'Episcopal Power in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135'

Samuel O'Rourke

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD

University of East Anglia

School of History

February 2014

Abstract

      The thesis presents an empirical view of episcopal power in England from 1066 to 1135. For simplicity's sake, 'power' is defined as efficacy, or the ability to achieve one's ends. No formal distinction is made here between 'power' and 'authority'. The bulk of the thesis (Chapters 3-5) consists of three case studies: the first examines the political relationship between bishops, the papacy and the kings of England; the second looks at episcopal landholding; and the third considers disputes between bishoprics and abbeys. These case studies start by asking what bishops did: what their political goals were and the extent to which they achieved them. They then ask *how* bishops did what they did: what resources bishops deployed; why certain actions were possible; why certain strategies were or were not successful. By doing this it is possible to determine the nature of the power which bishops exercised.

      Three conclusions emerge: firstly, that episcopal power was highly dependent on royal power in this period; secondly, that the basis of episcopal power was often intangible (ideology or personality), rather than material (land or money); and thirdly, that episcopal power was inherently limited, in that bishops sometimes had very little freedom of action.

      Chapters 1 and 2 are not case studies. They are concerned with ideals of episcopal power. Chapter 1 shows that ideals of episcopal conduct and episcopal power (as expressed in contemporary hagiography) changed in eleventh-century England. It attempts to link these changes to historical developments in this period. Chapter 2 shows that these changing ideals were reflected in the narrative sources for the episcopate of Anglo-Norman England, but not in the reality of episcopal conduct, and that historians have often been misled by these narrative sources, reproducing a model of episcopal power which was little more than a monastic fantasy.

Contents

Introduction

'Anglo-Norman England' is simple enough to define. The Anglo-Norman period is generally understood as the century or so after the Norman Conquest of 1066. Here the end of Henry I's reign (1135) is used as a loose cut-off point. The reign of King Stephen is both too large and too distinctive to be included. Besides, a study of Stephen's bishops already exists.[1] Martin Brett's reasons for choosing the English Church as a unit of study (rather than the Anglo-Norman Church) are still valid, and do not need to be repeated here.[2] The idea of 'episcopal power', however, is more of a sticking point.

There exists a large and often contradictory theoretical literature on power, and a multitude of rival definitions of the word: such a multitude that the editors of a recent *Handbook of Power* proposed to solve the problem by allowing each scholar to adopt his own definition, tailored to his field of interest.[3] In the present thesis power will be defined in the broadest, most basic and least ambiguous way possible: as the ability to get what one wants, or to achieve one's desire, whatever the means employed.[4] The thesis looks at how bishops in Anglo-Norman England acted; what they sought to do; what results they obtained; and what resources or faculties allowed them to obtain these results.

The thesis does not make the distinction, sometimes found in scholarship on the Middle Ages and elsewhere, between authority ('the generally accepted justification for action') and power itself ('the practical ability to induce others to obey or follow a lead').[5] According to the definition of power just given, authority

---

[1] See below, n. 12.

[2] Martin Brett, *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford, 1975), pp. 4-14. Unlike Brett's study, the present thesis also ignores the Welsh and Scottish bishops. Their political situation was more complicated than that of bishops in England, and deserves separate treatment.

[3] Stewart Clegg and Mark Haugaard, 'Introduction: Why Power is the Central Concept of the Social Sciences', in *The SAGE Handbook of Power*, ed. Stewart Clegg and Mark Haugaard (London, 2009), 1-24, pp. 22-3.

[4] *Cf.* Richard Jenkins, 'The Ways and Means of Power: Efficacy and Resources', in *SAGE Handbook of Power*, 140-56, p. 140: 'Power, in this approach, is understood as "efficacy": the many and varied ways in which humans, whether individually or collectively, attempt to achieve their objectives and to assist or obstruct others in the achievement of theirs.'

[5] Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek, 'Introduction', in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek (Turnhout, 2007), 1-19, pp. 1-2. This distinction is by no means anachronistic for the study of the Middle Ages: the Gelasian distinction

represents nothing more than one of the means through which power can be exercised; it is a form of power in itself. It is hard in any case to separate authority from power.[6] Money, for example, might be seen as a concrete form of power. But money's power comes from the commonly accepted attribution of value to essentially useless chunks of metal – from a kind of authority. Similarly, the most lawless robber baron (someone who exercised power without authority, but through force) was only able to commit his depredations because his violent followers did what he commanded – because of the authority they attributed to him.

The word 'authority' *is* used in this thesis, but in a non-technical sense, generally to refer to claims of legal jurisdiction (as with papal authority in Chapter 3).

***

Historiographically, this study of episcopal power fills an important gap. In recent years, historians have become increasingly interested in the medieval bishop. Timothy Reuter was planning a major project on the episcopate before his death,[7] and several collections of essays calling for renewed study of the subject have appeared over the past decade.[8] It is not that bishops were ignored before,

---

between *auctoritas sacrata pontificum* and *regalis potestas* was widespread: Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church* (London, 1979), p. 269. It is simply easier for our purposes to use a monolithic definition of power.

[6] As noticed by Susan Reynolds, 'Secular Power and Authority in the Middle Ages', in *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies*, ed. Huw Pryce and John Watts (Oxford, 2007), 11-22, p. 11.

[7] Timothy Reuter, 'Bishops, Rites of Passage, and the Symbolism of State in Pre-Gregorian Europe', in *The Bishop: Power and Piety at the First Millenium*, ed. Sean Gilsdorf (Münster, 2004), 23-36; *idem*, 'Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms', in *Bischof Burchard von Worms, 1000–1025*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Mainz, 2000), 1-28.

[8] *Bischofsmord im Mittelalter: Murder of Bishops*, ed. Natalie Fryde and Dirk Reitz (Göttingen, 2003); *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf; *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. John Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007); *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Western Europe*, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (Berlin, 2011).

but – according to certain scholars – a new approach to the question is needed.[9] A synthetic treatment of the medieval bishop is required. The older historiography tended to view the episcopate's religious and political functions in isolation.[10] This approach must be replaced by one which recognises that 'the bishop's duties and expectations were multifaceted and fundamentally interconnected – part of a single emotional, psychological, and social whole.'[11] Furthermore, while older studies were often biographical, looking at a single bishop in isolation, the episcopate itself (or at least groups of bishops) must now be looked at in unison.

Whether these writers are right to insist on the total synthesis of the medieval bishop is a matter of opinion (Chapter 3 of the present thesis suggests that this synthesis may be just as anachronistic as the older separation of the bishop's temporal and spiritual functions). For now, it is sufficient to note that, to a certain extent, the call for more work on the medieval bishop has been answered. Stephen Marritt's doctoral thesis on the bishops of King Stephen's reign,[12] and Mary Giandrea's book on episcopal culture in late Anglo-Saxon England cover the periods immediately before and after the one looked at here.[13] Charlotte Lewandowski's study of 'Cultural Expressions of Episcopal Power, 1070-*c.* 1150' covers much the same period as this thesis.[14] Richard Allen has studied the Norman episcopate between 989 and 1110.[15]

One might even describe the field of episcopal studies as congested. However, the present thesis differs from the works just cited in a number of

---

[9] See especially Michel Parisse, 'The Bishop: Prince and Prelate', in *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf, 1-22; John Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones, 'Introduction: The Bishop Reformed', in *The Bishop Reformed*, ed. Ott and Jones, 1-20.

[10] But even if this was the case, there were exceptions. We read in a book from the 1970s that '[episcopal] office, with its prerogatives, duties, profits, and patronage, was conceived as a whole, as royal writs often recognised': Brett, *English Church*, p. 114. See also John Le Patourel, 'Geoffrey of Montbray, Bishop of Coutances, 1049-1093', in *EHR* 59 (1944), 129-61, pp. 156-7.

[11] Ott and Jones, 'Introduction', pp. 18-9.

[12] Stephen Marritt, 'The Bishops of King Stephen's Reign' (PhD Thesis: University of Glasgow, 1999). See also his 'King Stephen and the Bishops' in *ANS* 24 (2002), 129-44, and 'Reeds Shaken by the Wind? Bishops in Local and Regional Politics in King Stephen's Reign', in *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme White (Woodbridge, 2008), 115-38. But obviously, Stephen Marrit cannot have been responding to the works cited in n. 8.

[13] Mary Frances Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007).

[14] Charlotte Lewandowski, 'Cultural Expressions of Episcopal Power, 1070-*c.* 1150' (PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham, 2010).

[15] Richard Allen, 'The Norman Episcopate, 989-1110' (PhD Thesis: University of Glasgow, 2009). See also *Les évêques normands du XIe siècle, actes du Colloque de Cerisy-la-Salle 30 sept.-3 oct. 1993*, ed. Pierre Bouet and François Neveux (Caen, 1995).

important respects. It addresses themes which they ignore. Among these are the role of legal ideas in defining episcopal action,[16] the role of episcopal tenants in defining episcopal power, and the relationship between hagiographical ideals of episcopal conduct and its reality. The present thesis also uses sources generally overlooked by historians, in particular the wealth of circumstantial detail tucked away in seldom-read miracle collections.[17] But the biggest departure of the present thesis is in its methodology: in the systematic approach which it takes to the question of episcopal power.

The thesis starts from a clear definition of power (as the ability to achieve one's ends) and attempts to trace and analyse the phenomenon in the field, that is, in the historical reality which examination of contemporary sources allows us to reconstruct. Each chapter (with the exception of Chapter 1, and, partially, Chapter 2) starts from a rigorous and empirical study of episcopal action, using traditional historical methodology to trace what happened: what bishops did. In this respect, each chapter stands as a self-contained and original contribution to our factual knowledge of Anglo-Norman England. However, at the same time as this, each chapter also asks questions about episcopal power, consciously analysing what it was which permitted bishops to do what they did. Each chapter considers a different type of power (landed power, charismatic power, legal power, *etc.*). The conclusion ties these diverse strands together and attempts to give, inasmuch as this is possible, a holistic picture of episcopal power.

This methodology has not (to my knowledge) been previously applied to the study of the medieval episcopate.[18] Studies of power do not always take an empirical approach. When they do, they tend to concentrate on the modern and

---

[16] Although Charlotte Lewandowski (*op. cit.*) touches on this, especially in c. 1.

[17] An eloquent defence of miracle collections as a historical source is found in Robert Frank, 'Shrine Rivalry in the North Sea World', in *The North Sea World in the Middle Ages: Studies in the Cultural History of North-Western Europe*, ed. Thomas Liszka and Lorna Walker (Dublin, 2001), 230-42, pp. 240-2: 'As though caught in the flash of a stroboscopic light, a scene lost in time bursts upon our vision.'

[18] However, the 2008 monograph by Steffen Patzold on the Carolingian and post-Carolingian episcopate deserves mention as an example of a very different, but equally systematic, approach to the question of episcopal power: *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008). Patzold also starts from a clear definition of power and attempts to trace its workings 'in the field'; but Patzold's conception of power – derived mostly from theoretical literature – is more narrow than the one used here. He concentrates on power as constituted through normative codes, and the power of such norms to enable and to limit episcopal action.

early modern periods.[19] So the present thesis, as well as expanding our empirical knowledge of Anglo-Norman England, and of the medieval episcopate, is intended as a contribution to the study of power in general.

<center>***</center>

It remains to sketch out the structure of the thesis. First, however, it is necessary to explain what the thesis does not cover, and why it does not cover it. Certain topics highly relevant to the study of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England are not included. The thesis does not discuss, for example, the wide-ranging reform of the English church in this period, the gradual extension of diocesan authority in eleventh- and twelfth-century England, and the gradual development of routine episcopal government. These were critical developments, but they have been extensively studied by Martin Brett, Frank Barlow and others.[20] This thesis aims to build on and respond to the work of these scholars – not to repeat it. Similarly, the efforts of Archbishops Lanfranc and Anselm of Canterbury to establish Canterbury's primatial authority are adequately treated in the biographies of these archbishops by H.E.J. Cowdrey and Richard Southern.[21] And it would be difficult to add much to Ulrich Fischer's voluminous synthesis of work on the cathedral architecture of Anglo-Norman England, and discussion of the architectural expressions of episcopal power.[22]

Other topics are left out because to cover them would have made the research project unfeasibly large. The question of episcopal liturgy is perhaps the

---

[19] A classic example is Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison* (Paris, 1975). See also John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Anatomy of Power* (Boston, 1983), pp. 93-6, which takes the simplistic view of feudal power as based on primarily land and force. *Cf.* Chapter 4 of the present thesis, which argues against this notion. One scholar who has included the Middle Ages in his analysis of power is Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1986-2012).

[20] Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, c. 3; Brett, *English Church*, pp. 141-61. The introductions to the volumes in the *English Episcopal Acta* series (see the list of abbreviations under *EEA*) are also important here.

[21] H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 87-98, 144-8; Richard Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1992), c. 14.

[22] Ulrich Fischer, *Stadtgestalt im Zeichen der Eroberung: Englische Kathedralstädte in frühnormannischer Zeit (1066-1135)* (Cologne, 2009).

most glaring of these omissions.[23] Similarly, the thesis does not tackle the thorny question of the changing place of bishops in eleventh- and twelfth-century law codes.[24] These themes would arguably require theses of their own. Elsewhere, the thesis uses case studies of individual dioceses to illustrate wider developments. Chapter 4, for example, uses the dioceses of Dorchester / Lincoln and Worcester to comment on episcopal landholding in general; but with sufficient time and space it would have been possible to carry out a similar study for more or less any English diocese. Chapter 5 uses the dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and the abbots of the abbey of St Augustine's to discuss the relationship between bishoprics and monasteries in this period; but it could just as well have used Worcester and Evesham, or East Anglia and Bury St Edmunds.

So the present thesis does not claim to be comprehensive. To cover every single aspect of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England would have made the thesis impossibly long, or the analysis uselessly superficial.[25] It has seemed better to study a few representative aspects of the question in depth. And here the extensive secondary literature relating to the Anglo-Norman episcopate is invaluable. Although there have been few synthetic studies of bishops in Anglo-Norman England, there exists a host of books and articles on individual bishops, and on aspects of ecclesiastical history in general. Some of these works provide an essential context for the thesis' case studies.[26] Others resolve technical or chronological issues which would otherwise hold up the train of argument.[27] Still others make it possible to compare the situation in Anglo-Norman England with earlier and later periods.[28] It would serve no useful purpose to catalogue these

---

[23] Mary Giandrea has made good use of this kind of evidence in looking at the late Anglo-Saxon episcopate: *Episcopal Culture*, c. 4.

[24] Stephen Marritt has drawn some interesting conclusions on the bishop's place in society from these sources: 'King Stephen and the Bishops', pp. 135-7.

[25] Although Richard Allen (*op. cit.*), working with the much thinner Norman evidence, was able to take this approach.

[26] *E.g.* Barbara Dodwell, 'The Honour of the Bishop of Thetford / Norwich in the Late Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', in *Norfolk Archaeology* 33 (1965), 185-99; Pamela Taylor, 'The Endowment and Military Obligations of the See of London: A Reassessment of Three Sources', in *ANS* 14 (1992), 287-312.

[27] *E.g.* Richard Sharpe, 'The Date of St Mildreth's Translation from Minster-in-Thanet to Canterbury', in *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991), 349-54; Ann Williams, 'The Spoliation of Worcester', in *Anglo-Norman Studies* 19 (1997), 383-408.

[28] *E.g.* Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984); David Knowles, *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge, 1951).

works of scholarship here. They are cited throughout the thesis; those cited are listed in the bibliography.[29] But without them the generalised (though in places specific) approach taken by the present thesis would be impossible.

With these limitations acknowledged and – it is hoped – justified, it is possible to explain what the thesis actually does. As has been mentioned, each of the five chapters looks at a certain aspect of episcopal power, while the conclusion unites the diverse threads of argument. Chapters 1 and 2 stand a little outside this structure; but they are essential to it.

Unlike the other chapters of the thesis, Chapter 1 starts not from an analysis of political events in Anglo-Norman England, but by tracing changes in ideals of episcopal conduct in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman England. It uses hagiography to do this. A number of *Vitae* of saintly bishops were written in England after the Norman Conquest on the basis of earlier texts. The redactors of these texts uniformly added certain elements to their sources and suppressed others. The sum of these changes was an ideal of episcopal conduct different to earlier ideals. Chapter 1 seeks to explain these changing ideals by reference to historical developments in the eleventh century.

It might be objected that this hagiographical study has little to do with the systematic analysis of episcopal power (based on episcopal action) proposed above. However, some scholars maintain that such ideals had, in themselves, a kind of power, in that, by shaping contemporary conduct they determined what historical actors did.[30] By comparing the ideals studied in Chapter 1 with the findings of the other chapters it is possible to test this hypothesis. Moreover, some of the hagiographical ideals uncovered in Chapter 1 prefigure the themes of subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2 also starts from an analysis of what are essentially normative texts. But here the textual analysis serves to make concrete points about episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. The narrative sources for this period (episcopal *Vitae* and chronicles) consistently show bishops using their religious authority for

---

[29] I have taken the approach of only including in the bibliography those works actually cited in the thesis. It would otherwise be hard to determine what was or was not relevant for inclusion.

[30] See Steffen Patzold's study of the Carolingian and post-Carolingian episcopate, discussed above in n. 18.

political ends, exercising a kind of charismatic power. Historians have often accepted these sources – and so this idea of charismatic power – uncritically. Chapter 2 shows that this is a mistake. Comparison of the narrative evidence with other sources suggests that the stories of charismatic episcopal authority are untrustworthy, representing more the ideals held by the monks who wrote them than the reality of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England.

So Chapter 2 serves a double purpose. Firstly, it serves as a methodological prelude to the thesis' other chapters, warning against an excessive reliance on dubious narrative sources. Where Chapters 3 to 5 use narrative sources they do so with the utmost caution, and they tend to prefer earlier authors to later ones: Osbern of Canterbury, or the Worcester monk Hemming, for example, as opposed to William of Malmesbury. Where possible, the argument is built on strictly contemporary evidence: letters, charters, *Domesday Book* and other land surveys. These sources are not necessarily trustworthy – no historical source is. But they do have the advantage of lacking the hindsight and monastic bias of Eadmer, William of Malmesbury or John of Worcester.

Secondly, Chapter 2 tests, and rejects, the hypothesis that certain bishops with a reputation for holiness enjoyed a special political influence because of that reputation.

Chapter 3 looks at a related, but different, type of power. It examines the small group of English bishops who came (individually) into conflict with the English king in our period. It shows that the papacy was somehow involved in all of these conflicts. Arguably, the only hope an isolated bishop had of resisting the English king was by appealing to the higher authority of the pope; but demands for obedience from Rome could also drag a bishop into conflict with the king. The papacy, therefore, both gave bishops power and in certain circumstances took power away from bishops (by constraining them). Chapter 3 also highlights the force of abstract legal conceptions (norms of episcopal power, although not the hagiographical norms discussed in Chapter 1). Like the papacy, these conceptions both gave bishops power – by protecting them from the full force of the king's law – and took power away from bishops: this episcopal immunity was lost when bishops contravened commonly held ideas of correct episcopal conduct.

