanings between two kinds of bodily experience which made the body an agent of power.[3] Since the 1980s this anthropological approach, which recognises the body as a 'culturally processed idea' has been highly influential in historical studies, both medieval and otherwise, investigating the represented body within a specific cultural and political

[1] E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (New Jersey, 1957), p. 4.
[2] E. H. Kantorowicz quotes liberally from Maitland in his introduction, noting in particular Maitland's criticisms and ridicule of the notion of the two-bodied king. Cf. F. W. Maitland, 'The Crown as Corporation', *Maitland: Selected Essays*, eds. H. D. Hazeltine, G. Lapsley and P. H. Winfield (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 104-127.
[3] M. Douglas, *Natural Symbols* (2nd ed. Abingdon, 2007), p. 72. In an earlier work, first published in 1966, Douglas analysed a number of texts concerned with bodily purity and concluded that it was possible to discover specific (and historically limited) expressions of social relations and the distribution of power which operated beyond individual psychological explanations. M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger* (Reprint, Abingdon, 2002), esp. pp. 149-50.

context.[4] When writing about the body, historians confront several areas of thought: the body as a social construction rather than an essential object and the body as a site of power or as the site for the operation of power.

The theorist who has done most to connect the body with the operation of power has been Michel Foucault, who commented in an interview in 1975 that, 'nothing is more material, physical, corporal than the exercise of power.'[5] Historians wishing to unlock the 'hidden' histories of marginalised groups, notably women and gay men, have used Foucauldian notions of power to produce a radical reassessment of the historical body. Yet it was feminist scholars who took this one stage further; by denying a common bodily essence or nature, they sought to seize control of the descriptions which others had imposed upon them. In this regard the work of Judith Butler has been particularly influential. Butler's work seeks to explain how the categories by which we live are created by us as we live them. This type of work has moved on from a discussion of the body as 'discovered' or 'constructed', preferring instead to see the body as 'performative': becoming by performing. According to Butler, the materiality of sex is constructed through *ritualised repetition of norms* that

---

[4] For example, Stephen Greenblatt, who described 'self-fashioning' a Renaissance version of 'the cultural system of meanings that creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment.' S. Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago, 1980), pp. 3-4. Although not specifically concerned with the physical body, Greenblatt and the New Historicists used anthropology, particularly the work of Douglas, Clifford Geertz, Jean Duvignaud and Victor Turner, among others, to examine constructed identities within the context of Renaissance culture. Other notable titles concerned with medieval, and early-modern, bodies include, P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, 1988); C. W. Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the religious significance of food to medieval women* (London, 1987); *Framing Medieval Bodies*, eds. Kay and M. Rubin (Manchester, 1994); L. Roper, *Oedipus and Devil: witchcraft, sexuality, and religion* (London, 1994).

[5] M. Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. C. Gordon (New York, 1980), pp. 57-8. Foucault's interest lay in the modern period. For him the eighteenth century marked a watershed in the operation of power concerning the body; when it became routinised control. Prior to what he described as the 'classical period', the body was the site for the demonstration of power, where 'the King's body wasn't a metaphor, but a political reality. Its physical presence was necessary for the functioning of the monarchy.' *Ibid*, p. 55.

regulate the body.[6] Gender performativity showed that the essence of gender difference was manufactured or constructed, 'it showed that what we take to be an "internal" feature of ourselves is one that we anticipate and produce through certain bodily acts, at an extreme, an hallucinatory effect of naturalised gestures.'[7] At the core of this theory is the rejection of domination based on sexual difference. However it is also asserted that *power* is reliant on performance; it does not exist apart from the various acts which constitute its reality. 'Performativity' is a flexible notion; it demonstrates that power relations are neither natural nor self-explanatory. Butler writes that, 'acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed are *performative* in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are *fabrications* manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means.'[8]

The following two chapters demonstrate the ways in which bishops expressed, reinforced and met challenges to their leadership at the level of the body. Performance, by which I mean repeated acts, is central to the public affirmation of power; it is not just a symbol of power but an act. These chapters also offer a challenge to the traditional secular-religious dichotomy which influences so much discussion of bishops. In the 1930s Sarell Everett Gleason provided a classic description of Odo, bishop of Bayeux writing that, 'as both bishop and earl, [he] is indeed almost too perfect an illustration of the *dual status and character* [my italics] of many of the higher ecclesiastics of the middle ages.'[9] Historians today are more likely to downplay the 'dual status' of bishops by emphasising the multiple

[6] In this sense Butler was deeply influenced by Foucault's notion of the disciplined body, which through examinations, was exposed to a 'constantly repeated ritual of power.' M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (London, 1991), p. 186.
[7] J. Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London, 1990), p. xv.
[8] *Ibid*, p. 173.
[9] S. E. Gleason, *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: the bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936).

contradictions of their office, as Thomas Head has put it, '[t]o be a bishop was to engage in not just one, but in a number of delicate balancing acts.'[10] The role of the bishops is no longer carved in two, religious leader and feudal landlord, but dissected into many parts. This multiple division of the episcopal role has *not* been reflected in an assessment of the basis for episcopal power. It is still usual to refer to religious and monastic bishops in opposition to secular and curial bishops. The norms or practices (or perhaps the 'script' for performance) for late eleventh- and early twelfth-century English bishops equipped them for action. It offered legitimising strategies which were employed to express and defend their position within the web of power relations. In the words of Pauline Stafford, 'all this provided a basis for action, but it also left, even created, room for agency.'[11]

In the same way a discussion of multiple masculinities for this period tends to subside into a secular-religious dichotomy. Historians hoped that by reading the body as a text (and by denaturalising sexual difference) it would be possible to re-examine systems of cultural domination and give voice to groups who had been marginalised in traditional historical narratives. As a consequence many scholars set out to re-examine familiar periods and reinterpret them in the light of the gendered body. This has been particularly fruitful for the eleventh-century reform period. However contemporary depictions of the *manly bishop* are loaded with contradiction. This needs to be considered in historical context in order to grasp the full range of episcopal power. In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* Michel Foucault warned against marginalising contradictions in order to maintain the appearance of coherence within

[10] T. Head, 'Postscript: The Ambiguous Bishop', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. J. S. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007), p. 250.

[11] P. Stafford, 'Writing Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens' *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 107.

a discourse. In fact, for Foucault, 'contradictions are neither appearances to be overcome, nor secret principles to be uncovered they are objects to be described for themselves, without any attempt being made to discover from what point of view they can be dissipated, or at what level they can be radicalised and effects become causes.'[12] Thus, if we accept that cultural concepts are transmitted through historical (and hagiographical) discourses, it is necessary to analyse the appearance of contradiction in the depictions of episcopal performance. In doing so it is possible to reach a more complete understanding of the power structures which framed and directed that performance.

[12] M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Abingdon, 2002), p. 169.

· Chapter Three ·

Courtiers and Monks: episcopal power in performance

In 1123 William of Corbeil became archbishop of Canterbury. He was the first non-monastic appointment of the Anglo-Norman era. According to William of Malmesbury the rest of the bishops resented the dominance of the Benedictine monks who had held the archbishopric since Lanfranc. Recognising that a secular clerk would be unacceptable to the Christ Church monks, they proposed a compromise candidate, William of Corbeil, prior of the Augustinian community at Chich. It was thought that 'the monks would be outfaced when they saw [William's] piety and would not give themselves airs in the matters of religious observance (*de religione blandirentur*).'[1] However the bishops ultimately regretted their intrigues; William disappointed them by proving to have a thoroughly monastic temperament. In a section that was later removed from the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* William of Malmesbury, with heavy use of satire, described the requirements for contemporary bishops.

> For it is openly said, even in the streets, that he is unsuitable for a bishopric who is unwilling or unable to misemploy worldly display (*pompis abuti seculi*) in the pursuits of the forest, the stimulation of the appetites, the elaboration of his dress, and the rowdiness of his retinue. Little or no account is taken of the winning of souls. And when it is objected that bishops were once looked to for piety and education not ambition and money, people answer: 'Now we have another age, and other manners (*mores*) to suit the age', thus using a slick reply to palliate harsh reality.[2]

---

[1] *Sed ut palliarent ambitum, qui aperte proderetur si secularem ponerent clericum, hunc potissimum eligendum putauerunt, cuis reuerentiae intuitu monachi frontes reuerberti nichil sibi de religione blandirentur. GP,* ii.73.22*β*1. Hugh the Chanter confirms this account of the election, Hugh the Chanter, pp. 184-5.

[2] *Palam enim iam et in triuiis cantatur non esse idoneum episcopatui qui nolit uel nesciat pompis abuti seculi in exercitiis nemorum, in irritamentis gularum, in uestium apparatu, in satellitum strepitu. De animarum lucris cura minor et prorsus nulla. Cumque eis obicitur quondam spectari episcopos solere religione et litteris, non ambitione et nummis, respondent: 'Nunc aliud tempus, alii pro tempore mores', atrocitatem uidelicet rei lenientes facilitate responsi. GP,* ii.73.22*β*2. I am grateful to Professor Nicholas Brooks for his help in clarifying the translation of this passage. For a discussion of William of Malmesbury's use of satire see R. M. Thomson, 'Satire, Irony, and Humour in William of Malmesbury', *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540*, ed. C. J. Mews, C. J. Nederman and R. M. Thomson (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 115-27.

In this passage William of Malmesbury lamented the decline of Benedictine power and influence. For many years the black monks had dominated the episcopate and they had been at the centre of religious practice and reform. Now, in another age (*aliud tempus*), it seemed that they were becoming a marginal voice, challenged, not only by the secular clergy but also by the new religious communities that were multiplying from the early twelfth century onwards. Traditionally historians have used the case of William of Corbeil's appointment to examine the mechanics of episcopal elections.[3] Yet William of Malmesbury's words reveal something much more basic about the nature of episcopal power in early twelfth-century England. He described the importance of secular display and lists those activities which bishops might undertake to demonstrate their power: hunting, feasting, elaborate clothing and a large and noisy household. This description is offered in contrast to another type of performance, the frugal living (*frugalitati*) of William of Corbeil.[4] According to this text, bishops were expected to *perform* in certain ways. Episcopal power was displayed. And, if William of Malmesbury's assessment is to be believed, English bishops at this time made use of two seemingly incompatible models for display: worldly magnificence and ascetic living.

Stephen Jaeger has formulated a model of the courtier bishop, an aristocratic cleric who served as a royal servant before being promoted to the episcopate. This provides an opposing figure to the traditional hagiographical model of the ascetic monk-bishop. Jaeger argues that modern scholarship has neglected the figure of the courtier bishop because there is an assumption that clerics had to be pious churchmen in order to become bishops and a failure to understand the political role of the imperial bishop, 'who was first and foremost an

[3] For a discussion of the intricacies of the election see D. Bethell, 'English black monks and episcopal elections in the 1120s', *EHR*, 84:333 (1969), pp. 673-81. Martin Brett describes the similarities with the debate that preceded the election of Archbishop Ralph in 1114. M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), pp. 73-4. For a contemporary account of this earlier election see, *GP*, i.67.2.

[4] *GP*, ii.73.22*β*.

administrator, statesman, and diplomat.'[5] According to Jaeger's model, the courtier bishop is 'handsome, tall and well proportioned. His character and manners (*mores*) are praised, then his virtues: he is discreet and wise (*discretus et prudens*) farsighted, diligent, and skilled (*prouidus, strenuus, sollertus*), but at the same time humble, meek and gentle, patient and pious (*humilis, mansuetus, aptiens, pius*).'[6] Elsewhere Jaeger has investigated the transition from the eleventh to the twelfth century as a contest between charismatic and intellectual culture, describing how a charismatic culture makes the body (and physical presence) the mediator of cultural values.[7] In contrast Claudia Rapp has described a new typology of power for the bishops of late antiquity. Rejecting the Weberian categories of charismatic versus institutional authority that have traditionally been used to distinguish between the bishop and the holy man, she proposed a new model of spiritual, ascetic and pragmatic authority.[8] Rapp has shown how bishops used ascetic performance to demonstrate their particular suitability for high ecclesiastical office and provide evidence of their spiritual power. Thus, despite its monastic connotations, 'asceticism' in this sense was an outward sign of ecclesiastical rulership, using the body as a site of power. It refers to a distinct physical appearance obtained through an austere lifestyle characterised by abstinence, self-denial and *in extremis* self-inflicted suffering. Rapp writes that,

---

[5] C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century' *Speculum* 58 (1983), p. 293. Although Jaeger's work is based on the *vitae* of German bishops from the Ottonian and Salian periods he is not specifically concerned with distinguishing conditions in Germany, supposing that the ideals of court clergy would have varied little in England and France. See also, C. S. Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilising Trends and the Formation of the Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 19-48.

[6] C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', *Speculum* 58.2 (1983), p. 297.

[7] C. S. Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (Philadelphia, 1994), esp. pp. 12-7.

[8] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (London, 2005), p. 17. Rapp builds on the socio-economic approach of historians such as Peter Brown who has examined the activities of the holy man in late antiquity. P. Brown, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity', *The Journal of Roman* Studies, 61 (1971), pp. 80-101. There is a retrospective article which addresses some of the weaknesses in the original article, in particular Brown's neglect of the spiritual element, P. Brown, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity, 1971-1997', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6:3 (1998), pp. 353-76. Other important contributions include P. Brown*, Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover, N.H., 2002); *The Cult of Saints in Late antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, ed. Howard-Johnson and P. Hayward (Oxford, 1999).

> Monastic literature broadcast the physical appearance of ascetics to the rest of the world and to posterity as incontrovertible evidence of their elevated spiritual status. The ascetic "look" was both outward manifestation and advertisement of personal holiness.[9]

Both Jaeger and Rapp have examined how bishops, and their literary representations, used a specific language of performance focusing on the body in order to demonstrate their suitability for office. They both attempt to subvert the secular-religious dichotomy by identifying a functional model of power for bishops which demonstrates a pragmatic notion of leadership grounded in historical circumstances.

Based on the commentaries of twelfth-century monks like William of Malmesbury, historians of the post-Conquest church have detected a deep divide within the English episcopate between religious, that is to say monastic, and secular or curial bishops.[10] Historians such as Frank Barlow and Robert Bartlett have literally counted monks and clerks in order to illustrate changing patterns in episcopal appointments.[11] This type of statistical analysis is a blunt tool.[12] It presumes that the institutional background of a bishop informs their subsequent actions. Consequently the historiography of the Anglo-Norman church frequently assumes that a monastic-secular division within the clergy underlies and accounts for any broader dispute. Norman Cantor used this divide to explain Anselm's alienation from

[9] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (London, 2005), p. 102.
[10] William of Malmesbury was highly sensitive to the relationship between bishops and monks.
[11] Barlow provides a set of neat statistics to illustrate the decline in the appointment of monks to English bishoprics during the eleventh century. He estimates that at the time of Cnut's death ten of the sixteen bishops were monks, this was reduced to seven from fourteen in 1066, and five from fifteen in 1087. F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154*, (London, 1979), p. 57. Bartlett's statistics cover slightly later period from 1070 until 1224, identifying three groups: monks, royal and ecclesiastical clerks. The reign of each king is used to compare appointment patterns with a clear focus on examining royal control of the institutional church. R. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 396-402. An alternative batch of statistics has been compiled by Everett Crosby who compares the distribution of monastic and secular bishops in relation to the cathedral chapters at the end of each reign from 1066-1154. E. U. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A study of the* Mensa Episcopalis (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 33-8, Table 1.
[12] In his article, 'King Stephen and Bishops', Stephen Marritt noted that 'the statistics look indisputable but calculating political activity and closeness to government on the basis of origins is simplistic'. S. Marritt, 'King Stephen and the Bishops', *ANS*, XXIV (2001), p. 138.

his episcopal colleagues.[13] Martin Brett argued that a 'self-perpetuating oligarchy of men' enjoyed a monopoly of all the bishoprics (excluding Canterbury and Rochester) from the early years of Rufus until 1125. This oligarchy, loosely described as royal chaplains, gained promotion to the episcopate, then promoted their own relations to ecclesiastical positions within their diocese, and then recommended those promoted men to the episcopal bench. Brett claims that the 'effect of this was to eliminate almost every monk from the ranks of the episcopate, and so incidentally, to intensify the mutual suspicions of secular and regular.'[14] Although Brett argues that the composition of the episcopate began to widen after 1125, David Crouch claims that the division between the secular and regular clergy continued to represent the most significant ecclesiastical divide during Stephen's reign.[15] More than this, the division invites a distinction between good and bad bishops.[16] Dichotomies are very often the basis for historical thought on this subject: religious and secular, monk and courtier, charismatic and institutional. This presupposes conflict rather than cooperation and it makes for a simplistic model of episcopal power. However more recently historians have begun to downplay this clerical divide. Mary Frances Giandrea has argued that it was the monastic historians of the twelfth century who perpetuated the view that the late Anglo-Saxon episcopate was divided into two groups: pious monastic bishops and worldly secular ones. She argues that Old English churchmen understood their political duties in pastoral terms and showed very little, if any, discomfort with this apparent contradiction.[17] Attempts to

[13] 'By his vehement partiality to the monks in the two years following his consecration, Anselm must have so antagonised the proud and wealthy curalist bishops that, if for no other reason, they would have been reluctant to accept the reform principles which he was to advocate at Rockingham in 1095'. N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture* (New Jersey, 1958), p. 68.

[14] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), p. 111. Brett's explanation for the widening of the episcopate is vague; he claims it was in response to 'obscure circumstances' incorporating men with more specifically ecclesiastical, rather than royal, background. Cf. D. S. Spear, 'The Norman Clergy and the Secular Clergy', *The Journal of British Studies*, 21:2 (1982), pp. 1-10.

[15] D. Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen 1135-1154* (Harlow, 2000), p. 296.

[16] For an example of this type of analysis see Christelow, 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', *ANS* XXII (1991), pp. 49-69, who describes the 'best' and 'worst' royal appointments.

[17] M. F. Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture in Later Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007), p. 35.

downplay the secular-religious division are hindered by the prevalence of monastic sources. Historians are highly sensitive to the prejudiced opinions of monastic authors seeking to defend their corporate rights against the incursion of 'greedy' curial bishops.

Episcopal power was constructed through performance. This chapter identifies 'roles' or models of normative behaviour which occur in the contemporary literature. It focuses on four sources which nominally reflect a monastic/clerical divide. William of Malmesbury's contribution to historical writing has been well documented.[18] Over the course of just a few months in the mid-1120s William composed the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum* (*GP*), a chronological survey of each English bishopric from the arrival of Augustine in 597.[19] The work contains no preface or dedicatory letter and it may have been originally conceived as part of a complete work with William's other 'secular' history, the *Gesta Regum* (*GR*).[20] Over the course of the next few years William made substantial alterations to the first version of the *GP* apparently seeking to dilute negative or critical comments about individual bishops.[21] Unsurprisingly perhaps, given its subject matter, this text was probably intended for a monastic audience; William shows a particular regard for monks and is highly critical of

---

[18] Specific treatments of William's contribution to historical knowledge include A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), pp. 166-85; B. Smalley, *Historians of the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), p. 90, 92-3; R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing IV: the Sense of the Past', *TRHS*, 5th ser., 23 (1973), p. 255.

[19] It seems likely that the text was originally conceived as part of a complete text. For a discussion of the composition dates see, *GP*, vol. II, xxii.

[20] William's first major work, the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (*GR*) was mostly written during 1124-5, though it was begun before 1118 and finished soon after February 1126. Sometimes considered the first 'general' or 'secular' history of England, William focused on kings, taking as his central theme the development of a single kingdom. According to Thomson, the *GR* and *GP* were originally conceived as a single work, although William later altered his plan, perhaps due to the sheer size and the significant overlap in material. *GP* II, ixx-xxii

[21] It is likely that the revision process was sporadic, although it is impossible to know whether the changes were directed by William himself or motivated by the reaction of his readers. Thomson points out that in at least one case the altered version is so 'absurd that one suspects that William could have only made it under duress'. *GP* II, xxv. The section refers to Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury; the original which accused Ralph of being 'hardly more than a trifler' was altered to read, 'it is an offence against religion to suspect him of anything untoward.' *GP*, 71.2. Some of the chronological surveys end earlier than 1125, suggesting that in some cases William was reluctant to write about living bishops. He kept a partial record of episcopal successions by recording appointments in the margins. The death of Archbishop Thurstan (6 February 1140) is among the last date to be recorded. In addition Antonia Gransden has pointed out that the literary form of both the *GP* and the *GR* made it difficult to add recent news because there was 'no chronological framework in which to fit it.' A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), p. 172.

any perceived threat to monastic independence.[22] Rodney Thomson has commented that, 'William is on the one hand unique and outstanding, on the other representative of the concerns, traditions, virtues and limitations of Benedictine scholarship.'[23] William may have shared information with another monk, Orderic Vitalis, a monk of St Évroul.[24] In 1113 Orderic was ordered by his abbot, Roger of le Sap, to write the ecclesiastical history of Normandy (and post-Conquest England) but it was later extended to include an earlier history from the birth of Christ, and recorded later events until 1141.[25] Again, he was highly sensitive to the position of monks particularly with regard to episcopal power; he bitterly resented William of Corbeil's appointment to Canterbury.[26] Yet Orderic also included material from pagan and mythical sources, which clearly undermines any claim to a typical 'monastic' outlook. He wrote to entertain; however his work was practically unknown outside Évroul.[27] In addition to these two works there is one significant and comparable history, the *Historia Anglorum*, written by a secular cleric, Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon.[28] In 1127 Bishop Alexander of Lincoln commissioned Henry to write an English history, beginning with Bede

[22] William was particularly critical of bishops for their harsh treatment of monks. For some examples, see William's account of the treatment of the monks of Bath by John of Tours, bishop of Bath and Wells, *GP*, ii.90.3*β*; see also Bishop Robert of Chester's attempts to move his see to the monastery at Coventry, *GP*, iv.173. William also claimed that in the immediate post-Conquest period many bishops, led by Walkelin of Winchester, attempted to replace monastic chapters with secular clerks, *GP*, i.44.5, although he reports that Walkelin later cherished them like sons, *GP*, ii.77.2. Eadmer supports this first accusation, *HNA*, p. 18.
[23] R. M. Thomson, *William of Malmesbury* (Rev. ed., Woodbridge, 2003), p. 8.
[24] For a discussion of the links and parallels between these two authors see B. Smalley, *Historians of the Middle Ages* (London, 1974), pp. 86-93.
[25] For an account of the composition process see *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, *Vol., 1, General Introduction* , ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1980), pp. 31-4; A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974), pp. 152-3.
[26] OV, xii.31.
[27] There are just two extant medieval manuscripts of this text. A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974), p. 165.
[28] Henry was born in Cambridgeshire or Huntingdonshire, the son of a clerk called Nicholas, who was a canon of Lincoln cathedral, and later became the first archdeacon of Huntingdon, a position his son would later hold. As a boy he entered the household of Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln (1093-1123), and he went on to serve Robert Bloet's successor, Alexander, nephew to Roger of Salisbury. Specific treatments of Henry of Huntington's contribution to historical writing include A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), pp. 193-200; N. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 11-48.

up until the present day.[29] This first edition was gradually extended over the next three decades to include a narrative of events until 1154 and it seems that Henry intended to extend it even further into the reign of Henry II but was unable to do so. Therefore Henry was writing at various dates between the late 1120s until at least 1154.[30] In the late 1140s Henry restructured his work and added two more books. One was a collection of miracles attributed to English saints. The other was a collection of three 'public' letters, which included a letter, *De contemptu mundi*, addressed to a friend, Walter.[31] This letter contains Henry's personal recollections of life in the episcopal household at Lincoln and for that reason it offers an alternative remembrance of 'worldly' bishops in twelfth-century England.[32] Another important source, probably written by a secular clerk is the *Gesta Stephani*, a contemporary history detailing the reign of Stephen.[33] This text has posed significant problems for historical analysis, particularly concerning the identity of the author, and with respect to several missing passages.[34] Concerning the author, R. H. C. Davis identified Robert of Lewes, bishop of Bath, as the most likely candidate, although this has since been refuted by a number of other scholars.[35] King concludes that the only safe judgement on the text was articulated by

---

[29] For a brief account of Alexander's episcopate see, Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979) 86.

[30] For an account of the various editions and composition dates see N. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 16-18.

[31] Of the other two letters: the first was addressed to King Henry I, concerned the succession of king and emperors across the world; the second was address to Warin, 'a Briton' and gave a brief account of the British kings taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth. The addressee of *De contemptu mundi*, Walter, has been tentatively identified with an archdeacon of Leicester, who was almost certainly dead by the time Henry wrote the letter.

[32] *De contemptu mundi* forms part of a sub-genre of historical writing – *ubi sunt*, moral writings on the vanity of a transitory world – which was particularly popular in the early twelfth century. It has been asserted that this form is intensely personal. N. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), pp. 34-8. For an account of the potential connections between the work of William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis and Henry of Huntingdon see A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), pp. 198-9.

[33] Antonia Gransden concludes that 'it is fairly certain that [the author] was a secular clerk not a monk.' A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397* (London, 1974), p. 189.

[34] For the most recent account of scholarship related to this see E. King 'The *Gesta Stephani*', *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 195-206. King argues convincingly that the missing sections severely limit historical assessment of this text.

[35] R. H. C. Davis, 'The Authorship of the *Gesta Stephani*', *EHR*, 77:303 (1962), pp. 209-32. Antonia Gransden and Frank Barlow have been among the most prominent historians to refute Davis's claim. A. Gransden,

the original seventeenth-century editor, Duchesne, *alius sine nomine historicus... certi contemporaneum ipsius regis et partium eius fautorem*.[36]

Comparing accounts from these four sources it is possible to counter the accusation of monastic partiality towards 'ascetic' models of behaviour. The 'modes' of performance have traditionally been seen as ascetic (monks) and worldly (courtiers) and there is evidence of both models within the texts. Yet they do not operate in opposition or follow strictly institutional lines. To adapt Claudia Rapp's phrase, 'a proper understanding of the role of the bishops can be accomplished only once we rid ourselves of the anachronistic baggage of a supposed monk-clerk dichotomy.'[37] Monastic authors did *not* present a coherent vision of the idealised bishop any more than did secular clerks. In fact these accounts reveal an anxiety about monastic performance in an episcopal setting. This is particularly reflected in the twelfth-century hagiographical literature dealing with monk-bishops.[38] Similarly clerks could be critical of episcopal connections with the royal court when this interfered with their pastoral duties. In fact most accounts of episcopal performance reflect a desire for moderation (*moderatio*). In other words they were alert to criticisms of bishops who strayed too far towards worldly or ascetic display.

These twelfth-century 'histories' may not represent a sociological reality but they describe models of episcopal behaviour and offer some commentary about how contemporaries understood power as it was performed. Indeed Henry of Huntingdon, a man who was acutely sensitive to the relationship between power and performance, wrote,

> So great is the majesty of the world's highest (*cacuminum mundi*), that others never weary of looking at them... Nor is it to be wondered

Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1397 (London, 1974), pp. 188-93; F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), p. 21, n.83.

[36] E. King 'The *Gesta Stephani*', *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 206.

[37] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (London, 2005), p. 6.

[38] For an account of the most important hagiographical sources from this period relation to English bishops see Chapter 4.

> that crowds of women and youths and even grown men of a superficial character should rush to gaze at them. But even the wise and serious minded are driven by a kind of pleasurable deference *to look at those they have seen many times before*.[39]

Henry's claim that spectators return to gaze on those they have seen before, speaks eloquently of the need for a repetitive performance of power. But this is not restricted to the gold and glitter of extreme wealth. Michel Foucault recognised that the sight of a tortured body was a demonstration of power whilst also hinting at the collusion of the spectators.[40] Peter Brown described how, 'the many active gestures of the holy man (recorded by his biographers) made sense as part of a *constantly enacted public ritual of power* that separated him yet further from his fellows… As for his clients, they… *colluded* in creating a gulf between themselves and the holy man [my italics].'[41] Just as the sight of the body draped in purple silks was an exercise in 'performative' power, so too was the body weakened by ascetic practices. Rapp states explicitly that ascetic authority is *visible* and 'depends on recognition by others, as it is made evident in the individual's appearance, lifestyle, and conduct.'[42] These depictions of the bishop's body and performance, once constructed in narrative sources, compel the audience (or reader) to take part in the ritualised repetition of power. Yet the sources are not only the product of the author's vision of idealised episcopal power. They reveal "hidden" voices of discontent. Clerical authors were highly attuned to criticisms of the 'performing' bishop and by emphasising *moderatio* they were reacting to (and reflecting) external criticism. By analysing depictions of the bishop's body it is possible

---

[39] *Horum igitur cacuminum mundi tanta est sublimitas, ut in eos uidendo ceteri non sacientur... Nec mirandum est si ad eos inspiciendos mulierum turba, uel iuuenum turba, uel etiam uiri leuitatis, prosiliunt, sed etiam sapientes et discretione graues ad uidendum sepe uisos, nescio qua gratia mulcente, impelluntur.* HH, pp. 604-5. This passage relates to kings, specifically Henry I; however the general point about public performance is relevant to all powerful men.

[40] Foucault used the horrific descriptions of the tortured body at ceremonies of public execution to examine the role of the spectator, writing that 'An execution could scarcely convey its full terror if undertaken in secret; the people, the spectators, must be made to be afraid, they must be witnesses, guarantors of the punishment and they must, to a certain extent, take part in it.' M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* (London, 1991) pp. 57-8.

[41] P. Brown, 'The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity, 1971-1997', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6:3 (1998), p. 368.

[42] C. Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (London, 2005), p. 17.

to access the concerns expressed by clerical authors about the transmission of meaning through performance. The subtleties and layers of description seem to be responding to multiple critics. In this way the texts demonstrate a variety of extreme performances which exposed bishops to criticisms but which also enabled them to act as bishops and identify themselves as separate and different from other powerful men.

It is an oversimplification to equate ascetic performance with monastic bishops and worldly display with their secular counterparts. This chapter will deemphasize the difference and explore how bishops drew on a complex blend of secular and religious performance, revealing itself in an ever-shifting balance of the two constructs. It will also go some way to address the question of reception: how contemporaries, both authors and audience, understood performance and how bishops, irrespective of their background, made use of different models in the complex web of power relations which they encountered. Far from reflecting a curial and monastic divide the narratives reveal that bishops drawn from both institutional backgrounds modified their performance both deliberately and spontaneously and in doing so they evoked varying responses. Performative power relied upon unlimited modes of behaviour and gestures which could convey a variety of meanings. In this sense it was (and still is) impossible to convey one standard meaning. More than this, contemporaries were highly sensitive to ‘unsuccessful’ modes of episcopal display which exposed bishops to criticism, ultimately damaging their claim to episcopal power.

William of Malmesbury’s description of Archbishop Thomas I of York neatly fits the model of a courtier bishop. Apart from a brief mention of Thomas’ mistake (*errore*) in contesting Canterbury’s claim to the primacy, William was generous with his compliments, reporting that ‘[Thomas] was outstanding for the elegance of his appearance, and everyone wanted to gaze upon him (*elegantia personatus spectabilis, desiderio uidentibus erat*).’ Indeed, as a

young man he was 'vigorous and well proportioned (*uigore et aequalitate membrorum commodus*)'. William continued,

> He brought together clergy of means and education, and built a church from the foundations up... He was comparable to the ancient philosophers in learning, but in no way puffed up. Agreeable in conversation and appearance, he had a sweet character.[43]

This description echoes Jaeger's model of the courtier bishop: a man of good manners and learning. William of Malmesbury reminds his audience of the spectacle of the elegant bishop. In particular he uses the depiction of the bishop's appearance as a young man to suggest an energetic character who is well proportioned (*aequalitate membrorum*), conveying the notion of balance and moderation. William shows no anxiety about Thomas having been appointed by the king (*a Willelmo rege archiepiscopus Eboraco datus est*).[44] It is possible that by using the comparison with 'ancient philosophers' he envisioned Thomas from an earlier time, thus sidestepping any issues over investiture.[45] Significantly the archbishop's status as a royal appointment is highlighted not by William but by Hugh the Chanter, polemicist of York. Recounting the events that led to Thomas' submission to Lanfranc, he described his archbishop as a 'clerk and household servant (*clericus et familiaris*) [who] was afraid to incur the hatred of his lord and king.'[46] The author, frustrated by the archbishop's capitulation, minimises Thomas's culpability by invoking the image of the powerful king. However he also identified the particular conflict of a courtier bishop: divided loyalty. From these descriptions any institutional prejudice stems not from a clash with the monastic vision of episcopal performance but from the York canon, concerned to maintain a narrative of effective metropolitan status for his community. Contemporary clerical authors demonstrate a flexible understanding of episcopal performance in context. William of Malmesbury was

---

[43] *Clerum suffitientem opibus et litteris adunauit: aecclesiam a fundamentis inchoatam consummauit... Philosophis antiquis scientia comparandus, nec elatus. Sermone et uultu comis, moribus dulcis. GP*, iii.116*.2.
[44] *GP*, iii.16*.1.
[45] In the same way Henry of Huntingdon described Thomas as a 'man of abundant genius (*uir ingenii florentis*)' at turn of phrase which he also used to describe Bede. HH, pp. 448-9.
[46] *Timuit domini sui regis clericus suus et familiaris odium incurrere.* Hugh the Chanter, pp. 6-7.

unconcerned by Thomas's institutional background provided it did not infringe upon his own corporate identity. He praises his virtues within the framework of the York cathedral chapter. Hugh the Chanter's jibe is a reminder that criticism of episcopal power (albeit in this case, fairly mild) did not necessarily always follow institutional divisions. In fact often clerical authors demonstrated a high level of tolerance with depictions of worldly episcopal performance. Orderic Vitalis was frequently able to see both sides.[47] In fact he went as far to suggest that although many of the king's chaplains and favourites (*capellani regis et amici*) who obtained bishoprics used their office to oppress the poor and acquire wealth, 'others... were filled with the fear of God on taking up the burden of ecclesiastical authority... and reformed their lives worthily' in accordance with God's will.[48] Contrastingly, Henry of Huntingdon supposed that men of learning might be exposed to new temptations in the episcopal office. He described how Gilbert the Universal, 'most learned in the arts [and] unparalleled and unique in speculative thought', having been appointed to the bishopric of London, 'set about devoting himself to the sin of avarice, acquiring much, giving little.'[49] Thus, episcopal performance is central to any contemporary characterisation and assessment of episcopal power.

When Henry of Huntingdon described his upbringing at the court of Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln, he left a vivid account of a worldly bishop using performance.

> For when throughout my boyhood, and adolescence, and young manhood, I saw the glory of Robert, our bishop – I mean his handsome knights, noble young men, his horses of great price, his golden and gilded vessels, the number of courses, the splendour of those who waited upon him, the purple garments and satins – I

[47] For example Orderic describes Gilbert Maminot, royal chaplain to William the Conqueror, who was appointed Bishop of Lisieux in 1077. He is described as a man of great learning and eloquence, who devoted himself to secular interests (*secularibus exercitiis*) throughout his life, but he was also generous to the poor and merciful in his judgments. OV, ii.311. Cf. Orderic's comments about Odo of Bayeux, OV, iii.266.

[48] *Sic utique capellani regis et amici presulatus Angliae adepti sunt, et non nulli ex ipsis prepposituras ad opprimendos inopes sibque augendas opes nicilominus tenuerunt. Alii uero pro suscepto aecclesiastici regiminis onere diuinitus perterriti sunt... uitasque suas secundum beneplacitam uoluntatem Dei laudabiliter correxerunt.* OV, v.12.

[49] *Artibus erat eruditissimus, theoria singularis et unicus.... Qui magna expectione susceptus cepit auaricie crimini deseruire, multa perquirens, pauca largiens, pauca largiens.* HH, pp. 600-1.

> thought that without doubt nothing could be more blessed. When everyone, and even those who taught in the schools of contempt for the world (*et ipsi qui etiam de mundi contemptu inscolis legebant*), bowed down to him, and he himself, who was looked upon as everyone's father and god (*pater et deus)*, cherished the world with a strong affection.[50]

According to Henry's narrative Robert's power, as father and god, was symbolised by his performance. It was for this reason that others bowed down to him (*ei osequerentur*). This was the source of his power. Yet, Henry remembers, that when he was older, he heard the 'utterly vile insults' directed at Robert, and so he began to place a lower value on the outward markers of power.[51] In fact William of Malmesbury was among Bishop Robert's fiercest critics, writing that '[Robert] never cared a jot if he was suspected, and accused, of every kind of lust... He was second to none in his knowledge of secular business but not so in church matters.'[52] He then states baldly that Robert decorated Lincoln cathedral with valuable ornaments (*ornamentis pretiosissimis*) before describing the disgusting smell which emerged from his disembowelled body.[53] Despite his protestations to the contrary, William's criticisms undoubtedly stemmed from his view of Robert's treatment of monastic communities within his diocese.[54] Yet within the narrative William claims that Robert's worldly preoccupations were symbolic of his unsuitability for episcopal office. In this way

[50] *Cum namquam puerulus, cum adolescens, cum iuuenis, Roberti presulis nostri gloriam conspicerem, scilicet equites decentissimos, adolescentes nobilissimos, equos pretiosissimos, uasa aurea et deaurata, ferculorum numerum, ferentium splendorem, uestes purpureas, et bissinas, nichil nimirum beatius estimare potui. Cum igitur omnes, et ipsi qui etiam de mundi contemptu inscolis legebant, ei osequerentur, et ipse, quasi pater et deus omnium estimatus, mundum ualde diligeret et amplexaretur.* HH, pp. 586-7.

[51] *Vir tamen effectus, narrationem audiui de turpissimis omnio conuiciis ad eum dictis, que si michi, nichil habenti, in tanta audientia dicta fuissent, semimortuum me ducerem. Cepi ergo illam inestimabilem beatitudinem minoris pendere.* HH, pp. 586-7.

[52] *Qui nichil umquam pensi fecerit quo minus omnis libidinis et infamis et reus esset... negotiorum scientia secularium nulli secundus, aecclesiasticorum non ita. GP*, iv.177.6*β*-7.

[53] *GP*, iv.177.7.

[54] William was particularly critical of Robert for his treatment of the monks of Stow, who were moved to Eynsham. He even claims that he was reluctant to record details of visions reported by others which were critical of Robert, 'in case it looks as if I am being too hard on someone who harried monks (*ne monachorum insectatorem premere et urgere uidear*)', and although he *does* record them, this section was later removed from *GP*. Eynsham, along with Selby, were the only two monasteries under episcopal rather than royal control. For a very brief guide to this and the circumstances of the move from Stow to Eynsham see W. Page, 'Houses of Benedictine monks: The abbey of Eynsham', *A History of the County of Oxford: Volume 2*, ed. W. Page (London, 1907), pp. 65-67; D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England* (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1976), pp. 132, 402, 630.

both contemporary accounts clearly position Robert's performance at the centre of his characterisation. William interpreted his performance in terms of the bishop's arrogant disdain for contemporary opinion. Yet Henry of Huntingdon, who lamented the bishop's later misfortunes, believed him to be, 'meek and humble (*mitis et humilis*), building up many and pulling down no one, the father of the fatherless, the delight of his men.'[55] Henry was imparting a message to his readers; in this world even the fortunate might be worn down by misfortunes. Yet his youthful memory of Robert's magnificence left a deep impression on him. Henry conveyed the transitory nature of life by describing the extravagance he had seen with his own eyes and how this had come to nothing. Yet he did not in any way suggest that Bishop Robert's worldly excess was an outward sign of his unsuitability for office *or* the reason for his later misfortunes. According to Henry, the extravagant retinue, the ornaments and the feasting, were all signs that the bishop was blessed. And as he recalls this impression, even within the confines of the *contemptu mundi* narrative, he repeats and reinforces that earlier impression. He is careful to present the bishop as a patron; recalling how the bishop wept when his servants, once dressed in purple garments and satins, were reduced to wearing woollens.[56] William of Malmesbury criticised Robert for being too worldly, yet Henry of Huntingdon, although recounting Robert's ultimate fall from grace, purposely re-enacted the magnificence of Robert's retinue in his narrative. And by including the story of the tears he demonstrated that Robert was a 'good' bishop who wept not for his own loss but for his inability to provide (as a father) for his dependents. Here we can detect links with Jaeger's model of the handsome royal servant, 'who was first and foremost an administrator, statesman, and diplomat.'[57] Henry writes of Robert that 'there was no one more handsome in

[55] *Fuit autem Robertus presul mitis et humilis, multos erigens, nullum deprimens, 'pater orpahnorum', delicie suorum.* HH, pp. 588-9.
[56] HH, pp. 588-9.
[57] C. S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century' *Speculum* 58 (1983), p. 293.

appearance, more serene in mind, or more agreeable in conversation.'[58] He also claims that Robert was 'justiciar of all England, and greatly feared by everyone (*iusticiarius tocius Anglie et ab omnibus summe formidatus fuerat*)'[59] Henry of Huntingdon was keen to associate Robert with other important men, recording that when Robert suffered his final illness he was at a hunting party with the king and Roger of Salisbury (*qui summi erat in regno*).[60] In this way Henry reminds his readers that Robert operated within the highest circles of powerful men. It is not necessary to understand his performance as 'secular', or as specifically related to his role in Henry's government. Quite the opposite: his performance is intrinsically connected to his memorialisation as a bishop. Henry of Huntingdon recalls his experience of episcopal performance for his readers and therefore reinforces the image, even as he (nominally) seeks to devalue it. We might speculate that irrespective of his stated purpose – to show the transient nature of worldly power – Henry of Huntingdon still imagined himself as a boy in awe of the magnificent display of the blessed few. As he states, *even* those who taught contempt for the world bowed down before this performance.