One of the main points of Chapter 3 is the immateriality of power. Abstract ideas could have a concrete force. The material resources of the bishops, by contrast, were of little significance in the disputes described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4, which uses the dioceses of Lincoln and Worcester as case studies for episcopal landholding in general, pursues this theme. Some historians have insisted on the importance of land, and the wealth one could gain from land, as the basis of all power in the Middle Ages. Chapter 4 suggests that this view needs to be modified. The first two bishops of Lincoln were able to gain a large amount of land not by exploiting the land they already had, but by pleasing the English king. Conversely, Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester was able to defend the existing lands of his church by appealing to the king's authority. Royal power was so dominant in England that – for bishops – the easiest way of achieving anything was by acting indirectly, through the king. It might be argued that the vast power of the king was due to his landed resources (although it was also abstract: when people obeyed the king, they did so because contemporary norms dictated that the king should be obeyed). In this respect, the view of land as the source of all power can be defended. But it is obviously insufficient as a means of understanding the political conduct of the English episcopate.

Chapter 5 offers another case study. This time the theme is the relationship between bishoprics and monasteries, and the disputes over monastic exemption which emerged in this period. The archbishopric of Canterbury and the abbey of St Augustine's are used to illuminate the nature of such disputes. The gradual progress from secular to ecclesiastical controversies seen at Canterbury was typical, and may relate to changing conceptions of episcopal office after the Norman Conquest. However, Chapter 5 also discusses episcopal power. It shows that the tenants and dependants of prelates were sometimes able to direct the action of their masters. The dispute at Canterbury is best understood as one between the monks and retainers of the archbishops of Canterbury and the monks and retainers of the abbots of St Augustine's. The abbots and archbishops often did not want conflict, but were dragged into it by their underlings. These dependants, in part, constituted episcopal power. Bishops had to act through such men; and their support gave a bishop influence at a local level. But they also limited episcopal power. Bishops may often have had little choice as to how they

exercised their own power. In these arguments, Chapter 5 echoes Chapter 3, and its discussion of the ideological constraints upon episcopal action.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

The conclusion to this thesis will tie together the diverse conclusions of the chapters, presenting, as far as it is possible, a holistic view of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. It would be premature to attempt to give such a view here. Some themes, however, have already emerged, themes which will appear repeatedly over the course of this thesis. It seems advisable to draw attention to these themes now. The first is the immateriality of episcopal power. We shall see again and again the relative unimportance of wealth, land and other concrete resources in what follows. The second is the limited nature of episcopal power. In some cases, bishops in Anglo-Norman England had only the power to follow certain, fairly sharply delineated, courses of action. A final theme of the present thesis, which has not yet been mentioned, is that of change: given the period covered, this is inevitable. Since ideas of historical change will come up again and again over the course of the thesis, it is advisable to end this introduction with a few words on the subject.

Questions of change permeate the historiography of Anglo-Norman England: whether the Norman Conquest should be seen as radically effacing the world of the Anglo-Saxons, or whether the superficial disruptions of 1066 mask substantial continuity in the government, culture and institutions of the English kingdom. Even where the post-Conquest situation manifestly differed from what had gone before it (as, for example, in the creation of territorial archdeaconries), there are questions: was this change caused by the Norman Conquest, or would it have taken place anyway? Was it simply a local manifestation of wider changes affecting the whole of Europe? Such wider changes are easily found. The eleventh-century drive for the reform of the papal and then the wider church, the subsequent disputes between popes and emperors for dominance in ecclesiastical affairs, 'the battle for the soul of Europe' – all this affected England. Other factors may also have been important. The decline in social mobility in England

following the Norman Conquest may, for example, have been the result of social and demographic processes unrelated to the Conquest itself.[31]

The present thesis cannot hope to resolve these questions of change versus continuity, or local versus international change. They can probably never be resolved. Often change is subjective: it depends on what one classifies as change and what one classifies as continuity. It is, however, possible to reflect on these questions. At each stage, the thesis will ask whether the phenomena which it describes were new or old ones; and if they were new, then what had given rise to them. It is not always possible to give answers. Nevertheless, this reflection deepens our understanding of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England by drawing our attention to what was special and distinctive about it.

***

A few technical points need to be made here. When bishops and abbots are introduced to the reader for the first time, the dates of their reigns are given in parentheses after their names. For abbots, these dates are taken from the revised version of *Heads of Religious Houses*.[32] For bishops, they are generally derived from the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.[33] When dates for letters by Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury are given with no further comment, they are taken from Walter Fröhlich's translation of the letters rather than F.S. Schmitt's edition.[34] Any dates tacitly given for other sources should be assumed to be those supplied by their most recent editors. All translations of Latin or Old English text given in this thesis are my own, unless otherwise stated. In quoting Latin text from printed editions, I have generally followed the conventions of orthography and punctuation adopted by the editors, even when these are clearly anachronistic (*e.g.* 'vultus', 'janua', 'oboedire'). In quoting manuscripts, I have mostly followed

---

[31] W.G. Runciman, 'Accelerating Social Mobility: The Case of Anglo-Saxon England', in *Past and Present* 104 (1984), 3-30, pp. 27-30.

[32] *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, I, 940-1216*, ed. David Knowles, C.N.L. Brooke and Vera C.M. London (rev. edn.: Cambridge, 2001).

[33] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Lawrence Goldman (online edn.: www.oxforddnb.com, accessed August-September 2013).

[34] See the list of abbreviations under *AEp*.

the original pointing and spelling. Tagged Es, however, have been rendered without their tags, and *punctus elevati* as semicolons.

All of the references to *Domesday Book* in this thesis are to the Phillimore editions, using the reference numbers given therein (*e.g.* WOR 2,45, LIN 7,4).[35] Anglo-Saxon charters are cited by their Sawyer number (*e.g.* S543, S1247). Where modern editions of charters exist, these editions are cited as well. Otherwise, the reference should be assumed to be to the electronic edition of the charter at the *Electronic Sawyer* (www.esawyer.org.uk). When charters are described as authentic or spurious with no further comment, the reader is referred to the comments of the scholars cited by the editors of the *Electronic Sawyer*.

When hagiographical *Vitae* are mentioned for the first time, their *BHL* (*Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*) numbers are given in brackets (*e.g.* (*BHL*, 854)). For papal letters, the Jaffé-Loewenfeld numbers (*e.g.* J-L 3487) and the most recent edition are given in the footnotes.

---

[35] *Domesday Book*, ed. John Morris *et al.*, 34 vols (Chichester 1975-92).

Chapter 1: Hagiographical Ideals of Episcopal Power

It is now widely accepted that medieval hagiography's proper use as a historical source is less as a record of the often fictional events which it describes, and more as a window into the mental world of the men who created it. Moreover, the close examination of successive redactions of hagiographical *Vitae* (saints' lives) is becoming increasingly popular.[1] The advantage of this approach is that, because each writer's work can be compared with his source, it is possible to see what exactly each individual writer added or suppressed or altered, and hence which parts of the idealised narrative can be attributed to the writer's immediate context rather than to the *Vita's* literary or factual substratum.

This chapter uses the hagiography written in Anglo-Norman England to examine how contemporaries (or contemporary writers of hagiography – the distinction is important) portrayed the ideal bishop. It focuses on a group of *Vitae* of saintly bishops which English hagiographers rewrote from earlier, mostly late Anglo-Saxon, models in this period: the *Vita Ecgwini*, originally written by Byrhtferth of Ramsey *c.* 1020 (*BHL* 2432), rewritten by the anonymous 'Digby-Gotha author' *c.* 1100 (*BHL* 2438), and rewritten again by Dominic of Evesham before 1126 (*BHL* 2433);[2] the *Vita Oswaldi*, written between 997 and 1002 by the same Byrhtferth (*BHL* 6374) and rewritten *c.* 1115 by Eadmer of Canterbury (*BHL* 6375);[3] the *Vita Dunstani*, written in the late 990s by 'B' (*BHL* 2342),

---

[1] For a general survey see Monique Goullet, *Ecriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies saints dans l'Occident latin médiéval (VIIIᵉ-XIIIᵉ s.)* (Turnhout, 2005); *eadem*, 'Vers une typologie des réécritures hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France', in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'occident médiéval: transformations formelles et idéologiques*, ed. Monique Goullet and Martin Heinzelmann (Ostfildern, 2003), 109-44. Specific examples are given below.

[2] Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita s. Oswaldi*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge in *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine* (Oxford, 2009), 1-204; 'The Digby-Gotha Recension of the Life of St Ecgwine', ed. Michael Lapidge in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 7 (1979), 39-55; Dominic of Evesham, *Vita s. Ecgwini episcopi et confessoris*, ed. Michael Lapidge in *Analecta Bollandiana* 96 (1978), 65-104. The sequence and dating of these *Vitae Ecgwini* is that proposed by Samuel O'Rourke, 'Hagiography and Exemption at Medieval Evesham, 1000-1250: The Evidence of the *Vitae Ecgwini*', forthcoming. Michael Lapidge puts the Digby-Gotha recension before Dominic of Evesham's *Vita Ecgwini*, and Dominic's work before 1100: 'Digby-Gotha Recension', pp. 39-42; *idem*, 'The Medieval Hagiography of St Ecgwine', in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 6 (1977), 77-93, pp. 85-9.

[3] Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *Vita s. Ecgwini*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge in *Byrhtferth: Lives of Oswald and Ecgwine*, 205-304; Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita s. Oswaldi*, ed. and trans. Bernard

condensed into a set of lections by Adelard of Ghent between 1006 and 1012, rewritten (on the basis of both 'B' and Adelard) between 1089 and 1093[4] by Osbern of Canterbury (*BHL* 2344), and later rewritten again by the aforementioned Eadmer (*BHL* 2346) and William of Malmesbury (*BHL* 2348);[5] and, finally, Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's two *Vitae* (one short, one long; *BHL* 777-8) of St Augustine of Canterbury, probably written in the 1090s, and mostly adapted from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* (completed *c.* 731).[6]

This is not the first time the rewritten hagiography of Anglo-Norman England has been used to trace changing ideals of episcopal conduct. An article by David Townsend from 1991, although mostly concerned with the hagiographers' literary technique, took a few steps in this direction,[7] while Alexander Vaughan's 2006 doctoral thesis thoroughly analysed the successive *Vitae Dunstani*.[8] Sally Crumplin's thesis on the changing hagiography of St Cuthbert also deserves mention,[9] as does work by Robert Bartlett and Matthew Mesley looking at hagiographical rewriting in the later twelfth century.[10] And

---

Muir and Andrew Turner in *Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald* (Oxford, 2006), 215-89.

[4] For this dating, see Jay Rubenstein, 'The Life and Writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1199*, ed. Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe (London, 1995), 27-40, p. 38.

[5] 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom in *The Early Lives of St Dunstan* (Oxford, 2012), 1-109; Adelard of Ghent, *Lectiones in depositione s. Dunstani*, ed. and trans. Lapidge and Winterbottom in *Early Lives of St Dunstan*, 111-45; Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita s. Dunstani*, ed. W. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1874), 69-128; Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita s. Dunstani*, ed. and trans. Turner and Muir in *Eadmer: Lives and Miracles of Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, 43-159; William of Malmesbury,*Vita Dunstani*, ed. and trans. R.M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom in *William of Malmesbury: Lives of Saints Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract* (Oxford, 2002), 157-303.

[6] *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969); Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia maior de adventu sancti Augustini*, in *AS*, May, vol. 6, 375-95; *Historia minor de vita sancti Augustini*, in *PL* 80, cols 743A-764B. Goscelin also used oral accounts from the region of Sherborne and Cerne: Fiona Gameson, 'Goscelin's *Life* of Augustine of Canterbury', in *St Augustine and the Conversion of England*, ed. Richard Gameson (Stroud, 1999), 391-409.

[7] David Townsend, 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography and the Norman Transition', in *Exemplaria: Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1991), 385-433.

[8] Alexander Vaughan, 'The Production and the Historical Context of the *Vitae Dunstani* of Osbern, Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, *c.* 1090-*c.* 1130' (PhD Thesis: Cambridge, 2008).

[9] Sally Crumplin, 'Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert from the Ninth to the Twelfth Centuries' (PhD Thesis: University of St Andrews, 2004).

[10] Robert Bartlett, 'Rewriting Saints' Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales', in *Speculum* 58 (1983), 598-613; Matthew Mesley, 'The Construction of Episcopal Identity: The Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century' (PhD Thesis: University of Exeter, 2009).

Maureen Miller's article on the *Vitae* of the German St Ulrich provides a crucial continental parallel.[11] However, this chapter looks at a wider range of sources than these scholars. As well as the four *Vitae* listed above, it covers other examples of rewritten hagiography, saints' lives created in Anglo-Norman England 'from scratch', and contemporary historical writing (not easily distinguished from hagiography). This makes it possible to offer more universally valid conclusions, and to distinguish common norms and values from the prejudices of individual authors – and so to determine how *in general* ideals of episcopal conduct, and of episcopal power, in Anglo-Norman England differed from those pursued under the Anglo-Saxons.[12]

This wide-ranging approach has its disadvantages. Hagiographical rewriters wrote in a local context, and sometimes the changes which they made to their sources reflect their gradually changing conceptions of the status and privileges of their monasteries. This chapter ignores such institutional concerns. But this neglect is perhaps excusable, if only because local considerations have been at the heart of other studies of rewritten hagiography in Anglo-Norman England.[13] A more pressing methodological objection is that of cherry-picking. Since this chapter flits from theme to theme, supporting its arguments with examples from diverse texts, rather than wading systematically through one or more pairs of rewritten *Vitae*, it might be accused of considering only evidence which supports it hypotheses and ignoring the rest. This is a real danger. To counter it, a section near the end is devoted to the examination of evidence which might be seen to contradict the chapter's conclusions.

---

[11] Maureen Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', in *Church History* 72, (2003), 25-52.

[12] However, although this chapter looks at a wide range of texts, it does not consider absolutely every relevant piece of hagiography from Anglo-Norman England. Among the more important omissions are: Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita s. Odonis* (*BHL* 6289), ed. and trans. Turner and Muir in *Eadmer: Lives and Miracles of Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, 1-39; Geoffrey of Burton, *Life and Miracles of St Modwenna* (*BHL* 2097), ed. and trans. Robert Bartlett (Oxford, 2002); *Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives: Vita sancti Birini, Vita et miracula sancti Kenelmi, and Vita sancti Rumwoldi*, ed. and trans. Rosalind Love (Oxford, 1996).

[13] *E.g.* Mesley, 'Construction of Episcopal Identity'; O'Rourke, 'Hagiography and Exemption'. And in its narrow focus on ideals of episcopal power this chapter neglects the other things which rewritten hagiography can tell us. *Cf.* Bartlett, 'Rewriting Saints' Lives' and Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, p. 425, which use rewritten hagiography to illuminate broader intellectual trends in twelfth-century Europe.

It should also be noted here that, although this chapter constantly refers to the heroes of the *Vitae* under discussion as 'bishops' and makes liberal use of phrases like 'episcopal power' and 'episcopal virtues', the hagiographers did not always draw a very clear distinction between the conduct of their heroes before and after they became bishops. Both Dominic of Evesham and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin went to some lengths in order *not* to describe their heroes as bishops, referring to them rather as *uir Dei*, *sanctus Dei* or, in some references to St Augustine, *patronus Angliae*. In their narratives they sought to associate their saints with the monasteries which they founded (and of which Goscelin and Dominic were monks) rather than with the bishoprics they held. It might be more appropriate to talk about 'holy men' or 'the power of holy men'. But for the sake of convenience the simpler episcopal designations are used for the time being. The question of whether episcopal saints in Anglo-Norman hagiography acted in a manner categorically different from other types of saint will be discussed in more detail at the end of this chapter.

The chapter itself is structured into three (unequal) sections, which do not, however, correspond to its three main contentions. These contentions are as follows. Firstly, that rewriters of hagiography in Anglo-Norman England tended to bring the conduct of their episcopal saints into line with wider changes in ecclesiastical law; if abuses such as the holding of multiple bishoprics were not excised from the *Vitae*, then at least the explicit praise for these practices found in Anglo-Saxon hagiography was not reproduced. Secondly, that our writers altered the narrative found in their sources to give bishops more control over events, often to the detriment of the king; this new power was often supernatural in origin, but the bishops used it to act within the secular world (at least, according to the hagiographers). And thirdly, that in the rewritten hagiography the actions of bishops became more public, as did the bishops themselves; more importance was attached to the bishop's role as a 'father of the people', and descriptions of episcopal charity and pastoral care were inserted or expanded upon.

The first section of the chapter presents the evidence for these three contentions, drawn from a variety of rewritten *Vitae*. The second section considers those *Vitae* of Anglo-Saxon bishops written in Anglo-Norman England whose authors were not adapting earlier sources. Since they have almost no information about their subjects, these authors were forced to rely on their powers of invention.

It shows, predictably enough, that these largely fictional *Vitae* present a similar ideal of episcopal power to the rewritten saints' lives, but that hagiographers unconstrained by earlier sources sometimes went further than did rewriters in portraying saintly bishops as crucial political figures, even as the wellspring of England's prosperity. The third section of this chapter looks, as has been mentioned, for possible counter-examples that would invalidate this chapter's arguments. It then assesses the significance of these hagiographical ideals of episcopal conduct for the historical analysis of episcopal power undertaken in the rest of this thesis, paving the way for Chapter 2, which shows the tangled relationship between the hagiographical ideals discussed here and the equally idealised portrayal of bishops in contemporary historical sources.

<div align="center">***</div>

As has been mentioned, rewriters of hagiography in Anglo-Norman England updated their *Vitae* to bring them into line with changing conceptions of ecclesiastical law. In the eleventh century, successive popes (most notably Gregory VII) and their partisans strove to free the European church from secular control and the corrupt practices associated with it. This led to conflict between the papacy and monarchs in Germany, France and England, and also to a wider interest in, and circulation of, international ecclesiastical (or canon) law. Even those unsympathetic to the Gregorians' ultimate goal of the subordination of temporal to ecclesiastical authority often sympathised and cooperated with their efforts to end the traditional abuses which contravened the church's law. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries it became less and less acceptable for clerics to purchase ecclesiastical office (simony), to be married, or to hold multiple benefices (pluralism). This hardening of attitudes is reflected in the rewritten hagiography.[14]

---

[14] Changes in ecclesiastical custom are also reflected in hagiography from earlier and later periods: 'The Lives of St Osyth of Essex and St Osyth of Aylesbury', ed. Denis Bethell in *Analecta Bollandiana* 88 (1970), 75-127, pp. 99-100; Stephanie Hollis, 'The Minster-in-Thanet Foundation Story', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), 41-64, pp. 47-55.

So Osbern of Canterbury's addition to 'B''s *Vita Dunstani* of an emphasis on St Dunstan's virginity can be linked to the continuing drive for clerical celibacy in Anglo-Norman England.[15] Nor is it surprising that Eadmer left out of his *Vita Oswaldi* the lavish gifts (including a church) which St Oswald received from his uncle, Archbishop Odo of Canterbury.[16] Such nepotistic favour, and the proprietary attitude towards ecclesiastical property that it implies, had presumably become distasteful by the early twelfth century. Similarly, while Adelard of Ghent and Byrhtferth of Ramsey, writing in the early eleventh century, lavishly praised the holding of multiple bishoprics by St Dunstan and St Oswald, the later hagiographers Eadmer and Osbern thought it necessary to find excuses for it.[17] Alexander Vaughan has argued that Osbern tried to reorder the *Vita Dunstani*'s narrative to create the impression of lawful progression between bishoprics.[18] Finally, when describing episcopal elections, our hagiographers routinely claimed (unlike their Anglo-Saxon predecessors) that the bishop had been chosen with the assent of the 'clergy and people'.[19] This was an obvious echo of the canonical stipulation that new bishops were to be elected by the clergy and people (*clerus et populus*).

But in some respects the hagiographers of Anglo-Norman England were ambivalent towards ecclesiastical law. The canons were guidelines rather than absolute rules, and could be overridden in the right circumstances. We see this in Osbern of Canterbury's *Vita Dunstani*. When Archbishop Oda of Canterbury consecrated St Dunstan as bishop of Worcester, the assembled clergy rebuked Oda for naming Dunstan not only bishop of Worcester, but also as the future archbishop of Canterbury (*i.e.* Oda chose Dunstan as his successor). This was against the decrees of the fathers (*patrum decreta*). Undeniably, ecclesiastical law

---

[15] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 12. *Cf.* 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 7.

[16] Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, ii.1; Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, cc. 4-5.

[17] Adelard, *Lectiones*, c. 12: '[Dunstan] gemini pontificatu claruit insigni'; Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, iv.4: 'Ipse [rex Eadgarus] autem dilexit miro affectu patrem Osuualdum, cuius in capite duas coronas imposuit; hoc est, contulit ipsi prius episcopatum Merciorum gentis, et postmodum, Northanymbrorum'. *Cf.* Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, cc. 29, 31; Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, c. 24.

[18] Vaughan, '*Vitae Dunstani*', pp. 74-5, 185.

[19] Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, i.10; Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 3 (although *cf.* 'Digby-Gotha Recension', c. 3); Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, iii.5, iv.5; Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, cc. 13, 22; 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 25; Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 29; Goscelin, *Historia maior,* c. 51. See also Thomas Vogtherr, 'Zwischen Benediktinerabtei und bischöflicher Cathedra. Zu Auswahl und Amtsantritt englischer Bischöfe im 9.-11. Jahrhundert', in *Die früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung im europäischen Vergleich*, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Cologne, 1998), 287-320, p. 319.

forbade the designation of heirs by bishops. But Oda replied that he had been ordered to consecrate Dunstan as his successor by the Holy Spirit: he acknowledged that this contravened human law, but as human matters bowed down to the divine, the authority of men (*hominum auctoritas*) was irrelevant here.[20]

Osbern was writing between 1089 and 1093. But his ambivalence towards the wider law of the European church remained acceptable well into the twelfth century. In the 1120s William of Malmesbury justified St Dunstan's simultaneous tenure of the bishoprics of London and Worcester with a similar argument: 'Nec fuit hoc transgredi canones, quia cedunt leges humanae ubi promulgantur diuinae.'[21] Other writers found other justifications for pluralism.[22] Eadmer alleged that St Oswald was obliged to continue as bishop of Worcester after his promotion to York because no suitable replacement could be found for him. Oswald would have endangered the fledgling monastery at Worcester by relinquishing the bishopric.[23] And Faricius claimed in his *Vita Aldhelmi* (written before 1100; *BHL* 256) that, although St Aldhelm wanted to give up his abbeys when appointed bishop of Sherborne, his monks loved him too much to let him go.[24] Interestingly, Aldhelm's simultaneous tenure of multiple abbeys does not in itself seem to have bothered Faricius: another indication of pliable attitudes towards canon law in Anglo-Norman England.[25]

A similar ambivalence appears in accounts of episcopal elections in the rewritten hagiography. Hagiographers in Anglo-Norman England may have added the canonical formula 'clerus et populus' to their predecessors' descriptions of episcopal appointments. But the elections of bishops in the rewritten *Vitae* could

---

[20] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 29.

[21] William of Malmesbury, *Vita Dunstani*, ii.53. 'Nor was this a transgression of the canons, because human laws yield where divine laws are proclaimed.'

[22] Elsewhere, Osbern used the biblical precedents of St John and St Peter: John had held seven bishoprics, while Peter had been placed over all the churches in the world: *Vita Dunstani*, c. 31.

[23] Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, c. 24. For similar arguments, see *GP*, iii.115.6, iii.115.11; Eadmer of Canterbury, *Miraculi s. Oswaldi*, ed. and trans. Muir and Turner in *Eadmer: Lives and Miracles of Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, 290-322, c. 4.

[24] Faricius, *Vita sancti Aldhelmi*, ed. Michael Winterbottom in *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15 (2005), 93-147, c. 12, pp. 109-10.

[25] And Goscelin of Saint-Bertin hardly seems to have minded pluralism at all: 'The Life of Saint Wulsin of Sherborne by Goscelin', ed. C.H. Talbot in *Revue bénédictine* 69 (1959), c. 4, p. 76; 'Texts of Jocelyn of Canterbury Which Relate to the History of Barking Abbey', ed. M.L. Colker in *Studia monastica* 7 (1965), p. 424.

hardly be described as canonical in themselves. The hagiographers almost always left the final choice of a new bishop to the English king, whereas ecclesiastical law forbade all secular involvement in episcopal elections. And it is worth noting that Osbern of Canterbury, when not working from a pre-existing source, was capable of imagining episcopal elections which were not canonical at all. In his *Vita Alphegi*, Osbern had St Dunstan unilaterally appoint St Ælfheah to Winchester and then to Canterbury (the second appointment was posthumous).[26] These elections were 'reformed' in that the secular power had no part in them. But ecclesiastical law hardly sanctioned this dictatorial control over the English church by one archbishop.

Chapter 3 of this thesis examines the gradual acceptance in Anglo-Norman England of canon law and the authority of the papacy (on which these laws ultimately depended). It shows that bishops were put in an uncomfortable political situation by the resulting ambiguities. Here we see these same ambiguities reflected in contemporary hagiography.[27]

However, the rewritten hagiography may also reveal a growing discontentment with royal control over the English church, at least in monastic circles. William I, William II and Henry I appointed bishops more or less at will (the archbishop of Canterbury was a partial exception),[28] as had the later Anglo-Saxon kings. [29] There is no evidence that the English king's dominance of episcopal elections was publicly challenged before the reign of King Stephen. Even Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury (1093-1109), who clashed with William II and Henry I over other aspects of their ecclesiastical policy, does not seem to have questioned the king's right to appoint bishops. So, although the descriptions

---

[26] Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita sancti Alphegi*, in *PL* 149, cols 371-93, cc. 3, 5.

[27] These ambiguities also appear in the writings of the Norman Anonymous: *The Electronic Norman Anonymous Project: A Digital Edition*, ed. J.R. Ginther and T. O'Sullivan (online edn. www.normananonymous.org, accessed September 2012-May 2013), Tract 6, pp. 54-6: 'Propter necessitatem quoque et utilitatem licet episcopos de suis ecclesiis ad alias transmigrare, quod sine necessitate fieri in sacris canonibus omnino est prohibitum. Per hec igitur omnia datur intelligi, quod in necessitate liceat leges pretermitti, nec inde tamen ullo crimine reos teneri.' See also Tract 26, p. 282.

[28] In 1114, for example, Henry I apparently allowed his bishops to override his choice of Abbot Faricius of Abingdon as archbishop of Canterbury: *GP*, i.67.2-5. See also Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, p. 85, on the election of William de Corbeil as archbishop in 1122.

[29] Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church* (rev. edn.: London, 1979), pp. 99-108; Robert Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin*

of episcopal elections in the rewritten *Vitae* were not canonical, in that the king had the deciding voice, they were nevertheless more canonical than actual elections in Anglo-Norman England. The hagiographers gave the *clerus et populus* a voice which they did not have in reality. It is also worth noting that William of Malmesbury, writing in the 1120s, looked back with nostalgia to an Anglo-Saxon past which may never have existed, when the election of bishops and abbots had belonged to clerics and monks alone.[30] The hagiography of Anglo-Norman England may reveal that certain monks held more idealised notions of the correct relationship between 'church and state' than is apparent from other sources.[31]

This does not only apply to their descriptions of episcopal elections. In Anglo-Norman England, before King Stephen's reign, councils of the English church do not seem to have been convened without the explicit will of the English king; the king very often presided over such assemblies.[32] It is therefore significant that both Eadmer in his *Vita Oswaldi* and Dominic of Evesham in his *Vita Ecgwini* departed from their sources in describing ecclesiastical councils in which kings appear to have played no, or very little, part, and which instead were dominated by the archbishops of Canterbury.[33] It is true that Eadmer's description of such a council is brief and ambiguous,[34] and that Dominic was obliged to alter the Digby-Gotha *Vita Ecgwini*'s description of the council of Alcester (in that text, a royal council) to bring it into line with a recently forged privilege for Evesham

---

Kings, 1075-1225 (Oxford, 2000), p. 406; Vogtherr, 'Zwischen Benediktinerabtei und bischöflicher Cathedra'.

[30] *GP*, iii.130.5. But there may have been some truth in William's statement. Cathedral communities in early Anglo-Saxon England may sometimes have been allowed to choose their own bishops; the (uncanonical) role of outgoing bishops in nominating their successors is also noteworthy: Catherine Cubitt, 'Wilfrid's "Usurping Bishops": Episcopal Elections in Anglo-Saxon England, *c.* 600-*c.* 800', in *Northern History* 25 (1989), 18-38, pp. 30-6.

[31] However, it should be noted that the rewritten *Vitae* say nothing about the customary investiture of bishops by the king, the main cause of Anselm's dispute with Henry I.

[32] On councils in this period, see Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, pp. 119-31. And even King Stephen generally played an important part in ecclesiastical councils: Marritt, 'King Stephen and the Bishops', pp. 140-2.

[33] Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, cc. 10-3 (based on Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, iii.4-6, and 'Digby-Gotha Recension', cc. 11-3); Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, c. 18 (the council is not mentioned in Byrhtferth's *Vita Oswaldi*).

[34] 'Per id temporis ex sanctione et auctoritate Iohannis apostolicae sedis antistitis, beatus Dunstanus archiepiscopus Cantuariae et primas totius Britanniae ... coacto generali concilio, statuit, et statuendo decretum confirmauit, uidelicet ut canonici omnes, presbyteri omnes, diaconi et subdiaconi omnes, aut caste uiuerent, aut aecclesias quas tenebant una cum rebus ad eas pertinentibus perderent.'

(in the forgery, Pope Constantine ordered Archbishop Beorhtheah of Canterbury to hold a council; still, Dominic did not need to remove the king entirely).[35] But with these *caveats* in place, the writings of Eadmer and Dominic suggest that hagiographers in England were imagining purely ecclesiastical councils of the English church in which the king played absolutely no part, and that they were doing so some years before the first such councils were actually held (Eadmer wrote before 1116 and Dominic before 1126).

It is tempting to relate these descriptions of purely archiepiscopal councils to the turbulent political career of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. Anselm's insistence on holding a council of the English church, and William II's refusal to let him do so, led to conflict between Anselm and that king (Henry I was more amenable in this respect). Anselm himself never seems to have considered convening an assembly without the king's involvement. But Eadmer and Dominic, probably writing after Anselm's death, may have imagined such purely archiepiscopal councils as a means of avoiding a repeat of the impasse reached under William II.

However, it should be noted that Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's *Vita Deo dilectae virginis Mildrethae*, probably written *c.* 1090 (*BHL* 5960), also describes what looks like a strictly archiepiscopal council. According to Goscelin, Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury and Abbot Hadrian of St Augustine's convoked a pontifical and popular council (*concilium pontificale et populare*); Theodore and Hadrian used this assembly to castigate King Egbert of Kent for the murder of his cousins Æthelred and Æthelbert.[36] The author of Goscelin's probable source (the *Passio beatorum martyrum Ethelredi atque Ethelbricti*; *BHL* 2641-2) had claimed that King Egbert called the council, and that he himself confessed to the murder.[37] This was a dramatic change. But Goscelin can hardly have been reacting to St Anselm's tribulations under William II in making it. Anselm only became archbishop in 1093, and Goscelin almost certainly wrote before then.

---

[35] O'Rourke, 'Hagiography and Exemption'.

[36] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Vita Deo dilectae virginis Mildrethae* (*BHL* 5960), ed. David Rollason in *The Mildrith Legend: A Study in Early Medieval Hagiography in England* (Leicester, 1982), 105-43, p. 117.

[37] *Passio beatorum martyrum Ethelredi atque Ethelbricti (BHL 2641-2)*, ed. Rollason in *The Mildrith Legend*, 89-104, p. 96.

In fact, the idea of purely ecclesiastical councils (held without the king's involvement) was not a new one in Anglo-Norman England. Bede had described such councils in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Similar councils had actually taken place. In 673, for example, Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury apparently convened (*cogit*) a council of bishops and teachers of the church, who knew and loved the canons.[38] Bede was widely read and mined for historical information by hagiographers in our period. Eadmer, Dominic and Goscelin could have got the idea of non-royal church councils from him. But the reasons why this idea appealed to them probably lie in the specific circumstances of late-eleventh- and early-twelfth-century Europe (although not necessarily in St Anselm's political career).

<center>***</center>

The possibility that hagiographers in Anglo-Norman England presented an ideal version of church-state relations in which the king's role was much reduced as compared with contemporary reality leads us directly on to the second of this chapter's three points: the greater power given to bishops in the rewritten hagiography. This power generally came at the expense of the king. And here too, there are possible links to the political situation of Anglo-Norman England.

'Greater power' in this context means that hagiographers in Anglo-Norman England rewrote the *Vitae* of saintly bishops in such a way as to give their protagonists more control over events. The changes made were often subtle, perhaps even unconscious. So in Byrhtferth of Ramsey's *Vita Ecgwini*, St Ecgwine was ordered by the king and the pope to go to Rome to clear himself of various accusations made against him.[39] According to Dominic of Evesham's rewritten version, Ecgwine, 'God's intrepid athlete', went of his own accord (the intermediate Digby-Gotha recension also gave the initiative to Ecgwine, but less

---

[38] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, iv.5.
[39] Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, i.12.

forcefully).[40] In Byrhtferth's *Vita Oswaldi*, King Edgar ordered the newly elected Archbishop Oswald of York to go to Rome to collect his pallium.[41] Eadmer claimed that Oswald himself chose to go to Rome.[42] In 'B''s *Vita Dunstani*, Dunstan was forced to leave the court of King Æthelstan by the false accusations of his enemies.[43] Osbern altered this to make Dunstan himself choose to leave the palace.[44] Finally, while Bede implied that King Æthelbert of Kent accepted baptism on his own initiative, Goscelin of Saint-Bertin made it clear that the king was the target of a sustained campaign of preaching by St Augustine. Goscelin also changed the sentence describing Æthelbert's baptism from the passive to the active voice, thereby laying more emphasis on its agent: Augustine himself.[45]

These changes might seem trivial. But their cumulative effect is significant. It is also worth noting that writers in Anglo-Norman England made the same kind of changes to their sources when writing history rather than hagiography. William of Malmesbury, for example, claimed in his *Gesta pontificum* that Bishop Felix of East Anglia founded schools to mollify the barbarous populace.[46] This was a liberal adaptation of Bede's description of a single school founded by King Sigebert with Felix's help.[47]

The greater control attributed to bishops in the rewritten *Vitae* is sometimes more evident. A coda to a miracle story in the Latin *Vita* of St Nicholas described the journey of three generals (who had featured in the story) to Phyrygia, where they suppressed a rebellion against the Byzantine emperor. The unknown individual who translated this *Vita* (or one similar to it) into Old English towards the end of the eleventh century made a number of significant additions. Now, as the generals went to their ships, Nicholas prayed to God that they might

---

[40] 'Digby-Gotha Recension', c. 5; Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 5.

[41] Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, iv.5.

[42] Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, c. 23.

[43] 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 6.

[44] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 11.

[45] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i.26; Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 21, p. 383D.

[46] *GP*, ii.74.1. But William of Malmesbury's words could be read differently, with Sigbert rather than Felix as the subject of the last sentence: 'Illoque [Sigebert] regnum prouintiae sortito, episcopus ordinatus [Felix] animositati regiae non defuit quin ingenti studio et uigilanti labore toti regioni Christianam credulitatem infunderet. Scolas quoque litterarum oportunis locis instituens, barbariem gentis sensim comitate Latina informabat.'

[47] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, iii.18. William of Malmesbury also modified Bede to make Felix a more constant companion of King Sigebert, as noticed by R.M. Thomson in his commentary to the *Gesta pontificum*: *GP*, vol. 2, p. 92.

come safely to Phrygia and that they might bend the foolish folk there to the divine will. God heard Nicholas' prayer, and sent favourable winds. When the generals arrived in Phrygia, the people there immediately surrendered to them. The generals won a bloodless victory, for which they gave thanks to St Nicholas.[48] Here the saintly bishop was made responsible for the entire success of the generals' mission to Phrygia. It is also worth noting that it was St Nicholas' sanctity which allowed him to exercise this new power.

Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* provides another example of a rewritten archbishop whose sanctity gave him an extraordinary influence over the course of events. In making Dunstan responsible for engineering the accession of the infant King Edward,[49] in giving Dunstan a new prominence as the advisor of King Eadred, so that he was 'quasi imperator effectus',[50] and in having Dunstan issue a furious (and fulfilled) prophecy against King Æthelred as a punishment for that king's attack on Rochester,[51] Osbern may have been drawing on earlier sources, sources written between the redaction of 'B''s *Vita Dunstani* and his own time of writing. Other incidents in Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* not found in 'B''s work seem to have been Osbern's own inventions.[52] In particular, Osbern expanded significantly on 'B''s description of the relationship between Dunstan and King Edgar. When, for example, King Edgar was tempted by the devil to rape a nun, the furious Dunstan reduced Edgar to a gibbering wreck with his pious tirade against such perversion. Dunstan imposed a seven year penance on Edgar, forbade him to wear his crown during that time, and ordered him to build a new nunnery at Shaftesbury, to reform England's other monasteries and to institute just laws in

---

[48] *The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles,* ed. and trans. Elaine Treharne (Leeds, 1997), pp. 93-6, 190-2.