Yet towards the end of his work Henry of Huntingdon offers a critique of the worldly performance cultivated by Robert's successor, Bishop Alexander the 'Magnificent', Henry's patron, who originally commissioned the *Historia Anglorum*. Noting Alexander's death and burial, Henry, presumably now free to write more openly, explained that,

> Wishing to surpass other great men in the bounty of his gifts and in the splendour of his patronage, and finding his own income insufficient for the purpose, [Alexander] would deliberately coax out of his [friends] the means to make up the difference between his present need and his earlier abundance. But he was not able to make up for it, for he continually squandered more and more.[61]

[58] *Quo non erat alter forma uenustior, mente serenior, affatu dulcior.* HH, pp. 416-7.
[59] HH, pp. 585-6.
[60] HH, pp. 588-9. In fact Roger of Salisbury shared Robert's title, *iusticiarius tocius Anglie*, and was described as second only to the king. HH, pp. 470-1. For an account of the title with particular reference to Roger see J. Green, *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge, 1986) 48; E. Kealey, *Roger of Salisbury* (London, 1972), esp. ch.2. Henry also uses the title with reference to Odo, bishop of Bayeux, HH, pp. 408-9.
[61] *Si quidem preterire uolens principes ceteros largitione munerum et splendore procreationum, cum proprii reditus ad hoc sufficere non possent, a suis summon studio carpebat, unde egestatem suam nimietate predicta*

This account reminds us that interpretations of performance were not static. They altered in view of changing historical circumstances. Not only this, but they were frequently contradictory. Elsewhere in the text, Alexander is highly praised; *cuius mens semper benigna, cuius discretio semper equa*.[62] Again this echoes the idealised qualities of Jaeger's courtier bishop. However Henry of Huntingdon is not presenting an idealised image. He is reporting at a much more sophisticated level. There should not be, nor can there be, any expectation of coherent interpretations of episcopal performance even within a single text.

William of Malmesbury wrote in his hagiographical account of the life of Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester, that, 'his life kept so fine a balance (*aequilibrio*) that he held onto both professions without losing either: he was the bishop without abjuring the monk in his religious practice, and the monk while preserving a bishop's authority (*auctoritate representaret episcopum*).'[63] In fact William depicts Wulfstan as a paragon of moderation (*moderatio*).[64] This mode of commentary reflects a typical hagiographical approach to the monk-bishop. However William also claims that others were openly critical of Wulfstan's continued monastic observance, writing that 'some said that such earnest humility was beneath a bishop's dignity (*citra episcopalem dignitatem*).'[65] Eadmer articulated similar criticisms directed at Anselm.

---

comparatam complere posset, nec tamen complere poterat, qui semper magis magisque dispergebat. HH, pp. 750-1.

[62] HH, pp. 748-9.

[63] *Tanto aequilibrio uitam informans ut utramque professionem teneret et neutram amitteret: sic episcopus et religione non abiuraret monachum, sic monachus ut auctoritate representaret episcopum. VW*, i.14.2. Even before he undertook monastic orders, William claimed that Wulfstan was reckoned superior to any monk (*Ita adhuc constitutes in seculo maior quolibet estimabatur monacho*). *GP*, iv.137.2; cf. *VW*, i.2.3. For an account of this hagiographical topos see Wright, 'Alfred burns the cakes: the *Vita prima Sancti Neoti, telesinus*, and Juvenal', *History and Literature in Late Antiquity and the early Medieval West*, ed. Wright (Aldershot, 1995).

[64] His dress, bedding, and shoes were moderate in quality, neither ostentatiously expensive nor self-depreciatingly cheap. He avoided both kinds of pride: there can be display even in mourning garments. But if he tipped in either direction, it was towards the humble: but in such a way that while all pomp was absent there was no lack of grace (*Indumenta eius, lectisternia, calciamenta moderata, nec arrogantis pretii nec abiectae uilitatis. Vitabatur in utroque fastus, quia et in sordibus luctuosis potest esse iactantia; pronius tamen ad id quod esset humile uergebat, ut totum deesset pompae et nichil desideraretur gratiae*). *VW*, iii.1.1.

[65] *Asserentibus quibusdam quod tam dilecta humilitas citra episcopalem dignitatem esset. VW*, iii.14.1.

> He was often blamed, and suffered in his reputation on account of his exaggerated – as it seemed to some people, and myself among them – cultivation of those virtues which were more fitting for a monk of the cloister than for the primate of so great a nation. His high humility, his boundless patience, his too great abstinence, were all in this respect noted, censured and condemned. And above all he was blamed for his lack of judgement in the mildness of his proceedings, for – as most people saw it – there were many on whom he ought to have inflicted ecclesiastical discipline, who took advantage of his mildness to remain in their wickedness as if by his consent.[66]

This passage, taken together with William of Malmesbury's assertions about Wulfstan provides evidence of an institutional anxiety about the performance of monk-bishops.[67] Both narratives are highly conscious of the accusation that ascetic performance, associated with monastic practice, was unsuitable in an episcopal context. This undoubtedly reflected a wider perception that an ascetic temperament undermined ecclesiastical leadership. In part, because this type of performance made full use of the quality of 'studied nonchalance': an uninterested attitude towards the conduct of secular business and administration. This is evident in the *vitae* of a number of monastic bishops.[68] It indicated an inability to operate within the power structures of the time. Henry of Huntingdon used this logic when criticising one of Anselm's successors, William of Corbeil, the regular canon whom William of

[66] *Unde etiam pro ipsarum indiscreta ceu nonnullis et mihi quoque aliquando visum est virtutum custodia sepe reprehensus, et quod monachus claustralis quam primas tantae gentis esse deberet praejudicatus est. Hoc pro excellenti humilitate ejus, hoc pro immensa patientia ejus, hoc pro nimia abstinentia ejus dicebatur, dictum accusabatur, accusatum damnabatur. Praecipue tamen in servando mansuetudinem indiscretionis arguebatur, quoniam sicut a pluribus putatum est, multi quos aecclesiastica disciplina corripere debuerat, intellect lenitate ejus in suis pravitatibus quasi licte quiescebant*. *VA*, p. 79.

[67] Eadmer's comments may well reflect the ambivalent feelings of the Christ Church community about Anselm's pontificate, due largely to the memory of the privations experienced at Canterbury during the archbishop's long periods of exile. Eadmer began the 'continuation' to the *HNA* with a stark defence of Anselm's reputation at Canterbury. *HNA*, pp. 217-21.

[68] Eadmer even reports that Anselm fell ill when dealing with secular business causing him to delegate much of his administrative work to the monk Baldwin, *VA*, 80-1. William of Malmesbury reiterates this claim, *GP*, i.65.4-5. For other accounts of what Thomson and Winterbottom, editors of the *VW*, have called 'studied nonchalance' see Eadmer's account of Anselm's conduct during secular pleadings, *VA*, pp. 45-6; William of Malmesbury's account of Anselm sleeping at the council of Rockingham, *GP*, i.49.13; Wulfstan, who was bored by secular affairs, also fell asleep, *GP*, iv.140.3, and *VW*, i.1.4. Eadmer even presents Lanfranc as disinterested by secular matters when describing his confrontation with Odo of Bayeux at Penenden Heath. *HNA*, 18. For an account of the Trial at Penenden Heath see H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 109-15.

Malmesbury had praised for his frugal living (*frugalitati*).[69] According to Henry, the archbishop summoned a legatine council where he and the bishops showed a lack of foresight, by granting the king jurisdiction over the matter of priests' wives. The king deceived the bishops 'through Archbishop William's simplicity (*simplicitate Willelmi archiepiscopi*).'[70] Yet Henry of Huntingdon was also highly critical of Henry, bishop of Winchester, whom he described as 'a new kind of monster, composed part pure and part corrupt... part monk and part knight.'[71] In this case, he was critical of the bishop's irreconcilable persona, rather than simply criticising monastic performance undertaken by bishops. In the same way Hugh the Chanter, the York polemicist, claimed that Archbishop Lanfranc was 'more eager for glory and honour than befitted a monk (*plus quam decebat monacum glorie et dignitatis appetens*).'[72] The York writer drew attention to the incongruity between Lanfranc the monk and his performance as depicted in the York text. This says much more about the flexibility of contemporary interpretations of episcopal performance than about the (simplistic) construction of literary ideals concerning the behaviour of monastic bishops.

William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon offered two radically different interpretations of Robert Bloet's performance, which broadly follow historian's expectations of institutional prejudice between the regular and secular clergy. Yet authors frequently expressed apparently contradictory opinions about episcopal performance. The circumstances

---

[69] See above.

[70] HH, pp. 484-5. In the summary of the bishops contained in *De contemptu mundi*, Henry wrote of William, 'whose praises cannot be spoken because there are none (*cuius laudes dici nequeunt, quia non sunt*).' HH, pp. 608-9. For an account of the significance of William as legate see N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1958), pp. 313; F. Barlow, 'Corbeil, William de (*d.* 1136)', *ODNB,* [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6284, accessed 30 Aug 2010].

[71] *Nunc autem sedet in loco illorum Henricus, nepos regis Henrici, qui futurus est nouum quoddam monstrum ex integro et corrupto compositum, scilicet monachus et miles*. HH, pp. 610-11. Diana Greenway notes that his comment is present in all versions of the text and was therefore written before Bishop Henry's brother, Stephen became king and certainly before the outbreak of the civil wars. She speculates that the suggestion that the bishop resembled a knight may have been intended to reflect his worldliness and social status. Henry was the grandson of William the Conqueror and the son of the count of Blois. F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), pp. 87-8.

[72] Hugh the Chanter, 4-7. In a section that was later removed from the *GP* William of Malmesbury noted that Lanfranc had been accused of corruption. *GP*, i.42.6*β*3-4.

by which Wulfstan, a monk, was raised to the episcopate are described by William of Malmesbury in the *GP* and in a hagiographical account of the bishop's life.[73] In the more detailed version contained within the hagiographical account, William of Malmesbury describes how the future bishop was charged with the care of two cardinals visiting England from the papal court.[74] Wulfstan provided well for his guests whilst maintaining his own austere regime of fasting and nightly vigils, evidently impressing the cardinals who subsequently recommended him for the lately vacant bishopric at Worcester. In this literary setting William of Malmesbury records Wulfstan's asceticism in detail.

> Wulfstan meanwhile did not forget to press on with his customary prayers and fasting, and stuck rigidly to his principles (*propositum pertinaciter urgebat*), staying awake for whole nights to sing psalms, frequently genuflecting, and making utter mock of the claims of sleep. Three days a week he abstained from all food, continuing his fast for twenty-four hours, while during the day he curbed his tongue to complete silence, for fear he should make a slip even in a single word. On the other three weekdays he supported life on leek or cabbage, cooked or boiled, together with coarse bread. On Sundays, to mark the festival, he would relax his frugal diet so far as to take fish and wine, rather to keep body and soul together than to pander to his appetites (*frugalitatis parsimoniam soluebat, magis ut contineret naturam quam deliniret gulam*). Further, he every day lavished affectionate attention on three poor persons, following our Lord's command by giving them their daily bread and washing their feet.[75]

The narrative explicitly connects Wulfstan's strict observance with his appointment to the episcopate.

> All this caused the cardinals to admire his way of life (*Haec cardinalibus fuerunt incitamento ut eius mirarentur uitam*) and to praise his teaching, which he made more worthy of respect by practicing what he preached... Well worthy of a bishopric, they said,

[73] See Chapter 4 for an account of the hagiographical text.

[74] The cardinals had accompanied Archbishop Ealdred back to England after he had been granted the pallium for York on condition that he surrendered the bishopric of Worcester that he held in plurality.

[75] *Ipse interea, et solitae orationis instantiam et ciborum inediam non oblitus, propositum pertinaciter urgebat: totis noctibus psalmicinas protelans excubias, genuacrebro flectens, somno penitus illudens. Tribus in ebdomada diebus omnis cibi abstemius, nocten perinde ac lucem continuabat ieiunio; ipsis etiam diebus, ne ullo saltem laberetur verbo, perpetuo linguam cohibebat silentio. Tribus reliquis porros caulesue coctos uel elixos panis cibaria aditiens uictum transigebat. Dominicis porror propter festi reuerentiam pisce uinoque frugalitatis parsimoniam soluebat, magis ut contineret naturam quam deliniret gulam: singulis preterea diebus tres paupers affectuose colens, quibus Dominici sequax mandati et uictum cotidianum et pedum exhibebat lauacrum. VW*, i.10.4.

> was one who brought the priesthood more cause for veneration than
> he received from it in the way of prestige. [76]

This explanation places emphasis on the cardinals' admiration for Wulfstan's way of life (*eius mirarentur vitam*) and appears to support the view that his ascetic practices led to his advancement. Only later in the *VW* does the author hint at the more complicated circumstances of Wulfstan's promotion, referring to a rival candidate for the bishopric, Æthelwig, abbot of Evesham. Ealdred, the outgoing bishop of Worcester, having been promoted to York and forced by the pope to abandon his hopes of continuing to hold Worcester in plurality, was for a time undecided about which candidate to choose: Æthelwig, the clear-sighted and hardworking man of business (*perspicacem industriam in seculo*), or Wulfstan, the straightforward man of God (*simplicem religionem in Deo*).[77] This depiction offers a clear-cut choice between two types of performance. Wulfstan was ultimately successful, despite Æthelwig's pressure; according to the hagiographical narrative 'the prudent stratagems of man (*humanarum prestigiarum cautelae*) gave way to the providence of God.'[78] In the *GP* Wulfstan's promotion to Worcester was principally orchestrated by his predecessor, Ealdred, although his nomination was supported by the visiting cardinals.[79] In this account, William claims that Ealdred 'chose Wulfstan, doubtless imagining him to be a nobody (*inefficacem scilicet ratus*), and intending to conceal his own plundering behind Wulfstan's simplicity and holiness (*simplicitate et sanctimonia*), and embezzle what he liked from the property of the see.'[80] It is made clear that Wulfstan's ascetic performance, his 'holy

---

[76] *Haec cardinalibus fuerunt incitamento ut eius mirarentur uitam, lauderent doctrinam: quam reuerentiorem fatiebat dum anticiparet exemplo quod predicaret uerbo… eum antistitio dignum qui sacerdotio plus uenerationis adiceret quam ipse per illud dignitatis acciperet. VW*, i.11.1.

[77] *VW*, i.11.4. Immediately prior to this in the narrative it was stated that the cardinals recommended Wulfstan to King Edward and their decision was supported by the two archbishops, Stigand of Canterbury and Ealdred of York, and two earls, Harold Godwinson and Ælfgar, Earl of Mercia. This certainly (perhaps deliberately) muddies the water when trying to establish who was responsible for Wulfstan's promotion.

[78] *VW*, i.11.4.

[79] William suggests the cardinals, having agreed to Ealdred's choice, put Wulfstan through a rigorous test (*examinatus*), perhaps referring to the time they spent in Worcester under Wulfstan's hospitality. *GP*, iv.139.2.

[80] *Wlstanum elegit, inefficacem scilicet ratus, cuius simplicitate et sanctimonia rapinas umbraret suas, rapturus de rebus episcopates quod liberet. GP*, iv.139.1. All this is written against the background of twelve vills that

naivety', singled him out as being suitable for a bishopric, because Ealdred believed he would be easy to manipulate. In this sense, William of Malmesbury acknowledged the view that monastic/ascetic performance was considered by some to be incompatible with the public role of an independent bishop who would be required to act in defence of his diocese and operate effectively against incursions by other powerful men. However it also confirms the view that ascetic performance led to promotion, albeit due to a misreading of Wulfstan's character. Thus two accounts produced two different interpretations: one emphasised sanctity and a positive interpretation of ascetic performance; the other emphasised political pragmatism and a negative interpretation.

William of Malmesbury's narrative shows a high level of sophistication when demonstrating the qualities required of an ideal episcopal candidate. Wulfstan's observance was remarkable for its consistency; in the company of the cardinals, his ecclesiastical superiors, Wulfstan, a relative provincial, 'rigidly sticks to his principles (*propositum pertinaciter urgebat*)'.[81] Thus his asceticism demonstrated his strength (of character).[82] In addition, the meticulous detail provided by the author ensured that the reader was acutely aware that Wulfstan's asceticism was restrained; he regulated his observance, relaxing his frugal diet on Sundays 'to keep body and soul together' (*frugalitatis parsimoniam soluebat, magis ut contineret naturam quam deliniret gulam*).[83] Moderation was vital in ensuring that Wulfstan was able to function as an ecclesiastical leader. As an extension of this point, it is

---

were taken from the Worcester diocese by Ealdred and only returned after Wulfstan was able to prove to Lanfranc in 1070 that they had been taken illegally by York, see, *GP*, iv.143; *VW*, i.13; Hugh the Chanter, pp. 2-3. See also J. M. Cooper, *The Last Four Archbishops of York* (York, 1970), pp.23-9; E. King, 'Ealdred, archbishop of York: the Worcester years', *ANS*, XVIII (1996), pp. 123-37; A. Williams, 'The Cunning of the Dove: Wulfstan and the Politics of Accommodation', *St. Wulfstan and His World*, eds. N. P. Brookes and J. Barrow (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 23-38.

[81] *VW*, i.10.4.

[82] In an earlier account Wulfstan is depicted in a physical confrontation with the devil. William notes that his body was wasted away by fasting (*corpus ieiuniis attenuatum*). Wulfstan wrestled with the monster and eventually drove him out; his wasted body was a symbol of his power. Despite the sometimes inconsistent approach to asceticism within the hagiographical accounts of Anglo-Norman bishops, the disciplined body is frequently used to illustrate strength in the depiction of the saint. *VW*, i.4.2.

[83] *VW*, i.10.4.

also made clear that Wulfstan was a successful host, providing for the dignity of the cardinals, 'omitting nothing that would give them an idea of the lavish liberality and liberal lavishness of the English.'[84] Without the contrast between his own abstinence and his liberal hospitality Wulfstan's asceticism may have gone unrewarded. It is significant that he did not wish to enforce his own strict observance upon others. This hagiographical narrative uses Wulfstan's self-denial (directed at the body) to demonstrate humility, moderation and, by way of contrast, efficient administration. And there are further hints in the *GP* that suggest a highly pragmatic approach to episcopal performance. Wulfstan was abstemious in food and drink, but in his hall (*in aula eius*), following the English custom, there was drinking until all hours after dinner. Of course Wulfstan, as a holy man, was pretending (*simulabat*) to drink but he did not discourage others from drinking.[85] Similarly he embraced the Norman custom of supporting a group of knights (*pompam militum*).[86] According to this account Wulfstan was surrounded by the outward markers of worldly power: lavish feasting with a retinue of fighting men. The key to his success was his ability to demonstrate balance, but also his ability to pretend (*simulare*), in other words to perform, as the situation required.

Similarly, Ranulf Flambard was remembered for his great aptitude for display. R. W. Southern described him as the 'most princely bishop in England'.[87] Monastic authors made Ranulf the literary embodiment of an unscrupulous secular bishop. Orderic Vitalis claimed that '[Ranulf] was promoted to a bishop's chair not because of any piety, but through secular power (*non merito religionis sed potentia seculari prouectus est*).'[88] In the first redaction of

---

[84] *Aderat eis humanitas hospitis nichil pretermittentis quo minus Anglorum dapsilem liberalitatem et liberalem dapsilitatem experirentur. VW* i.10.3. Cf. J. Kerr, 'The Open Door: Hospitality and Honour in Twelfth/Early Thirteenth-Century England', *History*, 87:287 (2002), pp. 233-335.

[85] *Cibi et potus... erat abstinens, quanuis in aula eius pro more Anglorum totis post prandium biberetur horis. Cum quibus ipse assidens psalmos ruminabat, ordine tamen suo se bibere simulabat. GP*, iv.139.4-5.

[86] *Nam et consuetudines Normannorum non omittebat, pompam militum secum ducens. GP*, iv.139.5.

[87] Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970) 183-205, at 204. Orderic Vitalis claimed that while Ranulf was in exile from England, he resided in Lisieux, like a prince in the city (*princeps in urbe*). OV, iv.273. For an account of Ranulf's career see J. O. Prestwich, 'The Career of Ranulf Flambard', *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds. D. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 299-310.

[88] OV, iv.107.

the *GP*, William of Malmesbury accused Ranulf of attempting (unsuccessfully) to corrupt the Durham monks by enlisting attractive servant girls, in skin-tight clothes, with their hair loose down their backs, to serve forbidden foods in the refectory. Ranulf would mock those who looked away and accuse those who didn't of hypocrisy.[89] In the narrative William characterises Ranulf in direct opposition to a monastic/ascetic model of episcopal display, but he also describes a man highly conscious of public performance. This is supported by the account of the Durham monastic community who characterised Ranulf as a bishop of noble spirit (*magnanimitas*), which he derived from the power he had enjoyed as procurator of the kingdom (*quam quondam procurator regni contraxerat ex potentia*).[90] This author, writing at Durham, described how the bishop would 'perform'.

> With his immensely loud voice and his threatening looks, he simulated indignation rather than showing it in reality (*magis simulare indignationem quam exhibere*)… His mood was also sometimes capricious, so that neither his anger nor his merriment would last long, but would change easily from one to the other (*ex altero in alterum permutari facilis*).[91]

This clearly gives the impression of a cultivated performance, learned at the royal court. William of Malmesbury claimed in the *GP* that Ranulf was 'a man of uncertain extraction (*ex quo ambiguum genere*).'[92] Other accounts confirm that Ranulf advanced rapidly in the royal household and that his familiarity with the king 'placed him above the powerful men of all England (*Anglie potentes et natu quosque nobiliores illum superferret*).'[93] According to these narratives then, Ranulf cultivated the trappings of nobility during his rise to prominence in order to compensate for his relatively modest background. He then continued to perform in this way after his appointment to the bishopric of Durham. However his behaviour was not necessarily incompatible with episcopal performance. The community at Durham

---

[89] *GP*, iii134.3*β*.
[90] *LDE,* pp. 274-5.
[91] *Uastiori sepius clamore et uultu minaci, magis simulare indignationem quam exhibere… Motus animi quoque interdum leuis, nec diutius iram retinens, nec leticiam, ex altero in alterum permutari facilis. LDE*, pp. 274 -5.
[92] *GP*, iii.134.1.
[93] *LDE*, pp. 268-9; OV, iii.310-2.

remembered him as a relatively successful bishop who defended the rights of the bishopric against outsiders.[94] Even Orderic conceded that '[Ranulf] was resourceful and persuasive, and though cruel and quick-tempered was also generous and affable on many occasions, so that numerous people found him acceptable and likable.'[95] Ranulf's anger was part of the recognisable performance undertaken by all powerful men.[96] Bishops inhabited a world where emotions were used frequently in the culture of power.[97] Yet contemporary authors were highly conscious of the difference between performed anger and genuine loss of control. William of Malmesbury described how Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, was prone to anger in his latter days, although he attributed this principally to his ill health.[98] When, after the coronation of Queen Adeliza Ralph noticed that the king was wearing his crown, he demanded to know who had usurped the rights of Canterbury, and 'was scarcely restrained

---

[94] *Iura libertatis episcopii secundum uires contra extraneos defendebat. LDE,* 274. William of Malmesbury was not so forgiving; he claimed that Ranulf tried to cover his offences by the ornamentation he lavished on the church. *GP*, iii.134.3β2. Ranulf's relationship with the Durham monks is ambigious. Southern reminds his readers that Ranulf's generosity to the Durham monks and apitude for administration did not necessarily make him 'an adequate bishop'. R.W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 202-3.

[95] *Erat enim sollers et facundus, et licet crudelis et iracundus, largus tamen et plerumque iocundus, et ob hoc plerisque gratus et amandus.* OV, iv.108.

[96] There lots of examples from the twelfth century literature of anger being used as a social emotion. There are a number of important studies on this topic. In particular two see G. Althoff, '*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger', *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. Rosenwine (Ithaca, New York, 1988), pp. 59-4 and from the same volume, S. White, 'The Politics of Anger', pp. 127-52. White argues that lordly anger can be understood as a political statement with the accompanying rule and conventions. So too, Althoff argues that royal anger was part of "rulership practice", based on a range of unwritten laws. For a more detailed discussion of the bad-tempered unpredictability of lords as a recurring theme in medieval literature, see M. Toch, 'Asking the Way and Telling the Law: Speech in Medieval Germany', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 16:4 (1986), pp. 667-82. Above, I have deliberately specified men although it is feasible to assume that some powerful women also used anger in this way. In particular for the Anglo-Norman the sources are keen to emphasise Matilda's arrogance and masculinity. Describing her behaviour towards the citizens of London who rejected her demands for money, the author of the *GS* wrote that 'with a grim look, her forehead wrinkled into a frown, every trace of woman's gentleness removed from her face, [she] blazed into unbearable fury'. *Talia his modis ciuibus prosequentibus, illa, torua oculos, crispata in rugam frontem, totam muliebris mansuetudinis euersa faciem, in intolerabilem indignationem exarsit. GS*, pp. 122-3. Cf. Stephen's wife, also Matilda, 'a woman of subtlety and a man's resolution (*astuti pectoris uirilisque constantiae femina*)'. *GS*, pp. 122-3.

[97] This is not to say that medieval emotion was not heartfelt or authentic. However as John Arnold has pointed out, 'emotions need to be analysed in terms of the cultural discourses they inhabit... because, as historians, any claim we make to move 'beyond' such realms is problematic. J. Arnold, 'Inside and Outside the medieval laity: some reflections on the history of emotions', *European religious cultures: essays offered to Christopher Brooke on the occasion of his eightieth birthday*, ed. M. Rubin (London, 2008), pp. 107-129, at p. 111.

[98] *GP*, i.71.1.

from bringing violence to bear on the king's head.'[99] William of Malmesbury goes on to criticise Ralph for being more inclined to laughter and joking than seemed consistent with his dignity or his rank (*risus et iocos inclinatior erat quam uel dignitatis gradus interesse uideretur*).'[100] Yet even Wulfstan the sainted bishop was noted for his temper on occasion, and William of Malmesbury records that, 'people were especially concerned to avoid his being provoked by any fault of theirs into irritation or harsh language.'[101] In this way the author demonstrates that Wulfstan was a good, mild and gentle bishop (*bonus mansuetus et lenis*), 'he did not deal with the wicked by blandishments [but] would castigate their vices and utter menacing words (*minacibus infrendebat uerbis*).'[102] In this case the bishop's anger is controlled but purposeful. By comparing accounts of Ranulf, Ralph and Wulfstan, it is clear that narratives of episcopal anger do not conform to any straightforward model of idealised performance. The depictions are used for a variety of purposes within the narratives: demonstrating on the one hand, deliberate and calculated episcopal agency, but on the other, moments of impromptu and impulsive performance. The consequences (and interpretation) varied dramatically. Yet the notion of cultivated performance, that is to say bishops

[99] *Illo ergo manus ad auferendum diadema componente et rege subligar menti denodante, uix unanimi omnium strepitu et prece uictus iniuriam regio capiti facere detrectauit. GP*, i.71.1*β*4

[100] *GP*, i.71.2. William uses a similar expression relating to John of Tours, bishop of Wells and Bath, who was criticised by William of Malmesbury for his sharp tongue: 'But he had a sharper tongue in replying to those who criticised him than one of his rank should have indulged (*salsioris tamen in obloquentes dicacitatis quam gradus eius interesse deberet*).' *GP*, ii.90.5. For a discussion of William of Malmesbury's use of the verb, *interesse*, with the sense 'to concern, be the job of', see Winterbottom, 'The Language of William of Malmesbury', *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: essays in honour of John O. Ward*, eds. C. J. Mews, C. J. Nederman and R. M. Thomson (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 140-1. In fact William of Malmesbury often describes laughter as a veil to hide other emotions. For example, when describing William II, who was being pressured by his bishops to fill the vacancy at Canterbury, William claims that, 'he veiled his anger with a laugh (*respondit ludibundus, risu iram dissimulans*)'. *GP*, i.48.4. Rufus was widely remembered for his humour. In a later correction to the *GP* William of Malmesbury presents his humour as counterpoint to his unbridled power. 'Indeed it should be seen as a further sign of greatness in the king that, though he could have carried every point by exercising naked power, he preferred to turn some things aside with a jest, resorting to sallies of wit rather than make a decision. (*Nam et hoc in rege magnificum uideri debet, quod qui omnia pro potestate facere posset, magis quaedam ioco eludebat, ad sales multa extra iuditium animi transferens*).' *GP*, i.48.3.

[101] *Nec erat quicquam quod magis caueretur a suis quam ut culpis eorum irritatus uel moueretur animo uel excederet uerbo. VW*, ii.17.1.

[102] *Sane licet esset pontifex bonus mansuetus et lenis, non tamen ad improbos indulgebat blanditiis, sed uitia eorum arguens minacibus infrendebat uerbis*. *VW*, i.16.3.

deliberately following cultural models of behaviour (*simulare*), posed significant problems for clerical authors describing ascetic performance.

William of Malmesbury described the violent circumstances of Anselm's investiture, claiming that as the newly appointed archbishop-elect left the court 'shedding many tears and heavy at heart (*lacrimas ubertim fundens multoque dolore grauis*)... this outward show betrayed his inmost feelings (*tali igitur gestu, internae uoluntatis interprete*)' but it merely roused (*accendit*) the sick king to give orders at once for his proclamation as archbishop.[103] The narrative explicitly links Anselm's tears, which were shed in order to reflect his genuine horror at the thought of promotion, with the king's decision to appoint him to Canterbury. This speaks to a strong hagiographical tradition of episcopal reluctance.[104] However it also distinguishes between outward gestures (*gestu*) and internal desires (*internae uoluntatis*), thereby explicitly rejecting any notion of a deliberately cultivated performance. Anselm's ascetic behaviour is presented in the narrative as heartfelt. In the hagiographical account of the life of Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, the author records how the bishop obtained his office not by money but by tears.

> Some become bishops by making a false show of holiness (*simulationem sub uelamine religionis nonnunquam minus caute ostendendo*); this man was made bishop by the shedding of many and heartfelt tears (*ex corde profundendo*). He considered it a cause for tears because it was clear to him the he had been made a bishop by showing some semblance of sanctity. 'Woe to me a sinner', he would say, 'Just as some purchase a bishopric by the payment of money, so I by an unwise display of holiness.' [105]

[103] *GP*, i.48.16.

[104] The notion of episcopal reluctance dates back to the early hagiographical accounts of holy bishops, including, Martin of Tours, Ambrose and Augustine of Hippo, but most notably Gregory the Great, who was, incidentally, the first Benedictine to hold the bishopric of Rome. See, *The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an anonymous monk of Whitby*, ed. and trans. B. Colgrave (Lawrence, 1968), pp. 85-7. For an account of 'episcopal reluctance' in the context of post-Conquest Canterbury see M. Ruud, "Unworthy Servants": The Rhetoric of Resignation at Canterbury, 1070-1170', *The Journal of Religious History*, 22:1 (1998), pp. 1-13; and her earlier article, 'Episcopal Reluctance: Lanfranc's Resignation Reconsidered', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 19:2 (1987), pp. 163-175.

[105] *O episcopum dignum, non pecuniis sed lacrimis episcopatum adeptum! Fiunt epicopi quidam simulationem sub uelamine religionis nonnunquam minus caute ostendendo; factus est iste episcopus lacrimas multas ex corde profundendo. Hoc tamen ipsum materiam lacrimarum sibi ipsi proponebat, quod uidelicet quandam religionis speciem ostentando factus episcopus fuerat. 'Vae,' inquiens, 'michi peccaotri, quia sicut quidam*

Gundulf lamented his misfortune at becoming a bishop believing it to be a result of his unwise display (*cauta ostentatio*) of sanctity. These words, put into the mouth of the bishop by the author of the *vita*, suggest that Gundulf's promotion to the episcopate was the direct result of his performance. Like William of Malmesbury the author is concerned to demonstrate Gundulf's depth of feeling. There must be no suggestion of false display, although the author claimed that other, unnamed bishops were guilty of this. Throughout the *vita* Gundulf's tears are placed within the context of performance. When he preached, he was often unable to speak through his tears, and the people would weep and lament as they listened.[106] Sat on his throne (*in sedili suo sedens*) he wept during mass at the thought of God's love.[107] Such public displays were followed by private devotions, when the bishop would search out some 'secluded place specially reserved for his private devotions (*locum petebat secretum… orationibus suis specialiter deputatum*).'[108] Gundulf's tearful displays were integral to his performance as a bishop, at least within the text. Yet the author was highly attuned to the accusation of false performance and he weaved this into his narrative in such a way as to demonstrate Gundulf's sincere feelings but also to show awareness that others might perform in a calculated act for power. For the purposes of this study, Gundulf's sincerity is inconsequential; it is the performance that is, and was, important in the construction of episcopal power.[109] Yet the author reminds us that bishops, and their

episcopatum emunt pecuniarum distractione, sic et ego sanctitatis cuiusdam minus cauta ostentatione. *VG*, 33:60-69.

[106] *Aliquando interumpentibus lacrimis loqui et ipse non poterat, nec populus quicquam aliud quam flere uel gemere illum attendens poterat. VG*, 33:44-46.

[107] *Ipse uero interim in sedili suo sedens et dulcedini cantus intendens, totus in lacrimas suauitatis Dei soluebatur. VG*, 21:14-16.

[108] *VG*, 21:20-22.

[109] Marylou Ruud has argued that historians need to look beyond the hagiographical overtone of the *VG*, which clearly depicts Gundulf as an active bishop in the world. M. Ruud, 'Monks in the World: The case of Gundulf of Rochester', *ANS*, XI (1988), pp. 245-60. Cf. R. W. Southern's review of Sally Vaughn's depiction of Anselm, as a politician, which sparked intense debate. R. W. Southern and S. N. Vaughn, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An Examination of the Foundations', 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 20: 2 (1988), pp. 181-220. See also S. N. Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: the Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987). It was inconceivable to Southern that Anselm deliberately sought the archbishopric by acting out the topos of episcopal reluctance

biographers, had to negotiate power with the audience (and spectator). There are occasional hints contained within these narratives that suggest that not everyone was prepared to collude in the performance of ascetic power. This explains some of the anxiety in clerical depictions of monastic/ascetic performance in an episcopal setting.

Following his reconciliation with King Henry, Archbishop Anselm was forced to delay his return to England after he became ill at Jumièges; and so his companions took him to his former monastery at Bec. According to Eadmer the archbishop had refused food until eventually he requested some partridge and after eating it he began to recover.[110] His illness had been considered so severe that many bishops and abbots had gathered together at Bec expecting a funeral. Eadmer records that one man from among the retinue of Ralph, abbot of Séez (and later archbishop of Canterbury), began to belittle (*detrahere*) Anselm, loudly proclaiming that he deserved no sympathy. He claimed that Anselm could easily have recovered his health with food and drink, if he had wanted to and if he had swallowed his pride (*si remota iactantia uellet*).[111] Hagiographers often record accounts of sceptics being proved wrong. Often, as in this case, the doubter is punished by God.[112] This was one way of establishing the sanctity of their subject. However Eadmer's account reveals something else about how overt representations of self-denial undertaken by a bishop might sometimes have been viewed by a contemporary audience. This chimes with Eadmer's earlier assertion that

---

and cultivating friendships as political support and then, finally ensuring his reputation by editing his own letter collection in order to present an idealised version of himself for posterity. Despite Vaughn's conciliatory protestations, such behaviour was, and remains, largely incompatible with Southern's view of Anselm. The strength of his feeling is clear when he writes of Vaughn, 'it is astonishing that she can continue to treat with respect a character to whom she so readily attributes the worst kinds of pious frauds.' R. W. Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm', p. 189. Likewise, Christopher Harper-Bill, seemingly in defence of Anselm's integrity, commented that, '[Vaughn's view of] the philosopher-saint as a politician is unfortunate, since the concept of ecclesiastical politics in the late eleventh century is anachronistic.' C. Harper-Bill, *The Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor, 1992), p. 29. The passions this excited was undoubtedly due to the fierce regard for the person of Anselm, whose sanctity further complicates matters. However this is also a demonstration of how far the religious-secular dichotomy divides scholarly thought, irrespective of the view of Anselm one favours.

[110] *VA*, pp. 135-6.

[111] *VA*, pp. 136-7. It is interesting that Eadmer chooses not to recount the same story about the partridge in the *HNA* where he only briefly mentions Anselm's illness, noting that, 'contrary to all expectations, almighty God of His goodness restored him to health and thereby brought a great joy to many.' *HNA*, pp. 182. Clearly Eadmer felt that such a story was inappropriate in an account of the political life of the archbishop.

[112] The man was thrown from his horse and dragged along.

Anselm's reputation sometimes suffered on account of his exaggerated cultivation of those virtues which were more fitting for a monk of the cloister than for the primate.[113] It was precisely this concern which Gundulf's hagiographer articulated. Even William of Malmesbury, whose portrayal of Wulfstan depicted the bishop pretending (*simulare*) to engage in worldly activities, wrote that, 'his good qualities were no pretence at holiness (*simulatae sanctitatis*); and if he had any failing it was not craft or deceit (*callidae fraudulentiae*).'[114] Depicting episcopal performance was a subtle skill. Monastic audiences were highly attuned to the outward signs of ascetic display. Hagiographers frequently describe the jealous criticisms levelled at saintly monks who outshone their brethren in religious observance.[115] Yet clearly there were others outside the cloister who offered varying interpretations of ascetic performance; some even viewing it as a deliberate and contrived act. William of Malmesbury reported an exchange between Wulfstan and Geoffrey, bishop of Coutances, who gently reprimanded him for his modest choice of dress. William had previously recorded Wulfstan's preferences.

> His dress, bedding, and shoes were moderate in quality (*moderata*), neither ostentatiously expensive nor self-deprecatingly cheap. He avoided both kinds of pride: there can be display even in mourning garments. But if he tipped in either direction, it was towards the humble: but in such a way that while all pomp was absent there was no lack of grace... So he shrank from showing off; despite the wealth at his disposal, he would only wear lambskins.[116]

Geoffrey asked why Wulfstan wore lambskin when he could have had sable, beaver or fox, causing the bishop to reply that Geoffrey and other men more versed in the way of the world (*et homines prudentiae secularis gnaros*) should wear the skins of crafty animals, but he was

---

[113] *Unde etiam pro ipsarum indiscreta ceu nonnullis et mihi quoque aliquando visum est virtutum custodia sepe reprehensus, et quod monachus claustralis quam primas tantae gentis esse deberet praejudicatus est. VA*, p. 79.

[114] *Nec enim bonum in eo simulatae sanctitatis, nec si secus quid callidae fraudulentiae fuit*. *GP*, iv.139.2.

[115] For example, William of Malmesbury noted that Wulfstan was criticised by one of the Worcester brethren, when he began preaching, and records the accusation that Wulfstan was 'usurping the duties of the bishop... such behaviour looked more like canvassing for office that the performance of a religious duty.' *VW*, i.8.2.

[116] *Indumenta eius, lectisternia, calciamenta moderata, nec arrogantis pretii nec abiectae uilitatis. Vitabatur in utroque fastus, quia et in sordibus luctuosis potest esse iactantia; pronius tamen ad id quod esset humile uergebat, ut totum deesset pompae et nichil desideraretur gratiae*. *VW*, iii.1.1.

conscious of no shiftiness in himself and was happy with lambskin.[117] Geoffrey then suggested that the bishop might at least wear cat, but Wulfstan replied, 'the Agnus Dei is more often chanted than the Cattus Dei (*sepius cantatur Agnus Dei quam Cattus Dei*)' causing Geoffrey to laugh (*risus excepit*).[118] According to William's narrative Wulfstan was conscious that his clothing set him apart from other more worldly men. William of Malmesbury reports in the *GP* that after his death, Wulfstan bequeathed his lambskin cope to Robert Losinga, bishop of Hereford, as a mark of their friendship.[119] In this way the physical object which characterised Wulfstan's moderate asceticism was passed on to another bishop, just as his literary depiction, reworked by William of Malmesbury, acted as a model for future bishops. But it also suggests that other men were conscious of Wulfstan's display and curious, even critical about it. In fact, the scene described shows both men as relative equals; Wulfstan was unconcerned by Geoffrey's teasing and able to counter his taunts. The key point is that Wulfstan did not show any pride in this display of moderation. William of Malmesbury also recounts how Lanfranc was returned to Duke William's favour after he arrived at court on a lame horse, and caused the duke to laugh.[120] There is a real sense that authors understood that performance had to be pragmatic in order to operate at multiple levels. This is a powerful image. In fact bishops who were unable to modify their performance suffered most in the power structures of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.

In the *GS* the author is very clear about the performance of Roger of Salisbury, who was 'supported by the vast power of his friends and his own magnificent lordship, he was

[117] *Vnde quadam uice, a Gaufrido Constantiensi episcopo benigne reprehensus, facetissimis hominem respersit salibus. Cum enim interrogasset cur agninas pelles haberet qui sabelinas uel castorinas uel uulpinas habere posset et deberet, eleganter repondit eum et homines prudentiae secularis gnaros uersutorum animalium pellibus uti debere, se nullius tergiuersationis conscium pelliculis agninis contentum esse. VW*, iii.1.2.

[118] *VW*, iii.1.2.

[119] *GP*, iv.165.4. For an account of the life and career of Robert Losinga see J. Barrow, 'Robert the Lotharingian (*d.* 1095)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17026, accessed 1 Sept 2010].

[120] *GP*, ii.74.13. Lanfranc, at that time prior at Bec, had fallen into disfavour with William after he ridiculed one of the ducal chaplains, Herfast, later bishop of Elmham and Thetford.

reckoned next to the king in the whole government of England (*immensa… amicorum et spendidissimi dominatus suffultus potentia, secundus post regem in omnibus regi imperiis habetur*).'[121] Such claims were supported by many of his contemporaries. The author specifies that Roger surrounded himself with a large and numerous bodyguard of troops (*copiosa innumerabilium militum stipatus frequentia*), his retinue further swelled by his many friends (*magnam et stupendam amicorum*).[122]

> His nephews too, who bore the titles of bishop of Lincoln and bishop of Ely, men who loved display (*uiri pompatici*) and were rash in their reckless presumption, agreed with this policy (*assentiebantur*), and disregarding the holy and simple manner of life that befits a Christian priest they devoted themselves so utterly to warfare and the vanities of this world.[123]

Waleran, count of Meulan, was said to be 'indignant at this splendid pomp of the bishops (*magnificam episcoporum gloriam*)'.[124] This narrative introduces the episode of the arrest of the bishops, when Roger and his nephews came into conflict with royal power.[125] The author was 'setting the scene' and in doing so he made it clear that the bishops understood and used the symbols of worldly display. They actively chose this type of performance over the simple life of a priest. In doing so, they failed to distinguish themselves from other nobles and exposed themselves to criticism and violence.

William of Malmesbury explains that there were two prevailing views about the arrest of the bishops. Some believed that the bishops had been rightly punished for building castles in defiance of canon law, while others, led by Henry, bishop of Winchester, argued that it was

---

[121] *GS*, pp. 72-3.
[122] *GS*, pp. 72-3.
[123] *Huic autem sententiae et nepotes illius, alter Lincolnensis alter Eliensis dicti episcopi, uiri pompatici temeritatisque non audendae praesumptores, assentiebantur; puramque et simplicem Christianae religionis conuersationem neglectui habentes, militiae prorsus et pompae seculari studium adeo accomodabant. GS*, pp. 72-3. Alexander was bishop of Lincoln from 1123 and Nigel was bishop of Ely from 1133.
[124] *GS*, pp. 72-3. Waleran was among the most prominent barons of the time, along with his brother, Robert, earl of Leicester.
[125] For an account of the immediate consequences of this event see K. Yoshitake, 'The arrest of the bishops in 1139 and its consequences', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14:2 (1988), pp. 97-114. Cf. S. Marritt, 'King Stephen and the Bishops', *ANS*, XXIV (2001), pp. 129-44.

not for the king to judge them, but for the canon law.[126] William of Malmesbury described how Roger of Salisbury responded to his accusers.

> Bishop Roger loudly contradicted Aubrey's statements, saying that he had never been King Stephen's servant or received pay. What is more, he uttered threats, for he was a man of spirit, and one ashamed to be broken by misfortune, saying that if he did not find justice in that council for what had been taken from him he would seek it in the hearing of a higher court.[127]

As the editors of the OMT edition point out, Roger was not denying his importance to Stephen's administration, but responding to the accusation that he was merely a salaried official. The depiction is of a defiant bishop challenging the presumption of the king. The contemporary authors all agree that Roger of Salisbury was incredibly powerful. William of Malmesbury described him as a man 'who knew how to adapt himself to any occasion according as the wheel of fortune turned (*qui se unicuique tempori pro uolubilitate fortunae accommodare nosset*)'.[128] In William of Malmesbury's account of the arrest of the bishops he claims that it was instigated after a violent dispute between the bishop's men and those of Alan, count of Brittany over lodgings during the council at Oxford. In this sense the final rupture was caused by fighting men. It is presented as a dispute between secular powers: a physical battle. The author of the *GS* confirms this report and notes that the bishop had arrived at court 'with the utmost ostentation (*ambitione*).'[129] Stephen however had long desired to break the power of Roger and his nephews, Nigel, bishop of Ely and Alexander, bishop of Lincoln. William claims that while under arrest Roger caused the surrender of his

---

[126] *HN*, ii.24. This is taken from William's contemporary history, the *Historia Novella*. See Chapter 2 for an account of this source. William barely makes reference to Roger in the *GP*, except to note his appointment, consecration and his involvement in the royal marriage ceremony between Henry I and Adeliza in 1121, *GP*, i.57.4*β*; i.63.2; i.71.1*β*1.

[127] *Reclamatum est ab episcopo Rogerio contra sermones Alberici, quod numquam regis Stephani minister fuisset, nec ipsius solidatas accepisset. Minae quinetiam ab animoso uiro, et qui malis erubesceret frangi, prolatae, si iustitiam de rebus sibi ablatis in illo concilio non inueniret, eam in audientia maioris curiae querendam. HN*, ii.28. Aubrey de Vere was Stephen's representative at the ecclesiastical council of 1139, to which the king had been summoned to answer for the arrest of the bishops.

[128] *HN*, i.3. William's view of Roger was undoubtedly influenced by the fact that the latter had tried to gain control over the abbey of Malmesbury which was situated in the diocese of Salisbury.

[129] *GS*, pp. 76-7.

castle at Devizes by imposing on himself a 'voluntary fast (*ulroneum ieiunium*), that by undergoing this suffering he might influence the mind of the bishop of Ely, who had taken possession of the place.'[130] However Henry of Huntingdon, describing the same event, writes that Stephen tortured Roger with starvation (*ieiunii tormento*), and even threatened to hang the bishop's son, Roger le Poer, unless the castle surrendered into royal hands.[131] This account is confirmed by Orderic Vitalis.[132] The author of the *GS* recorded that Bishop Roger and Alexander were both taken to Devizes, where the king ordered that they should be 'lodged dishonourably apart from each other and grievously tormented by insufficient diet (*macerarentur ieiuniis*)'.[133] The Worcester tradition however supports William of Malmesbury's claim that Roger underwent a voluntary fast. According to this account it was in response to the threat to his son that the bishop bound himself by an oath to fast and not to drink until the king gained possession of the castle. The Worcester chronicle claims that Roger neither ate nor drank for three days.[134]

All of the sources agree that Roger went without food. The issue is whether or not he fasted voluntarily or whether he was forced to do so by the king. It is difficult to attribute a direct political motive to presenting the bishop's starvation as forced or voluntary. William of Malmesbury supported Robert of Gloucester and despised Roger of Salisbury for attempting to take over the abbey at Malmesbury. He has no interest, it would seem, in presenting the fast as the voluntary self-denial of a persecuted bishop or to minimise Stephen's fault. In the same way the author of the *GS* if writing according to his political persuasion would be tempted to minimise Stephen's cruelty. Yet, despite his stated disapproval of Roger's worldly

[130] *Ipsae Diuisae post triduum redditae, cum sibi ultroneum ieiunium episcopus indixisset, ut hac angustia sua animositatem episcopi Heliensis, qui eas occupauerat, flecteret. HN*, ii.23.
[131] *Angarians eum igitur ieiunii tormento et filii eius, qui cancellarius fuerat regius, laqueo collum circumnectens, ut suspenderetur, tali modo castellum sibi extorsit.* HH, 720-1. Roger le Poer was Stephen's chancellor.
[132] OV, v.120-1.
[133] *GS*, 78-9. This account also claims that Stephen threatened to hang Roger le Poer.
[134] *Hoc uidens Rogerius, suo metuens filio, iuramento se strinxit, nuquam se manducaturum siue bibiturum, donec predictum rex habeat castellum*. JW, 246-7.

behaviour, he is careful to report the indignities suffered by the bishops at Stephen's command. The most obvious difference between the interpretations offered by contemporaries is the active and passive role of the bishop. The issue is whether the authors attributed agency to the bishop. This reflects the central concern evident in depictions of ascetic performance: a nominally ascetic act might be interpreted in many different ways. Bishop Roger was fasting in an attempt to resolve the situation. The bishop's body was the site (the very centre) of the political action: a visible symbol of power. There are a number of other accounts of starving bishops. In the *GP*, William of Malmesbury described the conditions experienced by Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury, deposed in 1070 and subsequently imprisoned at Winchester by William the Conqueror. From this time onward Stigand endured a slender manner of life (*tenui uictu uitam tolerauit*).[135] William interprets this as evidence of his stubbornness and greed. He conceded that the deposed prelate was given very little but argued that he could have provided for himself and chose not to do so despite the pleas of his friends. King Edward's widow, Edith, urged him to dress and eat less austerely (*ut se delicatius uestiret et pasceret*), however he refused, claiming (falsely, according to William) that he had no funds to support himself.[136] In the same way Æthelwine, bishop of Durham, was accused of rebellion against the king and deported to Westminster in perpetual exile. William writes that

> There, so long as he survived, he lessened the guilt of his past offences by voluntary fasting and abundant tears, and won himself a reputation for sanctity among men. When he died, people who saw him handed down their memories of him to the next generation, and today his tomb does not go without crowds of petitioners with their vows.[137]

[135] *GP*, i.23.7.
[136] *GP*, i.23.8.
[137] *Ibi quantum uixit uoluntaria inedia et lacrimarum affluentia preteritos reatus attenuans et diluens, sanctitatis opinionem apud homines concepit. Denique ab his qui eum uiderunt posteris memoriam tradentibus, hodieque tumulus eius nec uotis nec frequentia petitorum caret. GP*, iii.131. William of Malmesbury's narrative implies that it was Æthelwine's predecessor and brother Æthelric who was imprisoned and Rodney Thomson has followed this narrative. However he also points out that William had reversed the order of the last two episcopates by mistake. The other contemporary sources support the identification of Æthelwine. See below.

A similar account is recorded by the Durham monks who reported that, '[the bishop] refused to eat because of the great anguish he felt in his heart, and he died of hunger and sorrow.'[138] William of Malmesbury interpreted the bishop's tears and fasting in terms of repentance. However he alludes to the fact that others, having seen the bishop, interpreted his outward display as a sign of holiness. Thus it formed the basis for some claims to sanctity and the beginnings of a small cult. No other contemporary source records Æthelwine's reputation for sanctity. If it existed it must surely have been connected to his role as a symbol of Anglo-Saxon resistance, a martyred opponent of the foreign Norman elite.[139] However, according to William's narrative it was his ascetic performance undertaken as a bishop in captivity which initiated any claim to sanctity. The Durham account supports the tradition of starvation. All this suggests that episcopal performance was a topic for contemporary discussion. It provided evidence of a bishop's character, but it also demonstrated at any given moment the extent of their power. It is impossible to know whether Roger or Æthelwine deliberately cultivated a new model of performance in response to their changed circumstances. Henry of Huntingdon wrote that in the same year as his arrest, 'Bishop Roger wasted away, worn out by sorrow as well as age.'[140] He invited his readers to ponder on the sudden reversal of fortune.

[138] *Ubi dum ex nimia cordis anxietate comedere nollet, fame ac dolore moritur. LDE*, iii.17. Significantly, the monks claimed that Æthelwine was imprisoned having stolen treasures from Durham as he tried to escape. It was whilst washing his hands before eating (*manducaturus manus lauaret*) that the bishop allowed a bracelet to slip down from his arm, and exposed him as a thief to those that were present. According to the Worcester chronicle, Æthelwine was imprisoned by King William's men, where, 'after refusing all food (*comedere nollet*) in his anguish, he died of hunger (*fame*) and grief.' JW, p. 17. There are clear verbal echoes in these two accounts.

[139] The *Liber Eliensis* contains an account of Æthelwine's involvement with the rebellion led by Hereward the Wake. The text claims that Æthelwine was taken prisoner by the Normans on his way to Ely, and was imprisoned at Westminster 'where, exceedingly heart-sick, he departed this life (*ubi nimio cordis dolore uita decessit*).' The compiler claims that 'on hearing this' the people of Ely recalled Hereward determined to continue their rebellion. *Elyenses autem hoc audito nimium ingeminiscentes, simul consilio statuentes, Herewardum sibi in auxilium rouocant in ipsius tirocinio ualde subnixi. Liber Eliensis*, II.102. In his notes to the published edition, Blake points out that there was no supporting evidence that Hereward was ever recalled to Ely after the rebels surrendered. He speculates that this passage may have been originally placed earlier in the narrative as a prelude to the siege of Ely. Henry of Huntingdon confirms that Æthelwine was present at the first siege of Ely. HH, pp. 396-7.

[140] *Eodem anno Rogerus predictus episcopus, tam merore quam senio confectus, demarcuit.* HH, pp. 722-3.

> During the whole of his life he was unaffected by adversity, until at the last he was smothered by a great landslide of troubles simultaneously heaped upon him.[141]

Even the modern reader is forced to speculate how men such as Roger, Stigand and Æthelwine responded to their changed circumstances. All we can say is that the narratives frequently associated the weakening of episcopal power by depicting a weakened body. What is more, contemporaries were not bound by rigid notions of performance and in extraordinary circumstances there must have been many different views on the starving body of the bishop. Henry of Huntingdon was also mindful of the treatment of his former patron, Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, still in royal custody after the surrender of Devizes. This man, described at the papal court as 'magnificent', was taken to his episcopal castle at Newark, where, according to Henry's account, 'the king imposed on the bishop an unlawful fast (*ieiunium non legitimum*), swearing an oath that he would be deprived of all food until the castle was surrendered to him'[142] Henry claims that Alexander 'with tears and entreaties (*lacrimis et precibus*)' only just succeeded in persuading his men to surrender the castle.[143] The image of the courtier bishop is completely overturned; as Alexander stood before his men, weeping and starving (fasting), how many may have been reminded of the ascetic bishop?

Significantly, Orderic Vitalis reminds us that not all bishops suffered starvation at the hands of the king. He reports that Ranulf Flambard 'made merry in prison', ordering a fine feast daily which he shared with the guards. And in this way he was able to smuggle in a rope and escape while his captors were drunk. While his guards slept he fastened a rope to a mullion in the middle of a window in the tower and, taking his pastoral staff with him (*et*

---

[141] *Nec aliquibus aduersis in tota uita sua potuit affici, donec tante miserie cumulus simul confluens in extremis eum prefocauit.* HH, pp. 722-3.
[142] *Quo cum uenisset, indixit rex episcop ieiunium non legitimum, astruens fide data eum omni cibo cariturum, donec ei redderetur castellum.* HH, pp. 720-1.
[143] HH, pp. 720-1.

baculum pastoralem secum sumens), slid down the rope to freedom.[144] Starvation was not for everyone.

The religious-secular dichotomy evident in the contemporary accounts is a result of the desire to bring order to the operation of power. Twelfth-century authors depicted episcopal performance in order to describe how bishops *should* operate as powerful men. These depictions express or counter criticisms about episcopal power. Yet there is no evidence of a homogenous ideal of episcopal performative power even within the supposedly limited view of the monastic authors. The emphasis on moderation demonstrates a balanced understanding of power and reflects a basic concern to see that rulers act with restraint. Clerical authors used immoderate performance to explain the diminishment of episcopal power. The texts reflect clerical anxieties about ecclesiastical power and provide evidence of “hidden” voices of criticism from the secular world. Far from confirming a naive religious-secular dichotomy the sources demonstrate flexibility. The authors were not simply producing idealised depictions. The inclusion of contrary interpretations suggests that the authors *expected* a sophisticated and informed response from their audience. Yet the accounts of bishops in action support the view that there was considerable room for ambiguity. This draws attention to the diversity of cultural norms available to bishops, allowing them to operate in the unstable power relations of the period. Episcopal ‘roles’ or the structures they represent do not fit any situation perfectly. If we accept that power is performative, that is to say it exists only in the moment of performance, then it is reasonable to assume that bishops and the men who recorded their lives used ambiguity and conflicting possibilities of interpretation in order to best reflect the reality of power relations in twelfth-century England.

[144] OV, iv.109-10.

Post-Conquest bishops were not operating in a limited or rigid social structure. Their ability to be flexible was vital to their success in negotiating power structures at a variety of levels. The narratives reveal diversity, incoherence, and leave considerable room for manoeuvre which was necessary for any act of power. If the structures, norms, roles and scripts seem simplistic, it is because historians have not treated them with the level of subtlety required to understand the multiple layers and contradictions which accompanied the operation of power in a violent and unstable political environment. Indeed although bishops would not have been able to act outside the structures they gave meaning to their performance and there is evidence that bishops cultivated particular 'acts' in a deliberate manner (even if the reactions they engendered could not be guaranteed). However, individual bishops were the accumulation of roles, which overlapped and combined in different ways and at different moments depending on the circumstances. Episcopal power was full of contradiction and this is reflected in the literary characteristics of the bishops. In order to function, bishops, men of great ability and power, had to adapt quickly to the particular circumstances in which they found themselves. As Orderic Vitalis put it,

> Very often shallow, unlearned men are chosen for high ecclesiastical office, not because of any holiness of life or knowledge of church doctrine or learning in the liberal arts, but by the influence of noble kinsfolk and the help of powerful friends. Yet after their promotion God in his mercy pities and spares them, in time filling them with the riches of divine grace, so that through them the house of God is lit with the brightness of heavenly wisdom and many find a way to salvation through useful activities.[145]

Bishops were not simply a product of their past. Their experience of power altered significantly once they had been appointed to the episcopate. The demands on them changed. However this surely happened on a day to day basis. The notion of episcopal performance

[145] *Plerumque leues et indocti eliguntur ad regimen aecclesiae tenendum, non pro sanctitate uitae uel aecclesiasticorum eruditione dogmatum, liberaliumue peritia litterarum, sed nobilium pro gratia parentum, et potentum fauore amicorum. Quibus ita promotis clemens Deus parcit ac miseretur, eisque postmodum supernae ubertas gratiae infunditur, et coelestis sophyae per eos luce Dei domus illuminatur, et utilibus studiis plures saluantur.* OV, v.12-3.

relied on ambiguity and flexibility. As Gerd Althoff has shown, ritualised action allowed room for innovation. According to this view, 'the actors on medieval political stages did not carry out established rituals in a servile way. They varied, mixed or updated them in keeping with the given situation or even invented new rituals if there was no suitable pre-existing ritual language at their disposal.'[146] The stories contained within the contemporary narratives may not reflect an actual event but they correspond to the 'usual practices of communication.'[147] They were carefully constructed in order to convey authenticity.

There is a tendency to understand 'performance' as the symbol of power rather than the act of power. The clothes bishops wore, the ornaments they possessed, the number of men in their retinue, the activities they undertook, all these are seen as frosting, but they are acts of real power. More importantly, they are the only access we have to performative power in the past.

[146] G. Althoff, 'The Variability of Rituals in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* eds, G. Althoff, J. Fried, P. J. Geary (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 71-87, at p. 73.
[147] *Ibid*, p. 87.

· Chapter Four ·

The bishop as a man: gendered discourses on episcopal power

> In the same year [1102] Archbishop Anselm held a council in London at Michaelmas [29 September], in which he forbade English priests to have wives which had not been prohibited before (*in quo prohibuit uxores sacerdotibus Anglorum antea non prohibitas*). This seemed to some to be the greatest purity (*mundissimum*), but to others there seemed a danger that if they sought a purity beyond their capacity, they might fall into horrible uncleanness, to the utter disgrace of the Christian name.[1]

Archbishop Anselm's first great reforming council met at Westminster in 1102 and was attended by the English episcopate and a number of lay magnates.[2] The council concerned much more than just clerical celibacy, but it was this canon 'which seems to have been the most widely remarked, just as the execution was to be attended by the most serious obstacles.'[3] Analysing Henry of Huntingdon's account, Nancy Partner has argued that the opinions ascribed vaguely to "others", 'reveal the basic emotional protest of the married clergy, which inevitably must sound like a petulant threat: if they are denied marriage, they must descend to something worse, to "disgusting filth."'[4] Indeed there is continued evidence

[1] *Eodem anno ad festum sancti Michaelis, tenuit Anselmus archiepiscopus concilium apud Ludoniam, in quo prohibuit uxores sacerdotibus Anglorum antea non prohibitas. Quod quibusdam mundissimum uisum est quibusdam periculosum, ne dum mundicias uiribus maiores appeterent, inmundicias horribiles ad Christiani nominis summum dedecus inciderent.* HH, pp. 450-1.

[2] The council was attended by both archbishops and all of the English bishops except for Osbern of Exeter who was prevented from attending due to illness. In addition there was Bishop Harvey of Bangor (later translated to Ely) and 'the leading men of the kingdom in order that whatever was decreed by the authority of that council shall be firmly supported by the joint care and solicitude of both the clergy and laity.' *HNA*, p. 141. Anselm had expressed a desire to hold a reforming primatial council since his appointment in1096 but this had proved impossible during the reign of Rufus and it was further delayed under Henry I by the dispute over investitures. Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 272-4, 291-4.

[3] M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), pp. 76-9, at p. 77. There were five canons concerning clerical celibacy (in all ranks down to an including subdeacon) and one prohibiting the sons of priests from inheriting the churches of their fathers. For a full account of the canons see *Councils & Synods*, pp. 668-688; F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), pp. 128-9. The issue of clerical celibacy in England had been addressed during the pontificate of Lanfranc who issued a decree in 1076 which allowed married priests to keep their wives but forbade canons to marry. Brooke notes that, although this may seem 'relatively liberal... we may be tolerably sure that his aim was the practical elimination of clerical marriage by building up the institutions of the celibate clergy'. C. N. L. Brooke, *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford, 1989), p. 82.

[4] N. Partner, *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago, 1977), p. 42. See also, *idem*, 'Henry of Huntingdon: Clerical Celibacy and the Writing of History', *Church History*, 42:4 (1973), pp. 467-75.

of active resistance in the years that followed.[5] R. W. Southern wrote that ‘the council of 1102 was a complete failure... it is clear that on the more important matter of clerical celibacy there was no body of support to justify Anselm’s optimism about a rapid victory.’ He continued, ‘when we remember that at least one bishop, Roger, bishop of Salisbury, was a married man, we can judge the likelihood of support in that diocese.’ [6] In fact there were many more “married” bishops like Roger in England.[7] Anselm’s reforms envisaged the moral reform of the clergy, by distinguishing them from the laity. They were inspired by the papal reforms.[8] However England is often believed to have been especially slow in adopting this new practice.

The late eleventh and early twelfth centuries have been described as a period of gender restructuring, as a ‘crisis of masculinity’, what Jo McNamara has called *Herrenfrage*.[9] This was initiated by the Gregorian reforms which destabilised a patriarchal gender system by reordering the division between the civil and religious powers. According to Megan McLaughlin, ‘[it] seems obvious that many eleventh-century clerics must have struggled to create and maintain their identity as males given the new expectations being imposed on them during this period… they would be expected to eschew those practices (violence, the pursuit

---

[5] The issue continues to appear in Anselm’s correspondence. Anselm, *Letters*, 374, 391. Henry of Huntingdon records the events of the legatine council summoned by William of Corbeil in 1129 when the king deceived the bishops through Archbishop William’s simplicity (*simplicitate*) and gained jurisdiction on the matter of priests’ wives. The king took money from those priests who wished to keep their wives. HH, pp. 484-5. For a general account of the concept of clerical celibacy in the church see H. Parish, *Clerical Celibacy in the West, c.1100-1700* (Farnham, 2010).

[6] Southern, *Portrait*, p. 349.

[7] C. N. L. Brooke, ‘Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050-1200’, *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12:1 (1956), pp. 1-21. In an appendix to the same article Brooke identified ten “married” bishops of the post-Conquest era up until *c.*1150: Samson, bishop of Worcester; Robert Bloet, bishop of Lincoln; Ranulf Flambard, bishop of Durham; Roger, bishop of Salisbury; Richard, bishop of London; Robert Peche, bishop of Chester (Coventry); Geoffrey Rufus, bishop of Durham; Nigel, bishop of Ely, Robert de Sigillo, bishop of London; Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury. Brooke confirms that he has included all those where there is evidence of either wives or children, or both. C. N. L. Brooke, ‘Married Men Among the English Higher Clergy, 1066-1200’, *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12:1 (1956), pp. 187-8.

[8] N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, 1958), p. 163. The abolition of clerical marriage was a slow process. It is not until the first and second Lateran councils (1123) and (1135) that the argument was finally won.

[9] J. McNamara, ‘The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender system, 1050-1150,’ *Medieval Masculinities* ed. C. Lees (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 3-29.

of wealth and – above all – sex) that eleventh-century society defined as "manly".'[10] The papal reform movement has long been considered revolutionary; that the ultimate aim was 'not the *reform* [my italics] of the prevailing system, but rather its abolition and replacement by a new order.'[11] This traditional political reading has been complemented by the work of historians using gender theories to describe clerical attempts to redefine their right to rule as celibate men. The notion of 'hegemonic masculinity' developed by the sociologist R. W. Connell describes the pattern of practice that sanctioned patriarchal power. Although enacted by only a minority of men, it refers to normative behaviour; it 'embodied the currently most honoured way of being a man, it required all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimated the... subordination of women.'[12] Connell accepted that hegemonic masculinities existed within specific historical circumstances and as such were subject to change. This allowed for the possibility of a struggle for hegemony, when one form of masculinity might be replaced by another. Thus, medievalists have made use of gender as a category of analysis to (re)investigate tensions between clerical and secular masculinity in the wake of the eleventh-century reform movement.

Two of the most important contributions have come from Robert Swanson, who described clerical effeminacy and the construction of a 'third gender', and Maureen Miller, who argued that the reformed clergy pursued a policy of extreme masculinity, 'one more radically distanced from female impurity and one more powerful by virtue of its freedom from family entanglements.'[13] Such apparently contradictory accounts of gender construction in response to the Gregorian reforms belie the shared assumptions which underpin their

[10] M. McLaughlin, 'Secular and Spiritual Fatherhood in the Eleventh Century' in *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. J. Murray (New York, 1999), pp. 25-43, at p. 27.
[11] N. Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1958), p. 7.
[12] R. W. Connell and J. W. Messerschmidt, 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society*, 19:6 (2005), pp. 829-59, at p. 832. For the original statement of 'hegemonic masculinity' see R. W. Connell, *Gender and Power: society, the person and sexual politics* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 183-8.
[13] R. N. Swanson, 'Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to Reformation', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe* ed. J. Hadley (London, 1999), pp. 160-77, at p. 161; M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, Vol. 72 (2003), pp. 25-52, at p. 28.

work. Both agree that the clergy sought to provide an alternative to 'secular' notions of masculinity. Their understanding of this rests primarily, although not entirely, on a sexualised reading of the male body and the basis of masculine domination. According to Robert Swanson, 'religious men became extraneous to contemporary gender constructions... [and the] insistence on chastity (as opposed to virginity) meant a denial of sexuality and a rejection of the generative power / reproductive claims of masculinity.'[14] Miller argues that reform legislation betrays a preoccupation with 'the outward markers of lay masculinity – most notably of course, in the canons against clerical marriage and concubinage, the sexual enjoyment and possession of women.'[15] Both historians recognise that this was a contest about what kind of men should exercise authority. According to this view the real focus of the reform movement was not male attempts to assert power over women, but clerical attempts to challenge and undermine the dominance of secular men. Whether the conclusion is 'third gender' or 'extreme masculinity', both historians place sexuality at the heart of their definition of medieval masculinity, and seek to examine the concept once this core principle had been removed. Partaking in (or abstaining from) the sexual act was a profound distinction between competing clerical and lay hegemonic masculinities. As Jacques Le Goff asked, 'what better barrier could have been erected between clergy and laity than that of sexuality?'[16]

Gendered interpretations of the post-reform period have reignited historical debate about the competitive nature of clerical and secular power in the high middle ages. However there are two significant problems associated with this type of study. Firstly it tends towards a reductionist reading of masculinity centred on sexuality, which relies on a very limited notion of what it means to be male. In this case masculine domination is expressed

[14] R. N. Swanson, 'Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to Reformation', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe* ed. J. Hadley (London, 1999), p. 167.
[15] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, Vol. 72 (2003), p. 27.
[16] J. Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. Goldhammer (Chicago, 1988), p. 102.

principally in sexualised terms. McNamara posed the question, 'can one be a man without deploying the most obvious biological attributes of manhood?'[17] Vern Bullough concluded his article, 'On Being Male in the Middle Ages' by claiming that ultimately 'the key to male definition was in his virility.'[18] According to this account, masculinity was defined in terms of sexual performance. Secondly, having identified two competing models of masculine domination associated with clerical and secular power, historical analysis lapses comfortably back into the traditional Church-State dichotomy. This also poses problems for a specific analysis of episcopal leadership; it suggests that churchmen can be categorised by their response to reform.[19] This view is further complicated in the historiography of the English church by the lack of historical consensus about how far and how quickly Gregorian ideas were adopted by the English hierarchy. And it further heightens the perception of a division between the regular and secular clergy who made up the English episcopate.

The clerical construction of an alternative hegemonic masculinity was in response to the perception of an increasing divide between the religious and the secular realm. In other words it was related to a newly developed conception of power. Miller argued that the narratives of holy bishops written in the wake of the eleventh-century reforms presented a clerical attempt to redefine power, authority and ultimately the depiction of reformed clergy as 'men'. By studying eleventh- and twelfth-century redactions of earlier episcopal *vitae*

---

[17] J. McNamara, 'The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender system, 1050-1150,' *Medieval Masculinities* ed. C. Lees (Minneapolis, 1994), p. 5.

[18] It is worth quoting the whole passage here: 'Ultimately, however, the male was defined in terms of sexual performance, measured rather simply as his ability to get an erection. This was essential for the functioning of society. It kept women from becoming hysterical, it led to pregnancy and childbirth, and, in brief, it was how a male was defined, both by himself and by society… the key to the male definition was in his virility.' V. Bullough, 'On Being a Male in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages* ed. C. Lees (Minneapolis, 1994), p. 43.

[19] Studies of continental bishops often define them as 'imperial' or 'Gregorian/reformist'. Cf. J. Ott, '"Both Mary and Martha": Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. J. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 137-60.

Miller identified a new model of the 'manly' bishop.[20] According to this model hagiographers referred to the bishop's *uirtus*, emphasising manly strength, hardness, military prowess and even sexual desire. The bishop was a powerful and independent protector, who accomplished and fulfilled the duties of laymen, who were portrayed as violent despoilers of the church. This overt masculinity presumes complete separation from all things feminine; even contact with women could be poisonous. Miller is conscious that this hagiographical depiction was essentially a 'fiction' designed to reinforce the central tenet of reform: the separation of the church from the world. That is to say, the author was constructing an idealised vision of clerical masculinity in response to particular historical circumstances. Jay Rubenstein has argued that that 'we must take into account the circumstances in which a text was written and the goals which an author had for his story before we seek to interpret the events it purports to describe... The *Life* which they present is a life designed to demonstrate... ideals in action.'[21] In fact Miller concludes that attempts by the clergy to define a new masculinity that preserved their power were ultimately unsuccessful; not least because their depictions contained inconsistencies, most notably in their attitude towards women, which remained unresolved and so, 'a coherent, compelling model of clerical masculinity never congealed.'[22] However as, John Ott has pointed out, narrative accounts do not easily fit the interpretive moulds modern historians have prepared for them, and it is for this reason that they are 'of paramount interest for discerning the ways in which the authors of these texts negotiated

[20] Miller based her conclusions on an analysis of two *vitae* of St Ulrich. Miller argued that there were attempts to define new clerical masculinity using hagiography. From these narratives she identified a new hagiographical type, 'the lone manly bishop who single-handedly brings peace and prosperity to his city', who worked independently of, and in opposition to, laymen. M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003), p. 45.
[21] J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', *Writing Medieval History*, ed. N. Partner (London, 2005), pp. 22-41, at p. 34.
[22] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003), p. 51.

political and ideological borders between frequently antagonistic polities and between complex, often competing, religious and ecclesiastical agendas.'[23]

This chapter will focus on twelfth-century episcopal *vitae* describing the lives of four contemporary bishops: Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester, and Robert Bethune, bishop of Hereford. These men were all regular clerics, who were promoted to the episcopate, and attained (to varying degrees) a posthumous reputation for sanctity. The *Vita Anselmi* (*VA*) was written by Eadmer and has been described as the 'first intimate portrait of a saint in our history.'[24] Eadmer started to record Anselm's words and actions during the archbishop's lifetime. When Anselm discovered this he initially offered some corrections but later changed his mind, withdrew his consent and ordered Eadmer to destroy his work. Eadmer complied with the order but not before he had made a copy.[25] As more manuscripts were produced, Eadmer altered his narrative over the course of about twelve years.[26] Although the author of the *Vita Gundulfi* (*VG*) is anonymous it was almost certainly written sometime between 1114 and 1124 by a Rochester monk who knew Gundulf personally.[27] The *Vita Wulftsani* (*VW*) was composed by William of Malmesbury sometime between 1125 and 1142, using a now lost Old English text, written by Coleman, chaplain to Wulfstan at Worcester.[28] It is difficult to know exactly

---

[23] J. Ott, '"Both Mary and Martha": Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. J. Ott and A. Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 137-60, at p. 141.
[24] *VA*, p. vii. See also Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 422-28. Cf. Michael Staunton's reinterpretation, whilst accepting Southern's characterisation, sought to emphasise the connections with the more established hagiographical tradition. M. Staunton, 'Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*: a reinterpretation', *Journal of Medieval History*, 23:1 (1997), pp. 1-14.
[25] *VA*, p. 150. R. W Southern has postulated that this incident took place shortly after 1100; thus explaining the very detailed account of the years down to 1100 and the almost complete absence of personal detail in the years that followed. *VA*, p. x. For a discussion of Eadmer's life see Southern, *Portrait*, pp. 404-21.
[26] For a full discussion of the extant MSS and their connections see, *VA*, xiii-xxv.
[27] *VG*, 3-5. The *vita* survives in only one mid-twelfth-century manuscript, British Library MS Cotton Nero A. Viii. Marylou Ruud has called into question Thomson's terminus date. M. Ruud, 'Monks in the World: The case of Gundulf of Rochester', *ANS*, XI (1988) 245-60, at 258. For an account of Gundulf's life see R. A. L. Smith, 'The Place of Gundulf in the Anglo-Norman Church', *EHR*, 58 (1943), pp. 257-72.
[28]The editors of the OMT text have asserted that the *VW* may have been planned during the composition of the *GR* in the late 1120s. William himself wrote that the 'translation' took less than six weeks. *VW*, iii.29.3. For an account of Wulfstan's life see E. Mason, *St Wulfstan of Worcester* (Oxford, 1990).

how closely William followed the earlier narrative, although historians, using the techniques of literary criticism, have speculated on Coleman's original content.[29] The *Vita Roberti Bethune* (*VR*) was written by Prior William of Wycombe shortly after Robert's death in 1148.[30] Both William and his subject, Bishop Robert, were canons regular at the Augustinian priory at Llanthony, and when the latter was promoted to Hereford, William joined him as a member of his episcopal household until he himself was promoted to prior at a new foundation, Llanthony Secunda in 1137.[31] This is the only known twelfth-century *vita* from England in which the subject and author were canons regular.[32]

Using these sources it is possible to investigate the concept of *herrenfrage* for episcopal power within the particular historical circumstances of early twelfth-century England. The narratives undoubtedly make use of traditional hagiographical formulae but with the exception of the *VW* (which was based on an earlier text) these episcopal *vitae* were written by close companions and within a few years of the bishops' death. They represent a

[29] The OMT editors have stated that William's assertion that he was producing a translation 'must be taken with a grain of salt.' *VW*, p. xvi. William altered the structure of Coleman's text (i.16.5) and he was critical of the content in places (iii.18.3). He even went as far to suggest that Prior Nicholas, from whom he obtained some additional stories, would have made a more suitable biographer (iii.17.2). Andy Orchard has offered some astute comments on the composition of the original Old English text and modified Antonia Gransden's account of links with earlier Old English lives, by suggesting specific connections with Wulfstan of Winchester's *Vita Æthelwoldi*. A. Orchard, 'Parallel lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', *St Wulfstan and his World*, eds. J. Barrow and N. P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 39-57, at p. 51. See also A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London, 1974), pp. 67-91.

[30] The exact date of the text is unknown although it is likely that it was composed in the early 1150s. There are three extant manuscripts. For a short discussion of the MSS see, *VR*, pp. 93-98. I am grateful to Matthew Mesley for allowing me to use his DPhil thesis which contains an entire chapter dedicated to the *VR*. Mesley argues that William Wycombe wrote principally for the canons at Llanthony and its daughter house, Llanthony Secunda, '[situating] his image of Robert as bishop within an Augustinian context'. M. Mesley, 'The Construction of Episcopal Identity: the Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century', (University of Exeter, 2009), pp. 113-77, at p. 116.

[31] William was subsequently deposed by the canons, supported by Llanthony's principal patron, Roger, earl of Hereford (*d.* 1155). William had been deposed before Bishop Robert departure for Rheims in March 1148. His successor Clement became prior in or before 1148. William moved to a cell of Llanthony at Frome where he spent the rest of his life. J. Barrow, 'Wycombe , William of (fl. c.1127–c.1148)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29464, accessed 5 Sept 2010].

[32] For an account of the introduction of the Augustinian canons in England see J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London, 1950); D. Postles, 'The Austin Canons in English Towns, *c.*1100-1350', *Historical Research*, 66 (1993) 1-20. See also D. M. Robinson, *The Geography of the Augustinian Settlement in Medieval England and Wales*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1980). Martin Brett has examined episcopal patronage of the Augustinian canons during the reign of Henry I. M. Brett, *The English Church Under Henry I* (London, 1975), pp. 138-40.

type of personal biographical writing which was emerging in the twelfth century.[33] However as Jay Rubenstein has argued, '*all* [my italics] medieval biography is, to a degree, autobiographical' and it is the authorial voice that, 'gives shape to what we read.'[34] The authors considered here were all regular clerics: three Benedictine monks and an Augustinian canon.[35] As such it is likely that they wrote principally for a limited audience of celibate men.[36] The particular circumstances of each text allow for a more detailed investigation of how celibate men chose to represent episcopal power in twelfth-century England. An

[33] Historians have traditionally supposed this to be a consequence of the 'discovery of the individual'. See in particular C. Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050-1200* (London, 1972); J. F. Benton, 'Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality', *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. R. L. Benson, G. Constable and C. D. Lanham (Oxford, 1982), pp. 263-95. Cf. C. W. Bynum, 'Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual', *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (London, 1984), pp. 82-109.

[34] J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', *Writing Medieval History*, ed. N. Partner (London, 2005), p. 34.

[35] There is very little historical agreement about the existence of a separate twelfth-century canonical spirituality, distinct from monastic culture. Caroline Walker Bynum has produced a survey of the historiography relating to this topic in her article 'The Spirituality of Regular Canons in the Twelfth Century', where she challenges those accounts which suppose little difference between the canonical and monastic conceptions of the cloistered life. Bynum argues for a unique canonical motif, *docere uerbo et exemplo*, which distinguishes canons regular from monastic spirituality. Bynum, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (London, 1984) 22-58. Terrie Colk has taken issue with this view arguing that it is particularly unpersuasive in an English context. His study of Augustinian canons in East Anglia concludes that 'monks of the new orders and canons shared a search for the spiritual dimension within the temporal...and were united in a set of beliefs and ideas that went deeper than the particular order by which the houses were designated.' In fact he envisions a much more general sense of spiritual community common to all cloistered religious of the twelfth century. T. Colk, 'Twelfth-Century East Anglian Canons: A Monastic Life', *Medieval East Anglia*, ed. C. Harper-Bill (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 209-224, at p. 224. In particular Colk sought to moderate the criticism of some historians, notably R. W. Southern, who supposed the Augustinians to be 'neither very rich, nor very learned, nor very religious, nor very influential.' R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, 1970), pp. 240-50, at p. 248.