[49] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 37, probably drawing on an earlier passion of King Edward (although perhaps not the recension which has come down to us): Christine Fell, *Edward, King and Martyr* (Leeds, 1971), p. xviii.

[50] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani,* c. 22, probably echoing Adelard, *Lectiones*, c. 8: 'Humiles [Dunstanus] erexit, mitibus blanditus est, Deum timentes et colentes prouexit, auctoritate et animi uirtute ipsis etiam regibus quasi imperator dominatus est.'

[51] This prophecy first appears in Sulcard of Westminster, *Prologus de construccione Westmonasterii*, ed. B.W. Scholz in *Traditio* 20 (1964), 59-91, c. 5.

[52] However, we cannot rule out that Osbern had them from an Old English account of St Dunstan's life which is now lost: William of Malmesbury, *Lives of Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, pp. xviii-xx. But *cf.* Vaughan, '*Vitae Dunstani*', pp. 51 *ff.*.

his kingdom. Edgar, desperate to obtain Dunstan's forgiveness, humbly followed Dunstan's orders.[53] This story does not appear in the work of 'B' or Adelard.

Furthermore, where 'B' had written that King Edgar ruled well thanks to the advice of Dunstan and other wise men,[54] Osbern removed the other advisors and gave Dunstan an entirely unprecedented political importance. Everything Dunstan said, Edgar accepted as if it had come from the mouth of God; everything Dunstan thought necessary, Edgar decreed; everything Dunstan thought wrong, Edgar punished. By Dunstan's counsel, Edgar expelled all thieves, witches, perverts and traitors from his kingdom, and all unworthy priests from England's churches. The 'cult of divinity' in England grew; nobles spurned their pomp and fled to the divine service; 'those whom the ecclesiastical order had admitted' competed in virtue, knowing that only the virtuous could hope for honour in this new state of affairs.[55]

Through God's favour, the religious renewal brought peace and prosperity. Osbern made it clear that this all came ultimately from St Dunstan:

Ob hujus quoque disciplinae excellentiam tanta pacis constantia, tanta rerum exstitit opulentia, ut omnia mundi elementa Ipsum quoque elementorum Creatorem Deum regiis temporibus arridere putares. Sic pontificis sapientia dictabat regis justitiam; regis justitia obtinuit Dei misericordiam, Dei autem misericordia omnium rerum praestitit abundantiam.[56]

Osbern was not the first writer to describe King Edgar's reign as a golden age. But his portrayal of St Dunstan as the origin of this golden age was new. King Edgar ruled well, but only because he submitted to Dunstan. The episode with the nun shows who, in Osbern's eyes, was the dominant partner in the relationship.

Osbern was only one hagiographer. But other writers took up his vision of St Dunstan as the monitor of kings and the wellspring of England's prosperity,

---

[53] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 35.

[54] 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 25.

[55] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 34.

[56] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 34. 'Because of the excellence of this discipline, there was such constancy of peace, such material opulence, that you [the reader] would have thought that all the elements of the world – and God himself, creator of the elements – smiled on the times of this king [literally, 'on the royal times']. Thus the wisdom of the bishop dictated the king's justice; the king's justice obtained God's sympathy; and God's sympathy lent an abundance of all things.'

most importantly Eadmer and William of Malmesbury.[57] This vision has also tricked a number of modern historians into attributing an unfairly prominent role to St Dunstan in the tenth-century reform of English monasticism.[58] Even now it is a dangerous image. The striking descriptions of the reign of King Edgar in Eadmer's *Historia novorum* and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum* might lead one to think that, for monastic writers in England in the early twelfth century, there was only one possible political ideal: the pious king, whose submission to the admonitions of a dominant archbishop of Canterbury brought both him and his kingdom good fortune. But this was not the case. Other chroniclers, such as John of Worcester and Orderic Vitalis, attach very little importance to episcopal advice in describing Edgar's glorious reign.[59] Even William of Malmesbury could imagine other political ideals. He described King Alfred's reign as a golden age, but said nothing about bishops: in this case, King Alfred was the source of all virtue.[60]

It should also be noted that the idea of a saintly bishop as the root of a country's prosperity was not entirely new. In his *Vita Wilfridi*, Stephen of Ripon (writing *c.* 720; *BHL* 8889) claimed that, while King Ecgfrith of Northumbria and his queen Æthilthryth remained obedient to the saintly Bishop Wilfrid of York, God sent them peace, fruitful years and victory over their enemies; but when they drove St Wilfrid into exile, the victories ended.[61]

---

[57] Eadmer, *Vita Dunstani*, cc. 56, 59; *HN,* pp. 3-4; William of Malmesbury, *Vita Dunstani*, ii.9.5-7, ii.13.2, ii.14.1-2; *GP*, i.18.2-6; *GR*, ii.148-9, ii.158. On the general importance of clerical advice for William of Malmesbury, see Björn Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', in *History* 90 (2005), 3-22, pp. 18-20.

[58] Nicola Robertson, 'Dunstan and Monastic Reform: Tenth-Century Fact or Twelfth-Century Fiction?', in *ANS* 28 (2006), 153-67; *Early Lives of St Dunstan*, pp. xlii-li.

[59] *JW*, vol. ii, pp. 424-6, *s.a.* 975; *OV*, vol. 3, p. 82. Compare John of Worcester's description of Harold II's brief rule, a golden age, but one in which episcopal advisors played no part: *JW*, vol. ii, p. 600, *s.a.* 1066. For Orderic Vitalis, Henry I's reign was a golden age, but because of the king's lay advisors: *OV,* vol. 5, pp. 294-8. Roger Ray has argued that, although Orderic Vitalis toned down his source's fulsome and sycophantic praise for William the Conqueror when adapting the work of William de Poitiers, his views on royal authority were essentially conservative and theocratic: 'Orderic Vitalis and William of Poitiers: A Monastic Reinterpretation of William the Conqueror', in *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire* 50 (1972), 1116-27; *idem*, 'Orderic Vitalis on Henry I: Theocratic Ideology and Didactic Narrative', in *Contemporary Reflections on the Medieval Christian Tradition: Essays in Honor of Ray C. Petry*, ed. George H. Shriver (Durham, 1974), 119-34.

[60] *GR*, ii.122-3. See also Björn Weiler, 'William of Malmesbury, Henry I, and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*', in *ANS* 31 (2009), 157-76, p. 164.

[61] Stephen of Ripon, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1927), c. 19.

Nonetheless, the forceful statement of Dunstan's superiority over King Edgar found in the works of Osbern, Eadmer and William of Malmesbury had few precedents. It is also worth noting that when Eadmer rewrote Stephen's *Vita Wilfridi* between 1089 and 1110 (*BHL*, 8893) he went further than had Stephen in attributing such miraculous / political powers to Wilfrid. When exiled by King Ecgfrith, Wilfrid ended up, for a time, in Frisia, where he converted the pagan populace to the Christian faith. According to Stephen, the pagans were inclined to believe Wilfrid, because the year in which Wilfrid came to them was unusually fruitful.[62] Eadmer wrote that, when the pagans received Wilfrid's teaching, not only were their hearts softened, but the land's bitterness was turned to sweetness, its sterility to fertility, and its asperity to fecund softness.[63] The implied causal link is not present in Stephen's text. Like Osbern's Dunstan, Eadmer's Wilfrid commanded even the inanimate elements with his piety.[64]

This second of the three trends identified by this chapter (the tendency of rewritten *Vitae* from Anglo-Norman England to attribute more influence to bishops than their sources had) may be less obvious than the first trend (the greater attention paid to ecclesiastical law in the rewritten hagiography). The clearest evidence comes from Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* and Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi*. If these two writers were removed, the picture would be very different; the significance of the fact that they were both from Canterbury will be discussed later. Nevertheless, it is possible to find at least one example from virtually every episcopal *Vita* written in our period, and the general tendency seems clear. And as we shall see, it is hard to find examples of a bishop being given less control over events in a rewritten *Vita*.

Like the hagiographers' new attention to ecclesiastical law, the greater power given to bishops in the rewritten *Vitae* can be linked to historical developments. In particular, the key role that Osbern and his followers assigned to St Dunstan in the government of England seems to echo Archbishop Anselm's

---

[62] Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita sancti Wilfridi: The Life of St Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. Bernard Muir and Andrew Turner (Exeter, 1998), c. 19.

[63] Eadmer, *Vita Wilfridi*, c. 53.

[64] Compare the poem on England in the golden age of St Æthelwold from the *Libellus Æthelwoldi* (an early-twelfth-century compilation from Ely), printed as part of Appendix B to Wulfstan of Winchester, *Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1991), p. 84: 'Tunc et sponte dabat tellus quod quisque rogabat; / Pura fides, pax, uerus amor tunc emicuere.'

famous comparison (as recorded by Eadmer) of the English kingdom to a plough dragged by two bullocks: the king and the archbishop of Canterbury.[65] Eadmer's *Vita Wilfridi*, at least, was probably a conscious comment on Anselm's political career, given the obvious similarities between Anselm and Wilfrid (disputes with kings in England, multiple exiles, appeals to Rome).[66] But Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* is thought to have been written before Anselm's accession to the archbishopric. So Osbern at least cannot have been reacting to his experience of Anselm's turbulent archiepiscopate.

In fact, it may be that Anselm was reacting to Osbern and his peers. Osbern had spent time at Bec with Anselm (probably from 1076 to 1080). While there, Osbern almost certainly told Anselm about Dunstan, and about Canterbury's other saints. Anselm himself expressed an interest in reading a *Vita* of St Dunstan (Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* had not yet been written; but Anselm may later have received a copy of it).[67] When Anselm was elected as archbishop of Canterbury in 1093, Osbern sent at least one letter of advice to him.[68] After Anselm's enthronement, Osbern (a member of the cathedral community at Canterbury) may have continued to advise him. Chapter 5 of this thesis returns to this theme, discussing the possible role of cathedral and monastic communities in formulating the policies of their bishops and abbots.

***

Just as the rewritten hagiography's increased attention to ecclesiastical law can be linked to its tendency to make saintly bishops more powerful, this tendency towards the empowerment of saintly bishops can be linked to the third of this chapter's three points: the greater 'social' or 'public' role of bishops in rewritten hagiography from Anglo-Norman England. As we have seen, the rewritten

---

[65] As noticed by Sally Vaughn, 'Henry I and the English Church: The Archbishops and the King', in *Haskins Society Journal* 17 (2007), 133-57.

[66] Eadmer, *Vita Wilfridi*, pp. xxix-xxx. But Richard Southern thought that the *Vita Wilfridi* was probably written before Anselm went into exile in 1097: *Saint Anselm and His Biographer: A Study of Monastic Life and Thought, 1059-c. 1130* (Cambridge, 1963), p. 367.

[67] *AEp,* no. 39.

[68] *AEp*, no. 149.

bishops Dunstan and Wilfrid became the root of their peoples' prosperity. Elsewhere in the rewritten *Vitae* the bishops' care for the people is more simply expressed.

Hagiographical rewriters in Anglo-Norman England added or enlarged upon descriptions of episcopal charity. Where Byrhtferth of Ramsey claimed that St Oswald regularly washed the feet of twelve paupers every day during Lent, Eadmer claimed that Oswald not only washed the paupers but fed, clothed and gave alms to them, and this was 'besides the innumerable others whom he nourished every day'.[69] Osbern of Canterbury, unlike 'B', mentioned the paupers fed each day by St Dunstan's 'customary stipends'.[70] And Dominic of Evesham felt it necessary to enlarge the Digby-Gotha recension of the *Vita Ecgwini* with a chapter on Ecgwine's pious care for the poor during his final illness.[71]

Such care for the poor and vulnerable could also manifest itself miraculously. Goscelin of Saint-Bertin added two miracles to Bede's account of St Augustine in which the saint was able to provide water for his thirsty followers by striking the ground with his pastoral staff.[72] The Digby-Gotha author added a similar miracle to Byrhtferth's *Vita Ecgwini*.[73] And Dominic of Evesham upgraded this miracle by having St Ecgwine provide food as well as water for his followers.[74]

The idea of the bishop as a defender of the poor and vulnerable was hardly new in Anglo-Norman England. Anglo-Saxon hagiographers had also lauded bishops for their charity and pastoral care.[75] Wulfstan of Winchester's description of Bishop Æthelwold of Winchester's care for the victims of a famine is a good example (in his *Life of Æthelwold*; *BHL*, 2647). Æthelwold apparently used all of his money to feed the starving poor, and then sold the ornaments of his church for the same purpose. He could not bear to see dumb metals remain untouched while

---

[69] Byrhferth, *Vita Oswaldi,* v.16; Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, c. 35. 'praeter alios quos cotidie innumeros alebat'

[70] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 27.

[71] Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 16.

[72] Goscelin, *Historia maior,* c. 10, p. 360C, c.44, pp. 391F-392A; *Historia minor*, cols 745B-746B, 760C. Goscelin's possible sources for these stories are discussed in Gameson, 'Goscelin's *Life* of Augustine', pp. 396-7.

[73] 'Digby-Gotha Recension', c. 10.

[74] Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 10.

[75] *E.g.* Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, i.10; Wulfstan, *Life of Æthelwold*, c. 28.

men, created in the image of God and redeemed by Christ's blood, were dying.[76] The expansion of such praise and the addition of a few water miracles by Anglo-Norman hagiographers could simply be attributed to the natural tendency for hagiographical saints to become more saintly, and for the pious and miraculous elements in hagiographical *Vitae* to grow. [77] However, two alterations made regularly to rewritten hagiography in Anglo-Norman England suggest that hagiographers in this period were genuinely concerned to portray their episcopal subjects as more public and more popular figures.

Both of these alterations were subtle, and both might be attributed more to changes in literary taste than to a conscious programme on the part of the hagiographers (but such changes in literary taste are not necessarily insignificant). Firstly, hagiographers in Anglo-Norman England regularly departed from their sources in order to give saintly bishops an audience. That miracles now took place in the presence of the *populus* or 'coram cunctis' could be blamed on an increased scepticism towards the miraculous in this period; the hagiographers presumably wanted to lend their stories more authority by writing witnesses into them.[78] But such scepticism does not explain why Dominic of Evesham, unlike the Anglo-Saxon Byrhtferth, or the slightly earlier Digby-Gotha author, considered it necessary to describe St Ecgwine proceeding to the consecration of his church at Evesham 'in the company of many members of both orders [*i.e.* lay and ecclesiastical]'.[79] Nor does it explain why Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, unlike Bede, thought that St Augustine travelled 'dragging with him troops of followers'.[80]

The second literary alteration concerns the funerals of saintly bishops. Goscelin spoke of the 'tearful crowds' (*lacrymosa examina*) at St Augustine's

---

[76] Wulfstan, *Life of Æthelwold*, c. 29.

[77] *Cf.* Paul Fouracre, 'Merovingian History and Merovingian Hagiography', in *Past and Present* 127 (1990), 3-38.

[78] Compare: Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ii.2, with Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 33, p. 388F, and *Historia Minor*, p. 757A; Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, i.13, with Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 6; 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 22, with Osbern, *Vita Dunstani* c. 27; and *Historia de sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of His Patrimony*, ed. and trans. Ted Johnson South (Woodbridge, 2002), c. 23, with *Capitula de miraculis et translationibus sancti Cuthberti*, ed. Thomas Arnold in *Symeonis monachi opera omnia*, 2 vols (London, 1882-5), vol. 1, 229-61, vol 2, 333-62, at vol. 1, pp. 238-40.

[79] Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 13. 'multis secum comitantibus utriusque ordinis'

[80] Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 36, p. 390A; *Historia minor*, p. 758C. 'trahens secum sequacia agmina'

burial.[81] Bede had simply said that Augustine was buried.[82] 'B' ended his *Vita Dunstani* by coolly reporting his hero's death.[83] Osbern added a lengthy section on Dunstan's burial 'under the immense murmur of the grieving populace'.[84] Byrhtferth of Ramsey reported St Ecgwine's funeral as a cheerful gathering.[85] The Digby-Gotha author (followed by Dominic of Evesham) confessed himself incapable of describing the sorrow, grief and desolation caused by the saint's death.[86] Finally, we have Eadmer, who added no less than three descriptions of public grief at the death of archbishops to Byrhtferth's *Vita Oswaldi*. His use of the same phrase twice ('grauis meror') suggests that he was simply slotting in an expected, possibly even compulsory, formula.[87]

Such descriptions of public grief at the death of a bishop are found in Anglo-Saxon hagiography. Again, Wulfstan of Winchester's *Vita Æthelwoldi* is the best example.[88] But by the twelfth century, the bishop surrounded by a crowd of followers and the beloved bishop mourned by his bereft flock seem to have become obligatory features of episcopal hagiography, little more than literary tropes, unthinkingly applied by our authors. Taken together with the other evidence discussed in this chapter, they hint at a new conception of the perfect bishop, as a kind of 'father of the people'.

Another possible facet of the increased public role of the episcopate in rewritten hagiography from Anglo-Norman England deserves consideration here: the bishop's duty to atone for or correct the sins of the populace. The best example comes from the Old English *Life* of St Nicholas. Its author radically altered a miracle in which St Nicholas saved the city of Myra from famine by

---

[81] Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 51, p. 384F; *Historia minor*, p. 763.

[82] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ii.3. Of course, here the change could be explained in terms of the transfer from the historical to the hagiographical genre.

[83] 'B', *Vita Dunstani*, c. 38.

[84] Osbern, *Vita Dunstani*, c. 45. 'sub immenso murmure lugentium populorum'

[85] Byrhtferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, iv.6.

[86] 'Digby-Gotha Recension', c. 17; Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 17.

[87] Eadmer, *Vita Oswaldi*, cc. 8, 22, 38-9. Byrhtferth, *Vita Oswaldi*, c.18, did say that people grieved at Oswald's funeral, but then added that the mourners were consoled by a miraculous vision of a dove and a ray of light. Eadmer retained this miracle, but soon returned to the people's grief, about which, moreover, he is far more specific than Byrhtferth had been: 'Hos inter acerbior fletus monachos et inopes cruciabat, hos quia pastorem, patrem et aduocatum, illos quia se in eo perdidisse aduerterant totius uitae subsidium, spem et consolationem.'