[36] Eadmer claimed in his preface to the *VA* that he was induced by his friends (*familiaribus meis*) to write an account of Anselm's life and conversation to accompany the *HNA*. *VA*, p. 1. William of Malmesbury was commissioned to produce his Latin *vita* of Wulfstan by Prior Warin and addressed his prologue to the prior and the community at Worcester. *VW*, i, prol.1-4. Thomson has argued that the *VG* was composed during the early stages of a forging-programme in order to support claims of donations from Gundulf. *VG*, p. 9. Marylou Ruud has taken issue with this arguing that 'Gundulf's biographer needed no impetus such as monastic-episcopal rivalries for his interest in the bishop's land acquisitions, because the activities he described were compatible with twelfth-century spiritual ideas. Ruud, 'Monks in the World: The case of Gundulf of Rochester', *ANS*, XI (1988) 258. In the same way William of Wycombe produced two prologues suggesting that he intended the *VR* for circulation beyond the Llanthony community. An introductory letter to Henry, bishop of Winchester, and the flattering terms by which Henry is described in the main text suggest that William may have always intended to dedicate the *vita* to this important ecclesiastical patron. *VR*, pp. 225-30. The alternative prologue was addressed to Prior Reginald of Much Wenlock, a Cluniac priory in the diocese of Hereford. Matthew Mesley concludes that although the evidence might suggest that the audience was not exclusively Augustinian, '[William of Wycombe] probably directed the *vita* principally to the canons formally in his charge.' M. Mesley, 'The Construction of Episcopal Identity: the Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century', (University of Exeter, 2009), p. 128. For an account of Henry of Winchester's particular patronage of the Augustinian canons see M. J. Franklin, 'The Bishops of Winchester and the Monastic Revolution', *ANS*, 12 (1990), pp. 47-65.

analysis of paternal imagery reveals that far from being concerned to compensate for the limitations of celibacy, the authors were inspired to provide a vision of episcopal leadership which resonated with the expectations of a cloistered community using parental imagery: both mother and father. In particular the depiction of the celibate bishop and his relationship to women (and femininity) offer a range of contradictions which counter claims that clerical masculinity was constructed in the absence of all things female. Analysis of how far William of Malmesbury altered Coleman's original narrative is one way of determining whether new concepts of masculinity were emerging. This is helped through a comparison with William's abridged account of Wulfstan's life contained in the *GP*. In the same way Eadmer produced a parallel account of Anselm's life in the *HNA* which demonstrates different authorial concerns. In contrast Frank Barlow believed that both William of Wycombe and the author of the *VG* produced narratives 'more typical' of the conventional form of hagiographical *vitae*; he supposed that the *VR* was 'for its time... a very old-fashioned [life].'[37] In fact the *VR* was written as many as forty years after the *VG* and therefore it *should* demonstrate a more mature response to the programme of clerical celibacy and reform in general. Yet the sources minimise the importance of celibacy in the construction of episcopal power as distinguished from episcopal sanctity. This opens the way to a broader discussion about the influence of Gregorian reforms in England within the specific context of episcopal power relations.

Although gendered analysis is a highly profitable area of study, the notion of competing masculinities can prove distracting; it not only replicates an unhelpful dichotomy but also ignores areas where there was clear overlap between clerical and secular ideas of rulership. As we have already seen (Chapter 3) conflicting ideals of power (through performance) frequently occur in individual narratives. In fact literary depictions rely on contradiction to negotiate complex power structures. In a study of lay masculinity in the

[37] F. Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London, 1979), p. 23.

Carolingian period Janet Nelson has argued that the 'notion of the warrior and the wimp as mutually exclusive categories may be… positively unhelpful… [for] men were offered competing, even conflicting, models of manliness, and learned somehow to live with dissonance.'[38] These sources demonstrate a highly pragmatic approach to the depiction of the bishop acting as a powerful man. The literary model was never clearly defined precisely because that would have been counterproductive to the claims of individual biographers constructing a specific episcopal identity. Any attempt to define hegemonic masculinity *has* to conclude that the basis of (masculine) domination was neither homogenous nor stable. Depictions of hegemonic masculinities do not correspond closely to the lives of any actual men. Connell commented that, 'the public face of hegemonic masculinity… is not necessarily even what powerful men are, but is what sustains their power'.[39] Therefore it is not surprising that bishops, who function as an exemplum at a local level, through a constructed hagiographical identity, exhibit gender ambiguity. Yet these depictions provide models of power relations with women and other men and articulate the practical foundation of masculine power, in everyday local circumstances. To this extent they contributed to hegemony in society, and they position the bishop at the forefront of gendered power relations in twelfth-century England.

Power in the middle ages was frequently expressed as patriarchy, where fathers were synonymous with rulers. Masculinities naturalise patriarchal power, which in turn privileges the male experience; as Jacqueline Murray has put it, 'masculinities reflect patriarchy back on

---

[38] J. L. Nelson, 'Monks, Secular Men and Masculinity, *c*.900' in *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London, 1999), p. 142.
[39] R. W. Connell, *Gender and power: society, the person and sexual politics* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 185.

itself.'[40] Although it was usual for hagiographical accounts to include a brief reference to the saint's parents in order to emphasise nobility of birth, it was also usual for family ties to be seen as a burden or distraction to spiritual advancement. In particular Maureen Miller noted that reformist hagiographers sought to minimise the role of the bishop's family, presenting the bishop as a man who, 'has divine help, but otherwise accomplishes all on his own.'[41] William Wycombe relates almost nothing of Bishop Robert's parents, except to say that he was descended from quite well-known knightly stock (*ex illustri satis ordine militari duxit originem*), noting that, 'tender concern for his upbringing was a measure of his parents' love.'[42] Indeed although Robert was the youngest, he was favoured as if he was the first-born. His parents entrusted his education to his eldest brother, Gunfrid, an 'outstanding master in his day (*diebus suis magister emeritus*)'.[43] But just as Robert, the youngest, had superseded Gunfrid, the eldest, in his parents' affections so he also exceeded his brother in learning and dedication to his studies. Thus in William Wycombe's narrative Robert's older brother, not his father, is the focus of his family ties. Robert, we are told, had been pondering his future but he was prevented from acting by a 'fresh hindrance (*novum impedimentum*)': Gundrid's death. As such he undertook his brother's burden (*fraternam sarcinam*) by acting as guardian to his children.[44] Robert, an unwilling parent, ensured that, as soon as they were old enough, his nieces were married and his nephews sent to the cloister. He sought to cut all ties. Robert however remained in the world, studying under William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon, and continued to contemplate his future, until the bonds of family tightened again.[45]

> When his brother's offspring had multiplied like a plentiful crop, even to the third generation, they began afresh to harass the man of God, to

[40] J. Murray, 'Introduction', *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. J. Murray (New York, 1999), p. xi.
[41] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003), p. 39.
[42] *Qui quanto parentibus suis tenerius dilectus erat tanto tenerius educatus. VR*, pp. 107-8.
[43] *VR*, pp. 107-8.
[44] *Suscepit igitur fraternam sarcinam sustinendam filios et filias quos ille de coniugio susceperat. Expectatis autem sub custodia nubilibus annis nepte suas nuptum tradidit nepotes religioni mancipauit. VR*, pp. 111-2.
[45] For an account of Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux see R. W. Southern, *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 25-49.

> allege their own poverty, to demand his attention as though such were owed by the law of nature... he was influenced by the sacred ties of flesh and blood, according as is it written, "though you drive out nature with a pitchfork, yet it returns of its own accord"... At length he gave his attention even to the new cradles. He introduced afresh nurses and tutors in accordance with the sex and age of the children. For the expenses of all this meanwhile, he sought and planned earnestly, and by this means he succeeded. [46]

William Wycombe seeks to explain Robert's delayed entrance into religious life by citing his family commitments, presenting them as a burden and distraction which tied him to the world and prevented spiritual advancement. Eventually Robert, 'snapping asunder the bonds of nature (*vinculis nature*), set himself free', joining the Augustinian Order at Llanthony.[47] Yet Robert's ability to provide for the children in his extended family established a pattern of behaviour. He accepted the burden of parental responsibility both within the secular world and later within a religious context as prior at Llanthony and bishop of Hereford. When he left Llanthony for the final time, the canons lamented the loss of their 'most pious father (*piissimi patris*)' and William Wycombe, who was present at this event, reported that he himself cried out, "Where are you going father without your son?"[48] William then describes how Robert, having been raised to pontifical dignity, was able to provide for all people with fatherly compassion (*miseratione paterna*).[49] Thus Robert finally fulfilled his potential as a pastoral leader which had been evident since his boyhood. Following a well-worn hagiographical topos, William of Wycombe described Robert's precocious sanctity and his rapid maturity. As a young boy Robert's ascetic practices (fasting, prayers and vigils) not only marked him out for sanctity but caused others to call him Our Father (*pater noster*), 'a name happily chosen for one who was to become the father of so many children not by a

[46] *Fraterni nempe sanguinis soboles cum ad terciam usque generacionem tanquam seges succrevisset opima cepit denuo virum dei sollicitare paupertatem suam ingerere et tanquam debitam ex iure nature sui curam exigere... pietate carnis et sanguinis mouetur iuxta quod dicitur 'Si furca naturam expuleris sponte recurrit'... Denique mentem usque ad cunabula nova inclinat. Nutrices renovat et nutricios pro sexu pro etate necessarios. Sumptus interim queritat et prouidet facultate qua prevalet. VR*, pp. 111-2.

[47] *Surgens igitur ruptisque tandem vinculis nature, sibis liber redditur. VR*, pp. 115-6.

[48] *Ego quoque impatientius ferens desolationem meam,"quo inquam progrederis sine filio pater". VR*, pp. 139-42. In this instance Robert was able to bring William with him to Hereford.

[49] *VR*, pp. 153-4.

physically begetting but by preaching (*auspicato tamen nomine, qui tantorum filiorum pater futurus erat non genitura sed prelacione*).'[50] The narrative quickly established Robert's role as a pastoral leader and a 'spiritual father', laying the foundations for his subsequent promotion to the episcopate. Megan McLaughlin has examined the continued desire for celibate clerics to establish themselves as fathers, 'who begot and raised children in the faith' through the public celebration of the sacraments, particularly baptism.[51] Conrad Leyser describes the reform movement's attempt to create a new body of the faithful commenting that, 'symbolically the priest was tied to no human family: in imitation of Christ, his bride was rather the church as a whole, all the faithful.'[52] The public celebration of the sacraments by a priest or bishop turned the celebrant into a spiritual father for the entire body of the faithful. This is central to an understanding of Robert's role as bishop; both as a continuing patron of the Llanthony canons and, more generally, as pastor of his diocese, he acts as a father by providing for *all*. In William's narrative he uses Robert's family experiences to examine his ability as a leader. The demonstration of 'spiritual fatherhood' was not to compensate for no issue but to demonstrate his ability to provide and to order a household. In this sense the role of the bishop was gendered as a father, protector and provider. Excluding basic religious terminology, which makes use of the title 'father', there is evidence of a metaphorical application of paternal terms. But this should be understood *not* as a reactionary symbol of clerical anxiety in the face of reformist policies, but as a technique used by authors writing within (and for) a cloistered community in order to represent the demands of episcopal (diocesan) authority as compatible with their own expectations of an ecclesiastical leader of a cloistered community. Fundamentally spiritual fatherhood is about ideal rulership.

In a similar vein Eadmer examined the role of Anselm's father as an obstacle to the

[50] *VR*, pp. 109-10.
[51] M. McLaughlin, 'Secular and Spiritual Fatherhood in the Eleventh Century', *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. J. Murray (New York, 1999), p. 27.
[52] C. Leyser, 'Custom, Truth and Gender in Eleventh-Century Reform', *Gender and Christian Religion: Studies in Church History*, ed. R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge, 1998), p. 76.

young man's religious progression. Gundulf, we are told, 'was given up to a secular way of life... so that he was regarded by some not only as generous and good-hearted, but even as prodigal and spendthrift.'[53] He actively prevented his adolescent son from becoming a monk. Twice Anselm independently sought out the abbot of a local monastery and requested conversion, but the abbot was afraid to offend his father and denied him on both occasions.[54] Eventually, Anselm's relationship with Gundulf experienced a complete breakdown and he left his hometown of Aosta. According to Eadmer, God stirred up domestic strife between father and son foreseeing what he was going to make of the young man. And so Anselm 'chose rather to renounce both his patrimony and his country (*elegit potius paternis rebus et patriae abrenunciare*) than to bring some disgrace upon either himself or his father by continuing to live with him.'[55] Eadmer's language leaves little doubt that Anselm was leaving behind everything associated with his biological father. As a monastic author family ties were undoubtedly seen as a barrier to ecclesiastical and spiritual advancement in the cloister. However, Eadmer contrasts the personalities of Anselm's parents using his mother, Ermenberga, as a counterbalance to his feckless father.

> Though they were both affluent, and bound together in marriage, yet they were somewhat different in character... [His mother] was prudent and careful in the management of her household, both spending and saving with discretion, and performing well the offices of a mother of a family (*bonae matris familias officio fungebatur*). Her ways were upright and blameless and in a true sense guided by reason.[56]

Ermenberga is the template for a wise bishop/abbot; she is prudent in the management of the household, performing her role diligently, living her life blamelessly and guided by reason. In fact we learn that it is from his mother's conversation that Anselm first learnt of God and

[53] *Gundulfus enim seculari deditus vitae... in tantum ut non modo atque beneficus, verum etiam prodigus atque vastator a nonnullis estimaretur. VA*, p. 7.
[54] *VA*, pp. 5-6
[55] *VA*, p. 7.
[56] *Conjuncti sunt lege conjugali ambo divitiis non ignobiles, sed moribus ex quadam parte dissimiles. Ermenberga vero bonis studiis serviens, domus curam bene gerens, sua cum discretione dispensans atque conservans, bonae matris familias officio fungebatur. Mores ernat probi et irreprehensibiles, ac iuxta rectam considerationem ratione subnixi. VA*, pp. 3-4.

heaven.[57] Her teaching and way of life provided an exemplum to the young man, and for a time after her death, Anselm 'drifted almost entirely among the waves of the world (*in fluctus seculi pene tota dilapssa est*).'[58] In other words, the loss of his father was liberating, but the loss of his mother was dangerous. Eadmer later makes use of parental imagery to describe Anselm's role as prior, writing, 'while he was father to those who were well, he was a mother to the sick: or rather, he was both father and mother to the sick and sound alike.'[59] He emphasises paternal and maternal, not in opposition, but as two representative dimensions or *personae* of the idealised public household. Eadmer is *not* favouring femininity over masculinity; he is using culturally recognisable terms, used by Anselm himself, to describe the role of the ideal prelate, just as they exist within the ideal household.[60] As Caroline Walker Bynum has shown, 'the use of maternal imagery to talk about male figures was developed in the twelfth century by cloistered authors with particular reference to a cloistered setting.'[61] Bynum supposed that the use of explicit and elaborate maternal imagery to describe male religious authority figures was evidence of monastic anxiety. In a Cistercian setting it reflected an increased concern with the pastoral burden and ambivalence about authority in general.[62] In the *VA* maternal imagery is clearly associated with Anselm's role as a gentle abbot within the monastic community. It reflects an ambiguity about the role of a monk-bishop and the 'problem of authority' for twelfth-century monastic authors. In particular it supports Eadmer's complex characterisation of Anselm as a reluctant leader.

William of Malmesbury claims that Wulfstan's name was made up of the first part of his mother's and the second part of his father's, writing that 'the child had fair hopes, and fair

[57] *VA*, p. 4.
[58] *VA*, p. 6.
[59] *Sicque sanis pater et infirmis erat mater, immo sanis et infirmis pater et mater in commune. VA*, p. 23.
[60] Anselm appears to have identified with maternal imagery likening himself, on one occasion at Canterbury, to an owl in a hole with her chicks. *VA*, p. 70.
[61] C. W. Bynum, 'Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing', *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (London, 1984) pp. 112-3.
[62] *Ibid*, pp. 154-9. Significantly Bynum suspects that the image of mother Jesus may have been borrowed from Anselm's prayers. (Prayer 10 to St Paul, *Opera Omnia* 3:33 and 39-41).

too the omen which gave him a name taken from both parents, considering that he was destined to pour into himself the sanctity of both'.[63] In other words he was literally both father and mother. Yet maternal imagery is extremely limited in the *VW* and Wulfstan's primary association with his mother, Wulfgifu, is through his name. In fact Emma Mason supposes that the relative lack of information about the bishop's family was designed to deflect attention from the fact that Wulfstan was probably the son of a priest.[64] However the narrative emphasises that far from being an obstacle to his advancement, Wulfstan's parents acted as an exemplum; they both undertook monastic vows at Worcester before their son. Clearly their relationship was chaste. However the narrative quickly produces a new 'father' from whom Wulfstan can seek advice. Following his father's entrance into the cloister, Wulfstan, 'so as to sketch out in himself the shape of virtue by the example of higher rank (*ut altioris gradus exemplo in se uirtutum spetiem deliniaret*),' joined the household of Brihtheah, bishop of Worcester.[65] William of Malmesbury describes how Wulfstan 'won over the bishop's love (*amorem pontificis conciliauerat*)' so that he was advanced to the priesthood and more than once offered a church on the outskirts of the city.[66] At the bishop's prompting then, Wulfstan finally decided to become a monk at Worcester; 'Brihtheah supporting him and granting him the habit (*Brihtego indulgente fauorem et habitum*).'[67] Significantly, Wulfstan, the son of a priest, eventually inherited a bishopric from his spiritual father, Brihtheath.

In Eadmer's narrative Lanfranc acts as Anselm's spiritual father. Having spent three years travelling through Burgundy and France, Anselm came to Bec, attracted by the reputation of Lanfranc. He was the main influence in the development of Anselm's

[63] *Spei felicis infans felici auspitio utrorumque parentum nomen mutuatus, qui utrorumque sanctitatem in se transfunderet. VW*, i.1.2.
[64] E. Mason, *St Wulfstan of Worcester c.1008-1095* (Oxford, 1990), p. 30.
[65] *VW*, i.2.1.
[66] *VW*, i.2.3.
[67] *VW*, i.3.2.

ecclesiastical career, advising the young man about his vocation.[68] And it is at this point in the narrative that Eadmer casually refers to the death of Anselm's biological father, Gundulf. The narrative composition clearly demonstrates the importance of Anselm's new monastic family, where the filial relationship consisted of absolute trust and obedience, in comparison to his former biological relations.[69] In fact as successor to Lanfranc on two occasions, initially as prior of Bec and later as archbishop of Canterbury, Anselm assumed an 'inheritance', which he had deliberately renounced in Aosta. Yet close study of the details of the last meeting between Lanfranc and Anselm at Canterbury provides evidence of a change in the dynamics of the relationship. Lanfranc sought Anselm's advice concerning the veneration of certain Anglo-Saxon saints and in this instance the teacher acquiesced to his pupil's opinion. Although Anselm continues in direct speech to refer to the older man as 'reverend father (*reverende pater*)', Eadmer compares their relationship in less formal terms: '[Lanfranc] had Anselm with him, a friend and brother (*amicum et fratrem*) with whom he was of one mind.'[70] Here the author is positioning Anselm so that he can cross the linguistic boundary from son to father.

In fact Anselm made the literary transition to idealised fatherhood after his election as prior at Bec. His swift promotion caused resentment among some of the brethren who imagined they should have been preferred before him.[71] At this point in the narrative Eadmer, describes how Anselm was able to reform a young monk named Osbern. As the young man improved, 'his father (*pater*) rejoiced in those things more than can be said, and inspired by the holy fire of charity, he loved his son more than you could believe possible (*et diligit*

---

[68] *VA*, p. 10.

[69] Eadmer illustrates the depth of Anselm's regard for Lanfranc by recounting one of the archbishop's familiar anecdotes, which claimed that, '[if] Lanfranc had said to him "Stay in this wood and see that you never come out so long as you live", without doubt, as he used to say, he would have obeyed the command (*imperata servaret*).' *VA*, p. 11.

[70] *VA,* pp. 51-3.

[71] *Cum primum igitur prior factus fuisset, quidam fratres ipsius coenobii facti sunt emuli eius, uidentes et uidendo inuidentes illum praeponi, quem iuxta conuersionis ordinem iudicabant sibi debere postponi. VA*, p. 15.

filium sancto caritatis igne plusquam credi possit).'[72] The relationship between Anselm and Osbern is described in unambiguous paternal terms. The narrative transformed Anselm from son to father. Yet the relationship was problematic. Following the young man's premature death, Anselm's grief was so deep that it caused some from the Bec community to criticise the prior for too personal an attachment to one individual, whilst others attempted to succeed Osbern in Anselm's affections. As a consequence Anselm learned to become 'all things to all men, that he might save all (*omnibus omnia factus est, ut omnes faceret salvos*).'[73] Thus from this point in the narrative the monks at Bec loved him 'as if he were a very dear father (*carissimi patris*)'.[74] Anselm used his newfound 'fatherly authority (*paterna auctoritate*)' to convince even those older members of the brethren who had at one time shown hatred towards him.[75] And once he became archbishop his generosity was felt by all, not just monks, 'even beyond the means of a tender father (*pii patris*), to the relief of any needy layman who asked for his help.'[76] Eadmer even described Anselm as the father of his country (*patrem patriae*).[77] Anselm's experience with Osbern marked a significant stage in the development of his personal authority. He never again allowed one individual to inspire his special affection, recognising that as a spiritual leader he had a duty not only to the young brethren who followed his own path, but also to the wider community. In this sense the notion of 'spiritual fatherhood' was not just a clerical construction to correspond with secular notions of patriarchy. It necessarily surpassed the biological role. It was an attempt to examine (and express) the particular requirements of episcopal power in the context of pastoral leadership not only within the cloister but beyond. Within the narrative Anselm's developing paternal

---

[72] *Laetatur pater in his ultra quam dici posit, et diligit filium sancto caritatis igne plusquam credi possit. VA*, p. 17.
[73] *VA*, p. 20. Cf. Cor. 9:22.
[74] *VA*, p. 22.
[75] There is a particular account of an elderly monk who 'hated Anselm with long-standing hatred (*qui ueteri odio plurimum erat infestus Anselmo*)' but was reconciled on his death bed. *VA*, pp. 24-5.
[76] *Nec ista largitas solummodo monachorum seu clericorum penuriam sublevabat, sed et in quosque laicos ea indigentes, ea sibi subveniri petentes, pro posse et nonnunquam ultra posse pii patris redundabat. VA*, p. 72.
[77] *VA*, p. 98.

role demonstrated his ability to provide as a father for all his spiritual children. In doing so it reinforced his right to exercise power in a self-evident patriarchal system. It was, in this sense, Eadmer's treatise on personal episcopal power.

The author of the *VG* deliberately plays with parental imagery throughout the text. Again he offers very little information concerning Gundulf's parents, other than their names.[78] According to the narrative, Gundulf, having left Bec with Lanfranc for the new foundation at Caen, brought his mother to the convent there which had been founded by Matilda, the wife of William the Conqueror; 'and so it came that the father committed to God the mother who had brought him into the world in the habit and sanctity of the religious state.'[79] The author explains that Gundulf became a spiritual father to his biological mother, sending her out of the world, while she had brought him into it. Later, once he had been appointed to Rochester, the small community of no more than five monks 'under the instruction of Father Gundulf (*sub doctrina patris Gundulfi*)' rose to sixty or more.[80] He was profligate. Even during the reign of William II, when the churches were oppressed, Father Gundulf (*patri Gundulfi*) and the church at Rochester were not only spared royal exactions, 'but [the king] also and with great liberality increased the bishop's possessions.'[81] He acted as a father and a husband to St Andrew's church, producing and providing for his children (the monks) and defending the dowry of the church. Yet Gundulf's role as father was principally a demonstration of his power. During a rebellion against King Henry I, Gundulf acted as a mediator persuading some of the rebels to desist in their revolt.

> On this account Gundulf was beloved alike of the king and of the barons of the realm and when mention was made of him among the other nobles in their conferences at the palace or elsewhere, he was reckoned among them not merely as their equal but rather as their

[78] Gundulf's father was Hatheguin and mother Adelesia. *VG*, 3.1.
[79] *Et sic idem pater matrem suam, quae eum pepererat mundo, per religionis habitum et sanctimoniam commendauit Deo. VG*, 9.13-5.
[80] *VG*, 17.13-4.
[81] *Et si alios quibusdam angariis perturbauit, patri Gundulfo et aecclesiae Rofensi omnibus diebus suis benigne pepercit, et non solum pepercit, sed et larga manu possessiones episcopii multum liberaliter auxit. VG*, 27.7-10.

> superior and their father (*Gundulfus inter eos non ut socius sed ut superior et quasi pater reputabatur*).[82]

William of Malmesbury uses paternal imagery to describe Wulfstan's relationship with secular rulers. King William, we are told, honoured and respected Wulfstan, 'venerating him as father and dignifying him by calling him that name (*ueritus patrem et uenerabatur amore et dignabatur nomine*).'[83] Similarly, as prior at Worcester he had inspired devotion in the future king, Harold Godwinnson, and his predecessor Bishop Ealdred, 'a man wily in secular affairs (*uir multum in secularibus astutus*)' who became the 'devoted servant of the lord prior [Wulfstan] and obeyed him humbly, deferring to him in everything as to a beloved father (*parenti gratissimo*).'[84] In fact William writes that once Wulfstan had been promoted to the episcopate, 'he cherished every man as his own child out of love of charity, so they all in return loved him as a parent (*uicissim omnes eum diligebant ut parentem*).'[85] And later he is described as 'father of the diocese (*patris diocesis*)'[86] To some extent analysis of the representation of family ties from these hagiographical accounts reinforces the image of the independent bishop achieving advancement without recourse to a kinship network. Yet this was a consequence of their cloistered setting. In fact the cultural notion of the household ruled by both the mother and the father was a powerful metaphor of idealised leadership. Similarly the transition from son to (spiritual) father was less about countering the claims of hegemonic masculinity to fertility and reproduction and more about establishing a pattern of paternal authority over all men as a pastoral leader.

Jo McNamara states bluntly that the 'Gregorian revolution aimed at a church virtually free of women at every level but the lowest stratum of the married laity.' She argues that

[82] *VG*, 35.25-8. Thomson concludes that this is a reference to the invasion of Robert Curthose early in 1101 supported by some of the English barons; at this point the support of the English church was decisive for Henry's victory.
[83] *VW*, ii.1.
[84] *VW*, i.7.3.
[85] *VW*, i.14.3.
[86] *VW*, ii.2.

clerical misogyny reached a crescendo between the mid-eleventh and the mid-twelfth centuries, noting that 'public statements of all sorts depicted women as dangerous and aggressive, poisonous and polluting.'[87] Maureen Miller has also remarked that 'both the marginalisation of women and heightened misogyny are evident in the more mature examples of reform hagiography.'[88] Without Coleman's original text it is impossible to be precise about the changes made by William of Malmesbury when he composed his Latin text sometime during the second quarter of the twelfth century. At a cursory level the text demonstrates some misogyny, particularly when emphasising the bishop's virginity and chastity. During his youth Wulfstan encountered a local girl, 'designed by nature for shipwrecking chastity (*nata ad naufragium pudoris*)', who employed indecent gestures and movements to act the role of a 'dancing girl (*psaltriam*)'.[89] For a moment he almost succumbed to her alluring gestures. He was instantly horrified by his weakness and burst into tears, throwing himself into a patch of thorns and brambles. From that day he no longer felt any sexual desire: he was cold in his groin and his whole innards (*uentre et totis uitalibus algere*).

> He hoped that from now on he would be free of fleshy impulse... Never after that was his heart or eye distracted by anyone's striking beauty, never was his quiet sleep interrupted by a wet dream (*numquam turbulenta eluuies dormientis interpellauit quietem*).'[90]

Wulfstan's virginity was a sign of his sanctity rather than his suitability for episcopal office. However there is a clear narrative thread linking chastity with self control; introducing the story of Wulfstan's first temptation the author writes that, 'in all things God's grace lavished on him the gift of unshaken self-control (*ne uacillaret arbitrii libertas*).[91] And Wulfstan's

[87] J. McNamara, 'The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender system, 1050-1150,' *Medieval Masculinities*, ed. C. Lees (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. 7-8.
[88] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, Vol. 72 (2003), p. 49.
[89] *VW*, i.1.6-7.
[90] *Sperare se ulterius incentiuo carnis cariturum... Numquam enim deinceps animum uel oculum eius sollicitauit ullius formae miraculum, numquam turbulent eluuies dormientis interpellauit quietem. VW*, i.1.8-9.
[91] *Aderat ei in cunctis diuinae gratiae liberalitas, ne uacillaret arbitrii libertas. VW*, i.1.5.

ability to withstand temptation endowed him with precocious authority as he preached to the children present during this first encounter, thereby demonstrating his future role as an ecclesiastical leader. Yet the discussion of Wulfstan's first (and last) sexual temptation seems primarily intended as a moral guide for a monastic audience. According to the text Coleman heard this story from sub-prior Hemming, who had heard the bishop relate this story to youths (*ephebis*).[92] In the same way William of Wycombe described how Robert, having joined the Llanthony community, 'earnestly began to learn the rule and customs of his order (*regulam ordinis et consuetudines*)', keeping strictly to the common observance, but also adding private devotions. William elaborates further noting that Robert was particularly strict in private discipline, 'punishing with lavish tears the fantasies of nightmares (*nocturne delusionis fantasias*), he strove to punish them more severely than another would have punished the actual sin.'[93] In this way William was defining the limits of the Augustinian Rule and using Robert as an exemplum.[94] The (oblique) reference to nocturnal emissions was presumably intended provide a guide to canons, perhaps even to reassure them. These narratives fulfilled a pastoral role within the cloister.[95]

---

[92] *VW*, i.1.9. Andy Orchard has gone as far to suggest that, 'in this case the bishop is unwittingly acting as his own hagiographer.' A. Orchard, 'Parallel lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', *St Wulfstan and his World*, eds. J. Barrow and N. P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005), p. 48.

[93] *Nocturne delusionis fantasias uberibus lacrimis puniens ultra quam alius etiam actus turpitudinis punier curare. VR*, pp. 123-4

[94] Significantly sometime after 1147 William was deposed as prior by the canons of the Augustinian community at Llanthony Secunda in Gloucestershire who were angered by his strict discipline. J. Barrow, 'Wycombe , William of (fl. c.1127–c.1148)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29464, accessed 5 Sept 2010].

[95] In the *VA* Eadmer recounts the story of Anselm's encounter with a young monk at Bec who had taken a vow not to touch his genitals, only to be struck down with intolerable pain, 'for his flesh felt so heavy that it was as if a great weight of lead were attached to that part of his body drawing him downwards.' Anselm, noticing the 'great anxiety (*anxietatis magnitudinem*)' in the young man's appearance, advised the boy to place his hand on the ailing place to discover what trouble there was. But the boy, fearing to break his vow, would not. So Anselm taking one of the other brethren with him, a very old and pious man, led the youth to a private place where he might diagnose his problem. On first examination the flesh was found to be normal, 'the mere fact that Anselm inspired by a fatherly pity (*ex paterna pietate*) and reflecting that to the pure all things are pure, had looked on him freed him from so great a distress (*Anselmi perpendentis omnia esse munda mundis ex paterna pietate prodiens simplex aspectus a tanta clade fecit immunem*)'. *VA*, p. 24. For an account of monastic concerns with nocturnal emissions and the overtones with Cassian's work, see C. Leyser, 'Masculinity in Flux: Nocturnal Emission and Limits of Celibacy in the Early Middle Ages', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Hadley (London, 1999), pp. 103-120.

William of Malmesbury recorded one further story related to Wulfstan's preservation of his virginity. Whilst still prior at Worcester Wulfstan attracted the romantic attentions of a beautiful married woman who tried to seduce him. As she stood next to him in church, 'she polluted his habit with her shameless touch (*stantis pannos tactu impudenti*).'[96] Wulfstan, supposing that she wanted to confess her sins, stopped and drew aside with her. In this intimate setting she propositioned the prior; she was wealthy, her parents had died and her husband was absent and she wanted Wulfstan to administer her household and join her in bed. He interrupted her and strongly admonished her for her impropriety.

> These admonitory words were followed by a slap, which he, in his zeal for chastity (*zelo castitatis*), administered to the face of the gabbling woman with such force that the smack of his palm could be heard right through the door of the church.[97]

There is an obvious misogynist message: women of independent means, unbridled by the patriarchal structure, posed a danger to the purity of the clergy. It acts as a reminder that churchmen must be free from accusations of impropriety. The slap was heard beyond the church implying that it quashed any rumours. It was important that bishops did not expose themselves to criticism by seeming to usurp the role of the secular man. In this sense the author was distinguishing between the role of the celibate priest and the layman. Yet Andy Orchard has interpreted this story as part of deliberate attempt by Coleman to emulate earlier *vitae*, and to reinforce Wulfstan's sanctity by referring to other figures from biblical and hagiographical literature.[98] In fact neither this story nor the account of the dancing girl, appears in the *GP* where William of Malmesbury makes only passing mention of the

[96] *VW*, i.6.1. Again the author uses the symbol of unsolicited touch to convey the notion of sexual danger. This is found in the earlier story concerning the young local girl who first aroused Wulfstan's desire; she would grab his hand (*manum prensitare*), wink at him, and do everything that signifies virginity on the point of departure. *VW*, i.1.6.

[97] *VW*, i.6.3.

[98] This story contains an explicit reference to Joseph (Genesis 39) but Orchard also detects an implicit reference to a similar incident from the life of St Agnes, which was incorporated into a treatise by Aldhelm, *DE uirginitate*, and translated by Ælfric. A. Orchard, 'Parallel lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', *St Wulfstan and his World*, eds. J. Barrow and N. P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005), p. 49. See also P. Jackson, 'The Vitas patrum in eleventh-century Worcester', in *England in the Eleventh Century*, ed. C. Hicks (Stamford, 1990) pp. 119-34, who argues that Wulfstan's own asceticism was inspired by the hagiographies of the Desert Fathers.

bishop's virginity.[99] In the *VW* all of the female characters, with just one exception, remain unnamed and appear either as methods of temptation, which Wulfstan overcame, or as participants in his miracles.[100] Yet it is likely that this was more to do with Coleman's attempt to imitate other *vitae* than symptomatic of an increasing clerical misogyny in response to the Gregorian reforms.

In contrast Robert's virginity is introduced into the narrative only *after* he had been appointed bishop and is closely linked with his pastoral role as confessor.

> Moreover concerning the preservation and proof of his chastity, as far as we know, he was wont never to fix his eyes on a woman. For he had read that he who so fixes his eyes is the abomination of the Lord. He nowhere presumed to sit or speak alone with a woman except in the presence of appointed companions, not even in confession or in any secret matter... I have said in a few words, that as far as I knew, he died an old man still a virgin.[101]

Despite Frank Barlow's assertion that the *VR* was representative of an old-fashioned narrative, it does, at least at a superficial level, support the claims for the development of an increasingly misogynistic tone characterising clerical masculinity. Yet William's words may have deliberately echoed the Augustinian Rule.[102] In this sense it examined the particular concerns of an Augustinian canon acting as bishop. However William is concerned to relate

[99] *GP*¸ iv.137.2. He does however repeat one story concerning the bishop's *uirtus* when he bravely fought the devil in the guise of a manservant. *GP*, iv.138.1-2. Cf. *VW*, i.4.2-4.

[100] In addition to the local girl and married woman who attempted to seduce the saint there are three unnamed women healed by miracles attributed to Wulfstan. The first a wealthy woman who having recovered her sanity became a nun, the second was a servant, and the third a woman of modest means who had lost the use of her limbs. *VW*, ii.4.1-4, ii.9.2-3, ii.13.1-3. It is worth noting here the range of social examples of those women who received healing from Wulfstan this is also the case with his other miracles. There is also mention of a sheriff's wife who doubted Wulfstan's sanctity, *VW*, ii.21.1-4.The only other named woman to occur in the *vita*, apart from Wulfstan's mother, is Gunnhild, daughter of Harold I. *VW*, ii.11.

[101] *Proinde quod ad custodiam et argumentum pudicitie pertinere dinoscitur nunquam oculum in feminam figere consueuit. Legerat enim quomodo abhominatio est domino defigens oculum. Nusquam solus cum sola sedere uel loqui nisi coram positis arbitris presumsit, nec de confessione quidem uel quolibet archano... cito dixerim quod scire potui virgo senex obit. VR*, pp. 159-60.

[102]G. Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule* (Oxford, 1987), p. 89. Matthew Mesley has drawn attention to this passage as evidence of William of Wycombe's inconsistent use of the Augustinian Rule. He suggests that William was influenced by twelfth-century canon law, which was increasingly concerned to systematise confession. Mesley argues that William 'used the teaching so of the Rule, alongside a canonical injunction applied to clerics [in order] to frame Robert's behaviour.' M. Mesley, 'The Construction of Episcopal Identity: the Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century', (University of Exeter, 2009) pp. 166-7.

both virginity and chastity, the former concerned with Robert's claim to sanctity but the later with specific reference to his episcopal duties. The narrative construction of the *VR* deliberately limits Robert's dealings with women.[103] Among the many miracles attributed to Wulfstan there is an account of a wealthy woman who sought out Coleman asking for help for her sick maid, knowing that she could not approach the bishop directly. Wulfstan was a guest in a rich man's house following the dedication of church.

> The mother of the house, being inhibited from striking up a conversation with the bishop because of her sex and her respect for him, told her tale of woe to Coleman.[104]

Within Coleman's narrative this may have principally reflected his desire to include a reference to his own relationship with the holy bishop.[105] William of Malmesbury's use of this story alludes to the social conventions which limited interaction between chaste clerics and lay women. However elsewhere, Wulfstan's interaction with the nuns at Wilton is portrayed in a very different manner. The nuns 'greeted him with much pleasure and he took his seat in a large group of them.'[106] In this case the bishop's pastoral role is less problematic.

The *VG* frequently examines Gundulf's relationship with women. The author writes that, 'he was beloved by both sexes so he took pains to promote the spiritual welfare of each

[103] In fact William records two episodes involving women gaining access to the bishop, although on both occasions one of the parties was dead. Only posthumously, it seems is the bishop able to interact closely with women. On the first occasion Robert and his companions were travelling along a lonely road when they found a woman lying by the wayside with a small girl weeping beside her. When they dismounted they found that the woman was dead, '[Robert] caused her to be lifted on to his palfrey, but the little girl to be carried behind an attendant.' *Quam fecit episcopus in palefridum suum levari. Puellulam uero post clientem deferri. VR*, pp. 179-80. The second occasion took place after Robert's death during the long journey back to Hereford. His body had been laid on a bier in the church of St Nicholas at a seaport before they crossed back to England. A woman brought her sick daughter to the 'guardians of the body (*custodes corporis*)', claiming to have heard a voice from heaven telling her to bring the girl to the holy body in order that she might be healed. She begged them to allow the girl to spend the night beneath the holy bier (*sub feretro sancto*), and having obtained consent, the girl rested beneath the body and was healed. *VR*, pp. 219-22. William states that the woman, finding her daughter healed, left in haste and so the miracle did not become known in England until later. There is one other posthumous miracle involving a woman, however she does not come into contact with the body, but is cured by the hay which had been beneath the bishop's body during his funeral procession in Hereford. *VR*, p. 234.

[104] *Mater familias, quoniam sexus sui uerecundia et episcopireuerentia inhiberet cum eo colloquium serere, Colemanni auribus dolorem suum exponit. VW*, ii.9.2.

[105] Jay Rubenstein has noted that 'biographers often feel the urge to insert themselves in to the text, to tell a story about themselves or their connection to the subject.' J. Rubenstein, 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', *Writing Medieval History*, ed. N. Partner (London, 2005), p. 34.

[106] *Frequenti sanctimonialium exceptus laetitia inter eas assedit. VW*, ii.11.

(*amabilis enim utrique sexui ad religionis pietatem prodesse studuit et utrique sexui*).'[107] He established a community of nuns at Malling. Although he appointed nuns from other convents to watch over his new community as their spiritual mothers (*matres spirituales*), he preferred at first not to appoint an abbess, 'choosing to rule over them himself for several years.'[108] The author clearly defines Gundulf's gendered role however, noting others acted as spiritual mothers, 'while he procured for them such revenues and lands as he was able and gave much care to beautifying and adorning their church.'[109] This replicates Gundulf's role as father and husband, used previously in the narrative concerning St Andrews, Rochester. Yet his relationships were not restricted to celibate women. Queen Matilda, first wife to Henry I, is an important part of the narrative construction of his episcopal authority. The author writes that the queen 'frequently sent for him and was never tired of listening to his life-giving words.'[110] Gundulf was held in such affection by the queen that she requested that he perform the baptism of her newly born son. This close relationship meant that visitors to the royal court would beg the bishop to help them, 'and he as a kind intercessor (*pius interuentor*) confidently approached the king and queen and often obtained from them some act of mercy'.[111] It reinforces his role as an intercessor. This is a vital aspect of his role as bishop, both politically and spiritually. Following the solemn translation of the relics of St Paulinus to the newly built church at Rochester, the author recounts a story involving a married woman who, having been healed at the saint's shrine, broke her vow and returned to her life of oft-repeated sin. Following a subsequent visit to the shrine she was struck down with a

---

[107] *VG*, 34.5-6.

[108] *Abbatissam tamen eis primum praeficere noluit, sed eas per plures annos propria cura regere curauit. VG*, 34.19-21. Malling Nunnery was founded *c*.1090. According to the text Gundulf displayed some reluctance to appoint an abbess even on his deathbed until letters containing the advice and authority of the king and the archbishop in the matter had been read to him. *VG*, 43.7-9.

[109] *Matres igitur spirituales de aliis acceptas monasteriis priores uel custodes eis praeficiebat, redditus uel terras undecunque poterat adquirebat, earum aecclesiam ornatu uario decorare curabat. VG*, 34.14-17.

[110] *Eum ad se frequenter uenire faciebat, eiusque salubri colloquio infatigabiliter saciari cupiebat. VG*, 37.4-5.

[111] *Nam cum multi apud regem seu reginam aliquo impedimento obligati essent, ipse ab impeditis requisitus, pius interuentor fiducialiter ad eos accedebat, et opem misericordiae et sulleuationis se requirentibus ab eis sepius impetrabat. VG*, 37.9-13.

serious illness, 'and after summoning the venerable Bishop Gundulf she laid bare her guilt by humble confession and with heartfelt contrition promised to persevere in the complete amendment of her life.'[112] Following the bishop's guidance she undertook penance and was restored to health and later able to revisit the shrine without incurring the wrath of the saint. This was not a miracle related to sanctity; it is a narrative about the pastoral role of a bishop acting as intercessor between saints and sinners. However it also demonstrates that Gundulf was acting as confessor to men and women. Elsewhere in the *VG*, the author claims that Gundulf helped an unnamed bishop to avoid sexual temptation.[113] In this sense he helped both married women and (nominally) chaste men avoid sexual sin.

Maureen Miller argued that attacks on women were rooted in the clerical construction of alternative masculinity; one more powerful and deserving of power because it was not weakened by contact with the weaker sex.[114] Caroline Walker Bynum has noted a broad trend towards the feminisation of religious language from the twelfth century onwards; a development which Miller supposed to have undermined the depiction of clerical masculinity by introducing contractions within narrative accounts.[115] Episcopal hagiographers frequently make use of the biblical analogy of Mary and Martha as 'shorthand' for the active and contemplative life.[116] The author of *VG* makes frequent reference to Gundulf as both Mary and Martha. He writes that his reputation was enhanced as much on account of his sanctity as his ability in the management of secular affairs.

> For he divided his time with such discretion (*discretione*) that during some hours he would sit at the feet of the Lord with Mary, and during others he prepared the Lord's supper with Martha. He seems always

[112] *Aduocato ad se uenerabili Gundulfo episcopo per humilem confessionem reatus sui turpitudinem pandit, perseuerantiam emendationis integram in uita sua ex magna cordis contritione promittit. VG*, 18
[113] *VG*, c.33
[114] Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003) 49-50. See also, Moore, *The First European Revolution*, 7-23; Moore, 'Family, Community and Cult' *TRHS*, ser. 5. 30 (1980) 49-69
[115] Bynum, 'Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing', *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (London, 1984) 135-46; Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003) 51.
[116] There is not always a clear distinction made between Mary of Bethany and Mary Magdalene. See G. Constable, *Three studies in medieval religious and social thought* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 11.

> to have possessed this virtue of a two-fold discretion (*uirtutem discretionis bifidae*) as much before he was made bishop as afterwards...[117]

In fact the author repeats this analogy twice more: once in connection with monastic discipline and again, when describing how Gundulf was held in great reverence by King William II and all the barons (*caeteri nobiles*) of England.[118] William Wycombe uses the same analogy when describing the daily religious observance undertaken by Robert; 'for when at night he put aside the daily service of Martha, he sat at the feet of the Lord spellbound with Mary (*ut cessante diurno Marthe ministerio nocte resideret ad pedes domini suspensus cum Maria*).'[119]

Elsewhere in the *VG* the early friendship between Anselm and Gundulf is 'gendered' as the former appropriates the role of Christ and the latter, Mary; one talking the other weeping.[120] In fact Mary plays an important role in the narrative of Gundulf's life. Her penitence was the basis for his most extreme contemplations. The author describes how Anselm and Gundulf renewed their intimate conversation as venerable bishops in England (*in Anglia uenerandi episcopi*), subsequently detailing the mode of Gundulf's preaching, when at times he was unable to speak for tears.

> This happened especially on the feast of Saint Mary Magdalen when he was preaching to the people on her penitence and tears (*de eius poenitentia uel lacrimis*)... He had a particular love for this saint, making daily commemoration of her and celebrating her feast with

[117] *Tanta enim discretione diei spacia diuidebat, ut aliis horis ad pedes Domini sederet cum Maria, aliis Dominicam coenam praepararet cum Martha. Hanc autem uirtutem discretionis bifidae tam ante episcopatum quam in episcopatu semper noscitur habuisse... VG*, 10.8-12.

[118] The author describes how Gundulf, having established a new community of monks at Rochester, provided for them a pattern of the religious life; 'He was as Martha to them in procuring what was needful and as Mary in being a model of ardent contemplation (*his Martha necessaria procurando, his Maria intentae contemplationis se formam praebendo*).' *VG*, 17.17-8. Later in the text, following an account of the siege of Rochester in 1088, when William II cornered Odo of Bayeux, the author claims that 'the king and the rest of barons of England held Gundulf in great reverence, seeing in him now the tearful sighs of Mary, now the painstaking service of Martha (*princeps et caeteri nobiles regni eum nimia ueneratione coluerunt, attendentes in eo praecipue nunc Mariae lacrimosa suspiria, nunc Marthae laboriosa officia*).' *VG*, 29.1-4.

[119] *VR*, pp. 127-8.

[120] Anselm and Gundulf first met at Bec. According to the author of the *VG* their subsequent close friendship was marked out by their frequent conversations (*conversionem*). Anselm, having greater knowledge of the scriptures, spoke the most, while Gundulf was more frequently moved to tears. One spoke the other wept, 'one took the part of Christ, the other of Mary (*Christi uicesille, iste gerebat Mariae*).' *VG*, 8.14-5.

> great solemnity. For, believing himself to be a great sinner, he said that she who had formerly been such a sinner was more able to understand his needs and more willing, he believed, to have compassion on him.[121]

Gundulf's deep regard for Mary Magdalene is in stark contrast to the criticisms found in William Wycombe's work. In his narrative he uses the saint as a counterpoint to the actions of Robert, prompting the reader to judge (*iudicium*) their relative holiness. William describes how Robert, 'barefoot and with his face hidden', washed the leprous feet of the poor, before distributing alms. He examines the biblical comparison further.

> The sinful woman (*mulier peccatrix*) washed the feet of the saviour, watered them with her tears, dried them with her hair, and pressed her lips to them. The feet of the Saviour I say, the feet of the most clean, the feet of the most holy. This most humble bishop (*antistes humillimus*) washed the feet of the poor in whom was Christ; but leprous feet, ulcerated, foul. Even those he watered with his tears, dried with his hair and kissed. Compare the humility and devotion of these two.[122]

William uses the comparison with Mary Magdalene to highlight Robert's sanctity, emphasising the bishop's humility. In doing so he clearly implies that Mary's virtues had been overstated. However, the misogynistic tone of the narrative conceals a more obvious point; Robert was deliberately imitating Mary's holy actions.[123] Irrespective of the author's commentary, Robert repeatedly acts out the same scene: *lacrimis rigauit, capillis extersit, et oscula fixit*. Later during his last illness Robert again received the poor on Maundy Thursday, and from his sick bed he washed their feet, 'watered them with his tears, [and] dried them

[121] *Hoc autem maxime fiebat cum in festiuitate beatae Mariae Magdalenae de eius poenitentia uel lacrimis sermonem ad populum faciebat... Hanc quippe speciali quodam diligebat amore, huius memoriam et cotidiana commemoratione et annua simper facere satagebat solennitate. Quia enim multum peccatorem se esse credebat, eam quae multum peccatrix fuerat, quid multum peccatori magis necessarium esset magis nosse dicebat, et magis uelle misereri credebat. VG*, 33.47-56.

[122] *Lavit mulier peccatrix pedes Saluatoris, lacrims rigauit, capillis extersit, et oscula iunxit. Pedes inquam Salvatoris, sed pedes mundissimos, pedes sanctissimos. Lavit antistes humillimus pedes pauperum in quibus erat Christus, sed pedes leprosos, ulcerosos, cenulentos. Sed et hos lacrimis rigauit, capillis extersit, et oscula fixit. Confer opus humilitatis et devotionem amborum. VR*, pp. 165-6. The description of Mary as *mulier peccatrix* is found in Luke 7:39.

[123] The association of Mary Magdalen with the washing of Christ's feet is unclear. The Gospel of John 11:1-45, 12:1-8, mentions Mary of Bethany, who may or may not have been the same person as Mary Magdalene. Mary of Bethany was the sister of Lazarus and Martha, see Luke 10:38-42 .

with his hair (*lacrimis rigauit, capillis extersit*)'.[124] Jesus washed the feet of his disciples during at the Last Supper and bishops re-enacted this rite on Maundy Thursday along with the distribution of alms. However William Wycombe specifies that Robert dried the feet with his hair, explicitly referring to the feminine expression of penitence associated with Mary Magdalen. Even if the practicalities of a tonsured bishop drying hair are difficult to accept, it is clear that William is portraying a more complex attitude to feminine imagery than a cursory reading might reveal. Robert, in the throes of his last illness, remained 'in that constancy of mind for which Anna is celebrated'.[125] He is also associated with the devout women (*mulieres pias*) who wept outside the sepulchre, as 'he mingled his tears with theirs (*collacrimatur*).'[126] He contemplated the faithful women (*devotas mulieres*) who washed Christ's crucified body.[127] Female imagery is representative of tender affection and provision – in this sense it is an extension of the maternal imagery common in depictions of clerical rulership and therefore speaks largely to an Augustinian audience about the true nature of episcopal authority. However it also underlines the assertion that episcopal power is not gendered in a simplistic manner. Maureen Miller demonstrated in her study of two lives of St Ulrich that hagiographical texts revised in the post-reform era did *not* show a new concern for the role of women, rather they produced an extremely negative characterisation of lay men.[128]

Contemporary clerical authors, notably William of Malmesbury and Orderic Vitalis, were keen to report the levels of effeminate behaviour at the royal court.[129] Accusations of effeminacy suggest an attempt to undermine secular power and demonstrate its particular

[124] *VR*, pp. 201-2. This took place on Maundy Thursday. *Pedilavium* (washing of the feet), traces of which are found in the most ancient rites, occurred in many churches alongside the distribution of alms. For an account of the practice in post-Conquest England see Lanfranc, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, trans. D. Knowles (London, 1951), p. 31.
[125] *In ea tamen constantia mentis tota die permansit que de Anna predicator. VR*, pp. 207-8. It seems likely that this is a reference to Anna the prophet who appears in Luke 2:36-38.
[126] *VR*, pp. 209-12.
[127] *VR*, pp. 215-6. The Gospel accounts of Christ's burial are unclear about the participants. Mary Magdalene, Joanna and Mary the mother of James according to Luke 24:10; two Marys and Salome according to Mark 16:1; Mary Magdalene and the 'other' Mary according to Matt. 28:1; Mary Magdalene alone in John 20:1.
[128] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History*, 72 (2003), p. 34-7.
[129] For example OV, iv.186-90.

weakness. William of Malmesbury reports that Wulfstan had been shocked by the effeminate manners at the court of King Harold, leaving the readers of the *VW* in little doubt about the cause of the Anglo-Saxon defeat.

> For at that time, almost everywhere in England, morals were deplorable, and in the opulence of peace luxury flourished. Wulfstan employed invective against the wicked, not least those who grew their hair long. Indeed if any of these offenders put his head within range, the bishops would personally snip a flowing lock... Anyone who though it worth objecting he would openly charge with effeminacy and openly threaten with ill: men who blushed to be what they had been born, and let their hair flow like women would be no more use than women in defence of their country against a foreigner. No one would deny that this was shown to be very true that same year when the Normans came.[130]

Thus William of Malmesbury attributes defeat to feminine mores at court. In this narrative Wulfstan criticises secular power and reprimands the king, warning him of the consequences of his failure to act as a man. Kirsten Fenton has speculated that William of Malmesbury was using Wulfstan to reclaim a heroic English past by presenting the cleric as a man who could be admired for his masculine qualities.[131] Yet elsewhere William also uses sexually-charged criticism to attack more recent behaviour connected with the royal court of Henry I.[132] Eadmer claims that even before his appointment to Canterbury, Anselm rebuked William II over rumours about his sexual conduct, noting that, 'almost everyone in the whole kingdom daily talked about him, in private and in public, saying such things as by no means befitted

[130] *Vivebatur enim tunc pene ubique in Anglia perditis moribus, et pro pacis affluentia delitiarum feruebat luxus. Ille uitiosos et presertim eos qui crinem pascerent insectari, quorum si qui sibi uerticem supponeret ipse suis manibus comam lasciuientem secaret... Si qui repugnandum putarent, eis palam exprobrare mollitiem, palam mala minari. Futurum ut qui erubescerent esse quod nati fuerant, qui emularentur capillorum fluxa feminas, non plusquam feminae ualerent ad defensandam patriam contra gentes transmarinas. Quod in aduentu Normannorum eodem anno claruisse quis eat in infitias? VW*, i.16.3-4.

[131] K. A. Fenton, 'The Question of Masculinity in William of Malmesbury's Presentation of Wulfstan of Worcester', *ANS*, XXVIII (2005), pp. 124-137. See also R. Bartlett, 'Symbolic Meaning of Hair in the Middle Ages', *TRHS*, 6th Ser. 4 (1994), pp. 43-60, at p. 45-7, for a discussion of the significance of hairstyle as a mark of ethnic differentiation.

[132] In the *HN* William of Malmesbury makes similar allegations about the court of Henry I. They vied with women in the length of their locks and, when the hair was inadequate, they fastened on a kind of wig, forgetting, or rather not knowing, the Apostle's judgement, 'If a man have long hair it is a shame unto him.' *longitudine capillorum cum feminis certabant, et, ubi crines deficient, inuolucra quedam innodabant, obliti uel potius ignari sententie apostolice, 'Vir si comam nutrierit, ignominia est ille.' HN*, p. 6.

the dignity of a king.'[133] In the *HNA* Eadmer further expanded this point, writing that 'it was the fashion for nearly all the young men of the court to grow their hair long like girls... with locks well-combed, glancing about them and winking in ungodly fashion, they would daily walk abroad with delicate steps and mincing gait.' However following a sermon delivered by Anselm 'he brought a number of them to repentance with the result that they cut their hair short and adopted again such bearing as became a man'.[134] Those who would not comply were refused his blessing. These accounts reflect a very general monastic criticism aimed at secular power. But as John Boswell pointed out many years ago, '[s]exual foibles involving gender are favourite sources of humour or derogation for public figures, and one must exercise extreme caution in assessing accounts of homosexual behaviour on the part of controversial medieval monarchs or nobles.'[135] However beyond this both William of Malmesbury and Eadmer are attempting to demonstrate that (celibate) bishops were concerned with issues of gender. However, this does not imply a particularly reforming spirit; it merely indicates that bishops were concerned with gender boundaries.

Elsewhere in the *vita* of the holy woman Christina of Markyate, written by a monastic author sometime in the mid-twelfth century, there is an account of a 'shameless bishop (*impudicus episcopus*)', the lecherous Ranulf Flambard, who attempted to seduce the young virgin.[136] Christina was born at the very end of the eleventh century into a noble, Anglo-

---

[133] *Pene etenim totius regni homines omnes talia cotidie nunc clam nunc palam de eo dicebant, qualia regiam dignitatem nequaquam decebant. VA*, p. 64.
[134] *HNA*, p. 48.
[135] J. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago, 1981), p. 229.
[136] *The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse*, ed. and trans. C. H. Talbot (Reprint, Oxford, 1987). The text provides an account of the life of a holy woman, a recluse and later the prioresss of Markyate, who overcame various attacks to her vow of virginity. Talbot concludes that the text was composed by a monk of St Albans who was close to Christina, although no dedicatory letter or prologue has survived to confirm this assertion. The subject matter suggests that it was principally intended as a work of edification for the nuns of Markyate. However, it is likely that it was commissioned by an important churchman known to Christina. Talbot considered (and disregarded) two candidates from the episcopate (Archbishop Thurstan of York and Bishop Alexander of Lincoln) preferring a monastic patron from St Albans, Abbot Robert Gorham (1151-1166). Talbot speculates that much of the text was composed during Christina's lifetime, suggesting a final date of composition between 1156 and 1166. The only extant copy survives as an incomplete text added at the end of a folio manuscript (MS Cotton Tiberius E.1.) written during the second half of the fourteenth century. This was

Saxon family in Huntingdon in the diocese of Lincoln. Her struggle to maintain her virginity, against the wishes of her family, brought her into contact with a number of important churchmen and for this reason her life is an important source for the nature of episcopal involvement in gendered relations in England. The author 'sets the scene' by confirming that before his appointment to the bishopric at Durham, Ranulf had had children (*filios procrearat*) by Christina's maternal aunt, Alveva, who he later gave in marriage to one of the citizens of Huntingdon and 'for her sake held the rest of her kin in high esteem (*et illius causa reliquam eius honorabat propinquitatem*).'[137] The author is clear that Ranulf's liaison with Alveva was before his appointment to Durham (*ante episcopatum*) however he notes that the relationship continued to some degree after his appointment, explaining that the bishop, on his journeys between Northumbria and London would always lodge with her (*apud ipsam semper hospitabatur*).[138] It was during one of these visits that the bishop lured Christina into his chamber and attempted to seduce her.

> The shameless bishop (*impudicus episcopus*) took hold of Christina by one of the sleeves of her tunic and with that mouth which he used to consecrate the sacred spices, he solicited her to commit a wicked deed.[139]

The *Life* describes Christina's cunning in escaping from his clutches, fearing that she would be forced if she refused.[140] R. I. Moore has taken issue with the suggestion that Ranulf would have forced the girl, claiming that his subsequent actions (returning from London with gifts of silken garments and ornaments) sound more like 'courtship – even conceivably with a hint

partly destroyed by fire in the eighteenth century and so there are large sections missing from the narrative. For a more detailed study see C. Holdsworth, 'Christina Markyate' *Medieval Women*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1978), pp. 185-204; D. Gray, 'Christina of Markyate: the literary background', *Christina of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser (Abingdon, 2005), pp. 12-24.

[137] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 40-1.

[138] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 40-1.

[139] *Impudicus episcopus virginem per alteram tunice manicam irreverenter arripuit et ore sancto quo misteria [divina solebat] conficere de re nephanda [sollicitavit]. Christina Markyate*, p. 42-3.

[140] *Consentire nullo modo uoluit, aperte contradicere ausa non fuit. Quia si aperte contradiceret, proculdubio vim sustineret*. *Christina Markyate*, p. 42-3.

of apology for its overhasty beginning.'[141] However, whether Ranulf was a sexual predator or clumsy suitor, the fact remains that as a bishop he was subsequently able to use his power to influence the life of the young girl. Christina's hagiographer records that Ranulf was determined to take her virginity even by proxy.

> Then that wretch, seeing that he had been made a fool of by a young girl, was eaten up with resentment and counted all his power as nothing until he could avenge the insult he had suffered. But the only way in which he could conceivably gain his revenge was by depriving Christina of her virginity, either by himself or by someone else, for the preservation of which she did not hesitate to repulse even a bishop.[142]

According to the narrative Ranulf persuaded a young man named Burthred to claim Christina for his wife, and promptly left for Durham, satisfied that he had succeeded in conquering the maiden. We are informed that Burthred pursued his claim because of the bishop's support and with family and friends pressuring her Christina was forced to consent to the betrothal, even though she still maintained her vow to virginity. The hagiographer portrays Ranulf as an unsuitable bishop not only for his lust but also for his spiteful response to being spurned. He was outwitted by a young girl and then unable to reign in his passions: 'first a slave to lust and afterwards to malice (*captiuus prius luxurie post invidie*)'.[143] However Moore has argued that Ranulf's role in Christina's betrothal was considered 'consonant with his patronal relationship with her family'; he helped secure an advantageous match for the eldest daughter, even though she had rejected his own offer of protection.[144] In fact Christina's resistance to the institutional demands of her family was deeply unsettling for gendered relations of power. She posed a threat to the manliness of all involved. Burthred's

---

[141] R. I. Moore, 'Ranulf Flambard and Christina of Markyate', *Christina of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser (Abingdon, 2005), pp. 138-42, at p. 139.

[142] *Tunc ille miser videns quia illusus esset ab adolescentula, contabuit dolere [ut nisi] contemptum ulcisceretur, nichili [pend]eret quantumcumque uidebatur habere [po]tencie. Set nullo alio modo se ultum iri credidit quam ut uel per se uel [per] alium auferret Christine florem pudicicie, propter quam tutandam episcopum quoque spernere non dubitauit. Christina Markyate*, pp. 42-3.

[143] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 44-5.

[144] R. I. Moore, 'Ranulf Flambard and Christina of Markyate', *Christina of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser (Abingdon, 2005), p. 140.

companions, goaded him for his inability to consummate the marriage, urging him to take his wife either by force or entreaty, 'all he had to do was to act the man (*modo meminerit esse virum*)'[145] Later we are told that Christina behaved manfully (*viriliter*) as she continued to 'violently resist the desires of the flesh (*violenter res[pu]ebat desideria sue carnis*)'.[146]

Rather than interpreting Ranulf's behaviour in direct opposition to the demands of a reforming clergy it is possible to see some parallels with the depictions of Wulfstan and Anselm as bishops actively enforcing gender divisions. Ranulf set out to ensure that Christina complied with his own expectations of a noble woman. Ranulf's role as a lustful bishop is shocking, but it occurs in the narrative as a way of investigating Christina's staunch defence of her vow. It was his subsequent behaviour as a bishop, directing the sexual lives of others, which provided the greatest indication of his episcopal power. Wulfstan cut hair; Anselm preached; Ranulf arranged marriages. Indeed Christina's father, frustrated at being unable to persuade her to abandon her vow, sought out another bishop, Robert of Lincoln. At first Robert declared that 'there was no bishop under heaven who could force her into marriage (*non est episcopus sub cello qui ad nupcias illam constringere possit*)' if she wished to keep her vow.[147] However, Christina's father, learning of Robert's greed, was able to bribe the bishop and obtain a reversal of the initial judgment.[148] Later when Christina escaped her parental home and the unwanted marriage, she sought shelter with a hermit, still fearing that she might be discovered and handed over to her husband on the orders of the bishop. Her new protector, Roger the hermit, at first refused to hide a married woman until Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, declared her vow of virginity valid.[149] Later he sought the help of Archbishop Thurstan of York who was known to support such holy vocations. Thurstan met secretly with Christina and promised to annul her marriage, allowing her to fulfil her earlier vow and her

[145] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 52-3.
[146] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 113-5.
[147] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 64-5.
[148] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 70-1.
[149] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 84-5.

husband Burthred to marry another woman.[150] His interference in the diocese of Lincoln must have incensed Bishop Robert, undoubtedly as it was intended to do. Later Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury confirmed her vow. When Christina eventually decided that she would make her profession at St Alban's, the site of her first vow of virginity, she sought and obtained permission from Bishop Alexander.[151]

Gender is a useful category of analysis for any analysis of power. However the *Herrenfrage* of the eleventh and twelfth centuries has become a distraction. Yes, bishops were men, but there is no indication of a particular concern with their own vision of masculinity. Miller argues that narratives of holy bishops written in the wake of the eleventh-century reforms displayed a clerical attempt to redefine power, authority and ultimately the masculinity of the reformed clergy. Miller studied hagiographical texts which sought to define a new model of clerical masculinity, but in doing so she posed a central question: 'why should we understand these changes in the portrayal of the holy bishop's power as relating particularly to masculinity?'[152] It is also worth asking, why should they relate particularly to reform and the Gregorian conception of power?

The bishops of London offer an interesting case study. William of Malmesbury offered a highly significant description of two successive bishops as men.

> Next, William, duke of Normandy and then king of England, appointed one Hugh D'Orival bishop [of London]. But within a few

[150] *Qui seorsum diu locutus est cum illa et per ipsam discens [quid fieri]oportuit... ex illa hora accepit eam in sua. Promittensque illi quod post[modum] executus est: scilicet immunitatem coniugii confirmacionem uoti pro sponso suo licenciam ducendi aliam uxorem per apostolicum: remisit eam. Christina Markyate*, pp. 112-3. After Roger her protector died, Thurstan arranged for her to be taken into the charge of another cleric, and he late offered Christina the role of abbess at the convent of St Clement, York, founded sometime between 1125 and 1135. He also suggested a role for her at Marcigny-les Nonnains, founded by St Hugh of Cluny in 1080, or Fontevrault. *Christina Markyate*, pp. 126-7. For an account of the bishops involvement in Christina's life see, T. Head, 'The Marriages of Christina of Markyate' *Christina of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser (Abingdon, 2005), pp. 116-37.

[151] *Christina Markyate*, pp. 126-7.

[152] M. Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture', *Church History,* 72 (2003), p. 39.

> years of his ordination he fell incurably ill. The king's disease had covered his body with blisters, and it brought him to try a shameful remedy. For he believed those who told him that his one hope was to have his testicles, seat of his humours, cut off, and did not flinch from the operation. So a bishop had to put up with the slur of being a eunuch, without finding any cure, for he remained leprous all his life. Hugh was followed by Maurice, a man restrained in other pleasures, but more sensually devoted to a self-indulgent love of women than befitted a bishop. There was a persistent rumour that the remedy prescribed by his doctors was to look to the health of his body by the emission of humours. He was indeed unlucky to have to safeguard the flesh by endangering his soul.[153]

William of Malmesbury's account of two successive bishops of London, one without, the other very much in possession of a penis, has reasonably been interpreted as monastic gossip aimed at a powerful group of canons at St Paul's. Indeed Brooke suggested that the cathedral remained a home for married clergy long after Maurice's death in late September 1107, noting particularly that their immediate successor, Richard, was married.[154] Compare this with the account of the bishops produced by a canon of London.

> When Maurice had gone the way of all flesh, the lord Richard, a man worthy of veneration, assumed the burden of the episcopacy, a man, I say, both wise and energetic, distinguished for his nobility of character and for his morality. He marvellously advanced the work on the walls of the new church; also he acquired, at his own expense, the broad streets around the church which had been previously occupied by the houses of the laity, and which he virtually surrounded with a very solid and strong outer wall, and in general he enhanced and enlarged the London church with many additional gifts (*aliisque quam plurimis beneficiis ludoniensem ecclesiam ampliauit*).[155]

---

[153] *Porro Willelmus ex comite Normanniae rex Anglie Hugonem quendam, cognomento Deoriual, episcopum creauit. Is post paucos ordinationis annos in morbum incurabilem incidit. Siquidem regia ualitudo totum corpus eius purulentis ulceribus occupans ad pudendum remedium transmisit. Nam credens asserentibus unicum fore subsidium si uasa humorum receptacula, uerenda scilicet, exsecarentur, non abnuit. Itaque et obprobrium spadonis tulit episcopus, et nullum inuenit remedium quoad uixit leprosus. Hugoni successit Mauritius, a ceteris quidem uoluptatibus sobrius, sed in feminarum amorem delicatius tener quam episcopum deceret. Erat tamen fama constans medicos ei hanc medelam dictasse, ut effusione humorum corporis salubritati prouideret. Infelix profecto, qui carnis statum tueretur animae periculo. GP*, ii.73.18-19*β*.

[154] C. N. L. Brooke, *The medieval idea of marriage* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 78-89. Elsewhere Brooke claimed that the next two successive bishops London were "married": Richard and Robert de Sigillo, C. N. L. Brooke, 'Married Men Among the English Higher Clergy, 1066-1200', *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12:1 (1956), p. 187.

[155] *Mauricio autem uiam uniuerse carnis ingresso, dominus Ricardus, uir uenerandus, curam suscepit regiminis, uir, inquam, prudens et strenuus, nobilitate et moralitate conspicuus. Iste quidem incepte muros ecclesie mirabiliter auxit, necnon et plateas circa eandem ecclesiam permaximas, que ante domibus laicorum obsesse*

This resonates loudly with the 'reformist' notion of masculinity. The author does not mention the 'marriage' or the flagrant nepotism associated with this bishop; however it cannot have been unknown to the principal audience at St Paul's. Was this author attempting to appropriate or subvert the generic depiction of the manly bishop?

Clerical celibacy may not have caused a crisis for everyone. As we have seen the body is often a synonym for sexuality. This is all connected with interpretations of gender. Undoubtedly sexuality was considered to be part of a person's public persona. Yet neither Hugh nor Maurice found their position as bishop under threat. Maurice in particular was remembered as a successful bishop and administrator. Even William conceded this and he later removed the accusation writing instead that Maurice, 'the king's chancellor, [was] a man of tarnished reputation in certain respects, though rightly praised as a man of business.'[156] Medieval historians are conscious that accusations of sexual impropriety are part of a 'fiercely competitive culture of public power... which subsumed the institutional divisions between lay and ecclesiastical estates.'[157] These texts show a highly pragmatic use of gendered language. Authors use gender to demonstrate power but not in response to an anxiety about reform. They are primarily concerned with individual rather than generic episcopal power.

---

fuerant, proprio sumptu adquisiuit, et in circuitu muro fortissimo pene cinxit, aliisque quam plurimis beneficiis Lundoniensem ecclesiam ampliauit. MSE, V.1-22. For a full account of this source see Chapter 5.

[156] *Hugoni successit Mauritius, regis cancellarius, quanuis in quibusdam minus prosperae famae, predicabilis tamen efficatiae. GP*, ii.73.19.

[157] C. Leyser, 'Masculinity in Flux: Nocturnal Emission and Limits of Celibacy in the Early Middle Ages', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London, 1999), pp. 103-120, at p. 105.

Part Three

Et habitavit in nobis

> In the final analysis, what is the past but a once material existence, now silenced, extant only as sign and as sign drawing to itself chains of conflicting interpretations that hover over its absent presence and compete for possession of the relics, seeking to inscribe traces of significance upon the bodies of the dead?[1]

Weeks before his death, Timothy Reuter received a British Academy research professorship for a project that promised to illuminate medieval bishops and their dioceses. In an unpublished paper delivered at the IMC at Leeds in 1995 Reuter described a *Europe des dioceses* in the late-tenth and early-eleventh century, 'where bishops ruled over what by contemporary standards were highly coherent and functioning statelike units' that kept in touch with one another.[2] By this interpretation bishops should not be viewed as royal servants, or by the terms of their relationship with royal power, but within the setting of their diocese.

Roberta Gilchrist has written that 'space forms the arena in which social relationships are negotiated, expressed through the construction of landscapes, architecture and boundaries. The resulting spatial maps represent discourses of power based on the body.'[3] The study of social space has allowed historians to discover much about the operation of power: institutionalised competition over economic and political power, as well as the struggle for hegemony and clashes of interest. Chris

---

[1] G. Spiegel and L. Stone, 'History and Post-Modernism', *Past and Present*, 135 (1992), pp. 189-208, at p. 208.

[2] T. Reuter, 'Leeds Paper: *Europe des diocèses*' (IMC Leeds, Typescript, 1995), p. 5

[3] R. Gilchrist, 'Medieval Bodies in the Material World: Gender, Stigma and the Body', *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin (Manchester, 1994) 43-61. *Idem*, *Gender and Material Culture: the Archaeology of Religious Women* (London, 1994), p. 43.

Wickham described it as, ‘the intricate connection between the physical topography of power and its mental counterpart’.[4] The history of the patrimony (*mensa*) of the bishops is particularly fertile for the study of episcopal power. As George W. Dameron has pointed out, ‘a proper understanding of any advanced society requires the historian to identify the groups that control the institutions.’[5] But the institution is merely the building. A number of individual diocesan studies have also been produced and this has stimulated interest in the relations between the bishop and his cathedral chapter.[6] There has been no attempt to combine these studies. Archaeologists too have increasingly moved from an economic explanation to a social explanation of particular through the study of the use of space within buildings. Using Bourdieu’s theory of *habitus* archaeologists have been increasingly concerned to investigate the relationship between space and ideology. Christopher Gerrard has examined the adoption of struturalist principles, writing that, ‘culture is perceived to be underlain by deeper codes and rules, and archaeologists seek to make these hidden mental structures explicit.’[7] Like their historian counterparts medieval archaeologists have been caught up in a theoretical minefield.

Maureen Miller traced the development of urban space and sacred authority by shifts in the topography of the holy in northern Italian cities. According to Miller, ‘architecture articulated and provided the theatre for cultural expressions of power.’[8] The bishop’s seat came to be a prominent locus of the holy, particularly by fostering

---

[4] C. Wickham, ‘Topographies of Power: Introduction’, *Topographies of Power in the early Middle Ages*, eds., M. de Jong, F. Theuws and C. van Rhijn (Leiden, 2001).
[5] G. W. Dameron, *Episcopal Power and Florentine Society 1000-1320* (Cambridge, Mass., 1991), p. 2.
[6] Important contributions include, *Anglo-Norman Durham* 1093-1193, eds. D. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich, (Woodbridge, 1994); *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996*, eds. I. Atherton, E. Fernie, C. Harper-Bill and H. Smith (London, 1996).
[7] C. M. Gerrard, *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches* (London, 2003), p. 226.
[8] M. Miller, *The Bishop’s Palace: Architecture & Authority in Medieval Italy* (New York, 2000), p. 253.

the cults of their episcopal forebears as the special patrons of the city.[9] In addition to this the new physical centrality of the cathedral, its patron saint, and its bishop had become potent unifying symbols of the city. Miller describes episcopal efforts to translate the bodies of their holy predecessors as well as their attempts to secure their own burial in the cathedral. This has particular significance for the post-Conquest period in England.

[9] *Ibid*, p. 126.

· Chapter Five ·

New Cathedrals and Old Saints: negotiating episcopal power

The impact of the Norman Conquest on the English landscape is well documented.[1] Alongside their castles, sometimes literally in the case of Durham and Lincoln, the Normans oversaw the construction of some of the greatest Romanesque churches in Europe. These cathedrals and abbeys were monumental symbols of Norman rule. The sheer scale was intimidating. These buildings were statements of Christian piety but also of wealth and power. Most of all, they were reminders to a conquered people about who now controlled England. The physical evidence speaks eloquently of the dramatic and visible impact of the Conquest on the English. Eric Fernie states plainly that Normans 'undertook the great rebuilding not only because the money and opportunity were available to them, but equally because they saw modernising the country as a means of indicating who, both politically and culturally, was in charge.'[2] Erecting vast stone monuments in order to dominate the landscape was a Norman policy of complete control over their new conquest; in this way, historians have had no problem interpreting cathedrals in the same way that they understood the building of castles.

The Normans did not just build; they destroyed the past.[3] Historians have suspected that it was a deliberate policy by Norman patrons to eradicate the Anglo-Saxon past and assert their dominance. Normans built churches in the Norman style to demonstrate Norman power and mark the conquered landscape. Wulfstan, the only English bishop to retain his see

[1] This is a vast topic but important contributions to this topic include, E. Fernie, *The Architecture of Norman England* (Oxford, 2000); B. Little, *Architecture in Norman Britain* (London, 1985). For the Normans in England see D. Douglas, *William the Conqueror: the Norman Impact upon England* (London, 1969); R. A. Brown, *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (London, 1973); M. Chibnall, *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford, 1986); *idem*, *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester, 1999); A. Williams, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge, 1995).
[2] E. Fernie, *The Architecture of Norman England* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 24-5.
[3] Eric Fernie has noted that 'no English cathedral or large monastic church is known to retain within its fabric *any* standing masonry of Anglo-Saxon date.' *Ibid*, p. 24. The only major Anglo-Saxon church not rebuilt after the Conquest was Westminster Abbey, which had been designed in the Romanesque style.

for a significant period after the Conquest, rebuilt the cathedral at Worcester in the 1080s. William of Malmesbury provided an eloquent account of the bishop's regrets over the destruction of the Anglo-Saxon church. According to William the bishop lamented the destruction of the old church built by St Oswald.

> When the bigger church, which [Wulfstan] himself had started from the foundations, had grown large enough for the monks to move across to it, the word was given for the old church, the work of St Oswald, to be stripped of its roof and demolished. Wulfstan stood there in the open air to watch, and could not keep back the tears. His friends mildly reproved him: he should rather rejoice that in his lifetime so much honour had accrued to the church that the increased number of monks made larger dwellings necessary. He replied: 'My view is quite different. We unfortunate are destroying the works of saints in order to win praise for ourselves. In that happy age men were incapable of building for display; their way was to sacrifice themselves to God under any sort of roof, and to encourage their subjects to follow their example. But *we* strive to pile up stones while neglecting souls.[4]

This passage reveals an enormous amount about contemporary attitudes to cathedral building and sacred space in the post-Conquest period. Firstly that the cathedral was a testament to the religious devotion of the founder and was closely identified with the line of episcopal authority. Wulfstan lamented the destruction of the old building precisely because it was a physical reminder of his predecessor St Oswald. Secondly, the old building offered a physical comparison with the elaborate constructions of the Norman era which demonstrated pride in display. It offered an implicit criticism of the new extravagant architecture which characterised the new building. This was incompatible with the notion of simple (monastic) piety favoured by Wulfstan. Richard Gem identified parallels (even connections) between Wulfstan's criticisms and later twelfth-century Cistercian criticisms of elaborate architecture.

[4] *Cum aecclesiae maioris opus, quod ipse a fundamentis inceperat, ad hoc incrementi processisset ut iam monachi migrarent in illam, iussum est ueterem aecclesiam, quam beatus Oswaldus fecerat, detegi et subrui. Ad hoc spectaculum stans sub diuo Wlstanus lacrimas tenere nequiuit. Super quo modeste a familiaribus redargutus, qui gaudere potuis deberet quod se superstite tantus aecclesiae honor accessisset ut ampliatus monachorum numerus ampliora exigeret habitacula, respondit: 'Ego longe aliter intelligo, quod nos miseri sanctorum opera destruimus ut nobis laudem comparemus. Non nouerat illa felitium uirorum aetas pompaticas edes construere, sed sub qualicumque tecto se ipsos Deo immolare, subiectosque ad exemplum attrahere. Nos e contra nitimur ut animarum negligentes accumulemus lapides.' GP*, iv.141.4. Cf. *VW*, iii.10.2-4.

The key idea, according to Gem, was 'the one about buildings meriting preservation because they are to be regarded as holy relics.'[5] Wulfstan's views expressed by William of Malmesbury were representative of traditional Anglo-Saxon views that an ancient church should be preserved because of its holy associations. This is in contrast to Norman practice which favoured complete rebuilding.

From 1070 onwards new cathedral buildings were underway in every English diocese. Bishops were the driving force behind this change.[6] And bishops undoubtedly betrayed a personal involvement in the desire to memorialise their own rule and compete with their contemporaries. However impressive (or oppressive) they may appear from the outside, cathedrals are much more than stone monuments; they are spaces. Inside these buildings many operations of power took place, from ritualised religious ceremonies of inauguration to personal engagement with God. They were places for noisy crowds of pilgrims and quiet individual contemplation. Perhaps most significantly they were reliquaries for the holy dead. To understand them simply as physical symbols of conquest built to intimidate the local population is to misunderstand the complex nature of power in space. At a local level, at least initially, bishops were propelling the desire to build and extend the cathedral space. There are many factors to consider: who was financing the building, who was designing the overall structure as well as the intricate carvings and painted façades? Very quickly a whole range of people claimed ownership of these buildings: from the bishop on his throne to the young girl carving her name into the stone wall.[7] The bishop's role in the cathedral is a matter for meaningful enquiry. It was literally the seat, *cathedra*, of his power but inside this building he experienced many challenges and negotiations of power.

---

[5] Gem, 'England and the Resistance to Romanesque Architecture', *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*, eds., Harper-Bill, Holdsworth and Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989) 131-9, at 133.

[6] Crownie, *Religious Patronage in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135* (Woodbridge, 1998)

[7] Christina of Markyate's carved her name into the cathedral wall. *Christina Markyate*, pp. 7.