[88] Wulfstan, *Life of Æthelwold*, c. 41. It should be noted that such grief was not reserved for bishops: see, for example, the description of Cnut's death in *Encomium Emmae reginae*, ed. and trans. Alistair Campbell and Simon Keynes (Cambridge, 1998), Book 2, c. 24.

miraculously multiplying a small amount of grain grudgingly given to him by passing sailors. In the new, English, version of the story, the famine itself was blamed on the sinful people who would not listen to the 'right belief' that Nicholas taught them (in the Latin *Vita* the famine simply occurred). Apparently, the ships with the grain only came when the people repented and begged at Nicholas' feet that he intercede for them with God. Nicholas, mollified by their promises of future piety, went to pray for them in the temple, remaining there until the ships arrived.[89] So the English rewriter / translator of this text not only added a new miracle (by which Nicholas effectively summoned the ships), but also a new theme: the antagonism between the saintly bishop and his disobedient flock.

Two other *Vitae* hint at this. Dominic of Evesham added to his sources (Byrhtferth's *Vita Ecgwini*, and the Digby-Gotha recension) the detail that St Ecgwine went to Rome not only to clear himself of false accusations made by his enemies but also 'for the salvation of the erring people'.[90] And in his *Vita Aldhelmi* Faricius wrote that, while still abbot of Malmesbury, St Aldhelm used to spend his Sundays preaching on a bridge, and denouncing the impious laypeople crossing it to go to market.[91] But the motif of the bishop who corrected, or intervened for, his sinful flock does not seem to have been an essential component of hagiographical rewriting in Anglo-Norman England, even though it can clearly be related to the greater public and pastoral significance which hagiographers tended to give bishops in the post-Conquest period.

<p style="text-align:center">∗∗∗</p>

The three hagiographical themes discussed so far – an increased regard for ecclesiastical law, the politically powerful saint, and the bishop as the father of his people – also emerge in those works of hagiography whose authors were not drawing on any previously extant source, had very little information at their disposal, and who therefore created works of – essentially – idealised fiction.

---

[89] *Old English Life of St Nicholas*, pp. 90-1, 187-8.
[90] Dominic, *Vita Ecgwini*, c. 5. 'pro salute errantis populi'

Three such *Vitae* are discussed here: the anonymous *Vita Swithuni* written at Winchester, probably in the 1090s (*BHL* 7943);[92] Eadmer of Canterbury's *Vita Bregowini*, written in 1123 (*BHL* 1449);[93] and Osbern of Canterbury's *Vita Alphegi*, probably written between 1080 and 1093 (*BHL* 2519).[94]

The anonymous author's depiction of St Swithun (bishop of Winchester 852/3-863) is unremarkable. Swithun was apparently elected canonically (*canonice*) by the clergy and people of Winchester, and King Æthelwulf of Wessex assented to this.[95] As bishop, Swithun cared for the poor and for the common utility of the citizens; he helped King Æthelwulf rule his people justly and benignly.[96] It was by Swithun's prayer and exhortation that Æthelwulf tithed his landed possessions, giving a tenth of them to the church.[97] These concerns are in line with the rewritten hagiography discussed earlier in this chapter. But pastoral solicitude and advice given to kings appear in episcopal hagiography from any period. The *Vita Swithuni* tells us little specifically about Anglo-Norman England.

The two Canterbury hagiographers, however, were more radical. Eadmer described St Bregwine's time as archbishop of Canterbury (761-4) as a golden age for England. Peace flourished, and there was no fear of foreign enemies. The people modestly lapped up Bregwine's preaching and carried out his instructions. But this prosperity could not last. When Bregwine died, the golden age ended.[98] Without Bregwine's teaching, England degenerated from her pristine state to wallow in voluptuousness and riches, and the Danes, learning of this, invaded.[99]

The link between Bregwine's virtue, the people's receptiveness to (and imitation of) that virtue, and England's well-being is unmistakeable, and familiar.

---

[91] Faricius, *Vita Aldhelmi*, c. 4, pp. 101-2.

[92] *Vita s. Swithuni episcopi et confessoris*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge in *The Cult of St Swithun* (Oxford, 2003), 611-39.

[93] Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita beati Bregowini Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, ed. B.W. Scholz in *Traditio* 22 (1966), 127-48.

[94] Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita sancti Alphegi*, in *PL* 149, cols 371-93. For discussion of this text, see Rubenstein, 'Osbern', p. 35.

[95] *Vita Swithuni*, c. 4.

[96] *Ibid.*, cc. 5-7.

[97] *Ibid.*, c. 6. But the author of the *Vita Swithuni* may have got this information from one of King Æthelwulf's charters: *Ibid.*, p. 634 n. 20

[98] Eadmer, *Vita Bregowini*, c. 5, p. 141.

[99] *Ibid.*, c. 7, p. 142.

There is an obvious similarity to the portrayal of St Dunstan by Osbern, by William of Malmesbury and by Eadmer himself. But Eadmer's *Vita Bregowini* went beyond this. While St Dunstan always acted through King Edgar, King Æthelbert of Kent was only necessary to make Bregwine archbishop.

Osbern of Canterbury also seems to have gone further in depicting strong archbishops when freed from the constraints of a source text. Although Ælfheah was a comparatively recent saint (he died as archbishop of Canterbury in 1012), it is generally accepted that Osbern knew next to nothing about him, that most of what he did know had been invented by his monastic brothers at Canterbury, and that he was therefore free 'to create the saint's life as he imagined it ought to have happened'.[100] So it is striking that, after a short aside on Ælfheah's personal asceticism,[101] Osbern's account of Ælfheah's time as bishop of Winchester consisted solely of a description of the saint's almsgiving and an exposition of his apostolic beliefs: Ælfheah permitted no inhabitant of his diocese to beg, and no pauper of another diocese to leave him empty-handed; he considered it a tremendous and horrible crime for any man to usurp as his own that which nature had constituted as common property. No one who did not attend to the needs of the poor could consider himself a member of the *dominicum corpus*; Ælfheah, however, could. When the funds set aside by the law of the Church for the sustenance of the poor ran dry, Ælfheah raided his bishopric's treasury, 'docens ex hoc ornatissima quaeque ecclesias possidere, ut tempore felicitatis sint honestati, tempore vero neccessitatis sint utilitati'.[102] This surpasses any of the descriptions of episcopal almsgiving discussed above, even the Anglo-Saxon Wulfstan of Winchester's account of St Æthelwold.

Osbern's account of Ælfheah's time as archbishop of Canterbuy is similarly radical. Ælfheah continued to be a 'consoler of the poor, uplifter of the oppressed and sole refuge for the afflicted'.[103] But here Ælfheah's charity is obscured by the *Vita Alphegi*'s great theme: the failure of King Æthelred and his lay nobility to resist the Danish invasions, and Ælfheah's heroic efforts to make

---

[100] Rubenstein, 'Osbern', p. 36; Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, p. 316.

[101] Osbern, *Vita Alphegi*, c. 4, cols 378C-D.

[102] *Ibid.*, c. 4, cols 378D-379A. 'teaching by this that churches possess ornaments, so that in prosperous times they may serve as decoration, and in times of need they may be useful'

[103] *Ibid.*, c. 5, cols 379D-380A. 'pauperum consolator, oppressorum relevator, unicum afflictis refugium'

up for this failure. Æthelred, 'imbellis, quia imbecillis', acted more like a monk than a soldier. The self-interested and voluptuous men of Kent were little better. The monk-archbishop Ælfheah, however, acted like a warrior or a king. Ælfheah went out to preach the word of life to the enemy; Ælfheah ransomed the English captives; Ælfheah fed those left without food by the war.[104] When the Danes attacked Canterbury, Ælfheah offered himself to them as a sacrifice, begging only that they stop their slaughter of the townspeople.[105] And, having been taken prisoner by the Danes, Ælfheah gave his life for his flock, letting himself be martyred, even though he had the chance to escape or to buy his freedom from his captors.[106]

This willing martyrdom was the last, and the most important, of Ælfheah's acts in defence of his people, for by it he was able to defeat the Danes. The English were finally roused to unified military action by the Danish plan to throw Ælfheah's body dishonourably into a river.[107] And Ælfheah's posthumous miracles converted many of the Danes to the Christian faith.[108] Finally, God's anger fell so heavily on those responsible for Ælfheah's death that 225 shipfuls of terrified Danes fled from England. 160 of the ships sank.[109] Later, King Cnut was only able to defeat his English enemies after he had promised to appease Ælfheah's anger by translating his remains to Canterbury.[110]

Like the hagiographical depictions of Dunstan, Bregwine, Nicholas and Wilfrid already discussed, Osbern's *Vita Alphegi* describes a saint who used his sanctity to act in the political (and posthumously, the military) sphere. And in the *Vita Alphegi* the supersession of royal by episcopal (in this case, archiepiscopal) power is striking. St Ælfheah did not stand up to King Æthelred; Æthelred was so weak as to make this unecessary. Instead, Ælfheah replaced the king. As has

---

[104] *Ibid.*, c. 6, cols 380A-B.

[105] *Ibid.*, c. 8, cols 381A-D.

[106] *Ibid.*, cc. 10-13, cols 382C-384D. A demon falsely led Ælfheah out of prison, but the saint was 'saved' by an angel, who returned him there to face his pious death.

[107] *Ibid.*, c. 13, col. 385A: 'Sed quod Dani ad contumeliam, Christus Elphego paravit ad gloriam. Protinus namque omnis populi multitudo, quae illo docente errorem abjecerat, armata procedit, malens cum defuncto pariter occumbere, quam illud corpus, cujus ministerio sanctificationis susceperat mysterium, aquarum voragini tradere absorbendum.' However, this *populi multitudo* could conceivably have been composed of Danes whom Ælfheah had converted to Christianity, rather than of Englishmen.

[108] *Ibid.*, c. 14, cols 385B-C.

[109] *Ibid.*, c. 14, cols 385D-386A.

[110] *Ibid.*, c. 15, col. 386B.

already been mentioned, Osbern's views may have been unusually extreme. It may be that few of his contemporaries would have gone as far as he did in his *Vita Alphegi* in imagining an entirely dominant political role for the archbishop of Canterbury. Eadmer, in his *Vita Bregowini* came nearest to matching him. The fact that both Eadmer and Osbern were cathedral monks of Canterbury may be significant here; as has been mentioned, this is a theme to which we shall return later.

Of all the *Vitae* discussed in this chapter, Osbern's *Vita Alphegi* appears the most closely tied to the time and place of its composition: Canterbury after the Norman Conquest (although, like his *Vita Dunstani*, Osbern's *Vita Alphegi* was written before the accession of the controversial Archbishop Anselm). Osbern's emphasis on the failure of the English to overcome their narrow self-interest and to act as a group against the Danish invaders, and his insistence that this failure allowed the Danes repeatedly to defeat the English, is striking.[111] It is hard not to see this as an oblique reference to the Norman Conquest of 1066, and the failure of English resistance to the Normans in the following decades.[112] In the years after the Conquest, it was, at least partly, the inability of the English to coordinate themselves and to act in unity, and the unwillingness of individuals to risk losing their possessions, which allowed the numerically inferior Normans gradually to dispossess the English landholders and thus to take control of England.[113] Jay Rubenstein has characterised Osbern as a cloistered dreamer, who barely even noticed the events of 1066.[114] The *Vita Alphegi* suggests that this may not have been the case.

<div align="center">∗∗∗</div>

---

[111] *Ibid.*, c. 6, cols 380A-B, c. 8, col. 381B.

[112] For another interpretation of Osbern's nationalism, see Robert Stanton, 'National Martyrs and Willing Heroes: Piety and Patriotism in Two English Saints' Lives', in *The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West: Selected Proceedings of the International Conference, Groningen 20-23 November 1996*, ed. Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt and Jan Veenstra (Groningen, 1997), 191-204, pp. 198-204.

[113] Hugh M. Thomas, 'The Significance and Fate of the Native English Landholders of 1086', in *EHR* 118 (2003), 303-33.

So far, this chapter has presented evidence that, taken as a group, the hagiographical lives of bishops written or rewritten in Anglo-Norman England share three characteristics: a new sensitivity to the strictures of ecclesiastical law; an idealisation of saintly bishops as a dominant political force; and a focus on the bishop as a public or 'social' figure. Some effort has already been made to link these hagiographical trends to actual historical developments. The conclusion to this chapter will consider further the links between the ideal and the reality of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. First, however, it is necessary to examine the possible objections to this chapter's arguments. Two of these are particularly important: the possibility that the changes to rewritten hagiography discussed above were balanced by changes made in the opposite sense; and the possibility that the same changes were made to the *Vitae* of non-episcopal saints, which would mean that we are dealing with changing ideals of sanctity in general, rather than with ideals of episcopal sanctity in particular.

It should be noted that the three phenomena identified in this chapter are present, to a greater or lesser degree, in virtually every episcopal *Vita* written or rewritten in Anglo-Norman England, and that counter-examples are hard to find. There are only three obvious ones, and as we shall see, their evidence is ambiguous, and does not invalidate the chapter's conclusions.

The first counter-example is William of Malmesbury's abridgement of Odbert of Saint-Bertin's *Vita* of Bishop Frederick of Utrecht (*BHL*, 3157) in his *Gesta pontificum*. William removed the *populus* whom Frederick tearfully addressed when performing his final mass, as well as the *clerus et populus* who flocked to Bishop Frederick after he was attacked by assassins sent by the nefarious Judith, the niece and wife of Louis the Pious (Frederick had condemned their incestuous marriage).[115] This seems a clear example of a *Vita* rewritten in such a way as to make a bishop a *less* public figure. But William's omission of these details may simply have been due to his desire to save space in the *Gesta pontificum*.

---

[114] Rubenstein, 'Osbern', p. 40: 'In fact, based on his almost complete silence on the subject of the Norman Conquest, Osbern seems not to have realised that the Anglo-Saxon world has ended.'

[115] *GP*, i.6.3-12; Odbert of Saint-Bertin, *Passio Friderici episcopi Traiectensis*, ed. Georg Waitz *et al.* in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores 15,* 2 vols (Leipzig, 1925), vol. 1, 342-56, cc. 2-6.

Osbern of Canterbury's account of the translation of St Ælfheah's body to Canterbury in 1023 (a separate work to the *Vita Alphegi*; *BHL* 2519) is next.[116] As Paul Hayward has noted, while in the D text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* King Cnut simply assented to Archbishop Æthelenoth of Canterbury's plan to move Ælfheah from London to Canterbury, Osbern made the translation Cnut's idea.[117] This appears to be a case of a hagiographer from Anglo-Norman England restructuring events to give the king, rather than the episcopate, a leading role (although Osbern may simply have read the C text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which states that Cnut ordered the translation).

However, Osbern was obliged to give Cnut the initiative for the translation. His *Vita Alphegi* had described God's anger with the Danes over the death of the saint, and how Cnut had to promise to translate Ælfheah's body to avert this anger from himself. Osbern reiterated this in the *Translatio Ælfegi*.[118] If Osbern altered the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle's* account of Ælfheah's translation to give King Cnut a more active role, it was only so that Cnut's submission to the martyred Archbishop Ælfheah could be made more evident. In general the *Translatio Ælfegi* hardly displays a reverent attitude towards royal power. In fact, Cnut often appears slightly ridiculous. At one point, he jumps out of his bath and rushes to meet Archbishop Æthelnoth dressed only in his cloak and sandals.[119]

The third and final counter-example comes from Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's adaptation of Bede's account of St Augustine. According to Bede, St Augustine founded the cathedral at Canterbury and the monastery of St Peter and St Paul, also at Canterbury.[120] Goscelin, however, attributed all the responsibility for this to King Æthelbert of Kent.[121] He also, unlike Bede, wrote that it was at

---

[116] Osbern of Canterbury, *Translatio sancti Ælfegi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi et martiris (BHL 2519)*, ed. and trans. Alexander Rumble and Rosemary Morris in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway* (London, 1994), 283-315.

[117] Paul Hayward, 'Translation Narratives in Post-Conquest Hagiography and English Resistance to the Norman Conquest', in *ANS* 21 (1999), 67-93, pp. 70-3. It should be noted that the other translation narratives discussed by Paul Hayward in this article actually support the arguments of this chapter: the hagiographers in question, in seeking to legitimise the cults of their saints by associating them with historical figures of authority, generally chose to associate them with ecclesiastical figures.

[118] Osbern, *Translatio Ælfegi*, pp. 298-300.

[119] *Ibid.*, p. 302. See also p. 308, where Cnut humbly, and apparently single-handedly, rows a boat containing Archbishop Æthelnoth, his monks, and Ælfheah's relics.

[120] Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i.33.

[121] Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 23, p. 384B; *Historia minor*, col. 752B.

King Æthelbert's command that St Augustine went to Arles to be consecrated as archbishop of Canterbury.[122] It appears Goscelin gave a radically new importance to the king (rather than St Augustine) in the introduction of Christianity to England. But the context of Goscelin's statements is worth noting. In the *Historia maior,* Æthelbert's foundation of the churches follows Augustine's baptism of St Æthelbert and is directly prefaced by the following statement (which has no parallel in Bede): 'Exinde Euangelicus Sanctorum alumnus, et Augustini praeceptoris adjutor robustissimus, jam non suum regnum aestimat quod administrabat, verum ejus, cui se cum omnibus suis dediderat.'[123] So Goscelin showed Æthelbert's actions within the English church as implicitly dependent on his submission to St Augustine (whose 'helper' he was), and to God.[124]

Furthermore, Paul Hayward's conclusion that Goscelin was an extreme royalist, for whom 'the English church was a royal creature and the king's authority was supreme in ecclesiastical as well as secular matters', must be rejected.[125] Apart from the examples cited above, Hayward's main evidence is a passage praising King Æthelbert of Kent, which he translates as follows: [126]

> *it was glorious that he [Æthelbert] was seen ruling widely, serving the destitute, terrifying kings, <u>putting dread into God's priests</u>, presiding over the people, giving ear to the clerics, disciplining dukes and princes, honouring the weak and the humble in the church.*

But which actually reads:

> *Gloriosum erat uidere. late imperantem. egenis seruientem. reges terrentem. <u>sacerdotes dei metuentem</u>. populis presidentem. clericis*

---

[122] Bede*, Ecclesiastical History*, i.27; Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 24, p. 384B; *Historia minor*, col. 752A.

[123] Goscelin, *Historia maior*, c. 23, p. 384A. 'And so the evangelical nursling of the saints, the robust assistant of his teacher Augustine, no longer considered the realm which he governed to be his own, but His, to whom he had surrendered himself with all that which he owned.'

[124] But *cf.* Goscelin, *Historia minor*, cols 751D-752A and *Historia translationis Augustini et aliorum sanctorum* (*BHL*, 781), in *AS,* May, vol. 6, 411-43, pp. 439F-440A, where far less significance is attached to Æthelbert's submission to St Augustine.

[125] Paul Hayward, 'An Absent Father: Eadmer, Goscelin and the Cult of St Peter, the First Abbot of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in *Journal of Medieval History* 29 (2003), 201-18, p. 215.

[126] Hayward also argues that Goscelin thought of St Augustine's as a royal abbey, but the only 'evidence' for this is the fact that Goscelin described the foreign journeys of certain abbots on the king's service and claimed that those kings who treated the abbey of St Augustine's well were rewarded by the saint's protection: Hayward, 'An Absent Father', p. 214.

obedientem. duces et principes increpantem. pusillos et infimos ecclesie uenerantem[127]

When the verb 'metuo' is given its more conventional definition of 'to fear, to be afraid of, to dread', and when 'oboedio' is translated with the more straightforward 'to obey', this passage emerges as a fairly standard (for hagiography in Anglo-Norman England) description of a pious king, who despite his great power, submitted himself to ecclesiastical authority.[128] Similarly, Goscelin's phrase 'in principe primatus est' (a further piece of evidence cited by Hayward) is only proof that Goscelin saw the king as 'the pre-eminent authority in the kingdom' when taken out of context.[129]

So even this counter-example is not entirely unambiguous.[130] And Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's attribution of a special authority in the English church to King Æthelbert can be explained from a local point of view as well. Goscelin was a monk of St Augustine's, a monastery in Canterbury which in the Anglo-Norman period came into dispute with the cathedral and the archbishops of that city. Goscelin may have been loath to attribute too much ecclesiastical authority to St Augustine, who was archbishop of Canterbury, lest he provide a precedent for the current Archbishop Anselm to interfere in the affairs of St Augustine's.[131] It could be argued that in this case Goscelin's institutional concerns overrode the general change in hagiographical attitude in Anglo-Norman England.

***

In short, the three counter-examples just discussed do not refute this chapter's arguments. A more pressing question is whether the changes made to

---

[127] Hayward, 'An Absent Father', p. 213 and n. 51; Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 440A.

[128] See also Goscelin, *Vita Mildrethae*, p. 112: '[Æthelbert] gaudebat Dei famulis obedire magis quam regnare, reuerebatur uerba sacerdotum potius quam bella augustorum.'

[129] Hayward, 'An Absent Father', p. 213; Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 440D-E.,The *princeps* in question is probably actually Augustine himself.

[130] But *cf.* Townsend, 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography', pp. 427-8 on Goscelin's *Vita Mildrethae*, where an abbess tries to compel the chaste Mildreth into marriage: 'The issue is that much further complicated in that Goscelin juxtaposes the indictment of ecclesiastical authority with a positive and more or less unquestioning view of the benevolence of royal personages.'

rewritten episcopal *Vitae* in Anglo-Norman England were also made to the *Vitae* of other categories (generally royal or female) of saint. A full answer would require a more extensive examination of the hagiography of Anglo-Norman England than can be undertaken here. A provisional answer is that non-episcopal saints were sometimes shown acting like saintly bishops, but that this is only to be expected. It is not that the hagiographical bishops were simply acting like other types of saint; rather that other saints were acting like bishops.

For example, the Old English *Life* of St Margaret, translated *c.* 1100 from a Latin *Vita*, included a new section on Margaret's public preaching of the Christian faith to the people.[132] Not only holy bishops, but also holy virgins, became more public in Anglo-Norman hagiography. Similarly, Goscelin of Saint-Bertin wrote of the 'troops of the poor and strife-stricken' who flocked to St Sexburga as to a mother.[133] And Sexburga played (according to Goscelin) the political role played in other *Vitae* by saintly bishops. She encouraged her husband, King Erconbert of Kent, to religion and the destruction of pagan idols. Spurred on by Sexburga, Erconbert built churches and enforced the observance of Lent. The result was that 'by his own and by Sexburga's merits, [the king] obtained a far greater rule than any of his predecessors'.[134] Once again, we see a saint whose wise guidance of the king's conduct ensured – in a quasi-miraculous manner – the kingdom's prosperity.[135]

Osbert of Clare, writing slightly later than the other authors discussed in this chapter, enriched his *Vita* of Edward the Confessor (*BHL*, 2422) with a miracle not found in his late Anglo-Saxon source. Apparently, King Sweyn of

---

[131] See Chapter 5.

[132] *The Old English Lives of St Margaret*, ed. and trans. Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 65, 152-3. The *Life* in question is that from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 303.

[133] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Lectiones in festiuitate s. Sexburge* (*BHL*, 7694), ed. and trans. Rosalind C. Love in *Goscelin of Saint-Bertin: The Hagiography of the Female Saints of Ely* (Oxford, 2004), 1-9, c. 4: 'Currebant ad aulam hinc caterue plebium et procerum, inde examina inopum et uaria clade afflictorum'. See also Goscelin, *Vita Mildrethae*, p. 125.

[134] Goscelin, *Lectiones in festiuitate Sexburge*, c. 5. From the same volume (*The Hagiography of the Female Saints of Ely*), see also Goscelin's *Lectiones in natale S. Eormenhilde* (*BHL*, 2611), 11-23, cc. 3-4, and the anonymous *Vita beate Sexburge regine* (*BHL*, 7693), 133-89, cc. 4-5.

[135] Cf. *The Warenne (Hyde) Chronicle*, ed. Elisabeth van Houts and Rosalind Love (Oxford, 2013), p. 66, (*Liber monasterii de Hyda,* p. 313), where Queen Matilda is given a key and quasi-miraculous role in Henry I's rule: 'Ceterum ut ostenderetur eius [Matildae] meritis Angliam valuisse et regem Henricum eius precibus regnasse, infra dies octo deposicionis eius orta est contra eum noua quedam et quasi inextinguibilis discordia.'

Denmark died suddenly, while planning a military expedition against England. Edward the Confessor saw Sweyn's death in a vision and astonished his court by announcing it to them. The fame of this miracle spread and terrified those who heard it. The new Danish king gave oaths and hostages to the saintly Edward and venerated him as a lord and father, while other kings and princes made peace with Edward and accepted his overlordship (*dominatus*).[136] So, like the saintly bishops discussed earlier in this chapter, Osbert of Clare's Edward the Confessor was able to act in the political domain through his sanctity.

But all this is less of a problem for the arguments of the present chapter than it might seem. The perceived political role of women in Anglo-Norman England, especially of queens, resembled that of bishops.[137] Like bishops, queens were expected to advise the king, and to mediate between him and his subjects. Like women, bishops were (theoretically at least) cut off from certain types of political conduct (especially the exercise of violence). So it is unsurprising that idealised queens and idealised bishops are found acting in a similar manner. Moreover – although this is a question for further research – no hagiographer seems to have attributed to a female saint the massive and extraordinary political importance of Osbern of Canterbury's Dunstan or Eadmer's Wilfrid.

The similarity between the conduct of saintly kings and saintly bishops is even less surprising. In some respects the hagiographical bishops discussed in this chapter (especially Osbern's St Ælfheah) fulfilled traditionally royal roles: the protection of the people, the assurance of the nation's well-being, leadership in times of war.[138] This hagiographical usurpation of kingly responsibilities is reflected in what appears to be – this is another question for further research – the increasing tendency of eleventh- and twelfth-century writers to describe bishops,

---

[136] Osbert of Clare, *Vita beati Eadwardi regis Anglorum*, ed. Marc Bloch in *Analecta Bollandiana* 41 (1923), 5-131, c. 5, pp. 76-7.

[137] Pauline Stafford, 'Royal Women and Transitions: Emma and Ælfgifu in 1035-1042/1043', in *Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Western Europe*, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (Berlin, 2011), 127-44, p. 142; Vaughn, 'Henry I and the English Church', pp. 142-3.

[138] As expressed, for example, by Hugh de Fleury, *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate*, ed. Ernest Sackur in *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, *Libelli de lite*, 3 vols (Hannover, 1891-7), vol. 2, 465-94, Book 1, c. 6, p. 473: 'Porro legitimi regis officium est populum in iusticia et aequitate gubernare et aeclesiam sanctam totis viribus defendere. Oportet etiam eum esse pupillorum tutorem, et viduarum protectorem, et pauperum auxiliatorem.'

archbishops and popes as 'father of the fatherland' (*pater patriae*).[139] The Romans had used this epithet for egregious leaders and emperors; in the Middle Ages it was generally applied to kings and emperors, and even to important lay nobles.[140] That saintly bishops in Anglo-Norman hagiography began to act in the same way as idealised kings is not only unsurprising – it is one of the main contentions of this chapter.

Similarly, in his description of ideal kings, Osbert of Clare may have been consciously attempting to give them some of the characteristics of bishops. In his *Vita* of King Æthelbert of East Anglia (*BHL*, 2623), Osbert included a comparison between such saintly kings and the priests of his own time.[141] Priests should – so runs the comparison – be both kings and priests (kings by protecting those under them, priests by offering themselves up in praise of the Lord); but they have involved themselves in worldly greed and so have neglected their starving flocks: 'But behold! This temporal prince Æthelbert was both king and the Lord's priest, because he inflamed the hearts of his people to the faith and love of God'.[142] The implication is that Æthelbert, by his sanctity, took on a priestly role.

One hagiographical text from our period does show a saint who was definitely not a bishop, or similar to a bishop, but who acted like the saintly bishops discussed in this chapter. The author of the mid-eleventh-century *Vita*

---

[139] *E.g.* 'Digby-Gotha Recension', c. 13; *VA,* pp. 98, 156-7; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People,* ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford, 2002), Prologus, p. 6.

[140] *E.g. Brevis relatio de Guillelmo nobilissimo comite Normannorum*, ed. Elisabeth van Houts in *Camden Miscellany* 34 (1997), 5-48, c. 17, p. 45; *The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni* ed. and trans. Elisabeth van Houts (Oxford, 1995), p. 132; Goscelin, *Vita Mildrethae*, p. 112; 'Gregory of Ely's Verse Life and Miracles of St Æthelthryth' (*BHL*, 2639), ed. Elizabeth Stevens and Pauline A. Thompson in *Analecta Bollandiana* 106 (1988), 333-90, Book 3, l. 11; *OV*, vol. 2, p. 190, vol. 3, p. 82, vol. 4, pp. 38-44, 82, 98-100, vol. 6, p. 450. See also Megan MacLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 161, 188-99.

[141] Osbert of Clare, *Vita Ethelberti*, ed. John Mayor in *Richard of Cirencester: Speculum historiale de gestis regum Anglie*, 2 vols (London, 1863-9), vol. 1, 262-94, pp. 276-7. For the attribution to Osbert, see M.R. James, 'Two Lives of St Ethelbert King and Martyr', in *EHR* 32 (1917), 214-44, pp. 215-7; Bartlett, 'Rewriting Saints' Lives', p. 601 n. 14. Robert Bartlett considers this passage to be an addition to the *Vita Ethelberti* by the fourteenth-century chronicler Richard of Cirencester, on the grounds that it does not appear in the other extant manuscript, Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, MS Memb. I 81, fos 30r-39r. But the passage is written in Osbert's characteristic rhyming prose, a style which went permanently out of fashion soon after he wrote; and, as Bartlett himself states, other material unquestionably from Osbert's *Vita* was omitted from the Gotha version.

[142] Osbert of Clare, *Vita Ethelberti*, p. 277. 'Sed ecce temporalis princeps iste beatus Æthelbertus et rex fuit et sacerdos Domini, quia ad fidem et amorem Dei inflammavit corda populi sui.'

prima sancti Neoti (*BHL*, 6054-5) portrayed the saintly hermit Neot in much the same way as Osbern of Canterbury portrayed Archbishops Dunstan and Ælfheah.[143] Neot's care for the poor was such that he gave them everything he had;[144] multitudes flocked to hear Neot's teaching;[145] the West Saxons acclaimed Neot as father, lord and augmenter of the fatherland.[146] And, like St Dunstan, Neot was a scourge of kings. Neot castigated King Alfred for his wicked deeds, and prophesied that Alfred would be punished for them by the loss of his kingdom. If, however, Alfred repented and sent gifts to the pope, this loss would only be temporary. Alfred obeyed the saint.[147] Neot's prophecy was fulfilled after his death. The pagans invaded England, but Alfred narrowly avoided defeat – thanks to the help of St Neot, who appeared to the beleaguered king twice in visions prophesying his eventual victory.[148]

The *Vita prima Neoti* was rewritten after the Norman Conquest (the '*Vita secunda*'; *BHL*, 6052);[149] it also formed the basis for an Old English homily on St Neot.[150] These reworkings followed the *Vita prima* in presenting Neot as a kind of father and protector of the English people, to whom King Alfred owed his victory over the pagans.[151] The representation of St Neot in these texts suggests that, in some respects, the ideals of saintly power and conduct discussed in this chapter were not purely episcopal. But it is worth noting that the post-Conquest rewriters of the *Vita prima Neoti* do not seem to have increased Neot's power and influence in the same way that the rewriters of the episcopal *Vitae* discussed in this chapter increased the power and influence of their saintly bishops: Neot was already the father of the English people and Alfred's saviour in the probably pre-1066 *Vita prima*. It is possible that the *Vita prima Neoti* represents an Anglo-Saxon ideal of the saintly hermit, which influenced the new ideal of the saintly bishop current

---

[143] *Vita prima sancti Neoti*, ed. Michael Lapidge in *ASC 17*, 109-42.
[144] *Ibid.*, p. 113.
[145] *Ibid.*, p. 116.
[146] *Ibid.*, p. 119: 'Iam patrem, iam dominum, iam patrie auctorem occidentales nuncupabant.'
[147] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-2.
[148] *Ibid.,* pp. 124-32.
[149] *Vita secunda sancti Neoti*, in *AS*, July, vol. 7, 319F-329A; discussed in *ASC 17*, pp. cxii-cxv.
[150] Edited by Rubie Warner in *Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS. Vesp. D. xiv* (London, 1917), 129-34; most recently discussed by George Ruder Younge, '"Those were good days": Representations of the Anglo-Saxon Past in the Old English Homily on Saint Neot', in *Review of English Studies* 63 (2012), 349-69.
[151] *Vita secunda Neoti*, *passim.*, but especially pp. 322A-B, 329A; *Early English Homilies*, pp. 131-3.

after the Norman Conquest. This, however, requires further investigation into the *Vitae* of hermits from both pre- and post-Conquest England.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

It is now time to consider the significance of the present chapter's findings. The evidence that hagiographers writing in Anglo-Norman England constructed their ideal bishops in a fundamentally different manner to their Anglo-Saxon predecessors seems indisputable, even taking into account the objections just raised. Hagiographers writing in England in the two or three generations after the Norman Conquest paid more attention to the demands of ecclesiastical law, even if their acceptance of this law was not absolute. They also attributed more political influence to saintly bishops. Often this influence was exercised through miraculous or quasi-miraculous means, or was understood as a consequence of the bishop's sanctity. Finally, the hagiographers made their bishops into more public figures, paying more attention to their care for and protection of their subjects.

There are two obvious explanations for this shift in hagiographical mentality: the Norman Conquest, and 'the first European revolution', R.I. Moore's convenient umbrella term for the series of interlinking crises triggered by the eleventh-century drive for a radical reform and desecularisation of the European church.[152] It is not easy (and perhaps not necessary) to choose between these explanations.

That monastic writers in post-Conquest England laid a new emphasis on the bishop's duty to protect the weak and vulnerable, might be read as a direct reaction to the devastation (in some parts of England) which followed the Norman Conquest, and the Norman invaders' lack of concern for the English populace. Some ecclesiastical figures, most notably Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham (1057-78), really do seem to have taken it upon themselves to help those displaced by the Conquest.[153] Similarly, the dissatisfaction of English monks with the Norman kings, and perhaps with the royal treatment of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury,

---

[152] R.I. Moore, *The First European Revolution, c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000).

could be used to explain why the rewritten *Vitae* tended to increase the power of bishops at the expense of the monarchy.

But in her study of the changing hagiography of the German St Ulrich, Maureen Miller has shown that, there too, a hagiographical rewriter consistently increased the influence of his episcopal subject, even in a military context (Miller also traced the later development of the theme of the holy bishop as a dominant political force).[154] Bernd Schütte has noticed independently the developing and increasingly canonical nature of episcopal elections in the *Vitae* of Ulrich.[155] It is also worth noting that Folcard of Saint-Bertin's *Vita* of St John of Beverley (bishop of Hexham and then of York), probably written in England just before the Norman Conquest (*BHL*, 4339),[156] displays most of the characteristics of the post-Conquest *Vitae* discussed above.[157] It may be that this chapter has simply uncovered the English manifestation of a European phenomenon.

This is a question for further investigation. It would clearly be unwise to see the Norman Conquest as the sole cause of hagiographical change in Anglo-Norman England.[158] It should, however, be noticed that, in one respect the English evidence does not match Maureen Miller's conclusions. Miller relates the increased influence given to the rewritten St Ulrich to a new model of clerical (as opposed to secular) masculinity put forward by ecclesiastical reformers in the eleventh century, a masculinity based on continence and manly self-control, and the avoidance of contamination by women.[159] But gender is unimportant in the English *Vitae* discussed in this chapter. The kind of clerical misogyny discussed

---

[153] *HAE*, cc. 159-60, 162.

[154] Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture', *passim.*, but especially pp. 38-9.

[155] Bernd Schütte, 'Bischofserhebungen im Spiegel von Bischofsviten und Bistumsgesten der Ottonen- und Salierzeit', in *Die Früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung*, ed. Erkens, 139-91, pp. 154-6. But on p. 157 Schütte gives an example of an episcopal election rewritten to remove the *clerus et populus*.

[156] Susan Wilson, *The Life and After-Life of St John of Beverley: The Evolution of the Cult of an Anglo-Saxon Saint* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 7-9.

[157] Adapting Bede, Folcard removed a case of uncanonical (hereditary) succession, and changed a miracle story to give St John divine foreknowledge and thus more control over events: Wilson, *John of Beverley*, p. 56. Folcard also took a single mute pauper cured by John, and made him into just one of a crowd of paupers whom John had decided, as was his custom, to console: Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, v.2; Folcard of Saint-Bertin, *Vita s. Johannis episcopi Eboracensis*, ed. James Raine in *The Historians of the Church of York and Its Archbishops*, 3 vols (1879-94), vol. 1, 239-60, pp. 246-7.

[158] As does Townsend, 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography', *passim*, but especially p. 402.