A vital source for examining the relationship between the bishop and the cathedral in the late eleventh and early twelfth century is Simeon of Durham's *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie* (*LDE*) and its continuations, which chronicle events in the cathedral up until the mid 1150s.[8] Simeon was commissioned by his monastic superiors to record the journey undertaken by the religious community of St Cuthbert, who fled Lindisfarne in 875 with the saint's relics, and having settled for more than a century at Chester-le-Street, finally moved to Durham in 995 where they remained.[9] Simeon explains that although the church no longer stands in the place where it was founded, 'nevertheless by virtue of the constancy of its faith, the dignity and authority of its episcopal throne, and the status of the dwelling place of the monks… it is still the very same church founded by God's command.'[10] Many historians have interpreted Simeon's work as an attempt to justify and endorse the introduction of a new monastic chapter, using Cuthbert's relics to demonstrate continuity with the past; Lindisfarne had been founded as a monastic community but by the late eleventh century their successors at Durham were secular, married clerks. In 1083 William St Calais, the second post-Conquest bishop, replaced the community of clerks with Benedictine monks from the newly refounded monasteries of Monkwearmouth and Jarrow.[11]

[8] Previously known as the *Historia Dunelmensis ecclesie*, the most recent edition of this text and the accompanying continuations was published by OMT (2000). The main text written by Simeon traces the history of the church of Durham, which was founded in 995, back to its ecclesiastical predecessors at Chester-le-Street and Lindisfarne, the ancient monastery founded by King Oswald and Bishop Aidan in 635, and the home of St Cuthbert. According to Rollason it was written in the period 1104-1107x1115. There are ten manuscript versions of the *LDE*, two of which date from the early twelfth century. The author Simeon was a monk of Durham (possibly introduced by William St Calais) commissioned by his monastic superiors. He was present at the translation of St Cuthbert in 1104. Rollason has indicated that the *LDE* may have been 'a team effort', written by a number of monks and compiled by Simeon. Each manuscript, apart from one, contains a 'continuation' which details the pontificate of Ranulf Flambard (1099-28), his successor Geoffrey Rufus (1133-41), and the usurpation of the bishopric by William Cumin, followed by the installation of the rightful bishop, William St Barbe (1143-52). The date of the continuation is uncertain although it is likely that it was completed sometime in the 1160s. A variant account, found in only one manuscript, includes the episcopate of Hugh le Puiset (1153-95). For a fuller account see, *LDE*, pp. xv-lxviii; *Simeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D Rollason (Stamford, Lincs, 1998), esp. pp. 1-13.
[9] Simeon refers to his commission, *LDE*, prologue.
[10] *Licet enim causis existentibus alibi quam ab ipso sit locata, nichilominus tamen stabilitate fidei, dignitate quoque et auctoritate cathedre pontificalis, statu etiam monachice habitationis… ipsa eadem ecclesia Deo auctore fundata permanet. LDE*, pp. 16-7.
[11] For the significance of this event see D. Rollason, 'Simeon of Durham and the Community of Durham in the Eleventh Century', *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. C.

In fact it has been suggested that the introduction of the monastic community was 'as much part of the advancement of Norman control in the north as a process of ecclesiastical reform.'[12] However, William Aird has argued that the events of 1083 have been overstated. He suggests that the *LDE* was principally a response to the appointment of a predatory and greedy bishop, Ranulf Flambard, as bishop of Durham in 1099. Aird claims that 'there are signs that the attentions of this notoriously rapacious bishop inculcated in the hitherto unmolested convent of Durham a sense of institutional and proprietorial insecurity which they sought to assuage through a corporate assertion of their rights, and a statement of their view of the way in which their bishop, as the spiritual heir of St Cuthbert, was expected to behave.'[13] Simeon's work is highly hagiographical in character; it emphasises the role of the bishop as a successor to Cuthbert, and warns of the punishments that will be inflicted on those who offend the saint.

Historians have catalogued the *LDE* alongside the work of other post-Conquest historians and hagiographers who used the Anglo-Saxon past to defend themselves against the Normans.[14] The increase in the production of historical (and hagiographical) texts had been interpreted as evidence of Anglo-Saxon attempts to assert their cultural identity in the

---

Hicks (Stamford, Lincs, 1992), pp. 183-198; A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989) pp. 437-46.

[12] Rollason has speculated that the monks were deliberately chosen to replace a clerical community with strong local and political connections. D. Rollason, 'Simeon of Durham and the Community of Durham in the Eleventh Century' *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. C. Hicks (Stamford, Lincs, 1992), p. 198. See also A. Dawtry, 'The Benedictine Revival in the North: The Last Bulwark of Anglo-Saxon Monasticism?', *Studies in Church History*, 18 (1982), pp. 87-98. For an account of the role of Durham in rebellion against the Normans see W. E. Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and its Transformation 1000-1135* (Chapel Hill, 1979), pp. 120-57.

[13] W. Aird, 'The Political Context of *Libellus de Exordio*', *Simeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D Rollason (Stamford, Lincs, 1998), pp. 32-45, at p. 42. Bernard Meehan has dawn similar conclusions about the motivation for the continuations to the *LDE*, arguing that they were produced in the context of the relationship between Durham priory and Bishop Hugh le Puiset. B. Meehan, 'Notes on the Preliminary Texts and Continuations to Symeon of Durham's *Libellus de Exordio*', *Symeon of Durham. Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D. Rollason (Stamford, 1998), pp. 128-139.

[14] R. W. Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing IV: the sense of the past', *TRHS*, 5th ser. 23 (1973), pp. 243-63; A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), pp. 114-21; M. Brett, 'John of Worcester and his Contemporaries', *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), pp. 101-26.

face of Norman scepticism.[15] However, this view has been modified by Susan Ridyard who has noted that before very long Norman churchmen realised the opportunity they presented 'in the definition both of [their religious communities'] internal relations and of their own relations with external secular and ecclesiastical powers.'[16] Rollason has claimed that 'the *Libellus de exordio* breathes the spirit of reconciliation between the native English and the continental incomers.'[17] This, according to Simon Yarrow, 'was part of a process of cultural and political assimilation between English monastic communities and those Norman ecclesiastics installed to positions of authority over them.'[18]

Medieval miracle collections or *miracula* are increasingly seen as a valuable part of the corpus of sources available to the medieval historian. They reveal the history of the particular shrine and the cult upon which it was centred. Above all it reveals the concerns of the compiler and his community. As William Aird has pointed out for Durham, miracle collections were not just a random selection of tales about a saint's thaumaturgical powers. The content of the *miracula* represents a conscious attempt to respond to the pressures experienced by the guardians of saints' relics in the opening decades of the twelfth century.[19] By contrast, the figures of the bishops of Durham rarely appear in connexion with the performance of Cuthbert's miracles. They are mentioned in a very few of the *capitula,* and

---

[15] The initial reaction of Lanfranc towards St Elphege is perhaps the most well-known example. *VA*, pp. 50-4; Southern, *Saint Anselm*, pp. 263-7; P. Hayward, 'Translation Narratives in Post-Conquest Hagiography and English Resistance to Norman Conquest', *ANS*, 21(1999), pp. 73-85; J. Rubenstein, 'Liturgy Against History: the competing visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum* 74 (1999), pp. 279-309; Richard Pfaff's work has concluded that there was no 'Lanfrancian purge' of the Anglo-Saxon calendar. R. Pfaff, 'Lanfranc's Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar' *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. T. Reuter, (London, 1992), pp. 95-108; *idem*, *Liturgical calendars, Saints and Services in Medieval England* (Aldershot, 1998). Rubenstein has suggested that Lanfranc's reluctance to cultivate the cults of St Dunstan and St Elphege was derived from a desire to shift attention from the Anglo-Saxon saints towards the central symbols of Christian worship.

[16] S. Ridyard, '*Condigna Veneratio*: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons', *ANS*, 9 (1987), p. 205.

[17] *LDE*, p. xc.

[18] S. Yarrow, *Saints and their Communities: miracle stories in twelfth-century England* (Oxford, 2006), p. 6.

[19] William Aird explains that, 'the compiler of the miracle collection discussed here sought to represent a particular set of views which he hoped would enhance the reputation of the saint and, by association, bolster the position of the monastic community which tended his tomb.' W. Aird, 'The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*', *Northern History*, 28 (1992), pp. 1-24, at p. 6.

where they are noticed it is usually incidentally. This has reinforced the view that cathedral chapters were developing increasing ties with the cathedral and excluding the bishop.

Historians have struggled to reconcile the apparently sceptical Norman attitude towards the cult of Anglo-Saxon saints and the continued vitality of many cults. Using Susan Ridyard's work many historians have argued that the Normans began to actively seek to promote such cults in their churches. In particular the construction of the new church is often seen as a way of demonstrating the strength of the cult. However, the archaeological evidence from this period does not support the contention that bishops were building principally to foster a pilgrimage site. The space in the cathedral was jealously guarded. These buildings were the product and cause of negotiated power between the bishops, the cathedral chapter, architects, masons, builders, local people and the available material. They were vast building projects which must have changed the area for a time as the construction was underway. But to understand these buildings in a purely functional way is to neglect the central purpose of the cathedral, as God's temple, resting place of the holy dead. This was one of the principal negotiations. Simon Keynes has commented that, 'the most effective expression was always the building of a new church, which in symbolising the glory of God also advertised the wealth and power of those who identified with local ecclesiastical interests.'[20] These buildings became the last resting place of bishops from the past as well as their twelfth-century successors. There is an obvious parallel between the cathedral building programme which deliberately undermined the Anglo-Saxon predecessors and the Norman attitude to the cult of saints.[21] This has been used to investigate ethnicity/identity in the wake of the Conquest: both in terms of continuity and change. The building and the cult has become a

[20] S. Keynes, 'Ely Abbey 672-1109', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, eds. P. Meadows and N. Ramsey (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 52-3.
[21] D. Rollason, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1989).

measure of the changing 'ethnicity' of England.[22] It is possible to use the cathedral/cult parallel to examine the relationship between the bishop and the chapter. In order to do this we must look at the narrative accounts of bishops' interactions with former bishops. How did they confront the physical relic in the cathedral?

Accounts of translations confirmed that the saint approved of the new location and, perhaps more importantly, with the decisions made by their custodians: the men who controlled the relics. Bishops were forced to negotiate power with their chapters through the persons of the saint. In this sense they were constantly confronted with the memory of their predecessor. They were judged by their ability to recreate a glorious remembered past. For this reason the relics, particularly at key moments of translation, have been seen as the focus of tension. However, the narratives demonstrate that the real focus of tension was the cathedral building. This is supported by the study of the relationship between the bishop and chapter in the cathedral churches and the separation of the bishop from the chapter. Everett Crosby's study of the historical development of the *mensa episcopalis* and the *mensa capitularis* is based on the economic development of the chapter. He argued that, 'in extreme cases the prelate was turned into a mere visitor, a distant official who was a stranger even to his own cathedral church.'[23] However, during the first half of the twelfth century Everett U. Crosby found no evidence of the legal and administrative structures which needed to be in place in order to account for the emergence of the chapter as a largely independent community of clergy. Yet the cathedral building was the site of this change. The construction of the new building forced bishops to confront the claims of their chapter. What came to be about episcopal lands in general began as the negotiated strategies of power over the site of the cathedral, the physical and material sign of episcopal power. This contest was especially

[22] I. Short, '*Tam angli quam franci*: Self-definition in Anglo-Norman England', *ANS*, XVIII (1996), pp. 153-175.

[23] E. U. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the* Mensa Episcopalis (Cambridge, 1994), p. 2.

evident when the bishop died. His entombment within the cathedral was the last act of episcopal power.

On Thursday 11 August 1093 a ceremony took place to lay the foundation stone of the new cathedral at Durham. According to Simeon, at the same time Bishop William St Calais 'led Prior Turgot before the people of the whole bishopric and enjoined him to be his representative over them so that through the office of archdeacon he should exercise pastoral care in all things throughout the bishopric (*Christianitatis curam per totum ageret episcopatum*)'.[24] Furthermore he declared that all future priors were to hold the office of archdeacon. This, according to Simeon, was not without authority and precedent (*sine auctoritate uel exemplo*). Cuthbert had preached while provost (*prepositus*) of his monastery and 'because of this Bishop William is known to have resolved that whoever should be St Cuthbert's successors as prior in his church (*ut quicunque sancti Cuthberti in ipsius ecclesia successores in prioratu fuerint*) should also succeed him both in preaching and in pastoral care.'[25] Simeon's account was intended to define the expectations of the role of prior/archdeacon at Durham. He stated that Prior Turgot and his successors should undertake the pastoral role of the bishop, particularly as a preacher. As such the prior *not* the bishop was the successor to Cuthbert. Throughout his work Simeon is at pains to emphasise the direct connection between the monastic community and Cuthbert. Having (re-)established the monastic chapter William St Calais led the monks *in ecclesiam sancti Cuthberti*, 'and handed

[24] *Quo tempore memoratum priorem Turgotum ante totius episcopatus populos producens, uices suas etiam super illos ei iniunxit, ut scilicet per archidiaconatus officium, Christianitatis curam per totum ageret episcopatum. LDE*, iv.8.
[25] *Quapropter memoratus antistes ita constituisse dinoscitur, ut quicunque sancti Cuthberti in ipsius ecclesia successores in prioratu fuerint, etiam in predicationis officium curam Christianitatis eidem succedant. LDE*, iv.8.

over the church to them and them to the church (*ecclesiam illis et illos ecclesie contradidit*)... he bound them indissolubly to the sacred body of the most holy father Cuthbert (*et ad sacrum sanctissimi patris Cuthberti corpus inseparabiliter astrinxit*).'[26] This account confirms that the monastic chapter, resident at the cathedral, were the principal guardians of the church. Just over a decade later, the new cathedral building was sufficiently complete for Cuthbert's relics to be translated to a shrine in the apse. Bishop William had died in 1096 and so his successor Ranulf Flambard presided over the ceremony in 1104.[27] A written account of this event was composed at Durham in the 1120s.[28] The narrative substantially limits the role of the bishop. Although Ranulf was present at Durham, the monks undertook to inspect the saint's body alone. Having confirmed it remained incorrupt they reported their findings to the bishop who refused to believe them.[29] In this sense he fulfils the Norman role of sceptic. In fact the original inspection took place in such secrecy that others, including a local abbot, expressed doubts about the monks' claims.[30] To resolve this Ralph, abbot of Seéz and later archbishop of Canterbury, proposed a further examination. Several leading clergy attended including William of Corbeil, at that time a chaplain of the bishop of Durham but later

---

[26] *LDE*, iv.3.

[27] William Aird has commented that 'it is surely no coincidence that the Translation should have taken place exactly eleven years after work on the cathedral had begun, for that was the same period which lay between Cuthbert's burial in 687 and his removal to a new shrine in 698.' W. Aird, 'The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*', *Northern History*, 28 (1992), pp. 20-1.

[28] A twelfth-century account of the *translatio* of Cuthbert in 1104 was composed at Durham along with a record of the saint's posthumous miracles. Together this collection is known as the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti* (Durham, *De mir.*). The miracle chapters are printed in *Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia Historia Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis*, 2 vols. ed. T. Arnold (London, 1882) I, 229-61; II, 333-62. Bertram Colgrave identified three distinct sections to the miracle collection, supposing the account of the translation to have been written twenty years after the event, perhaps even after the death of Ranulf Flambard in 1128. The author was probably a monk of the monastery at Durham who might well have been present at the original inspection of the body. For an account of the date and authorship see B. Colgrave, 'The Post-Bedan Miracles and Translations of St Cuthbert', *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe: H. M. Chadwick Memorial Studies*, eds. C. F. Fox and B. Dickins (Cambridge, 1950), pp. 307-32; W. Aird, 'The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*', *Northern History* 28 (1992), pp. 1-24. See also S. Crumplin, 'Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert from the Ninth to the Twelfth Centuries' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of St Andrews, 2004), pp. 124-150.

[29] Durham, *De mir.*, I, 254.

[30] The abbot is not identified. Durham, *De mir.*, I, 256. A. J. Piper has suggested that 'the very considerable length and circumstantial detail of the early account of the translation speaks perhaps of a certain insecurity on the part of the monks.' A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 437-46, at p. 438.

successor to Ralph at Canterbury (*tunc Dunelmensis episcopi clericus, sed post saepedictum Radulfum ecclesiae Cantuariensis archiepiscopus*).[31] However Bishop Ranulf was not present; he was busy elsewhere dedicating an altar in the church.[32] His position on the periphery of events is further confirmed by the account of his unsuccessful preaching outside the cathedral. The procession of Cuthbert's relics around the building was halted at the eastern end of the new church while the bishop began a long sermon.[33] The author then claims that a sudden rainstorm forced everyone into the church.

> No sooner had they [gone inside] than the rain straightaway ceased; and the inference from this is plain, that it was not pleasing to God that the sacred body of his servant should be detained any longer in unholy ground.[34]

The body was placed in the shrine; Cuthbert was now part of the cathedral. And the monks, using the body, were now able to assert their rights to this space.

In order to understand this account more fully it is important to examine it alongside Simeon's depiction of William St Calais. The *LDE* presented an idealised image of Bishop William, who delegated his specific pastoral functions (within the cathedral) to the monastic community. It is significant that whilst William entrusted the prior with the duty of preaching, Ranulf sought to hijack the translation service with his *longioris sermonis*. In addition the Durham account also deliberately excluded Ranulf from any significant contact with Cuthbert's remains. Yet their anxiety was not directed at episcopal power generally but with the person of Ranulf Flambard. In fact the narrative specifically identifies Ralph and William of Corbeil as future archbishops who reaffirmed Cuthbert's sanctity and endowed

[31] Several other churchmen are mentioned as well as Alexander, future king of Scotland. Durham, *De mir.*, 258. For an account of William of Corbeil's early career see Paul Anthony Hayward who has discussed the inclusion of names of kings and bishops in post-Conquest accounts of the *translatio* of Anglo-Saxon saints and concluded that the 'authority-laden translation-narrative' was a hagiographical device to promote and defend a cult against Norman scepticism. P. Hayward, 'Translation-Narratives in Post-Conquest hagiography and English resistance to the Norman Conquest', *ANS*, XXI (1998), pp. 67-93.
[32] *Praeterea et plures eiusdem ecclesiae fratres, nam caeteri episcopo assistebant, iam tunc in ecclesia altare dedicanti.* Durham, *De mir.*, I, 258.
[33] Durham, *De mir.,* 260.
[34] *Quo illato, pluuia continuo cessauit, ut hinc nimirum daretur intelligi, Deo non esse placitum famuli sui sacrum corpus aliquanto diutius extra sancta loca detineri.* Durham, *De mir.*, 260.

the solemn ceremony with pontifical authority. William St Calais acted decisively to devolve power to the monks. Ranulf's behaviour is presented as directly contradicting the precedent enshrined by his predecessor. However both accounts take place at significant moments in the construction of the new cathedral: the laying of the foundation stone and the *translatio*. The monastic accounts use William St Calais and Cuthbert to affirm their claim to the building. This also helps explain why Ranulf was absent from the examination of Cuthbert's relics. While the monks busied themselves with a dead body, Ranulf was concerned to consecrate the altar in the new church. In this sense the bishop and his chapter were negotiating power within the new cathedral building. The monks considered Ranulf's long sermon to be irrelevant precisely because it delayed the saint's entrance into the cathedral.[35] But this was the moment at which the bishop asserted his position as the dominant character in relation to the new building. His control over proceedings was only countered through divine intervention. From a monastic point of view the rainstorm indicated God's ill-favour towards the bishop's attempts to dominate the monks and supersede their authority in the church. Ranulf diverted funds from the monks to advance the building of the cathedral.[36] From Ranulf's point of view the new church belonged to him.

Simeon frequently uses the expression *ecclesia sancti Cuthberti*. Bishop Walcher the first Norman appointment was 'consecrated to the bishopric of the church of St Cuthbert (*ad pontificatum ecclesie sancti Cuthberti consecratur*).'[37] In fact Simeon recounts in great detail the complicated instructions left by the saint for his burial. Cuthbert, demonstrating himself to be a truly humble saint, requested that his body be buried at Farne, the small island on which he had spent his final years as a hermit. Eventually, however, he conceded that if the

[35] *Iam dies in altum processerat et episcopus, multa quae praesentis negotii non postulauerat causa interserens, longioris multos sermonis fecerat taedere.* Durham, *De mir.*, 260.
[36] A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 437-46, at p. 442; H. S. Offler, *Durham Episcopal Charters, 1071-1152* (SS 179; Durham, 1968), nos 14-18.
[37] *LDE*, iii.18.

monks should later overturn his decision then he should be buried in the interior of the church (*in interioribus basilice*), 'so that you yourselves [i.e. the monks] may visit my tomb when you wish, but so that it may be in your power whether any visitors should have access to it (*et in potestate sit uestra an aliqui illo de aduenientibus accedant*).'[38] Simeon then refers to the 1104 translation, giving thanks for Cuthbert's permission to control his relics: 'let us hold in contempt whatever adversity may assail us in the changeable state of this world, so long as we rejoice to have so a great a treasure as his holy body in our midst.'[39] Written in the context of the new Durham cathedral this is an explicit statement of ownership not just of the relics but of the church in which they are housed. Simeon is establishing monastic claims to the new cathedral building. It was precisely for this purpose that the monks insisted on the exclusion of women.[40] They were making the cathedral part of the monastery. Such exaggerated and repeated insistence suggests that others did not view the new building as monastic property. Monastic anxiety was principally focused on their position within this new space. Whoever controlled the cathedral was the principal representative of episcopal power.

Architectural evidence at Durham confirms that the church was not principally constructed as a pilgrimage site for the shrine for St Cuthbert. The cathedral, almost exactly as it now stands, was finally complete in 1133. It was built to a three-apsed plan, and Cuthbert's shrine was located within the central apse.[41] John Crook has noted that 'little in the architecture would suggest the presence of a major cult.'[42] Certainly in the early twelfth century bishops were not building cathedrals with the principal intention of fostering a

[38] *LDE*, i.10.
[39] *Omne quicquid nutante seculi statu aduersum ingruerit despectui habeamus, dummodo talem ac tantum sacri corporis thesaurum in medio nostri nos habere gaudeamus. LDE*, pp. 52-3.
[40] Accounts of Cuthbert's misogyny have been attributed to Benedictine monastic tradition beginning in the late eleventh century.
[41] *GP*,
[42] Crook argues that this accords precisely with the features of other early Anglo-Norman churches, which suggests that relic cults had no influence in architectural planning. J. Crook, 'The Architectural Setting of the Cult of St Cuthbert in Durham Cathedral (1093-1200)', *Anglo-Norman Durham*, eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 235-250, at p. 247.

valuable cult. The translation of the relics was not intended as a money-making enterprise. In fact the Durham account of the inspection confirms that even the monks were concerned about displaying the body. The architectural evidence, which is particularly strong in Durham suggests that the cathedral was representative of an innovation in design, part of what Eric Fernie has described as the 'second generation' in Anglo-Norman architectural development. Earlier cathedrals, notably Winchester, were devoid of decoration, yet Durham, 'is almost a riot of multiple mouldings on the arches, including chevron, the distinctive architectural ornament of Norman England.'[43] Most significantly is the technical advance of the vault rib, 'an epoch-making invention which contributed to the development of the Gothic style'.[44] Yet the revolutionary features found at Durham did not lead to further architectural developments; in fact Fernie argues that the chief impact of the rib vault in England can be seen 'primarily as part of the change in decoration', as from the 1090s structure gave way to decoration.[45] Yet it is now supposed that the decorative aspects of the cathedral were the most influential for the immediate development of medieval English architecture. The intricate decoration has been interpreted as a consequence of the main function of the church as a shrine for St Cuthbert.[46] Although it is unclear that the shrine influenced the plan of the building; it was not designed to accommodate a large number of visiting pilgrims.[47]

---

[43] E. Fernie, *The Architecture of Norman England* (Oxford, 2000), p. 34. Fernie points out that the change from plain to decoration may not have been striking to contemporaries who may have recognised the forms of carving in the earlier painted decoration which covered the external masonry of earlier buildings.
[44] Fernie argues however that, 'in the context of Norman England… [the rib vault] is the apogee of a previous long-running development rather than the springboard for a new one.' *Ibid*, p. 36.
[45] *Ibid*, p. 36.
[46] M. Thurlby, 'Patron and Master Mason of Durham Cathedral', *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds., D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 161-84. See also L. Reilly, 'The Emergence of Anglo-Norman Architecture: Durham Cathedral', *Anglo-Norman Studies XIX* (1996), pp. 335-51, p. 343. Cf. J. Crook, 'The Architectural Setting of the Cult of St Cuthbert in Durham Cathedral (1093-1200)', *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds. D. W. Rollason, M. Harvey and M. Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 235-250.
[47] For a discussion of the importance of iconography in Anglo-Saxon architectural features, including a discussion of Durham see E. Fernie, 'Archaeology and Iconography', *Architectural History*, 32 (1989), pp. 18-29. See also L. Reilly, 'The Emergence of Anglo-Norman Architecture: Durham Cathedral', *Anglo-Norman Studies XIX* (1996), pp. 335-51, at p. 341.

A. J. Piper has pointed out the particular emphasis on Cuthbert at Durham may have been a consequence of the introduction of a monastic chapter. 'The sweeping away of the old community in 1083 removed from the scene those whose historic identity involved the preservation of the traditions from the more immediate past, for whom conservatism was a matter of living memory.'[48] In this sense the Normans were making use of the Anglo-Saxon past 'to make their presence part of an ongoing tradition and to gloss over the rupture their conquest represents.'[49] It has been suggested that this was part of a policy to establish an influential pro-Norman group in Durham.[50] The close affiliation with Cuthbert may have been part of a Norman strategy to undermine the immediate Anglo-Saxon past by appealing to a more distant time when holy men were really present in England. Yet ironically Simeon's work is highly dependent on the concept of episcopal authority within the cathedral. It was at the order of Bishop William St Calais the old cathedral at Durham was replaced.[51] Cuthbert had defied bishops in the past. There had at one time been a plan to take Cuthbert's remains to Ireland. Bishop Eardwulf and Abbot Eadred, exhausted from fleeing the Viking attacks, had loaded the relic onto a ship only for the winds to change and their plan was aborted.[52] Another bishop, Sexhelm, had hardly been resident in the church for a few months when Cuthbert expelled him and he fled.[53] Emphasising their control over the saint's relics allows the community to assert their control over the situation and maintain some semblance of authority and agency. The monks insist that no one may access the saint without their permission. This is a symbolic of their attempts to assert control over the cathedral. Cuthbert's body was a metaphor for the cathedral and the diocese.

---

[48] A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), p. 445.
[49] L. Reilly, 'The Emergence of Anglo-Norman Architecture: Durham Cathedral', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XIX (1996), pp. 335-51, p. 345.
[50] B. Abou-el-Haj, *The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transformations* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 41. See also Dabid Rollason's account of the canons links with local aristocratic families.
[51] *LDE*, Bk 4c.8, pp. 128-9.
[52] *LDE*, ii.11.
[53] *Sexhelm loco eius est ordinates, sed uix aliquot mensibus in ecclesia residens, sancto Cuthberto illum expellente aufugit. LDE*, ii.19.

Ranulf Flambard hardly features at all in Simeon's work. There is an account of a 'tax collector', named Ranulf, who visited Durham during the reign of William Rufus and intended to plunder the church for the king. According to the *LDE* St Cuthbert appeared to Ranulf in a dream, 'struck him with his pastoral staff (*baculo pastorali*) which he held in his hand, rebuked him with episcopal authority (*auctoritate pontificali*) and with a threatening countenance that he should have dared to have come there to afflict his people'.[54] The man woke and found himself stricken by illness. He pleaded for the saint's forgiveness and sent a precious cloth to his tomb. But his illness only grew worse, 'and he had himself carried around the various parts of the bishopric on a litter to show everyone his guilt and the vengeance which had been wreaked on him.'[55] Gifts were not sufficient to calm the saint and as long as he remained in the places belonging to the bishopric (*in locis ad episcopatum*) his illness persisted. Simeon does not explicitly equate the tax collector with Bishop Flambard, however neither does he distinguish between them; the audience is left to draw their own conclusions.[56] In fact in a later passage from the 'continuation' to the *LDE* the author described the exactions imposed by Ranulf, who 'increased the weight of his hand on the bishopric (*aggrauauit manum super episcopatum*), demanding money from it immoderately.'[57] He conceded that the bishop added ornaments to the church but this generosity was never consistent. There is a further comparison with Simeon's narrative when the author describes Ranulf's final illness. The bishop 'ordered that he should be carried into the church, where he sat facing the altar (*se in ecclesiam isussit transportari, ubi residens*

[54] *Beatus Cuthbertus ei per somnium assistens, baculo pastorali quem manu gestabat illum impulit, et auctoritate pontificali et uultu minaci increpauit, quod illuc ad populum suum affligendum ausus fuerit uenire. LDE*, iii.20.

[55] *Verum inualescente infirmitate, per diuersa episcopatus loca in feretro se circumferri fecit, reatumque suum et uindictam ubique omnibus ostendit. LDE*, iii.20.

[56] For identification of the tax collector with Ranulf see A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 437-46, at p. 442; W. Aird, 'The Political Context of *Libellus de Exordio*', *Simeon of Durham: Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. D. Rollason (Stamford, Lincs, 1998), pp. 32-45, at p. 42-4.

[57] *LDE*, Continuation, pp. 274-5.

contra altare)'.[58] Here, he repented deeply of the sins he had committed against the church and by placing his ring on the altar (*per anulum altari impositum*) he restored everything he had taken away.[59] The depiction of the bishop being carried to the church resonates with Simeon's story of the tax collector being carried on a litter to show everyone his guilt. Ranulf relinquished his claim to the bishopric by placing his ring on the altar, behind which lay Cuthbert's relics. Like his namesake before him, his suffering would only be alleviated once he had left the diocese.

In contrast, William of Malmesbury wrote that Ranulf was cautious when he first arrived at Durham 'for fear of offending a saint who is said to be particularly severe in the censure of sinners... But when one or two offences passed without punishment, he went so far as to remove without hesitation any criminal who took refuge in the saint's church: an outrage of unprecedented temerity.'[60] Yet William concedes that 'by the erection of new buildings for the monks and by his veneration for St Cuthbert he contrived some glory for his name. So his fame was heightened by the elevation of the holy body, which he took up from its tomb and put on view for all who wished to see it.'[61] Ranulf invaded Cuthbert's space however he was also responsible for the construction of that space and therefore he had legitimate claim to act within it. Irrespective of how clerics interpreted Ranulf's behaviour they could not escape from the reality of his involvement with the church itself. William of Malmesbury even suggests that the impetus for displaying the body came from Ranulf. This is supported by the Durham account of the translation in the sense that the author claims that

[58] *LDE*, Continuation, pp. 278-9.
[59] *LDE*, Continuation, pp. 278-9. The author claims that Ranulf confirmed his restitutions by a charter under his seal. Two charters mentioning Ranulf's repentance and the ring are extant.
[60] *Venit ergo Dunelmum, et primo quidem timidius se agebat, Sanctum uerens offendere, qui fertur peccantium seuerus inprimis correptor esse. Sed uno et altero delicto commisso nec uindicato eo processit ut reum, si quando ad ecclesiam Sancti confugeret, absrahere non dubitaret, ausus scelus omnibus retro annis inauditum.* *GP*, iii.134.3. For an account of the sanctuary of St Cuthbert see D. Hall, 'The Sanctuary of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert, His Cult, and Community to AD1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 425-36.
[61] *In edifitiis autem nouis monachorum et translatione beatissimi Cuthberti nonnullam gloriam nomini suo commentus est. Extulit ergo eius famam sacri corporis elatio, quod e mausoleo leuatum cunctis uolentibus fecit conspicuum.* *GP*, iii.134.4.

the monks were reluctant to undertake the second public display before Ralph, abbot of Seéz intervened. The relics were displayed under episcopal power.

St Cuthbert acted as warning and example for Ranulf and his successors. Simeon states explicitly that 'as a bishop [Cuthbert] left a model of the episcopal life to be imitated by other bishops (*episcopus etiam episcopis imitandam uite pontificalis normam reliquit*)'

> Therefore whoever would succeed him in this highest office should strive also to imitate his life… He should carefully consider, I say, lest he should be burdened with sins when he occupies the episcopal throne (*cathedram*), a throne which Cuthbert himself, radiant with the splendour of all virtues, had made glorious.[62]

This passage may have been specifically intended for Ranulf Flambard. The text emphasises the physical *seat* of power, the *cathedra*. Piper argues that the *LDE* expressed the monk's perception of Flambard and the danger he posed to their newly founded monastic community.[63] Whoever presumes to become a successor, sits in Cuthbert's space. For Simeon and his contemporaries at Durham, the church was their space. By linking it so closely with Cuthbert, they sent a loud message to anyone who would presume to challenge them: you are merely a temporary link in a chain which connects us with Cuthbert. However this was not about who controls Cuthbert, it was about who controls the cathedral. Possession of relics symbolises the institutions legitimate and permanent guardianship of relic which conferred legitimate guardianship of the church and its lands. Simeon identified preaching as an important pastoral function and claims that it was given to Turgot. According to the *tranlsatio* Ranulf's preaching was long and inconsequential. Yet William St Calais possessed well-rounded episcopal power. He made all the decisions. He also initiated the building of the church. William, not Cuthbert, is the idealised vision of episcopal power. The monks did not

[62] *Quapropter qui ei in culmen honoris succedit, uitam quoque imitari studeat… Consideret, inquam, ne peccatis oneratus occupet cathedram, quam ille uniuersarum effulgens docore uirtutum effecerat gloriosam. LDE*, pp. 48-9.

[63] The bishop did not associate with the bishop in undivided company; he appointed an archdeacon other than the prior; he did not continue the plans made by William St Calais for a separate monastic endowment. A. J. Piper, 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 437-46, at 442.

object to episcopal power as presented by him. However, they undoubtedly viewed his pontificate through rose-tinted spectacles.

At Durham, the cult of St Cuthbert was so deeply connected to the monastic chapter's sense of identity that they were unable to tolerate any extension of episcopal involvement. Their anxiety about guarding their rights is clearly demonstrated in Symeon's account of the death and burial of William St Calais.

> Whilst he was lying there waiting for the hour of his summons, the bishops were deliberating on the place that he should be buried, and it seemed to them most fitting that his body should by rights be buried in St Cuthbert's church itself, since he had always devoted all his efforts to ensuring that the holy body of that bishop and confessor should have a continual service worthy and pleasing to God performed by the congregation of monks which he had established there. He protested against this, however, and earnestly forbade it. "By no means," he said, "by no means let my dead body be the occasion of the customs of St Cuthbert's church being broken, which have been so carefully preserved from ancient times up to the present. Not only has it never been permitted for anyone to be buried in the place where his undecayed body rests, but even for a corpse to be brought there for a time has never been allowed." They decided therefore that he should be interred in the chapter house, since the brethren would assemble there daily and the sight of their beloved father's tomb would daily renew his memory in their hearts.[64]

This account claims that 'the bishops' suggested that William should be buried in the church. It was an episcopal right. However William refused and his reasoning, presented by Symeon, was clearly applicable to his successors. Symeon is quite clear: it would be inappropriate for anyone, even a bishop, to be buried in St Cuthbert's church. This supports the vision of the *LDE* as a text designed to defend the church from the episcopal incursions. William, a pious and humble bishop, was worthy of the monks' prayers because he in no way sought to usurp

[64] *Iacente illo atque sue euocationis horam expectante, episcopis inuicem de loco sepulture illius conferentibus id conueniensuidebatur, ut in ipsa sancti Cuthberti ecclesia eius corpus iure sepeliri deberet, qui ad ipsum confessoris et episcopi sacrum corpus congregatione monachorum stabilita ut dignum et placitum Deo seruitium ibidem iugiter fieret, quam maxime simper sollicitus fuerta. Quod contra illeclamans, hoc fiery multum prohibuit, 'Absit, 'inquiens, 'absit ut sancti Cuthberti ecclesie consuetudo, que ab antiquis temporibus tam sollicite hactenus seruabatur, mei corporis causa soluatur. Nunquam enim in loco quo eius incorruptum corpus reqiescit, alicuius defuncti corpus non solum non sepeliri, sed nec ad horam inferri licuit.' Placuit ergo illis ut in capitulo tumulari deberet, quatinus in loco quo fratres cotidie congregarentur, uiso eius sepulchre carissimi patris memoria in eorum coribus cotidie renouaretur. LDE*, 252-5. This story is repeated in the *GP*, iii.133.3

their rights as guardians of St Cuthbert's church. Symeon was writing during a period of strained relations between the bishop and the monks. His message was unambiguous: do not allow a bishop to compromise control of Cuthbert's shrine. The account of Cuthbert's translation contained the same message. In other words, the monks controlled the cathedral space. It did not belong to the bishop but to Cuthbert. And Cuthbert belonged to the monks. Symeon's central purpose was to clarify this relationship. Undoubtedly there was a financial purpose. Symeon was at pains to describe the division of the episcopal lands between the bishops and the chapter. According to Aird, 'it is doubtful, however, at least during the pontificate of William St Calais, whether this division was as precise as Symeon or his fellow monks would have liked it to have been, but this lack of precision only became a source of dispute when Bishop William's arrangements began to be compromised by a more assertive bishop.'[65] Thus when William St Calais refused burial in the church he was keeping episcopal interference to a minimum. Symeon's comments were directed at William's successors: the cathedral is not your place. It belonged to Cuthbert and his monks. William St Calais was a model bishop in that he left the running of the church to Prior Turgot who he appoints as archdeacon along with his successors.[66] He stayed out of the cathedral – the realm of the monks.

William died several years before Cuthbert's translation to the new cathedral. His burial in the refectory may have had more to do with the practical aspect of the unfinished church. The church had to wait for Cuthbert to be present before they could accept a new body. In fact according to the *LDE*, William died in January 1096; his body was 'wrapped in episcopal vestments as is customary', and the brethren who were with him took his body back to Durham, where amidst much grief it was laid out in the church of St Michael.[67] In fact

---

[65] W. Aird, *St Cuthbert and the Normans: The Church of Durham, 1071-1153* (Woodbridge, 1998) p. 147.
[66] *LDE*, pp. 129.
[67] *LDE*, pp. 255. Historians have been unable to identify this church. It may well be a reference to the chapel in the castle.

when archaeologists excavated the chapter house in the 1870s they discovered three grave slabs inscribed with the names of William's successors, Ranulf Flambard, Geoffrey Rufus and William of Saint-Barbe, but no trace of William Saint-Calais.[68]

The *Liber Eliensis* was compiled by monks towards the end of the twelfth century and records the history of the religious community at Ely from the earliest days of English Christianity to the compiler's own time.[69] In 1109 the Benedictine monastery at Ely, which had been founded in 970, became the seat of the new bishopric and this development proved traumatic for the monks. The text describes how bishop Hervey, bishop of Bangor, had been exiled from his see and sent to Ely by Henry I 'to be provided there temporarily with support from the church's resources' until the king had decided what should be done with him.[70] According to the *LE*, Hervey's 'extreme rigour (*gentem efferam nimia austeritate tractabat*)' when exercising his episcopacy in Bangor had caused the local people to attack his *familia* and threaten his life, forcing the bishop to seek refuge under the protection of King Henry, who 'decided that he should be sent to the church of Ely and subsequently receive his episcopal charge from there (*ad Elyensem ecclesiam destinatum procurationem inde accipere eum constituit*).'[71] Despite being imposed from above, the bishop was welcomed by the monks, and he subsequently convinced them to agree to raise the status of the abbacy to a bishopric. It was agreed with the king and Robert, bishop of Lincoln that a new diocese would be created, and apportioned land from the church of Lincoln having made suitable restitution.

> And, after this secret negotiation between the king and Bishop Robert had been concluded – entirely without consultation with the monks,

[68] The editors of the *LDE* have speculated that the chapter house as excavated in the nineteenth century was not constructed by 1096, and the *LDE* is referring to a different structure. *LDE*, p. 254 n.53. The Continuation of the *LDE* confirmed that the monk's chapter house was completed during the pontificate of Geoffrey Rufus. K. W. Markuson, 'Recent Investigations in to the east Range of the Cathedral', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. N. Coldstratem and P. Draper (Leeds, 1980), pp. 37-48, at, p. 39.

[69] Blake provides a detailed discussion of the authorship and date of the *Liber Eliensis* in his introduction to the Camdem Third Series edition, esp. pp. xlvi-xlix.

[70] *Liber Eliensis*, III.1.

[71] *Liber Eliensis*, III.1.