[159] Miller, 'Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture', pp. 39-41, 44.

by Miller did exist in Anglo-Norman England, and was sometimes expressed by monastic writers,[160] but it does not seem to have been an essential component of the hagiographical empowering of the episcopate.[161]

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

In some ways the wider significance of the ideals of episcopal power discussed here is limited. Monks in general were a minority in Anglo-Norman England, and monks who wrote hagiography were a minority within a minority. Their values and expectations were not typical. A comparison with two non-monastic chronicles written just after our period is instructive. The married archdeacon Henry of Huntingdon portrayed King Edgar's reign as a golden age for England, but he made Edgar himself responsible for this, not his episcopal advisors.[162] Historians have also noticed that Henry drew a distinction between secular and ecclesiastical history, and between the saintly or miraculous and the purely historical, that would have been alien to his monastic contemporaries.[163]

---

[160] See Kirsten Fenton, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2008); *eadem*, 'The Question of Masculinity in William of Malmesbury's Presentation of Wulfstan of Worcester', in *ANS* 28 (2006), 124-37; Victoria Tudor, 'The Misogyny of Saint Cuthbert', in *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th ser. 12 (1984), 157-67, pp. 158-60.

[161] Goscelin's account of St Augustine, for example, though it includes a misogynistic story about a church dedicated to the saint from which women are prohibited, actually gives a far greater role in the conversion of the English to Queen Bertha – and portrays her more favourably – than Bede did: Goscelin, *Historia maior*, cc. 10-1, 20-1. On Goscelin's portrayal of women in general, see Elisabeth van Houts, 'The Flemish Contribution to Biographical Writing in England in the Eleventh Century', in *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), 111-27.

[162] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, v.24-6.

[163] Bernd Roling, 'Der Historiker als Apologet der Weltverachtung. Die ‚Historia Anglorum' des Heinrich von Huntingdon', in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 33 (1999), 125-68, pp. 147-9; Elisabeth van Houts, 'Historical Writing', in *A Companion to the Anglo-Norman World,* ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Elisabeth van Houts (Woodbridge, 2002), 103-21, p. 113. But *cf.* Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, p. 10: 'Although [Henry of Huntingdon's chronicle] differs in no obvious way from the other compilations, it is more likely that he was unable to escape from the dominant literary conventions than that married archdeacons thought like monks.'

This distinction left little room for dominant holy men like Osbern's St Dunstan.[164]

Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis* presents an even greater contrast. Gaimar was a cleric, but he was writing in the vernacular for a lay audience, and so represents the closest thing we have to a barometer of contemporary lay opinion.[165] He seems to have rewritten Bede and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to give more importance to kings (and less to bishops) in the conversion of England.[166] And not only did he say nothing at all about St Dunstan in describing England's good fortune under King Edgar,[167] he also completely upended the monastic story (first found in Osbern) of Dunstan's correction of Edgar's sexual mores. Apparently, Dunstan repeatedly ordered the king to dismiss his mistress Ælfthryth. On one occasion he burst angrily into their bedchamber with a pious warning about this. But Edgar refused point blank to give her up.[168] This lack of obedience to archiepiscopal commands drew no censure from Gaimar, nor does it seem – in the *Estoire des Engleis* – to have done the king any harm.

So the ideals of episcopal power discussed in this chapter were not 'contemporary opinion'. They may not even be representative of the opinion of literate monks. This chapter has treated monks from various parts of England (and Goscelin, a monk from Flanders working in various parts of England) over a period of some 70 years as a homogenous group of 'post-conquest hagiographers'. But most of the more garish examples of the 'holy man' model of episcopal power come from Osbern and Eadmer, two monks from the cathedral at Canterbury. It may be that the new norms of episcopal power discovered by this chapter were mostly limited to monks from the cathedral chapter of Canterbury. There are

[164] Although Henry did make the quasi-miraculous link between St Dunstan's death, the withdrawal of divine protection from England and the Danish invasions which appears in Osbern's *Vita Dunstani* and elsewhere: Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, v.28.

[165] See John Gillingham, 'Kingship, Chivalry and Love: Political and Cultural Values in the Earliest History Written in French: Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis*', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Proceedings of the Borchard Conference on Anglo-Norman History, 1995*, ed. C.W. Hollister (Woodbridge, 1997), 33-58.

[166] *E.g.* Geffrei Gaimar, *Estoire des Engleis: History of the English*, ed. and trans. Ian Short (Oxford, 2009), ll. 955-60, 1079-80. Rather than being converted by St Augustine, sent by Pope Gregory, King Ethelbert of Kent requested baptism from the pope, and received it from St Columba. *Cf. ASC E, s.a.* 565, 601; Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, i.23, i.26.

[167] Gaimar, *Estoire des Engleis*, ll. 3565-80.

[168] *Ibid.*, ll. 3939-66.

obvious reasons why they would be in favour of the archiepiscopal dominance of the English church and kingdom.

Durham, the other major literary centre in England in this period, provides a useful comparison. The history and hagiography from Anglo-Norman Durham attached less importance to living bishops than to the miraculous action of the dead St Cuthbert, who, propitiated by royal generosity to his church, ensured victory for the kings of England.[169] This is a different (and even less realistic) ideal to that proposed at Canterbury.

However, the hagiography discussed in this chapter has a relevance beyond the small group of monks who wrote or read it. Firstly, the Canterbury monks Eadmer and Osbern were friends of Archbishop Anselm; their influence on him (and the influence of their ideas of archiepiscopal power) may have been important. Secondly, Eadmer and William of Malmesbury produced between them most of the more enticing narrative evidence concerning the bishops of Anglo-Norman England (William of Malmesbury, though not a monk of Canterbury, followed the 'Canterbury model' in his *Gesta regum, Gesta pontificum* and *Vita Dunstani*). Chapter 2 of this thesis will show that when William and Eadmer discussed contemporary bishops they idealised them in the same way that they idealised the bishops of Anglo-Saxon England. When they worked from existing sources (such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) they tended to distort them in the same way that they distorted earlier works of hagiography. The mental world of the hagiographers discussed in this chapter thus takes on a disproportionate importance for our understanding of Anglo-Norman England in general. Finally, in some respects the concerns of the monastic hagiographers discussed in this chapter were shared by their more important contemporaries. Chapter 3 of the present thesis shows how their ambivalence over ecclesiastical law and, by extension, the papacy, was normal in the Anglo-Norman church.

---

[169] For example, Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius hoc est Dunhelmensis ecclesie: Tract on the Origins and Progress of This the Church of Durham*, ed. and trans. David Rollason (Oxford, 2000), ii.17, on King Æthelstan: 'Denique ante illum nullus regum ecclesiam sancti Cuthberti tantum dilexit, tam diuersis tamque multiplicibus regiis muneribus decorauit. Vnde hostibus passim emergentibus ubique preualens, omnibus illis uel occisis uel seruitio sibi subactis uel extra terminos Britanniae fugatis, maiori quam ullus regum Anglorum ante illum gloria regnabat.'

Chapter 2: Narrative Sources and Spiritual Authority

The first half of the twelfth century saw – for whatever reason – a new interest in history and historical writing in England.[1] This concern for the past was manifested in – *inter alia* – the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1, the famous chronicles by John of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, and also in a small group of biographies of bishops from Anglo-Norman England written by their contemporaries or near-contemporaries: the 'contemporary *Vitae*'. These *Vitae*, together with the other narrative evidence, have formed the basis of many historians' assessments of the episcopate of Anglo-Norman England. The contention of this chapter is that such an approach is misguided; that the contemporary *Vitae* are factually inaccurate and untrustworthy; and that they present a model of episcopal conduct closer to the hagiographical ideals discussed in Chapter 1 than to the political reality of Anglo-Norman England, a model which historians have often uncritically reproduced.

The first of this chapter's two sections examines these contemporary *Vitae*. There are three of them:[2] the pair of complementary works on Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury (1093-1109) written by Anselm's friend and companion Eadmer (the *Historia novorum* and the *Vita Anselmi* (*BHL*, 525));[3] the biography of Bishop Gundulf of Rochester (1077-1108) written by an anonymous monk of Rochester between 1114 and the 1130s (the *Vita Gundulfi*);[4] and the *Life* of Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester (1062-95), written in Old English by the monk Coleman (d. 1113), and translated into Latin by William of Malmesbury between 1126 and 1142, probably nearer 1126 (only the translation, the *Vita Wulfstani*,

---

[1] Richard Southern, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 4. The Sense of the Past', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (1973), 243-63.

[2] Two similar *Vitae* written just after our period are not discussed here: Milo Crispin, *Vita Lanfranci* (*BHL*, 4719)*,* ed. Margaret Gibson in *Lanfranco di Pavia e l'Europa del secolo XI nel IX centenario della morte (1089-1989)*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Milan, 1993), 659-715; William of Wycombe, *Vita domini Roberti de Betune Herefordensis episcopi*, ed. H. Wharton in *Anglia Sacra*, 2 vols (London, 1691), vol. 2, 295-322.

[3] See the thesis' list of abbreviations under *HN* and *VA*.

[4] See the list of abbreviations under *VG*. In his edition, Rodney Thomson dated the *Vita Gundulfi* to the reign of Bishop Ernulf (1114-24). Julie Potter, 'The *Vita Gundulfi* in Its Historical Context', in *Haskins Society Journal* 7 (1995), 89-100, argues for a date near the end of Ernulf's life. But Colin Flight, *The Bishops and Monks of Rochester, 1076-1214* (Maidstone, 1997), pp. 39-40, assigns the *Vita Gundulfi* to the pontificate of Bishop John (1125-37).

survives; *BHL*, 8756).[5] These texts have been studied individually,[6] but never as a group.[7] Consequently, important similarities between them have been overlooked.

The authors of the contemporary *Vitae* consistently showed their subjects acting with what we shall refer to as 'spiritual authority'. According to the *Vitae*, saintly bishops wielded a special political influence precisely because they were saints. The respect in which they were held allowed them to direct the conduct of others, sometimes in a politically decisive manner. It also meant that laymen gave preferential treatment to these bishops, again, sometimes in a political context. There was a more numinous element to this spiritual authority as well. The curses of the subjects of the *Vitae* were not only feared by contemporaries; they sometimes − according to our sources − had concrete results. Pious bishops also benefitted from divine help in their political dealings.

The first section of this chapter traces this theme in the contemporary *Vitae*. It gives particular attention to three recurring motifs: firstly, the holy bishop whose pious warnings averted a revolution; secondly, the holy bishop who won legal cases through a succession of pious antics, notably by falling ostentatiously asleep in court; and thirdly, the holy and venerated bishop who was able to enrich his church by attracting the love (and donations) of the laity. At the same time, the factual basis of the *Vitae*'s stories is examined. When the *Vitae* can be checked against other sources, their accounts of bishops achieving their political ends by deploying this spiritual authority inevitably appear to be either grossly exaggerated or simply fictional. Moroever, both William of Malmesbury and the author of the *Vita Gundulfi* appear to have borrowed from Eadmer's work on St

---

[5] See the list of abbreviations under *VW*.

[6] Fenton, 'Masculinity'; Flight, *Bishops and Monks*, pp. 37-48; Andy Orchard, 'Parallel Lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', in *St Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Julia Barrow and N.P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005), 39-57; Potter, '*Vita Gundulfi*'; Marylou Ruud, 'Monks in the World: the Case of Gundulf of Rochester', in *ANS* 11 (1989), 245-60; Southern, *Anselm and His Biographer*, pp. 314-43; Michael Staunton, 'Trial and Inspiration in the Lives of Anselm and Thomas Becket', in *Anselm, Aosta, Bec and Canterbury: Papers in Commemoration of the Nine Hundredth Anniversary of Anselm's Enthronement as Archbishop, 25 September 1093*, ed. Gillian Evans and David Luscombe (Sheffield, 1996), 310-32; Sally Vaughn, 'Eadmer's *Historia novorum*: A Reinterpretation', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 259-89.

[7] Antonia Gransden, *Historical Writing in England c. 550-c. 1307* (London, 1974), which discusses at various points all of the texts discussed here, is a partial exception, while Ruud, 'Monks in the World', p. 256, draws some comparisons between the *Vita Gundulfi* and the *Vita Wulfstani*.

Anselm (with the hero's name changed). This makes it difficult to accept the *Vitae*'s testimony in the frequent cases where their stories do not appear elsewhere.

The second section of this chapter discusses three other narrative sources from Anglo-Norman England: the *Chronicle* of John of Worcester; William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*; and the short biography of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham (1058-1078) embedded in the thirteenth-century Evesham chronicle. It shows that the spiritual authority model of episcopal (or rather ecclesiastical) power is just as apparent in these sources as in the *Vitae*, and its factual basis just as slender. It also shows that the spiritual authority model of power could be applied to bishops who were not saints (such as Archbishop Ealdred of York); and to men who were not bishops (such as Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham). As in Chapter 1 of this thesis, it is difficult to separate episcopal from other types of saintly power.

So the present chapter fulfils a methodological purpose. The reservations expressed here as to the narrative evidence will be important later on in the thesis. But the discussion of the *Vitae* and chronicles also forms part of the thesis' analysis of the mechanics of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. It is sometimes assumed in the secondary literature that, thanks to their spiritual authority, medieval bishops were 'more powerful than powerful laymen'.[8] But there have been few serious attempts to determine the real political significance of the episcopate's spiritual resources.[9] This chapter suggests that historians may, like the monks who produced most of our narrative evidence, have laid too much emphasis on saintly charisma in discussing the medieval episcopate's political conduct. If episcopal power really was determined by the bishops' religious status, then it is likely that this took place in a more prosaic fashion: Chapter 3 of this thesis shows how the position of bishops in Anglo-Norman England as both feudal barons and ecclesiastical dignitaries created legal ambiguities which they could exploit; and also obligations which limited their freedom of action. And Chapter 4 shows that on a local level, sanctity was much less of an indicator of

---

[8] Parisse, 'The Bishop', p. 12. *Cf.* Robin Fleming, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 186: 'The supernatural arsenal at ecclesiastics' disposal, coupled with churchmen's ability to publicize saintly heroics, did much to protect monastic patrimonies.'
[9] Brian A. Pavlac, 'Excommunication and Territorial Politics in High Medieval Trier', in *Church History* 60 (1991), 20-36, is an exception.

success than legal skill or royal favour, often obtained by administrative service to the king.

An issue of terminology needs to be raised here. This chapter's specialised use of the phrases 'spiritual authority' and 'contemporary *Vitae*' has already been mentioned. The word 'political' is also sometimes employed in an unusual, and very broad, sense. It describes any kind of public action not directly related to a bishop's ecclesiastical functions. By this definition, St Wulfstan's efforts to protect his church's lands were political, as was St Gundulf's friendship with the kings of England, which allowed him to attract donations from them and thereby enrich his church.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

As has been mentioned, the contemporary *Vitae* echo each other in a number of respects. This is unsurprising: hagiography was an essentially imitative genre.[10] Of the three recurring motifs to be examined in this chapter, the most important, and the most obvious, is that of the holy bishop whose saintliness gave him a special political influence, and who used that influence to convince his noble contemporaries to follow a particular course of political action: loyalty to the rightful king of England.

The best example comes from William of Malmesbury's *Vita Wulfstani*. In 1066 the newly crowned King Harold II faced a rebellion in Northumbria. The Northumbrians refused to be subjected to Harold's southern softness (*australis mollities*). Harold realised that he had little hope of suppressing the uprising with armed force. So he employed a gentler remedy: the saintly Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester, whose sanctity was believed capable of softening any arrogance. Harold took Wulfstan with him to the North, presumably so that he could admonish the rebels. The ploy worked: 'those peoples unconquerable by iron ...

---

[10] On Coleman's possible models for what later became the *Vita Wulfstani*, see Orchard, 'Parallel Lives'.

easily submitted, out of reverence for the bishop, to Harold's laws.'[11] And the Northumbrians would have persisted in their loyalty had it not been for the machinations of Harold's perfidious brother Tostig.[12]

This seems to be a classic illustration of the penetration of medieval politics by religion, and of the special political role which pious bishops like St Wulfstan could enjoy. Wulfstan's power in this case was limited, in that he could presumably only recommend conduct in accordance with common religious norms (so Wulfstan could not counsel, for example, resistance to a duly anointed king). His power was also paradoxical. In the *Vita Wulfstani*, William of Malmesbury based Wulfstan's saintliness on the bishop's rejection of the things of this world, his asceticism and his humility. Yet it was precisely this rejection of the world which allowed Wulfstan to act within the world, and to exercise a degree of power denied to his worldly contemporaries. William of Malmesbury stressed twice that the Northumbrians, cowed by Wulfstan's sanctity, could not be beaten by iron (*ferrum*), that is, by conventional, military, secular power. This underlined the extent, and the special nature, of Wulfstan's achievement.

Wulfstan's intervention in Northumbria in 1066 is part of the accepted sequence of events. It appears in most modern histories of the period.[13] But, as we shall see, it may never have happened. The Northumbrian rebellion of 1066 (and Wulfstan's suppression of it) appears only in William of Malmesbury's *Vita Wulfstani*. And the *Vita Wulfstani's* similarity to an incident from Eadmer's earlier *Historia novorum* (which William had certainly read) is highly suspicious.

According to Eadmer, when in 1101 Henry I risked losing his kingdom to his brother Duke Robert of Normandy, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury saved the day. Henry feared that his nobles would desert him *en masse* when Duke

---

[11] 'illi populi ferro indomitabiles ... pro reuerentia episcopi in iura Haroldi facile concesserunt.' *Cf.* Gregory the Great's comment on the conversion of the English in *Expositio in librum beati Job*, in *PL* 74, cols 590C-1162B and *PL* 75, cols 9A-782A, Book 27, c. 11, col. 411: 'Ecce quondam tumidus jam substratus sanctorum pedibus servit Oceanus, ejusque barbaros motus, *quos terreni principes edomare ferro nequiverant*, hos pro divina formidine sacerdotum ora simplicibus verbis ligant; et qui catervas pugnantium infidelis nequaquam metuerat, jam nunc fidelis humilium linguas timet.' This passage is quoted by Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, ii.1.

[12] *VW*, i.16.1-3.

[13] *E.g.* David C. Douglas, *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact upon England* (London, 1964), p. 183; Emma Mason, *St Wulfstan of Worcester, c. 1008-1095* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 102-3; Ian W. Walker, *Harold: The Last Anglo-Saxon King* (Stroud, 1997), pp. 138-9.