> sons of the church though they were, and without their knowledge – Bishop Hervey was sent off to Rome with letters from the king to have this proposed arrangement confirmed.[72]

It seems that Hervey had attempted to secure his translation to another bishopric in 1102, but he had met with opposition from Archbishop Anselm. According to the *Liber Eliensis* the initial impetus for change from monastery to cathedral came from Abbot Richard, who supposed that it was the most effective way to repel the attentions of the bishops of Lincoln.[73] Thus the cult of St Æthelthryth at Ely provides a useful comparison with Durham. The *Liber Eliensis* depicts St Æthelthryth as a defender of monastic rights against the incursions of another greedy bishop.[74] When Nigel, the royal treasurer and nephew of Roger of Salisbury, was appointed to Ely the community must have felt deeply uncertain about its future. Having already been consecrated by Archbishop William at Lambeth, Nigel entered the episcopal see, and 'was received in great glory, enthroned and took command in a manly fashion (*cum magna gloria suscipitur, intronizatur, et viriliter dominatur*).'[75] Thus the narrative confirms that from his very first moment in the cathedral the bishop sought to exercise control. Almost immediately however Nigel was forced to leave the diocese and travel to London in order to attend to 'urgent affairs of the kingdom (*causis regni imminentibus*)' because he was custodian of the royal treasury. As such he was forced, 'against his will admittedly', to entrust the care of the entire bishopric to a man named Ranulf.[76] Ranulf, an apostate and ex-monk (*apostata et exmonachus*), 'raised himself up as equal to his lord in all respects and now even above him (*ei per omnia consimilem et iam*

[72] *Et, finito hoc inter regem et Robertum episcopum secreto negotio, monachis omnino inconsultis ecclesie filiis et ignorantibus, Herueus episcopus cum litteris regis ad confirmandum hunc propositum Romam destinatur.* *Liber Eliensis*, III.1. The new see was confirmed by Pope Paschal, 21 November, 1108.
[73] *Liber Eliensis*, III.Prologue.
[74] Æthelthryth, also known as Etheldreda or Audrey, was a seventh-century Northumbrian queen and nun. She was married twice but maintained her virginity. She founded an abbey at Ely and where she ruled as abbess. For a short account see Thacker, 'Æthelthryth (*d.* 679)', *ODNB*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8906, accessed 17 Sept 2010]. For an account of the relationship between the monks and their female saint, see M. Otter, 'The Temptation of St Æthelthryth', *Exemplaria*, 9:1 (1997), pp. 139-63.
[75] *Liber Eliensis*, III.44.
[76] *Unde, licet inuitus, tamen his sollicite attentus, cuidam Radulfo nomine totius episcopatus commisit curam.* *Liber Eliensis*, III.45.

super illum extulerat).'[77] In other words Ranulf assumes the position of bishop. In fact the author suspects that Ranulf may have deliberately misled the Bishop Nigel about the monks with the intention of replacing the monastic community.[78] This is an explicit statement of monastic anxiety about the threat posed by an authoritative episcopal presence in the cathedral. Ranulf's corrupt administration was compounded by Nigel's rapacious attitude towards church properties. The bishops ordered a full list of all episcopal lands and possessions in order to ensure that he received everything to which he was entitled. Not content with this he stole from the monks and looted St Æthelthryth's shrine.[79] Eventually Æthelthryth is forced to intervene. According to the *Liber Eliensis* Ranulf conspired to murder Bishop Nigel gathering about his many supporters. When his plan was discovered the traitor fled. One of them, named Ralph, 'suddenly came rushing into the monastery and fled to the body of St Æthelthryth (*subito in monasterium se ingessit et ad corpus sancte Æðeldreðe confugit*).'[80] The plot against the bishop was exposed. Thus the author concludes that the monks were freed from their cruel tyrant by the intercession of their saint.[81] Yet Ranulf escaped and Nigel, although temporarily chastened having discovered the plot against him, soon returned to his avaricious ways. This was further compounded by his involvement in the Anarchy of King Stephen's reign. Nigel was forced to flee Ely.[82]

Virginia Blanton argues that the *Liber Eliensis* indirectly associates the shrine with the architectural space of the monastery, explaining that 'the sarcophagus holds the body, the shrine contains the sarcophagus, the church surrounds the shrine, and the monastic close

[77] *Liber Eliensis*, III.47. The text claims that Ranulf had been a monk at Glastonbury at one point.
[78] *Et ut miseros Elyenses monachos prediorum et possessionum iura potestatemque usurparet, malignis susurrationibus episcopum sepius circumuenit*. *Liber Eliensis*, III.47
[79] *Liber Eliensis*, III.50.
[80] *Liber Eliensis*, III.52.
[81] *Monachi ergo meritis sancte Æðeldreðe domine et advocate sue patrocinio liberati a crudeli tyranno, magno exultant tripudio. Liber Eliensis*, III.52.
[82] *Liber Eliensis*, III.62-88.

envelops the church... [which] was at that time completely surrounded by marshes.'[83] Accordingly the narrative uses these architectural (and geographical) features as symbols of the institutional boundaries which symbolise their power relations with others.

In the *Liber Eliensis* the author records the burial of Osmund, a Swedish bishop who had been attached to the royal court during the time of King Edward the Confessor. He retired to the monastery at Ely where he spent the rest of his life.

> Received into full fraternity, at the brother's request he used to carry out all the functions of a bishop in their house. For all bishops retiring here kept for themselves a single privilege: that now they had relinquished the care of their bishoprics, they were to exercise no office but that of a bishop… [When Bishop Osmund died] he left to us the episcopal ornaments granted to him for his lifetime, and finally he rests in peace, after translation by us from his old burial place.[84]

The new building at Ely was begun sometime in the 1080s under the direction of the newly-appointed Norman Abbot Simeon, former prior of Winchester and brother to Bishop Walkelin. Simeon died in 1093 and was not replaced until 1100 by Abbot Richard. The building work continued and the eastern arm was ready for the translation of St Æthelthryth in 1106.[85] The archaeological evidence supports the account from the *Liber Eliensis* which places the shrine near the high altar (*contra maius altare*).[86] The author also asserts that the abbot invited Anselm as the guest of honour, 'with the aim of strengthening this solemn

[83] V. Blanton, *Signs of Devotion: The Cult of St Æthelthryth in Medieval England, 695-1615* (University Park, PA, 2007), p. 136. Cf. Monica Otter has argues that the twelfth-century narratives insist on enshrining Æthelthryth firmly in her marble tomb because 'she is an alien presence in her own monastery; yet it is precisely that alienness, and the defensive psychological measures it forces, that make her an embodiment of her community.' M. Otter, 'The Temptation of St Æthelthryth', *Exemplaria*, 9:1 (1997), pp. 139-63, at p. 163.

[84] *In plenam fraternitatem receptus, omnia episcopalia apud eos eorum petitione faciebat. Hoc enim solum omnes episcopi huc se conferentes sibi retinuerunt, ut relicta cura episcopatuum solum episcopale officium exercerent… Sub quo defunctus, episcopalia ornamenta hic, dum uiueret, concessa nobis dereliquid et tandem de ueteri sepultura a nobis translatus in pace requiescit. LE*, II.99. P. H. Sawyer, *Kings and Vikings: Scandinavia and Europe, A.D. 700-1100* (London, 1982). In December 2004, the bishop of Skara visited Osmund's tomb at Ely.

[85] Æthelthryth's incorrupt body was translated along with the relics of her sisters, Seaxburh, Eorenhild and Wihtburh. Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, the eleventh-century hagiographer wrote a number of *vitae* concerning the female saints at Ely. See R. C. Love, *Goscelin of Saint-Bertin: the hagiography of the female saints of Ely* (Oxford, 2004). For an account of Goscelin's contribution to the revival of Anglo-Saxon saints see A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London, 1974), pp. 107-111.

[86] E. Fernie, 'The Architecture and Sculpture of Ely Cathedral in the Norman Period', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, eds. P. Meadows and N. Ramsey (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 95-111, at p. 96.

ceremony with his solemn and, most of all, his pontifical authority (*pontificali auctoritate*)'.[87] Other invitations went out to as many men as possible of pontifical dignity (*pontificalis dignitatis*) and honour. However Bishop Herbert of Norwich was the only member of the episcopate to attend the ceremony. In fact he, being a most eloquent man (*viro eloquentissimo*), preached to the congregation, causing many to weep while they contemplated the virgin saint. This was followed by a violent thunderstorm with lightning-bolts which shattered the windows of the church landing near to the holy bodies but did not harm the relics or damage the building. This was interpreted as evidence that, '[Æthelthryth] was displeased a being so handled in public, and yet was doing nothing to harm the church'.[88]

Simon Keynes has commented that 'an important sub-text is the relationship between the abbey or priory and episcopal power, drawing a deliberate contrast between the friendly relations which the abbey had enjoyed with bishop of Elmham, before the Conquest, and the attempted interference by successive bishops of Lincoln thereafter.'[89] Ely abbey was rebuilt in the 1080s under the direction of Simeon, brother of Walkelin of Winchester.

At Canterbury Eadmer wrote an account of Archbishop Dunstan's burial, describing the location of his tomb in the Anglo-Saxon cathedral. Dunstan, *even in bodily death*, would be constantly present in the midst of his sons, the monks of Christ Church. He wanted his body to be placed in their midst, to become part of the cathedral, a physical presence. Buried in a place he had chosen. At the time he was writing, the Anglo-Saxon cathedral had been destroyed, partly by fire, and then completely, in order to make room for a new Norman construction. As the new cathedral was erected the liturgical routine at Canterbury continued.

[87] *Liber Eliensis*, II.144. Anselm did not attend; the narrative later recounts that Anselm was in Canterbury at the time of the ceremony.
[88] *Liber Eliensis*, II.144. This account is confusing; the enraged saint may in fact refer to Æthelthyrth's sister, Wihtburh, whose body had been examined by Herbert prior to the translation. Blake has identified similarities in the narrative with the *Vita S Withburg* although he concludes that this was not the principal source used by the *Liber Eliensis*. *Ibid*, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii.
[89] S. Keynes, 'Ely Abbey 672-1109', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, eds. P. Meadows and N. Ramsey (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 3-58, at p. 52.

A small building was erected 'above the resting-place of the blessed man [Dunstan]' and masses and other services were performed daily 'around his sacred body.'[90] Dunstan's body, his physical remains, were the centre of the cathedral. He provided continuity with the past.

> And he was buried in the place he had chosen, namely in the place where the divine office used to be celebrated daily by the brothers, which was in front of the steps by which you ascend to the altar of Christ the Lord. I do not doubt that he made this arrangement from a sense of great love. For this most kindly father wished even in bodily death to be constantly present there in the midst of the sons whom he truly loved and was leaving behind him in this troubled world, so that they would be able to declare confidently in his presence whatever they wanted, as if he were alive… Therefore it should not be doubted that Dunstan knew these things before his death and so promised that he would be amongst his people in spirit, and for these reasons and being full of love he desired most of all for his body to be placed in their midst.[91]

Eadmer represented the Anglo-Saxon tradition, threatened by the ignorance of their new Norman overlords. Jay Rubenstein has suggested that Eadmer was deliberately using his hagiography to challenge the doubts expressed by Lanfranc over the legitimacy and power of the English saints. But this account also provides evidence for the way in which bishops operated in their cathedrals. It shows the ways in which they were confronted physically with their predecessors. And it poses interesting questions about how episcopal power operated when there was more than one bishop in the room. In fact Eadmer suggests that Dunstan and Lanfranc worked together to reform monastic life at Christ Church. A young monk named Æthelweard suffered from demonic attacks. The first occurred while Lanfranc was celebrating Mass. He recovered and Lanfranc brought him to the tomb of St Dunstan to offer

---

[90] Eadmer, *Miracula*, 175. The fire did not destroy the west end of the cathedral, which had an apse and altar. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc* (Oxford, 2004) 104.

[91] *Sepultus sane est in loco quo ipse disposuerat, loco scilicet ubi cotidie diuinum officium a fratribus celebrabatur, qui fuit ante gradus quibus ad altare Domini Christi ascendebatur. Quod ab eo grandi pietatis affectu dispositum non dubitamus. Volebat etenim benignissimus pater filius suis quos ueraciter diligebat, quosque in mundi turbine post se relinquebat, etiam defunctus corpore iugiter interesse, quatinus quae uellent, sicut uiuo fiducialiter coram eo depromere possent… Non ergo dubitandum haec illum ante obitum suum praescisse, et iccirco se suis spiritu affuturum promisisse, hisque de causis corpus suum inter eos pietate plenus uoluisse potissimum poni.* Eadmer, *Vita S. Dunstani*, 156-9. For a discussion of the original tomb in the Anglo-Saxon Cathedral see, Brooks, *The Early History of Canterbury,* 42; Ramsay and Sparks, 'The cult of St Dunstan in Christ Church , Canterbury' *St Dunstan*, eds. Ramsay 311-23

thanks. However his ravings soon returned and he attacked the prior. On one occasion he brought a young monk who had suffered a demonic attack during Mass to the tomb of St Dunstan.[92] Eadmer attributed this disruption to the incorrect manner of living by the monks. Eadmer describes how Dunstan was deeply involved in helping Lanfranc recover monastic lands from Odo of Bayeux.[93] According to Eadmer, Lanfranc summoned blessed Dunstan to be his advocate at Peneden Heath when he attempted to recover archiepiscopal lands which had been taken by Odo of Bayeux.

> And so father Dunstan whose intercession he had sought, appeared to him in a dream, distinguished by an angelic visage and marked out by his archiepiscopal robes, and said to him: "Lanfranc, let your spirit not be troubled by this throne which has been assembled against both me and you. Just enter the court with confidence and argue my causes and those of the church of our Lord, for I will be with you at every point. But if you do not overcome those who are opposing you, you may conclude most assuredly that I, Dunstan, who am speaking to you, neither live, nor am concerned about the business of my people, nor have spoken the truth to you." And so after he had gained a famous victory, as promised by that prophet who had spoken to truth, he preserved without damage to them the things that belonged to the church by right, and those things about which there was some doubt he confirmed for posterity with irrefutable and true logic, and with the authority of ancient precedents.[94]

By 1077 the eastern arm of the new cathedral church at Canterbury was ready and it may well have been entirely complete by that date.[95]

At St Paul's cathedral the principal cult was St Erkenwald a monk bishop appointed by Archbishop Theodore to the bishopric of the East Saxons in 675.[96] Whateley suggests that

---

[92] *Miracula S. Dunstani*, pp. 182-3.
[93] See also N. Ramsey and M. Sparks, 'The Cult of St Dunstan at Christ Church, Canterbury' *St Dunstan: His Life, Times and Cult*, eds. N. Ramsey, M. Sparks, T. W. T. Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 311-23.
[94] *Adest ergo ei in uisu quem interpellauerat, pater Dunstanus, angelico uultu conspicuus, stola sui patriarchatus insignitus, dicens illi: Lanfrance, ne turbetur spiritus tuus in te propter multitudinem hanc quae coacta est contra me et te. Quin securus placitum ingredere, et me tibi per singula affuturo, meas et aecclesiae Domini nostri causas age. Quod si eos qui obstiterint, non deuiceris, me qui tecum loquor Dunstanum nec uiuere, nec meorum negotia curare, nec uera tibi dixisse certissime noueris. Sicque iuxta sponsionem ueridici uatis nobili uictoria functus, quae iuris aecclesiae erant, inconuulsa seruauit, quae sub dubietate aliqua fluctuabant, irrefragabili ueritatis ratione et antiquorum exemplorum auctoritate in posterum confirmauit.* *Miracula S. Dunstani*, pp. 190-3.
[95] For a discussion of the architectural history of Canterbury cathedral see E. Fernie, *The Architecture of Norman England* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 104-6.

there was an active cult in London in the late Anglo-Saxon period. The *Miracula sancti Erkenwaldi* (*MSE*) was composed in the early 1140s by Arcoid, canon of St Paul's cathedral and nephew to the former bishop Gilbert the Universal.[97] Historians, most notably Christopher Brooke, have closely associated Arcoid with the election dispute over the appointment of a new bishop to London. After the death of Gilbert the Universal in 1134 there was a seven year's vacancy at London.[98] Brooke argues that the chapter at St Paul's was unable to agree on a successor to Gilbert due to an ideological split between an ascetic reform faction which had formed around Gilbert and a reactionary old guard, led by the family of the former bishop Richard Belmeis. During this time the cult of the seventh-century monk-bishop, Erkenwald, was revived 'as a sort of symbolic focus for the monastic ideals of the reformers', one of whose leaders, Arcoid, wrote the life and miracles.[99] E. Gordon Whateley, the most recent editor of the text, has challenged this interpretation arguing that the principal purpose of the *miracula* was to publicise the miraculous powers of Erkenwald's relics. In particular he notes that, 'Arcoid shows no special sympathy for or interest in the regular or ascetical life... what is uppermost in *MSE* is an enthusiasm for the *liturgical* life of the secular cathedral and for the colourful splendour of a big city church with its crowds of worshippers and pilgrims at its shrines.'[100] In fact Erkenwald's miracles are often framed by the stages of the building of the new cathedral. The fire of 1087 which destroyed the old cathedral

[96] He merits just a short paragraph in Bede, who refers to an early reputation for sanctity and miracles. The slim twelfth-century *vita* adds very little additional detail to the account of the bishop's life found in Bede.

[97] E. Gordon Whately, the most recent editor of the *MSE*, argues that the text can be precisely dated to the latter half of the 1140 or early 1141. The author does not mention the election or consecration of Robert de Sigillo which took place in June 1141 or make any reference to him in the prologue. Whateley suspects that, although individual portions of the *MSE* may have been composed before 1140, it is most likely that the work was composed as a whole rather than piecemeal. For a full account of the date and authorship of the *MSE* see, *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed., E. G. Whateley (New York, 1989), pp. 25-56.

[98] For an account of the circumstances of the failed election of Anselm, former abbot of St Saba in Rome and nephew to St Anselm of Canterbury see C. N. L. Brooke, 'The Earliest Times to 1485', *A history of St Paul's Cathedral and the men associated with it*, eds. W. R. Matthews and W. M. Atkins (London, 1964); *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed., E. G. Whateley (New York, 1989), pp. 32-3

[99] C. N. L. Brooke, 'The Earliest Times to 1485', *A history of St Paul's Cathedral and the men associated with it*, eds., Matthews and Atkins (London, 1964) pp. 24-8.

[100] *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed., E. G. Whateley (New York, 1989), pp. 35-6.

contained a prominent shrine behind the main altar. The *MSE* describes the miraculous survival of the relics.[101] Bishop Maurice, along with Walkelin of Winchester, was on hand to authenticate the miracle. Erkenwald's relics were housed in the crypt during the construction of the main church. The building process was extremely long.

This was the situation when Arcoid arrived either in late 1128 with his uncle, Gilbert, or shortly afterwards. The presence of Walkelin may have been intended to link with Henry of Blois. Most of the miracles take place during the period of episcopal vacancy 1134-41, and more specifically 1138-41, when Henry of Blois was in charge of the diocese following the expulsion of the bishop-elect.[102] The first three miracles share an ahistorical quality; there is no reference to when the miracles took place except to say that they occurred on the saint's feast day.

> While this miracle was still new, the aforementioned bishop [Maurice] began to build another church from the very foundations, a task which to many people seemed impossible to complete, but if it could be completed, it would be the honour and glory of London (*honor et decus ludonie*). When the crypt was finished, he ordered the body of the most holy Erkenwald placed in it. When Maurice had gone the way of all flesh, the lord Richard, a man worthy of veneration, assumed the burden of the episcopacy, a man, I say, both wise and energetic, distinguished for his nobility of character and for his morality. He marvellously advanced the work on the walls of the new church; also he acquired, at his own expense, the broad streets around the church which had been previously occupied by the houses of the laity, and which he virtually surrounded with a very solid and strong outer wall, and in general he enhanced and enlarged the London church with many additional gifts (*aliisque quam plurimis beneficiis ludoniensem ecclesiam ampliauit*).[103] After him Gilbert, who was named the Universal, was summoned from St Auxerre in France to ascend the episcopal throne. This was a happy event, for he indeed was filled with both learning and wisdom, and was possessed also of natural authority and the spirit of frugal moderation... But it is not within the scope of this work to describe the gifts, the great gifts, he bestowed upon the church after undertaking the burden of the see (*uero uel quanta, episcopii onere suscepto, ecclesie sue contulerit, cuiusue integritatis extiterit*), or to describe the purity of his life... In

[101] *MSE*, IV.114-9. The survival of the relics was testament to their sanctity.
[102] Whateley argues that the miracles of St Erkenwald begin to proliferate in 1138-39, after the removal of the ascetic candidate, Anselm of Saba.
[103] Cf. Ranulf at Durham.

> the fourth year after his death, a certain venerable woman named Benedicta was wont to come everyday to the saint's tomb to pray for mercy, and at the same time she would earnestly beg to obtain, by the prayers of Erkenwald, what nature had withheld from her...[104]

The narrative continues by explaining that Benedicta was deformed with a shrivelled hand. An Italian by birth, she had travelled widely to many shrines seeking a cure, even to Rome.

> O blessed Ekenwald, the prince of the apostles, Peter and Paul, defer to you and send their foster child to you that you might be revealed in greater glory and London might the better honour and revere you (*Lundonia te melius ueneretur et colat*)... glorious father, you possess the capital city of Britain all alone, you among men lie in the Lord, in the city of London (*in Lundoniensi ciuitate*).[105]

According to William of Malmesbury's account Erkenwald was regarded as especially sacred in London, having won the affection of the canons. He remarks that other bishops of London, 'lie so clouded in obscurity that even their burial places are unknown.'[106] According to Arcoid, Erkenwald was the only bishop who remained in London.

> All your most holy colleagues have foresworn London, deferring to you, and in the secret bosom of the earth they keep their most precious bodies in readiness for the supreme visitation.[107]

The relics were finally translated in 1140.[108] A second translation presided over by Richard de Sigillo took place in 1148 when the relics were placed in a new silver shrine which had

---

[104] *In huius nouitate mircauli supradictus episcopus aliam ecclesiam a fundamentis incepit, opus, uidelicet, ut multis uidetur inconsummabile, uerum si consummari posset, honor et decus Lundonie. Peractis denique criptis, sanctissimi corpus Erkenwaldi ibidem collocari precepit. Mauricio autem uiam uniuerse carnis ingresso, dominus Ricardus, uir uenerandus, curam suscepit regiminis, uir, inquam, prudens et strenuus, nobilitate et moralitate conspicuus. Iste quidem incepte muros ecclesie mirabiliter auxit, necnon et plateas circa eandem ecclesiam permaximas, que ante domibus laicorum obsesse fuerant, proprio sumptu adquisiuit, et in circuitu muro fortissimo pene cinxit, aliisque quam plurimis beneficiis Lundoniensem ecclesiam ampliauit. Post hunc cathedram Gislebertus, qui uniuersalis dictus est, ab autisiodoro, ciuitate gallie, uocatus, feliciter ascendit. Hic nempe litteris et sapientia, necnon auctoritate et frugalitate media cumulatus... Que uero uel quanta, episcopii onere suscepto, ecclesie sue contulerit, cuiusue integritatis extiterit, non est huius operis enarrare, cum cordatum uirum... Post mortem illius quarto anno, quedam uenerabilis mulier, Benedicta nomine, ad sancti feretrum diebus singulis ueniam postulabat, ut quod natura subtraxerat optinere Erkenwaldi precibus flagitabat. MSE*, V.1-22.

[105] *O beate Erkenwalde, apostolorum principes, Petrus et Paulus, tibi deferunt, alumnam suam tibi mittunt, ut gloriosior appareas et Lundonia te melius ueneretur et colat... pater gloriose, solus caput tenes Brittanie, solus inter homines cubas in domino in Lundoniensi ciuitate*. *MSE*, V.32-9.

[106] *Habetur ergor Erkenuoldus Lundoniae maxime sanctus, et pro ex auditionum celeritate fauorem canonicorum nonnichil emeritus. Alii adeo obscuritatis nubilo iacent ut nec eorum sciantur mausolea. GP*, ii.73.14.

[107] *Omnes sanctissimi college tui, Lundoniam abdicando, tibi deferendo, occult terre gremio sua preciosissima corpora uisitationi suppreme custodiunt*. *MSE*, IV.72-4.

been begun in ten years before.[109] The first ceremony was performed by the canons in response to threat by some English monasteries to steal the relics. Other historians have suggested that it was in response to the expected canonisation of St Edward the Confessor at Westminster.[110] Whateley suspects that the premature translation in 1140 took place at the instigation of the canons in order to promote the cult and help raise funds for the silver feretrum to which the saints' relics were eventually translated in 1148.[111]

One of the miracles attributed to St Erkenwald concerns a prisoner who was set free after seeking sanctuary at the shrine during the saint's feast day. In front of the whole congregation the man was miraculously freed from his chains which burst open. The narrative continues, explaining that 'as soon as the news about the man reached the bishop he issued an order concerning the miracle, to the effect that since St Erkenwald had seen fit to set the man free he forbade anyone to wrong him with further imprisonment.'[112]

Cuthbert's relics are the focus of the power in Simeon's writing. The presence of his undecayed body (*incorruptum corpus*) marked the centre of episcopal power in the diocese. During the construction of cathedrals there were frequent opportunities to renegotiate episcopal power. The cathedral helped to shape the direction of episcopal power. Yet the physical presence of an episcopal patron might not necessarily indicate an ethnic challenge to Norman bishops. The cathedral does not automatically belong to the bishop. He had to negotiate power and status. However once he was dead his remains were claimed by the chapter in their subsequent battles with new incumbents.

---

[108] There was a second translation in 1148.
[109] *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed. E. G. Whateley (New York, 1989), p. 63.
[110] B. W. Scholz, 'The Canonisation of Edward the Confessor' *Speculum*, 36:1 (1961), pp. 38-60, at p. 40-1.
[111] *The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald*, ed. Whateley (New York, 1989), p. 66.
[112] *Ut uero rumor uiri peruenit ad episcopum, uerba de miraculo fecit ad populum, et quem sanctus Erkenwaldus dignatus est absoluere, prohibuit cunctis predictum hominem custodia ulterius iniuriare. MSE*, III.40-2.

Fichtenau commented that 'a bishop always had to be a model for clergy and people, especially in his last, most difficult hours. A public life demanded a public death, which is presented in bishops' *vitae* in ritualised form.'[113] The final act of power for any bishop was his decision to be buried in the cathedral bounds. This, on occasion, exposed tensions with the chapter, as two increasingly distinct institutions attempted to assert control over the building and harness the power of a sacred space. However the evidence suggests that ultimately bishops had the last word. As Pauline Stafford has remarked 'the significance of life is summed up at death.'[114] The burial of a succession of bishops within the cathedral was the material visualisation of the genealogy of episcopal office articulated elsewhere by the primacy dispute. Cathedrals housed the bodies of episcopal predecessors and so bishops also sought to use their bodies to reinforce their ties to the sacred space of the cathedral, a space which the chapter was coming to view as its own. Miller has noted that 'by having themselves buried within the church and asking prayers of the canons for their souls, bishops created new ties, both physical and spiritual, with the cathedral. Their burials visually colonized the cathedral space: mortuary inscriptions marked their tombs around the church.'[115] This sometimes caused friction with the chapter.

Even when a bishop died many miles from his cathedral it was significant that he returned. The account of the death and funeral procession of Robert Bethune who died at Reims provides a better indication of the power of the dead body and the attempts to assert control over it. Even before his death, during his last days and hours, his companions asked Robert what he would have done with his body. Initially he displayed no interest in the matter, exclaiming that they could throw his corpse into a deep ditch, but he eventually

[113] H. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: mentalities and social orders* (Chicago, 1991), p. 213.
[114] P. Stafford, 'Writing Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens' *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. D. Bates, J. Crick and S. Hamilton (Woodbridge, 2006), p. 103.
[115] M. Miller, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture & Authority in Medieval Italy* (New York, 2000), p. 133. See also M. Miller, *Formation of a Medieval Church: Ecclesiastical Change in Verona, 950-1150* (Ithaca, 1993), pp.154-55.

agreed that the archbishop should determine his fate, and it was agreed that 'if it were in any way possible, they should remove his body and restore it to his own church (*si quo modo possent tollerent corpus eius et redderent ecclesie sue*).'[116] However when Robert died a dispute arose between the bishop's clerks and the monks of Reims, 'concerning the body of so great a bishop (*de corpore tanti pontificis*)', each claiming the right to relic (*reliquas*).'[117] It was only through the tenacity of Robert's friends who enlisted the help of the cardinals, so that by apostolic command (*per apostolicam iussionem*) his body was carried away.

William Wycombe describes how the precious body was embalmed with spices (*aromatibus conditum… almificum*) for the long journey back to Hereford, during which time it was the site of much veneration and some miraculous happenings. Indeed the body was first transported to London, where Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, who had come to meet the body, accompanied it into the city, 'proceeding on foot, the streaming tears watering his face and beard.'[118] According to William, the body was brought *ad templum domini* where the king and queen came to display their grief.[119] Indeed we are told that Henry 'refreshed bountifully with meat and drink the gathered multitude of the poor.'[120] Henry clearly undertakes the role of organiser at this event, even taking control of the royal couple whose 'royal grief exceeded moderation (*regium planctum modum excedere*)'.[121] Here Robert's body is being used by another bishop, in another church. Finally the holy body (*corpus sanctum*) arrived back in Hereford.

> He was buried in his mother church which he himself completed with great expense and anxious care; which he himself dedicated most solemnly after the manner of Solomon, he himself making the seventh

---

[116] *VR*, pp. 217-8.
[117] *VR*, pp. 217-20.
[118] *VR*, pp. 227-8.
[119] Although it is not specified which church in London, it is possible that it was the cathedral church of St Paul's, as Henry of Winchester was undertaking the role of bishop at this time.
[120] *Ille autem sicut preordinauerat collectam preter numerum pauperum multitudinem cibis et potu copiose refecit. VR*, p. 230.
[121] *VR*, pp. 229-30.

> of the bishops attending; and he adorned it as well with the relics of the saints as with the ornaments and precious vessels.[122]

And very soon we are told Robert was adding greatly to the glory of his church. According to William Wycombe Robert's burial coincided with the feast of St Ethelbert and the occasion of the annual fair, so the city and the church were overwhelmed with visitors. In particular many of the sick had travelled to the church seeking intercession and miraculous cures. According to William they lay around the tomb of the bishop begging his intercession with God.[123] Some were healed, although William is vague with the details. But not all visitors sought intercession. In fact Robert's new role as the intercessor for Hereford cathedral could well be used to punish those who doubted his power. Accordingly when a knight named Olwin, who held a grudge against the bishop, addressed the tomb, praising God that Robert now lay buried in the ground (*obcutus in terra*). Olwin was instantly struck blind and was unable to speak, although he partly recovered some time later.[124] John of Worcester records the death of Richard of Hereford in 1127, noting that he 'died at his township of Ledbury whence his body was taken to Hereford for burial with his fellow bishops in the church (*cuius corpus Hereford delatum, sepelitur cum coepiscopis in ecclesia sepelitur*).[125]

William of Malmesbury reports that the canons of York refused to allow Archbishop Gerard to be buried in the church, claiming that, 'they would barely allow a sod to be ignominiously cast on the body outside the door (*uix ignobilem cespitem cadaueri pre foribus inici passi*).'[126] William claims that Gerard was suspected of necromancy. According to the *GP* the bishop had died unexpectedly 'with a book of curious arts on his pillow'.[127] The manner of his death stained his reputation. Yet it seems more likely that the York canons

---

[122] *Sepultus est in ecclesia sua matrice, quam ipse multa impensa et sollicitudine consummauit, ipse Solomonis exemplo solemnissime dedicauit, adhibitorum secum septimus episcoporum, et tam reliquiis sanctorum quam ornamentis et uasis pretiosis adornauit. VR*, pp. 231-2.
[123] *Excubabant circa sepultaram pontificis postulantes eius erga Deum suffragium. VR*, pp. 235-6.
[124] *VR*, pp. 235-8.
[125] JW, pp. 172-3.
[126] *Certe canonici Eboracenses, ne in aecclesia sepeliretur, pertinacissime restitere, uix ignobilem cespitem cadaueri pre foribus inici passi. GP*, iii.118*.3.
[127] *GP*, iii.118*.2*β.*

were frustrated by Gerard's association with Anselm. By excluding the bishop's body from the cathedral they were distancing themselves from his legacy as a suffragan of Canterbury.[128] However, many years later according to William of Malmesbury's account Gerard's successor, Thomas II, 'mitigated the insult by giving him a conspicuous tomb inside the church alongside his predecessors (*indignitatem facti leniens, in aecclesia ipsum iuxta predecessores suos eminentissime tumulauerit*).'[129] It seems that the bishops were challenging the right of the chapter to exclude a consecrated body from the cathedral.

Not all bishops sought to be buried in their cathedrals. Some, like Thurstan of York, sought out new burial places in the new foundations. This represents a further shift in the places where bishops chose to be buried and Maureen Miller has supposed that this was a result of the intensification of the reform movement. As bishops began founding new monasteries outside their own cities, 'they chose to have themselves buried in these reformed institutions.'[130] The change in episcopal preference for burial may signal the beginnings of the rise of the chapter in the cathedral space. In fact Thurstan of York, who had made a promise to enter the Cluniac order before his death, attempted to resign his bishopric before his death.[131] He received corporeal discipline from the canons of York, stretched naked on the ground before the altar of St Andrew. Then he set off for Pontefract priory some twenty miles from York. He became a monk there just twelve days later he died, surrounded by the dignitaries of the church of York. He was buried at the high altar at the church of St John the Evangelist. The monks at Pontefract exhumed his body a few years later and found it incorrupt, and it seems that there was some attempt at forging an early cult which never really took off.[132] John of Worcester confirms that Thurstan was buried at Pontefract and adds that

[128] Before his translation to York, Gerard had been bishop of Hereford and as such had already undertaken a profession of obedience.
[129] *GP*, iii.118*.3.
[130] M. Miller, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture & Authority in Medieval Italy* (New York, 2000), pp. 134-5.
[131] D. Nicholl, *Thurstan Archbishop of York (1114-1140)* (York, 1964), p. 234.
[132] *Ibid*, pp. 237-8.

'his body was found to be whole and sweet-smelling one year and five months after burial.'[133] The point being that Thurstan was no longer the cathedral's property. In this case the bishop was choosing to provide another community with his body. Hervey, bishop of Ely, formerly of Bangor, was buried in the monastery. According to the *Liber Eliensis* the bishop had intended to become a monk, however 'he was compelled to defer the matter for so long that in the end he was overtaken by death.'[134]

William of Malmesbury relates the movement of the bishops of Lichfield and Chester. The church at Lichfield was 'built on a cramped site, showing the restraint and modest ambitions of the men of old. Bishops of our day feel ashamed that episcopal power has to have its home in such a place.'[135] The first Norman bishop, Peter, moved the see to Chester to the church of St Peter, but his successor moved to the monastery at Coventry, built by Leofric and Godiva. William of Malmesbury relates the movement of the bishops of Lichfield and Chester. When another successor, Walter, was enthroned at Coventry he was refused entry into the church at Lichfield.[136] According to William, Robert plundered the wealth monastery and refused to provide for any repairs. However, William of Malmesbury was most indignant about Robert's choice of burial site.

> Indeed on his deathbed, [Robert] disregarded the dictates of the canons, which lay down that bishops should be buried in their own sees, and ordered that he should be interred not at Chester but at Coventry, leaving to his successors what was in his view not a shaky claim to go to law about but a legitimate right to be defended (*sua opinione relinquens successoribus non indebitum ius calumpniandi sed quasi legitimum uindicandi*).[137]

---

[133] JW, pp. 282-3. A later account by John of Hexham suggests that the body was examined many years after burial.
[134] *Liber Eliensis*, III.41.
[135] *GP*, c.172.
[136] A. Saltman, *Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1956), p. 115.
[137] *Quin etiam moriens, {β parui fatiens scita canonum, quibus edicitur in sedibus suis pontifices sepeliri debere,} non apud Cestram sed apud Couentreiam se tumulatum iri precepit, sua opinione relinquens successoribus non indebitum ius calumpniandi sed quasi legitimum uindicandi. GP*, iv.173.3. Cf. *GR*, 4:341

If Robert had chosen to be buried at Chester, his successors might have had a less secure claim to the monastery at Coventry. By choosing to be buried at Coventry Robert was staking a claim to the monastery for his successors. In other words Robert used his body to establish a permanent episcopal presence in the monastery. Indeed William of Malmesbury reports that his successor, another Robert, was also buried at Coventry; 'right up to his death he took care to follow his predecessor's footsteps (*predecessoris sui quoad uixit sedulo emulatus uestigia*).'[138]

Yet despite his criticisms William later eulogises Bishop Robert de Limesey and associates him with the other great patrons. Yet he is clear to whom the building belongs.

> Here lies Bishop Robert, a man by no means of ill repute, taking him all in all. For he was an agreeable character, a great entertainer, and one who began great buildings at Lichfield. In the twin *porticus* at Coventry lie its builders, that distinguished couple.[139]

William of Malmesbury recognised that the bishop had become part of the building. Similarly he described Wulfstan's tomb at Worcester. 'He lies between two pyramids, with a beautiful stone arch curving above him. There is a wooden cover projecting out over his grave held firm by iron clamps called spiders. I mention this here because it supplies the setting for the miracle which I now describe.'[140] Thus according to William of Malmesbury the architectural setting for the miracles is an important part of the narrative. It contextualised the *mircaula* and placed it in the physical setting of the twelfth century. After relating how Wulfstan's tomb escaped damage from a fire he writes that, 'our modern lack of belief, which parades itself under the protection of caution, is not willing to believe in miracles, even if seen with

---

[138] *GP*, iv.174.
[139] *Ibi ergo iacet episcopus Robertus, non ita infamis in omnibus. Nam et iocundus et dapsilis et magnarum apud Licetfeld edificationum inchoator extitit. In ambabus porticibus Couentreiae iacent edificatores loci precellentissimi coniuges. GP*, iv.175.1-2.
[140] *GP*, c.148.

the eye or touched with the finger.'[141] Later we are told that his successors, Samson and Theulf, were also buried in the nave of the church in front of the rood screen.[142]

We can find within the narrative accounts of the deaths of the bishops the sort of process the body underwent after death. In the *VW* the monks who washed the corpse were taken by its gleaming whiteness and its purity. They in particular remarked upon how his nose, prominent while he lived, 'retreated and paled so beautifully in death that those that saw it marvelled.'[143] They could not remove the ring from his finger despite the fact that during his life those same fingers were wasted from his frugal lifestyle. William draws the conclusion that he had received the ring without asking and would take it to his grave.[144]

The burial of Wulfstan is described in some detail. In the *VW* the only specific mention of the bishop in his vestments is when he appears to Robert of Hereford posthumously.[145] Describing the death and burial of Wulfstan in the *GP*, William of Malmesbury describes the scene connected with the bishop's burial.

> For even the appearance and form of the dead body seemed to offer the grace that had come from the living bishop, and the tears were wiped from their eyes and their sorrow comforted. His body, marked by his pontifical insignia but without a covering, lay on a bier before the altar. A sea of people flowed past, offering prayers and doing obeisance to the body before sadly departing.[146]

Bishop Robert presided over the funeral of Wulfstan and after the lamentation and weeping the body was finally interned in the cathedral and it was from that place that he continued to influence his successors, the monastic community and the city. It was his permanent space. John of Worcester reports that when the citizens of Worcester (*ciuium Wigirnensium*) heard rumours that the city was to be attacked:

[141] *GP*, c. 149.
[142] *GP*, c.151.
[143] *VW*, iii.22.1.
[144] *VW*, iii.22.2.
[145] *VW*, iii.23.1.
[146] *GP*, i.149.

> After taking advice, they rushed in their wretchedness to the protection of the most high God the Father and his most blessed Mother, and to entrust themselves and all theirs under God's protection to the guardianship of the Worcester bishop, the confessor St Oswald and the blessed Wulfstan, bishop of the same city. Then could be seen all the goods of the citizens carried into the cathedral.[147]

William of Malmesbury writes of Anselm's tomb at Canterbury – 'But he did not leave those who loved him at the mercy of this world and devoid of his help. He still serves those who call upon him, and visit his tomb with eager hope who do not come away with their prayers answered in full.[148] William records that Anselm was first buried with Lanfranc but later translated to a new shrine.[149] New saints were being created in old churches.

Bishops had to operate within the confines of the cathedral space. Within that space the ritual of enthronement took place and this led to the development of a concept of episcopal power which was based on the notion that power was passed from one bishop to another. The case studies examined here reveal the disparate nature of post-Conquest English sees. The overall impression is one of variety. However it is possible to indicate valid areas of comparison which demonstrate the significance of acts of power taking place within the confines of the cathedral. Central to this was the process of relic translation and the continued significance of long-dead bishops and the practice of memorialisation. The cult of an episcopal predecessor often formed the basis for the developing identity of the cathedral chapter. This was the starting point for the separation of the bishop from the cathedral clergy, a process which was to dominate the development of episcopal power during the latter half of the twelfth century. The relationship between the physical building of the cathedral and the cult of relics developed in parallel to the division between the office and person of the bishop. In the

---

[147] JW, p. 273.
[148] *GP*, i.66.5.
[149] *GP*, i.65.1.

absence of the legal and administrative structures which helped demarcate the chapter from the bishop, the cathedral building became the site of these earlier power strategies. At Durham the role of St Cuthbert was essential to the development of the cathedral chapter and the creation of a strong monastic identity in the operation of power-relations between the Norman bishops and the monks. The enhanced role of the prior in the narratives testifies to a deliberate attempt by the monks to distance themselves from the bishop and to directly tie themselves to his predecessor's church. This was a direct result of Bishop Ranulf's own (legitimate) claims to the new cathedral building. Similarly the monks at Ely defended their monastery against the incursions of the newly appointed bishops. Using St Æthelthryth they created their own narrative of defence. The *Liber Eliensis* explicitly associates the shrine of the holy woman with the architectural space within the newly converted monastic cathedral built by a Norman abbot but defended by Anglo-Saxon relics. Similarly the cathedral at Canterbury was frequently altered and extended. The building work provided the backdrop for the monks to renegotiate their relationship with a succession of archbishops. Here the structure of power was constantly shifting in response to the developing physical space. Cathedrals were living buildings; they were never finished. The construction of the cathedral and the accompanying rituals created frequent opportunities to challenge and resist episcopal power. St Erkenwald's relics at St Paul's cathedral provided the community with a symbol of continuity which countered the deep anxieties which accompanied the transference of power and the long period of vacancy in London. However it was the cathedral building which provided the most imposing structure of power as an ever-present framework for episcopal power-relations. And ultimately all bishops were judged by their posthumous connection to the physical building and the resulting legacy of episcopal power passed to their successors.

· Conclusion ·

Hactenus de episcopis

This thesis attempts to use familiar sources in new ways and combine methodological approaches in order to reflect the complexity of power in post-Conquest England. Episcopal power was most notable for its flexibility of practice. In fact, to adapt Stenton's phrase, they were 'men without routine'. That does not mean that these men were without organisation. However the administrative techniques are totally unrecognisable. Bishops relied upon ambiguity, even while they demanded definition. While the written word was important, episcopal chapters from the first half of the twelfth century do not appear as independent corporate bodies. In fact, the beginnings of the separation of bishop from chapter can be traced to the cathedral building rather than to the archives. This contested space forced bishops into conflict with their chapters. The ethnic interpretations favoured by historians studying the post-Conquest period have mistakenly focused on the body of Anglo-Saxon saints rather than the physical space of the new building. Certainly bishops believed the cathedral, the seat of their power, to be the most important focus of their attention. Bishops produced documents, but more importantly they created new spaces. It was this which forced bishops to negotiate their power most frequently. It was in the cathedral where the beginnings of the separation of bishop from chapter began, driven forward by notions of precedent, tradition and innovation.

The image of episcopal power which emerges from the sources is one characterised by pragmatism. These were men operating in an uncertain climate where power relations were negotiated from moment to moment. The use of excommunication as a tool for negotiation amply demonstrates this. Historians have become distracted by process rather than action. When defined as an act of power, excommunication shows how bishops coped in

the twelfth century, when the violence of lordship was much more evident than the routines of administration. In fact excommunication was part of the rhetoric of violence and closely related to coercive force. An institutional history is one sided yet it is naive to imagine that bishops had to operate as either charismatic leaders *or* prudent administrators. Their success lay in their ability to do both. In his essay on Domesday, F. W. Maitland, the greatest constitutional historian, described the feudal cone, the apex of which grew more and more acute under Norman rule: 'Still a great change took place in the substance of the cone, or if that substance is made up of lords and men and acres, then in the nature of, or rather *the relation between, the forces which held the atoms together*.'[1] Maitland, with precise vision identifies the nature of power, the 'forces which hold the atoms together'. Throughout this thesis the focus has been on the forces or mechanisms of power. The border between the religious and the secular was always shifting. The depictions of episcopal performance reveal a great deal about the methods by which bishops sought to portray themselves. Yet they also reveal a great deal about the multiple interpretations which their performance could engender.

This thesis is not a systematic treatise but a series of discussions on the history of episcopal power which should speak to broader discussions about the nature of power generally. The study of power should not be limited to the source or typology; it has to incorporate the ideals, expectations and values of the historical period. It should also incorporate a vision of bishops resisting others. Not least the historiographical grand narratives which overshadow their actions. Many things contributed to the tradition of episcopal authority. To rephrase Reuter's conclusions about noble power, '[bishops] maintained and developed dominance by sharing and diffusing it, even if as individuals they were pursuing a quite different strategy.'[2] The implications for this three-fold approach help

[1] F. W. Maitland, 'Domesday Book', *Domesday Book and Beyond: Three Essays in the Early History of England* (Cambridge, 1897), p. 171.
[2] T. Reuter, 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111-126.

engage with a more authentic vision of power. But engaging with other disciplines or with theory is not an end in itself, only a means by which new perspectives can be gained. Any study of power has to be positioned firmly within the specific historical context.

It seems pertinent to end with the words of Henry of Huntingdon, who wrote to his dear friend (*consors karissime*) and listed the bishops who had lived and died during their lifetime: *Hii quoque exinaniti sunt et ad nichilum deuenerunt... Hactenus de episcopis*.[3]

[3] HH, pp. 608-12.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Sancti Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia (letters), Dom F. S. Schmitt (6 vols. Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1938-61).

Anselm, *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, trans. Walter Fröhlich (3 vols. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1990-1994).

Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969).

Canterbury Professions, ed. M. Richter (Torquay: The Devonshire Press, 1973).

Councils & Synods: with other documents relating to the English Church. 1, A.D.871-1204, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981).

The Chronicle of John of Worcester, III, *The annals from 1067 to 1140 with Gloucester interpolations and the continuation to 1411*, ed. and trans. P. McGurk (Oxford: OMT, 1998).

Eadmer, *Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule (London: RS, 1884).

Eadmer's History of Recent Events in England, trans. Geoffrey Bosanquet (London: The Cresset Press, 1964).

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Miracula S. Dunstani*, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, eds. and trans. Andrew Turner and Bernard Muir (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006).

Eadmer, *Vita Sancti Anselmi Archiepicopi Cantuariensis*, ed. and trans. R. W. Southern (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1962).

The Earliest Life of Gregory the Great by an anonymous monk of Whitby, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1968).

The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, (6 vols. Oxford: Oxford Medieval Texts, 1968-1980).

English Episcopal Acta, 1, Lincoln 1067-1185, ed. David M. Smith (London: OUP, 1980)

English Episcopal Acta, 5, York 1070-1154, ed. Janet E. Burton (London: OUP, 1988)

Gesta Stephani, ed. and trans. K. R. Potter (London: OUP, 1976).

Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, trans. Henry Davis (London: Newman Press, 1950).

Herbert Losinga, *Letter Collection*, ed. Nicholas Karn (OMT, forthcoming).

Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

Hugh the Chanter, *The History of the Church of York 1066-1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson, revised by M. Brett, C. N. L. Brooke, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: OMT, Clarendon Press, 1990).

John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. Marjorie Chibnall (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, 1956).

Lanfranc, *The Letters of Archbishops Lanfranc*, eds. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979).

Lanfranc, *The Monastic Constitutions of Lanfranc*, trans. David Knowles (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1951).

Liber Eliensis, ed. E. O. Blake (London: Camden Third Series, Vol. XCII, 1962).

Liber Eliensis: A History of the Isle of Ely from the seventh century to the twelfth compiled by a monk of Ely in the twelfth century, trans. Janet Fairweather (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005).

The Life, Letters and Sermons of Bishops Herbert de Losinga, eds. Edward M. Goulburn and Henry Symonds, 2 Vols. (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co. 1878).

The Life of Christina of Markyate, eds. Samuel Fanous and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse, ed. and trans. C. H. Talbot (Reprint, Oxford: OMT, 1987).

The Life of Gundulf Bishop of Rochester, ed. Rodney Thomson (Toronto: The Hunter Rose Company, 1977).

The life of the venerable man, Gundulf, bishop of Rochester (New ed. St Mary's Abbey, Kent: Malling Abbey, 1984).

Miracula sacnti Erkenwaldi, The Saint of London: the Life and Miracles of St Erkenwald, ed. and trans. E. Gordon Whateley (Binghamton, New York: Medieval & Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1989), pp. 100-165.

Offler, H. S. *Durham Episcopal Charters, 1071-1152* (SS 179; Durham, 1968).

Parkinson, B. J. 'The Life of Robert de Bethune by William de Wycombe: Translation with Introduction and Notes', B. Litt. Thesis (Unpublished Thesis, Oxford University, 1951).

Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum: the acta of William I 1066-1087, ed. David Bates (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

The Rule of St. Benedict: the Abingdon copy, ed. J. Chamberlin, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies for the Centre for Medieval Studies, 1982).

Simeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius, hoc est Dunhelmensis, ecclesie*, ed. and trans. David Rollason (Oxford: OMT, 2000).

Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia Historia Ecclesiae Dunhelmensis, 2 vols. ed. T. Arnold (London: Longman & Co., 1882).

Textus Roffensis, ed. Thomas Hearne (Oxford: e theatre Sheldoniano, 1720).

William of Malmesbury, *The Deeds of the Bishops of England*, trans. David Preest (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2002).

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificium Anglorum*, 2 vols. ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M Thomson (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2007).

William of Malmesbury*, Historia Novella: the contemporary history*, ed. Edmund King, trans. K. R. Potter (Oxford: OMT, 1998).

William of Malmesbury, *Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Idract*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).

Secondary Sources

Abou-el-Haj, Barbara. *The Medieval Cult of Saints: Formations and Transformations* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).

Aird, W. 'The Making of a Medieval Miracle Collection: the *Liber de translationibus et miraculis sancti Cuthberti*', *Northern History*, 28 (1992), pp. 1-24.

Aird, W. *St Cuthbert and the Normans: The Church of Durham, 1071-1153* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 142-83.

Alexander, J. W. 'Herbert of Norwich, 1091-1119', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, 6 (1969), pp. 119-232.

Althoff, Gerd. '*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger' *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. B. H. Rosenwine (Ithaca, New York, 1988).

Althoff, Gerd. 'The Variability of Rituals in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* eds. Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, Patrick J. Geary (Cambridge: CUP, 2002), pp. 71-87.

Arnold, B. *Count and Bishop in Medieval Germany A Study of Regional Power, 1110-1350* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991).

Arnold, John. 'Inside and Outside the medieval laity: some reflections on the history of emotions', *European religious cultures: essays offered to Christopher Brooke on the occasion of his eightieth birthday*, ed. M. Rubin (London, 2008), pp. 107-129.

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words: the William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, eds. J. O. Urmson and Marina Sbisà (2nd ed. Oxford: OUP, 1976).

Barker, Lynn K. 'Ivo of Chartres and the Anglo-Norman Cultural Tradition', *ANS*, XIII (1990), pp. 16-33.

Barlow, Frank. *The English Church, 1000-1066: a constitutional history* (London: Longmans, 1963).

Barlow, Frank. *The English Church, 1066-1154: a history of the Anglo-Norman church* (London: Longman, 1979).

Barlow, Frank. *William Rufus* (London: Methuen, 1983).

Barraclough, Geoffrey. *The Crucible of Europe: the ninth and tenth centuries in European history* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976) .

Barrow, Julia. 'How the Twelfth-Century Monks at Worcester Perceived their Past', *The Perception of the Past in the Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. Paul Magdalino (London: Hambledon, 1992), pp. 53-74.

Barthélemy Dominique. 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 152 (1996), pp. 196-205.

Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Bartlett, Robert. 'Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 31:1 (2001), pp. 39-56.

Bartlett, Robert. 'The Symbolic Meaning of Hair in the Middle Ages', *TRHS*, 6th Ser. 4 (1994), pp. 43-60.

Bates, David. 'The Character and Career of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux', *Speculum*, 50 (1975), pp. 1-20.

Bates, David. 'Normandy and England after 1066', *EHR*, 104:413 (1989), pp. 851-880.

Bates, David. *Normandy before 1066* (London: Longman, 1982).

Benson, R. L. *The Bishop-Elect* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968).

Bethell, Denis. 'English Black Monks and Episcopal Elections in the 1120s', *EHR*, 84:333 (1969), pp. 673-81.

Bethell, Denis. 'William of Corbeil and the Canterbury-York Dispute', *JEH*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (1968), pp. 145–159.

Benton, John F. 'Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality', *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, eds. Robert L. Benson, Giles Constable and Carol D. Lanham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), pp. 263-95.

Bisson, Thomas, N. *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2009).

Bisson, Thomas N. 'The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 142 (1994), pp. 6-42.

Blanton, Virginia. *Signs of Devotion: The Cult of St Æthelthryth in Medieval England, 695-1615* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007).

Bloch, Marc. *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. Manyon, 2 vols. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, 1962) [First published as *La Société Féodale* (Paris, 1949)]

Bolton, B. and Meek, C. 'Introduction', *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, eds. Brenda Bolton and Christina Meek (Turhout, 2007), pp 1-2.

Bordo, Susan. 'Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism', *Feminism/Postmodernism*, ed. L. J. Nicholson (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 133-56.

Boswell, John. *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality: Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginning of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

Bourdieu, Pierre. *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*, trans. Matthew Adamson (Oxford: Polity Press, 1990).

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. John B. Thompson; trans. Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).

Brett, Martin. 'The *Collectio Lanfranci* and its Competitors', *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays presented to Margaret Gibson*, eds. Lesley M. Smith and Benedicta Ward (London: Hambledon, 1992), pp. 157-74.

Brett, Martin. *The English Church Under Henry I* (London: OUP, 1975).

Brett, Martin. 'John of Worcester and his contemporaries', *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, eds. R. H. C. Davis, J. M. Wallace-Hadrill with the assistance of R. J. A. I. Catto and M. H. Keen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), pp. 101-126.

Brooke, Christopher N. L. 'The Earliest Times to 1485', *A History of St Paul's Cathedral and the men associated with it*, eds. W. R. Matthews and W. M. Atkins (London: Baker, 1964).

Brooke, Christopher N. L. ‘Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050-1200’, *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12:1 (1956), pp. 1-21.

Brooke, Christopher N. L. ‘Married Men Among the English Higher Clergy, 1066-1200’, *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 12:1 (1956), pp. 187-8.

Brooke, Christopher N. L. *The Medieval Idea of Marriage* (Oxford: OUP, 1989).

Brooke, Z. N. *The English Church and the Papacy: from the Conquest to the reign of John* (Reprint, Cambridge: CUP, 1989) [First published 1931].

Brooks, Nicholas P. *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (London: Leicester University Press, 1984).

Brown, Elizabeth A. R. ‘The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe’, *The American Historical Review*, 79:4 (1974), pp. 1063-1088.

Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988).

Brown, Peter. *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover, N.H. 2002).

Brown, Peter. ‘The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity’, *The Journal of Roman* Studies, 61 (1971), pp. 80-101.

Brown, Peter. ‘The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity, 1971-1997’, *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 6:3 (1998), pp. 353-76.

Brown, R. Allen. *The Normans and the Norman Conquest* (2nd ed. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1985).

Bullough, Vern L. ‘On Being Male in the Middle Ages’, *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), pp. 31-45.

Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: a politics of the performative* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990).

Buc, P. *The Dangers of Ritual: between early medieval texts and social scientific theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

Buc, P. ‘The monster and the critics: a ritual reply’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 15: 4 (2007), pp. 441-452.

Buc, P. ‘Ritual and interpretation: the early medieval case’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 9:2 (2000), pp. 183-210.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the religious significance of food to medieval women* (London: University of California Press, 1987).

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (London: University of California Press, 1984).

Campbell, James. *The Anglo-Saxon State* (London: Hambledon, 2000).

Cantor, Norman. *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958).

Cheney, C. R. *English Bishops' Chanceries, 1100-1250* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1950).

Cheney, Mary. 'Some Observations on a Papal Privilege of 1120 for the Archbishops of York', *JEH*, 31: 4 (1980), pp. 429–439.

Chibnall, Marjorie. *Anglo-Norman England 1066-1166* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).

Chibnall, Marjorie. *The Debate on the Norman Conquest* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).

Christelow, S. M. 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', *ANS* XXII (1991), pp. 49-69.

Clanchy, M. T. *From Memory to Written Record, 1066-1307* (2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

Colgrave, B. 'The Post-Bedan Miracles and Translations of St Cuthbert', *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe: H. M. Chadwick Memorial Studies*, eds. C. F. Fox and Bruce Dickins (Cambridge: CUP, 1950), pp. 307-32.

Colk, T. 'Twelfth-Century East Anglian Canons: A Monastic Life', *Medieval East Anglia*, ed. Harper-Bill (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), pp. 209-224.

Connell, R. W. *Gender and Power: society, the person and sexual politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 1987).

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, James W. 'Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept', *Gender and Society*, 19:6 (2005), pp. 829-59.

Constable, Giles. *Three studies in medieval religious and social thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 1995).

Cooper, Janet Mary. *The Last Four Anglo-Saxon Archbishops of York* (York: St Anthony's P, 1970).

Cooper, Kate. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (London: Harvard University Press, 1996).

Cowdrey, H. E. J. 'Bishop Ermenfrid of Sion and the Penitential Ordinance following the Battle of Hastings', *JEH*, 20 (1969), pp. 225-242.

Cowdrey, H. E. J. *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk and Archbishop* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).

Cowdrey, H. E. J. 'Pope Gregory VII and the Chastity of the Clergy', *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*, ed. Michael Frassetto (London: Garland, 1998), pp. 269-302.

Cronne, H. A. *The Reign of Stephen, 1135-54* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970).

Crook, John. 'The Architectural Setting of the Cult of St Cuthbert in Durham Cathedral (1093-1200)', *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds. David W. Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), pp. 235-250.

Crosby, Everett. U. *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the* Mensa Episcopalis (Cambridge: CUP, 1994).

Crouch, David. *The Reign of King Stephen 1135-1154* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

Crownie, *Religious Patronage in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998).

Dalton, Paul. 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign', *Viator*, 31 (2000), pp. 79-119.

Dameron, George W. *Episcopal Power and Florentine Society 1000-1320* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991).

Davies, R. 'The Medieval State: The Tyranny of a Concept?' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16: 2 (2003), pp. 280-300.

Davis, R. H. C. 'The Authorship of the *Gesta Stephani*', *EHR*, 77:303 (1962), pp. 209-32.

Davis, R. H. C. *King Stephen, 1135-1154* (London: Longman, 1967).

Davis, R. H. C. *The Normans and their Myth* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1976).

Dawtry, A. 'The Benedictine Revival in the North: The Last Bulwark of Anglo-Saxon Monasticism?', *Studies in Church History*, 18 (1982), pp. 87-98.

Delivré, Fabrice. 'The Foundations of Primatial Claims in the Western Church', *JEH*, Vol. 59, No. 3 (2008), pp. 383-406.

Dickinson, J. C. *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London: S. P. C. K. for the Church Historical Society, 1950).

Douglas, David Charles. *William the Conqueror: the Norman impact upon England* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964).

Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols* (2nd ed. reprint, Abingdon: Routledge, 2007) [First published, 1970].

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger* (reprint, Abingdon: Routledge, 2002) [First published, 1966].

Dueball, Margarete, *Der Suprematstreit zwischen den Erzdiözesen Canterbury und York 1070-1126* [Appears as Heft 184 of the *Historische Studien* edited by Dr E. Ebering] (Berlin: E. Ebering, 1929).

Duggan, Charles. 'From the Conquest to the Death of John', *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, ed. C. H. Lawrence (London: Burns & Oates, 1965), pp. 65-115.

Duggan, Charles. *Decretals and the creation of "new law" in the twelfth century: judges, judgements, equity and law* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1998).

Duggan, Charles. *Twelfth-Century Decretal Collections and their importance in English History* (London, 1963).

Farmer, H. 'William of Malmesbury's Life and Works', *JEH*, 13:1 (1962), pp. 39-54.

Fenton, K. A. 'Ideas and Ideals of Secular Masculinity in William of Malmesbury', *Women's History Review*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (2007), pp. 755-772.

Fenton, K.A. 'The Question of Masculinity in William of Malmesbury's Presentation of Wulfstan of Worcester', *ANS XXVIII* (2005), pp. 124-137.

Fernie, Eric. 'Archaeology and Iconography', *Architectural History*, 32 (1989), pp. 18-29.

Fernie, Eric. *The Architecture of Norman England* (Oxford: OUP, 2000).

Fernie, Eric. 'The Architecture and Sculpture of Ely Cathedral in the Norman Period', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, eds. Peter Meadows and Nigel Ramsey (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 95-111.

Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Living in the Tenth Century: mentalities and social orders* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2002) [First published as *L'Archéologie du savoir* (Éditions Gallimard, 1969)].

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin, 1991) [First published as *Surveiller et punir: Naissance de la prison* (Éditions Gallimard, 1975)].

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: Volume One, The Will to Knowledge*, trans. Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1998).

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, Kate Soper (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

Franklin, M. J. 'The Bishops of Winchester and the Monastic Revolution', *ANS*, 12 (1990), pp. 47-65.

Gameson, R. *The Manuscripts of Early Norman England (c.1066-1130)* (Oxford: British Academy of Oxford University Press, 1999).

Geary, Patrick J. 'Oblivion Between Orality and Textuality in the Tenth Century', *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography,* eds. Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, Patrick J. Geary (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 111-122.

Geary, Patrick J. *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, New York: Princeton University Press, 1994).

Gem, R. D. H. 'England and the Resistance to Romanesque Architecture', *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*, eds. Christopher Harper-Bill, Christopher J. Holdsworth and Janet L. Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 131-139.

Gerrard, C. M. *Medieval Archaeology: Understanding Traditions and Contemporary Approaches* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Giandrea, Mary Frances. *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007).

Gibson, Margaret. *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

Gibson, Margaret. 'Normans and Angevins, 1070-1220', *A History of Canterbury Cathedral*, eds. Patrick Collinson, Nigel Ramsay and Margaret Sparks (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp. 36-68.

Gilchrist, Roberta, *Gender and Material Culture: the Archaeology of Religious Women.* (London: Routledge, 1994).

Gilchrist, Roberta 'Medieval Bodies in the Material World: Gender, Stigma and the Body', *Framing Medieval Bodies*, eds. Sarah Kay and Miri Rubin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 43-61.

Gillingham, John. *The English in the Twelfth Century: imperialism, national identity, and political values* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2000).

Gleason, S. Everett. *An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: the bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1936).

Golding, Brian. *Conquest and Colonisation: the Normans in Britain, 1066-1100* (Rev. ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).

Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England c. 550 to c. 1307* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974).

Gray, Douglas. 'Christina of Markyate: the literary background', *Christina of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and H. Leyser (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005), pp. 12-24.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

Green, Judith A. *English Sheriffs to 1154* (London: H. M. S. O. 1990).

Green, Judith A. *The Government of England Under Henry I* (Cambridge: CUP, 1986).

Green, Judith A. *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006).

Hall, D. 'The Sanctuary of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert, His Cult, and Community to AD1200*, eds. G. Bonner, D. W. Rollason and C. Stancliffe (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 425-436.

Hamilton, Sarah. '*Absoluimus uos uice beati petri apostolorum principis:* episcopal authority and the reconciliation of excommunicants in England and Francia *c*.900-*c*.1150', *Frankland: Essays in honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, eds. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), pp. 209-241.

Harper-Bill, Christopher. *The Anglo-Norman Church* (Bangor: Headstart History, 1992).

Hayward, Paul Anthony. 'Translation-Narratives in Post-Conquest hagiography and English resistance to the Norman Conquest', *ANS*, XXI (1998), pp. 67-93.

Head, Thomas. 'The Marriages of Christina of Markyate', Christina *of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and Leyser (Abingdon, 2005), pp. 116-37.

Head, Thomas. 'Postscript: The Ambiguous Bishop', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Ashgate, Aldershot, 2007), pp. 250-64.

Helmholz, Richard H. 'Excommunication in the Twelfth Century England', *Journal of Law and Religion*, 11:1 (1994-5), pp. 235-253.

Holdsworth, C. 'Christina Markyate', *Medieval Women*, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: Basil Blakewell, 1978), pp. 185-204.

Holdsworth, C. 'The Church', *The Anarchy of King Stephen's Reign*, ed. E. King (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 207-229.

Hollister, C. Warren. 'The Norman Conquest and the Genesis of English Feudalism', *American Historical Review*, 66:3 (1961), pp. 641-663.

Hollister, C. Warren. 'St Anselm on Lay Investiture', *ANS*, X (1987), pp. 145-58.

Holt, James Clarke. *Colonial England 1066-1215* (London: Hambledon Press, 1997).

Innes, Matthew. 'Memory, Orality and Literacy in an Early Medieval Society', *Past and Present*, 158 (1998), pp. 3-36.

Jackson, Peter. 'The Vitas patrum in eleventh-century Worcester', *England in the Eleventh Century*, ed. C. Hicks (Stamford: Paul Watkins, 1990), pp. 119-34.

Jared, Lauren Helm. 'English Ecclesiastical Vacancies during the Reigns of William II and Henry I', *JEH*, 42:3 (1991), pp. 362-393.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. 'The Courtier Bishop in Vitae from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', *Speculum*, 58.2 (1983), pp. 291-325.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Envy of Angels : Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994).

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilising Trends and the Formation of the Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).

Kapelle, William E. *The Norman Conquest of the North: the region and its transformation, 1000-1135* (London: Croom Helm, 1979).

Kantorowicz, E. H. *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957).

Kealey, Edward. *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England* (Berkley; London: University of California Press, 1972).

Kerr, Julie. 'The Open Door: Hospitality and Honour in Twelfth/Early Thirteenth-Century England', *History*, 87:287 (2002), pp. 233-335.

Kery, Lotte. (ed.) *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages (ca. 400-1140): A Bibliographical Guide to the Manuscripts and Literature* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1999).

Keynes, S. 'Ely Abbey 672-1109', *A History of Ely Cathedral*, eds. Peter Meadows and Nigel Ramsey (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 3-58.

King, Edmund. 'The *Gesta Stephani*', *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 195-206.

King, Vanessa. 'Ealdred, archbishop of York: the Worcester years', *ANS*, XVIII (1996), pp. 123-37.

Knowles, David. *The Monastic Order in England: a history of its development from the times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940-1216* (2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP, 1976) [First published, 1940].

Koziol, G. *Begging Pardon and Favour: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

Koziol, G. 'The Dangers of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study?', *Early Medieval Europe*, 11 (2002), pp. 367-88.

Koziol, G. 'England, France and the Problem of Sacrality in Twelfth-Century Ritual', *Cultures of Power: Lordship, Status, and Process in twelfth-century Europe*, ed. Thomas Bisson (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1995), pp. 124-48.

Lawless, George. *Augustine of Hippo and his Monastic Rule* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987).

Lawrence, C. H. *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages* (3rd ed. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 2001).

Lea, Henry Charles. *Studies in church history: the rise of the temporal power; benefit of clergy; excommunication* (Philadelphia and London: Collins, 1869).

Le Goff, Jacques. *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

Le Patourel, John. *Feudal Empires: Norman and Plantagenet* (London: Hambledon, 1984).

Leyser, Conrad. *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

Leyser, Conrad. 'Custom, Truth and Gender in Eleventh-Century Reform', *Gender and Christian Religion: Studies in Church History*, 34, ed. R. N. Swanson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1998), pp. 75-93.

Leyser, Conrad. 'Masculinity in Flux: Nocturnal Emission and Limits of Celibacy in the Early Middle Ages', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 103-120.

Little, Bryan. *Architecture in Norman Britain* (London: Batsford, 1985).

Little, Lester K. *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Love, R. C. *Goscelin of Saint-Bertin: the hagiography of the female saints of Ely* (Oxford: OMT, 2004).

Loyn, Henry R. *The English Church, 940-1154* (Harlow: Longman, 2000).

McKitterick, Rosamond. *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789-895* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).

McLaughlin, 'Secular and Spiritual Fatherhood in the Eleventh Century', *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. Jacqueline Murray (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. 25-43.

McNamara, J. 'The *Herrenfrage*: The Restructuring of the Gender system, 1050-1150', *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1994), pp. 3-29.

Maitland, F. W. *The Constitutional History of England: a course of lectures delivered by F. W. Maitland*, ed. H. A. L. Fisher (Cambridge: The University Press, 1919).

Maitland, F. W. 'The Crown as Corporation', *Maitland: Selected Essays*, ed. H. D. Hazeltine, G. Lapsley and P. H. Winfield (Cambridge: CUP, 1936), pp. 104-127.

Maitland, F. W. *Domesday Book and Beyond: Three essays in the early history of England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1897).

Maitland, F. W. *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England: six essays* (London: Methuen, 1898).

Markus, R. A. *Gregory the Great and His World* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997)

Markuson, K. W. 'Recent Investigations in to the east Range of the Cathedral', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Durham Cathedral*, ed. N. Coldstratem and P. Draper (Leeds, 1980), pp. 37-48.

Marritt, Stephen. 'King Stephen and the Bishops', *ANS*, XXIV (2001), pp. 129-144.

Marritt, Stephen. 'Reeds shaken by the wind? Bishops in local and regional politics in King Stephen's reign', *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, eds. P. Dalton and G. J. White (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008).

Mason, Emma. *St Wulfstan of Worcester c.1008-1095* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990).

Mayr-Harting, Henry. *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England* (3rd ed. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991).

Meehan, Bernard. 'Notes on the Preliminary Texts and Continuations to Symeon of Durham's *Libellus de Exordio*', *Symeon of Durham. Historian of Durham and the North*, ed. David W. Rollason (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1998), pp. 128-139.

Miller, Maureen. *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture & Authority in Medieval Italy* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2000).

Miller, Maureen. 'Masculinity, Reform and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture*, Vol. 72 (2003), pp. 25-52.

Moore, R. I. 'Family, Community and Cult', *TRHS*, ser. 5. 30 (1980), pp. 49-69.

Moore, R. I. *The First European Revolution c. 970-1215* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

Moore, R. I. 'Ranulf Flambard and Christina of Markyate', Christina *of Markyate: A twelfth-century holy woman*, eds. S. Fanous and Leyser (London: Routledge, 2005), pp. 138-42.

Moorman, John R. H. *A History of the Church in England* (3rd ed. London: A. and C. Black, 1973).

Morris, Colin. *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050-1200* (London: SPCK for the Church Historical Society, 1972).

Murray, J. 'Introduction', *Conflicted Identities and Multiple Masculinities: Men in the Medieval West*, ed. Jacqueline Murray (New York: Garland, 1999), pp. ix-xx.

Nelson, Janet L. 'Family, gender and sexuality in the Middle Ages', *Companion to Historiography*, ed. M. Bentley (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 153-76.

Nelson, Janet L. 'Law and its applications', *Early Medieval Christianities, c.600-c.1100*, eds. Thomas F. X. Noble, Julia M. H. Smith and Roberta A. Baranowski (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 299-326.

Nelson, Janet L. 'Thematic Reviews: Gender, Memory and Social Power', *Gendering the Middle Ages*, eds. Pauline Stafford and Anneke B. Mulder-Bakker, (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 722-734.

Nelson, Janet L. 'Monks, Secular Men and Masculinity, *c*. 900', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 121-142.

Nicholl, Donald. *Thurstan Archbishop of York (1114-1140)* (York: The Stonegate Press, 1964).

Orchard, Andy. 'Parallel lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', *St Wulfstan and his World*, eds. Barrow, Brooks (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 39-57.

Ott, John S. '"Both Mary and Martha": Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai and the Construction of Episcopal Sanctity in a Border Diocese around 1100', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 137-60.

Ott, John S. and Trumbore Jones, Anna. 'Introduction', *The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, eds. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), pp. 1-19.

Otter, M. 'The Temptation of St Æthelthryth', *Exemplaria*, 9:1 (1997), pp. 139-63.

Page, W. 'Houses of Benedictine monks: The abbey of Eynsham', *The Victoria History of the County of Oxford: Volume 2,* ed. W. Page (London: Constable, 1907), pp. 65-67.

Parish, Helen. *Clerical Celibacy in the West, c.1100-1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010).

Partner, Nancy. 'Henry of Huntingdon: Clerical Celibacy and the Writing of History', *Church History*, 42:4 (1973), pp. 467-75.

Partner, Nancy. *Serious Entertainments: The Writing of History in Twelfth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

Pfaff, Richard. 'Lanfranc's Supposed Purge of the Anglo-Saxon Calendar' *Warriors and Churchmen in the High Middle Ages: Essays presented to Karl Leyser*, ed. Timothy Reuter, (London: Hambledon, 1992), pp. 95-108.

Pfaff, Richard. *Liturgical calendars, Saints and Services in Medieval England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998).

Philpott, Mark. 'Lanfranc's Canonical Collection and the Law of the Church', *Lanfranco di Pavia et l'Europa del secolo XI*, *nel IX centenario della morte (1089-1989)*, ed. Giulio D'Onofrio (Roma: Herder, 1993).

Piper, A. J. 'The First Generation of Durham Monks and Cult of St Cuthbert', *St Cuthbert and His Community to AD 1200*, eds. Gerald Bonner, D. W. Rollason and Clare Stancliffe (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1989), pp. 437-46.

Pollock, F. and Maitland, F. W. *The History of English Law* (2nd ed. Cambridge, 1898 and 1923).

Pössel, C. 'The magic of early medieval ritual', *Early Medieval Europe*, 17:2 (2009), pp. 111-125.

Postles, D. 'The Austin Canons in English Towns, *c*.1100-1350', *Historical Research*, 66 (1993), pp. 1-20.

Prestwich, J. O. 'Anglo-Norman Feudalism and the Problem of Continuity', *Past and Present*, 26 (1963), pp. 39-57.

Prestwich, J. O. 'The Career of Ranulf Flambard', *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1994), pp. 299-310.

Ramsey, N. and Sparks, M. 'The Cult of St Dunstan at Christ Church, Canterbury', *St Dunstan: His Life, Times and Cult*, eds. N. Ramsey, M. Sparks, T. W. T. Tatton-Brown (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 311-23.

Rapp, C. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition* (London: University of California Press, 2005).

Reilly, L. 'The Emergence of Anglo-Norman Architecture: Durham Cathedral', *Anglo-Norman Studies XIX* (1996), pp. 335-51.

Reuter, T. 'Contextualising Canossa: excommunication, penance, surrender, reconciliation', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge: CUP, 2006) 147-166.

Reuter, T. 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 155 (1997), pp. 177-95.

Reuter, T. 'Nobles and others: the social and cultural expression of power relations in the Middle Ages', *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J. L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111-126.

Reynolds, Susan. *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies*, ed. Huw Pryce and John Watts (Oxford: OUP, 2007), pp. 11-22.

Reynolds, Susan. 'There were states in medieval Europe: A response to Rees Davies' *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 16:4 (2003), pp. 550-555.

Richter, Michael. 'Archbishop Lanfranc and the Canterbury Primacy – Some Suggestions', *Downside Review*, 90:229 (1972), pp. 110-118.

Ridyard, Susan, '*Condigna Veneratio*: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons' *ANS*, IX (1987), pp. 179-206.

Robinson, David M. *The Geography of the Augustinian Settlement in Medieval England and Wales*, 2 vols. (Oxford: B. A. R. 1980).

Robinson, I. S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: the polemical literature of the late eleventh century* (Whitstable: Manchester University Press, 1978).

Robinson, I. S. '*Periculosus Homo*: Pope Gregory VII and episcopal authority', *Viator*, 9 (1978), pp. 103-131.

Rollason, David. *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).

Rollason, David, 'Simeon of Durham and the Community of Durham in the Eleventh Century', *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Hicks (Stamford, Lincs, 1992), pp. 183-198.

Roper, Lyndal. *Oedipus and Devil: witchcraft, sexuality, and religion* (London: Routledge, 1994).

Rubenstein, Jay. 'Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages', *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 53-69.

Rubenstein, Jay. 'Liturgy against History: The Competing Visions of Lanfranc and Eadmer of Canterbury', *Speculum*, 74:2 (1999), pp. 279-309.

Ruud, Marylou. 'Episcopal Reluctance: Lanfranc's Resignation Reconsidered', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 19:2 (1987), pp. 163-175.

Ruud, Marylou. 'Monks in the Word: The Case of Gundulf of Rochester', *ANS*, XI (1988), pp. 245-60.

Ruud, Marylou. '"Unworthy Servants": The Rhetoric of Resignation at Canterbury, 1070-1170', *The Journal of Religious History*, 22:1 (1998), pp. 1-13.

Saltman, Avrom. *Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury* (London: The Athlone Press, 1956).

Sawyer, P. H. *Kings and Vikings: Scandinavia and Europe, A.D. 700-1100* (London: Methuen, 1982).

Scholz, Bernard W. 'The Canonisation of Edward the Confessor', *Speculum*, 36:1 (1961), pp. 38-60.

Short, Ian. '*Tam angli quam franci*: Self-definition in Anglo-Norman England', *ANS*, XVIII (1996), pp. 153-175.

Smalley, Beryl. *Historians of the Middle Ages* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1974).

Smith, R. A. L. 'The Place of Gundulf in the Anglo-Norman Church', *EHR*, 58 (1943), pp. 257-72.

Southern, R. W. 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing IV: the Sense of the Past', *TRHS*, 5th ser. 23 (1973), pp. 246-63.

Southern, R. W. 'The Canterbury Forgeries', *EHR*, 73:287 (1958), pp. 193-226.

Southern, R. W. *The Making of the Middle Ages* (London: Hutchinson & Co. 1953).

Southern, R. W. *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970).

Southern, R. W. *Saint Anselm and His Biographer: A study of monastic life and thought, 1059-c.*1103 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

Southern, R. W. *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Southern, R. W. 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An Examination of the Foundations', *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 20:2 (1988), pp. 181-204.

Southern, R. W. *Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995).

Southern, R. W. *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1970).

Spear, David S. 'The Norman Clergy and the Secular Clergy', *The Journal of British Studies*, 21:2 (1982), pp. 1-10.

Spiegel, Gabrielle. 'History, Historicism and the Social Logic of the Text in the Middle Ages', *Speculum*, 65 (1990), pp. 59-86.

Spiegel, Gabrielle and Stone, L. 'History and Post-Modernism', *Past and Present*, 135 (1992), pp. 189-208.

Stafford, Pauline. ‘Writing Biography of Eleventh-Century Queens’, *Writing Medieval Biography 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow*, eds. David Bates, Julia Crick and Sarah Hamilton (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 99-109.

Staunton, M. ‘Eadmer’s *Vita Anselmi*: a reinterpretation’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 23:1 (1997), pp. 1-14.

Stenton, F. M. ‘Acta Episcoporum’, *Cambridge Historical Journal*, 3:1 (1929), pp. 1-14.

Swanson, R. N. ‘Angels Incarnate: Clergy and Masculinity from Gregorian Reform to Reformation’, *Masculinity in Medieval Europe* ed. D. M. Hadley (London: Longman, 1999), pp. 160-177.

Telfer, William. *The Office of a Bishop* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962).

Tellenbach, Gerd. *Church, State and Christian Society at the time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (Oxford: Blackwell, 1940) [Translated from the original: *Libertas: Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreites* (Leipzig: Kohlhammer, 1936)].

Thomson, R. M. ‘Satire, Irony, and Humour in William of Malmesbury’, *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: essays in honour of John O. Ward*, ed. Constant J. Mews, Cary J. Nederman and Rodney M. Thomson (Turnhout: Brepol, 2003), pp. 115-27.

Thomson, R. M. *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003).

Thurlby, M. ‘Patron and Master Mason of Durham Cathedral’, *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, eds. David W. Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 161-84.

Toch, M. ‘Asking the Way and Telling the Law: Speech in Medieval Germany’, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 16:4 (1986), pp. 667-82.

Vaughn, S. N. *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The innocence of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent* (Berkeley and Los Angeles; University of California Press, 1987).

Vaughn, S. N. ‘Anselm: Saint and Statesman’, *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, 20:2 (1988), pp. 205-220.

Vaughn, S. N. ‘Eadmer’s *Historia Novorum*: a reinterpretation’, *ANS*, X (1987), pp. 259-289.

Vodola, Elisabeth. *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986)

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Vol. 1, eds. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (New York: Bedminster, 1968).

Weber, Max. ‘The three pure types of legitimate rule’, *The Essential Weber: A Reader*, ed. Sam Whimster (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 133-145.

West, Francis James. 'The Colonial History of the Norman Conquest?' *History*, 84 (1999), pp. 219-236.

Wickham, Chris. 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 155 (1997), pp. 196-208.

Wickham, Chris. 'Topographies of Power: Introduction', *Topographies of Power in the early Middle Ages*, eds. M. de Jong, F. Theuws and C. van Rhijn (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

White, Stephen. 'Debate: The "Feudal Revolution"', *Past and Present*, 152 (1996), pp. 205-223.

White, Stephen. 'The Politics of Anger', *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. B. H. Rosenwine (Ithaca, New York, 1988), pp. 127-52

Williams, Ann. 'The Cunning of the Dove: Wulfstan and the Politics of Accommodation', *St. Wulfstan and His World*, eds. Brookes and Barrow (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), pp. 23-38.

Williams, Ann. *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1995).

Winterbottom, M. 'The Language of William of Malmesbury', *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: essays in honour of John O. Ward*, eds. Constant J. Mews, Cary J. Nederman and Rodney M. Thomson (Turnhout: Brepol, 2003), pp. 129-47.

Wright, 'Alfred burns the cakes: the *Vita prima Sancti Neoti, telesinus*, and Juvenal', *History and Literature in Late Antiquity and the early Medieval West*, ed. Wright (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1995).

Yarrow, Simon, *Saints and their Communities: miracle stories in twelfth-century England* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2006).

Yoshitake, Kenji. 'The arrest of the bishops in 1139 and its consequences', *Journal of Medieval History*, 14:2 (1988), pp. 97-114.

Unpublished material

Crumplin, Sally. 'Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert from the Ninth to the Twelfth Centuries' (University of St Andrews: Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2004).

Hamilton, Sarah. 'The Bishop's Bloodless Sword? Early Medieval Excommunication in Practice' (IMC Leeds, Typescript, 2009).

Hamilton, Sarah. 'Curse or Procedure? Excommunication in practice, 900-1050' (IMC Leeds, Typescript, 2007).

Mesley, Matthew. 'The Construction of Episcopal Identity: the Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century' (University of Exeter, Unpublished DPhil Thesis, 2009).

Reuter, T. 'Leeds Paper: *Europe des diocèses*' (IMC Leeds, Typescript, 1995).