Robert invaded England. The only man Henry could trust was Anselm. Henry had Anselm speak with, and confirm the loyalty of, certain magnates. After Duke Robert had landed, Anselm addressed the English army as a group. Anselm explained with indissoluble reasoning how execrable traitors were in the eyes of God and any good man. His listeners, 'seeing that Anselm himself walked in the path of virtue',[14] immediately resolved to die rather than to break their faith to Henry I. This cut off Duke Robert's support in England. Robert was obliged to make peace with Henry I. An additional factor in his decision was his fear of the anathema which he knew that Anselm would impose on him if he persisted in opposing his brother. So Henry I was saved, and Eadmer had no doubt that this was Anselm's doing: 'si, post gratiam Dei, fidelitas et industria non intercessisset Anselmi, Henricus rex ea tempestate perdidisset jus Anglici regni.'[15]

Again, the story is part of the accepted sequence of events, and appears in most modern accounts of the period,[16] even though, like Wulfstan's 1066 trip to Northumbria, it is only recorded in one source. However, the *Vita Gundulfi* might be taken as a partial corroboration: Gundulf's biographer gave a very similar account of the thwarted civil war of 1101, but with Gundulf rather than Anselm as the hero. Gundulf apparently admonished the nobles individually. 'Considering the innocence and sanctity of the man of God', some of the suspect magnates were moved to make peace with the king.[17]

So each of our three authors thought that his saint had the power (in varying degrees) to avert a rebellion. Anselm's own spotless reputation, Gundulf's innocence, and the fame of Wulfstan's sanctity – these were what made the rebels take them and their advice seriously. As has been mentioned, this was a peculiar form of power: the otherworldly sanctity of Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan allowed them to act effectively in the world, and made them more politically significant than those bishops (for example, Robert Bloet of Lincoln or Ranulf Flambard of Durham) who gave themselves wholeheartedly to secular politics.

---

[14] 'perspecto ipsum via virtutis incedere' ('perspecto' is an impersonal ablative absolute)

[15] *HN*, pp. 126-7. 'If, after the grace of God, Anselm's fidelity and industry had not interceded, King Henry would at that time have lost the kingdom of England.'

[16] *E.g.* George Garnett, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 205-6; Judith Green, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 64-5; Sally Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (London, 1987), pp. 231, 233-4.

[17] *VG*, c. 35. 'innocentiam uiri Dei et sanctimoniam considerantes'

In fact, according to some conceptions, 'authority' rather than 'power' would be the more appropriate word in this case. The bishops did not employ their own concrete power resources (men, money, land). Rather, they were able to cause holders of this concrete power to act in a certain way. But the difficulties with this distinction between 'power' and 'authority' were discussed in the introduction to this thesis. Consequently, this chapter will continue to use 'power' in the broad sense of any ability to exert one's own will, through whatever means.

Whether Wulfstan, Gundulf and Anselm actually acted in this way is less certain. Anselm's intervention in 1101 is not inconceivable; but it is only recorded in Eadmer's *Historia novorum*. According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, it was 'the head men' (*þa heafodmen*) who mediated between Duke Robert and Henry I. Later, twelve of the highest men from each side (*.xii. þa hihste of ægðre healfe*) swore to the peace.[18] John of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon translated this as 'sapientiores utriusque partis', 'principes', and 'eximiores procerum': the lay nobles.[19] Anselm is not mentioned. At the very least, Eadmer grossly exaggerated Anselm's political importance. The same reservations apply to the *Vita Gundulfi*'s description of Gundulf's actions in 1101, with the added objection that Eadmer did not mention Gundulf's mediation in that year, and that the author of the *Vita Gundulfi*, could easily have copied Eadmer, but with Gundulf instead of Anselm as the mediator.

St Wulfstan's 1066 trip to Northumbria in support of King Harold, as reported by William of Malmesbury, is even less probable. As we shall see later on in this chapter, William was not only prone to exaggeration, but to outright invention. And he had definitely read Eadmer's *Historia novorum*. Furthermore, the absence of St Wulfstan's intervention (and of the Northumbrian rebellion which caused it) from any other source is striking, especially since there are no less than three separate sources where we should expect any such events to appear.[20]

---

[18] *ASC E*, p. 111, *s.a.* 1101.

[19] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, viii.23; *JW*, vol. 3, p. 98, *s.a.* 1101.

[20] It is worth noting that the coin evidence for Harold II's reign (unlike that for, for example, his namesake and predecessor) indicates that the whole realm was under his control from the beginning of his reign (Gareth Williams of the British Museum, personal communication), although *cf.* William E. Kapelle, *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and Its Transformation, 1000-1135* (London, 1979), p. 101.

The first of these is version D of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This text was somehow linked to Archbishop Ealdred of York (1061-9), who had been bishop of Worcester before Wulfstan and still had close connections to his old bishopric. It is also exceptionally informative about northern affairs.[21] But the nearest it comes to a confirmation of the *Vita Wulfstani*'s story is in its enigmatic statement that King Harold came to Westminster from York before Easter 1066. So at least the king was in the right place at the right time.[22]

The second of our silent sources is John of Worcester's *Chronicle*. John was a monk of Wulfstan's old cathedral community. He liked Wulfstan and he liked Harold II;[23] and he seems to have read and drawn upon Coleman's Old English *Life* of Wulfstan which William of Malmesbury later translated into Latin.[24] It is hard to see how John could have been unaware of Wulfstan's suppression of the Northumbrian rebellion, or why he would have failed to report it. The simplest explanation is that these events were unknown to John of Worcester because they were not in Coleman's Old English *Life*; that they were not in Coleman's *Life* because they never happened; and that William of Malmesbury invented them when he wrote his *Vita Wulfstani* because he had read and been impressed by Eadmer's account of Anselm's actions in 1101.

Finally we have William of Malmesbury's own *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* (discussed in more detail below). William probably wrote the *Gesta pontificum* a few years before the *Vita Wulfstani*.[25] In the *Gesta pontificum*'s account of St Wulfstan, William drew extensively upon Coleman's Old English biography of the saint.[26] But William did not mention the 1066 rebellion of the Northumbrians in either the *Gesta pontificum*, or in his general history of England, the *Gesta regum* (written before the *Gesta pontificum* and the *Vita Wulfstani*). Again, the simplest explanation is that the story had not yet been invented when William wrote these works.

---

[21] Pauline Stafford, 'Archbishop Ealdred and the D Chronicle', in *Normandy and Its Neighbours, 900-1250: Essays for David Bates*, ed. David Crouch and Kathleen Thompson (Turnhout, 2011), 135-56, p. 135.

[22] *ASC D*, p. 79, *s.a.* 1066: 'On þissum geare com Harold cyng of Eoforwic to Westmynstre to þam Eastran þe wæron æfter þam middanwintre þe se cyng forðferde'.

[23] *JW*, vol. 2, p. 600, *s.a.* 1066.

[24] *JW*, vol. 2, pp. 588-92, *s.a.* 1062,

[25] William of Malmesbury, *Lives of Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, pp. xiv-xv.

[26] *GP*, vol. 2 (commentary), p. 192.

Nothing can really be proven *ex silentio*. It is easy to find explanations for the absence of the 1066 uprising from all of these sources. But it is much simpler to assume that William of Malmesbury simply invented the episode, or at least Wulfstan's role therein. Similarly, the intervention of Anselm and Gundulf on behalf of Henry I in 1101 looks doubtful. The *Vitae*'s description of these events probably has more to do with the ideals of episcopal power (and of politically dominant holy men) discussed in Chapter 1 than with the political history of Anglo-Norman England.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

The second of our spiritual authority motifs concerns the saintly bishop's power on a local rather than on a national level, in defence of the interests of his church rather than of his king. As Chapter 4 will show, local power in Anglo-Norman England was often wielded through litigation; it consisted to a large extent of an individual's ability to obtain favourable judgements in a court of law. According to Eadmer and to William of Malmesbury (the *Vita Gundulfi* does not contain any lawsuits), this was another context in which saints could use their sanctity to fulfil their political goals.

Once again, the motif seems to have originated with Eadmer and been borrowed by William of Malmesbury. According to Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, when St Anselm was abbot of Bec in Normandy (1078-93), he was always scrupulously honest in his legal dealings, never allowing his underlings to defraud others. In court cases, while his opponents dreamt up ways of tricking him, Anselm preferred to discuss scripture. When his pious discourse found no listeners, Anselm, in the purity of his heart, would go to sleep. But this somnolence did Anselm no harm. When woken up he was able to uncover and rip apart his enemies' machinations as if he had been attentively following the proceedings: 'caritas enim quae non emulatur, quae non agit perperam, quae non quaerit quae

sua sunt, in eo vigebat, per quam quae videnda erant veritate monstrante extemplo perspiciebat.'[27]

Anselm's legal conduct as archbishop of Canterbury was similar. In his *Historia novorum*, Eadmer described how William II put Anselm on trial at the council of Rockingham in 1095. At one point during the council, Anselm, trusting only in his heart's innocence and God's mercy, dozed off. Meanwhile his opponents concocted devious plans against him. But when Anselm woke up, he was able to demolish his enemies' arguments as if they had been nothing more than spider's webs.[28]

This is another clear example of a saint whose sanctity helped him to further his political ends. Here, Anselm's power came not from the respect in which he was held as a saint, but from a kind of divine inspiration. But as before, this saintly power was paradoxical. Anselm's success at law came from his disregard for the matter at hand, and from his elevation of justice over his own interests. And, as if to make it clear just where Anselm's success originated, Eadmer emphasised his lack of rhetorical skill. We are told that at Rockingham Anselm at first spoke so tepidly and quietly (*tepide et silenter*) that his opponents thought him bereft of all human prudence.[29]

That an aging prelate fell asleep at inopportune moments is entirely believable.[30] That this gave him an edge in a legal context is less so. But since Eadmer was the only writer to describe Anselm's legal conduct, this is all that can be said. However, William of Malmesbury's very similar claims about St Wulfstan can be checked against other sources – and disproved.

Wulfstan was apparently so disgusted by secular business that he slept at legal hearings, although anyone foolish enough to speak against him soon found that Wulfstan was 'not of blunted knowledge' (*non obtunsae scientiae*) in responding. [31] This information is in the *Gesta pontificum* but not the *Vita*

---

[27] *VA*, pp. 45-6. 'for the charity which does not envy, which does not act wickedly, which does not seek what is its own, was alive in him, through which, with the truth showing the way, he immediately saw what was to be seen.'

[28] *HN*, p. 58.

[29] *HN*, p. 62.

[30] *Cf. VW*, iii.21.4: St Wulfstan once fell suddenly asleep while in chapter with his monks, who thought that he had died.

[31] *GP*, iv.140.3.

Wulfstani. The extreme similarity to Eadmer's description of Anselm at Bec suggests that this is another literary borrowing, used by William to flesh out the *Gesta pontificum*, and forgotten by the time he translated Coleman's Old English *Life*. But it is possible that William was told this by the monks when he visited Worcester. Whether the monks accurately remembered their deceased bishop, or whether this was simply a pious rumour, is not clear.

More can be said about William of Malmesbury's description of a hearing at a royal court at Petherton early in the reign of William the Conqueror. Wulfstan's opponent was Archbishop Thomas of York, who claimed that Worcester was part of his archdiocese; Thomas also unjustly held twelve of Wulfstan's villages. Apparently, while Thomas stated his case 'with a great sharpness of senses, with a great river of words',[32] Wulfstan fell asleep. When he was woken up, Wulfstan was more interested in psalms, prayer and singing the appropriate monastic hour (nones) than in preparing his arguments. He trusted in Jesus and his saintly predecessors, Dunstan and Oswald, whose biographies he clasped, and whom he claimed to see encouraging him. When William the Conqueror ordered Wulfstan to state his case, Wulfstan supplied neither witnesses nor evidence but a scriptural allusion: 'consilium meum in uobis est … *cor regis in manu Dei*' (Prov. 21:1).[33] This ostentatious piety so impressed the king that he quashed Thomas' claim to the villages and to ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Worcester. Wulfstan was also appointed as overseer of the then vacant diocese of Chester (at that date the seat of the diocese was actually Lichfield).[34]

Such pious antics are – to a secular observer – more believable than Eadmer's claim that Anselm won court cases by divine revelation. St Wulfstan appears to have known that he could not compete in conventional terms with the well connected and cunning Archbishop Thomas; so he strategically exploited his religious capital. William the Conqueror was at least conventionally religious; and it is easy to see how he might have responded favourably to Wulfstan's public display of himself as a holy man, a man incapable of guile in legal matters, seeking only justice and – as a good bishop should be – ferociously loyal to his

---

[32] 'multo sensuum acumine, multo uerborum flumine'
[33] 'my counsel is in you … the heart of the king is in the hand of God'
[34] *VW*, ii.1.1-8. *Cf. GP*, iv.143.1-3; *GR*, iii.303.1-2.

ruler. Once again, a saintly bishop appears to have reaped political benefits from his sanctity. But the truth is more prosaic.

Two other sources record the hearing at Petherton. John of Worcester attributed Wulfstan's success to the just judgement of God, but also to the *scripta euidentissima* (presumably charters) with which Wulfstan backed up his claims.[35] And, while William of Malmesbury claimed that Wulfstan was 'almost alone' (*pene solus*) against the powerful and well connected Archbishop Thomas (only Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury favoured him), according to the early-twelfth-century biography of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham (1058-1078), Wulfstan was helped by the powerful Æthelwig, who gave him money with which to fight the case.[36] Both of these sources are to be preferred to the *Vita Wulfstani*. As Ann Williams has argued, there is unlikely to be much truth in William of Malmesbury's account of the Petherton hearing.[37] And it seems likely that, here too, William's portrayal of St Wulfstan owed something to the model provided by Eadmer.

***

The third and last of our motifs also concerns a bishop's power to further the material interests of his church. Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan were apparently able, through their holiness, to win the friendship and esteem of kings and nobles, to attract gifts from them, and thereby to increase their churches' material wealth. Here the bishops' spiritual authority, and the power stemming therefrom, was more passive than elsewhere. They did not consciously act or dictate the actions of others. Any conscious attempt to elicit donations would probably have been decidedly unsaintly. Nevertheless, even this passive holiness allowed the saintly bishops to fulfil their political (in the broad sense) duty of stewardship of their churches' lands – if, that is, the *Vitae* can be trusted.

---

[35] *JW*, vol. 3, p. 16, *s.a.* 1070.

[36] *HAE*, c. 157. R.R. Darlington demonstrated the early origin of this section of the Evesham chronicle: 'Æthelwig, Abbot of Evesham', in *EHR* 48 (1933), 1-22, 177-98, at pp. 1-3.

[37] Ann Williams, 'The Cunning of the Dove: Wulfstan and the Politics of Accomodation', in *Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 27-39, pp. 26-9.

Eadmer, chronologically the first of our three authors, and – possibly – a model for the *Vita Gundulfi* and *Vita Wulfstani*, is a good place to start. According to Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*, when St Anselm was abbot of Bec, the fame of his sanctity spread through France, Flanders and even England, so that:

> *Exciti sunt quaque gentium multi nobiles, prudentes clerici, strenui milites, atque ad eum confluxere, seque et sua in ipsum monasterium Dei servitio tradidere. Crescit monasterium intus et extra. Intus in sancta religione, extra in multimoda possessione.*[38]

Anselm's holiness also won him the goodwill of William the Conqueror. The king, who to all others was rigid and formidable, was well disposed and affable (*inclinus et affabilis*) to Anselm. When Anselm was present the king became, to everyone's surprise, virtually another person.[39]

Eadmer did not say anything similar about Anselm's time as archbishop of Canterbury, or his relationship with William II or Henry I. Probably, given Anselm's turbulent career in England, the material was too infertile even for exaggeration. It is also worth noting that the abbey of Bec actually does seem to have prospered during Anselm's time there,[40] although Anselm's reputation as a teacher of theology and the wildly popular school he ran might have been as important as his sanctity in this. But the similar claims which William of Malmesbury made about St Wulfstan as bishop of Worcester are demonstrably false.

William claimed that, although St Wulfstan had been friends with the defeated King Harold II, William the Conqueror loved and honoured him, afflicting him with no inconvenience (*incommodum*). Wulfstan consequently recovered many of the lost possessions of the church of Worcester – all thanks to his holiness: 'Sic ei regis fauebat dignatio, sic sanctitas rerum dominos ad se

---

[38] *VA*, pp. 39-40. See also pp. 41, 57. 'Everywhere nobles, prudent clerics and brave soldiers were stirred up, and flowed to him, offering themselves and their goods to the service of God in the same monastery. The monastery grew both internally and externally: internally in holy religion, externally in manifold possessions.'

[39] *VA*, p. 56. See also *HN*, pp. 12, 23.

[40] Sally Vaughn, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034-1136* (Woodbridge, 1981), pp. 36, 39-40; Marjorie Chibnall (as Marjorie Morgan), *The English Lands of the Abbey of Bec* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 10-2.

diligendum inuitabat, sic religio aliis timendos ad sui reuerentiam inclinat.'[41] However, as Chapter 4 of this thesis will show, Wulfstan actually lost land after the Norman Conquest, sometimes to officials of William the Conqueror acting with royal support. When the king gave land to Wulfstan, it was generally because Wulfstan had bought it from him.

Similarly, in the *Vita Gundulfi* we read that, although William II was in general burdensome and unfriendly (*onerosus et minus amabilis*), he treated Gundulf with respect. Hearing that Gundulf's life was proved in the study of supernal devotion, William venerated him above his other bishops and spared him from his general, and oppressive, taxation. In addition, he augmented Gundulf's bishopric with new possessions.[42] Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury also loved Gundulf for his sanctity. He never let Gundulf leave him empty-handed. And so, because of Gundulf's holiness, the church of Rochester was enriched, 'now by the gifts of that archbishop, now by the many offerings of others'.[43] Gundulf's time as bishop was undeniably a prosperous one for Rochester. But as Marylou Ruud has shown, the author of the *Vita Gundulfi* significantly overstated the generosity, and possibly the affection, of the kings of England towards the bishop. Gundulf's ability to enrich his church may primarily have been due to his worldly, secular abilities, and the building projects which he completed on behalf of the kings of England.[44]

Once again, the authors of the contemporary *Vitae* attributed the political (in a broad sense) successes of their subjects to their sanctity. And once again, their claims seem mostly to be false. As Chapter 4 of this thesis will show, the bishops who accumulated wealth after the Norman Conquest in England were not the saints, but the royal servants, the administrators and the exploitative opportunists. Similarly, Emma Cownie's study of monastic patronage in Anglo-Norman England shows that donations from the king and laity were indeed an important source of wealth for religious houses; but also that the abbots who benefited most from royal and aristocratic generosity were not those who were

---

[41] *VW*, ii.1.1-2. For the respect in which the laity held Wulfstan, see i.2.1-2, i.5.1, i.7.2-3, iii.20.2-3. 'Thus the king's esteem favoured him, thus sanctity invited the lords of affairs to cherish itself, thus religion inclined to its reverence those who were to be feared by others.'
[42] *VG*, cc. 26-7.
[43] *VG*, cc. 24-5. 'tum praecipue ipsius archipresulis donis tum et aliorum oblationibus multis'
[44] Ruud, 'Monks in the World', pp. 251-2.

most pious, but those who had something concrete (*i.e.* secular) to offer in return. Abbot Baldwin of St Edmund's, for example, profited from his medical skills, while William II's policy of enriching the monastery of Gloucester sprang from his desire to create a powerful royal dependency on the Welsh marches.[45]

It is hard to say whether it was from Eadmer that William of Malmesbury and the author of the *Vita Gundulfi* got this idea of the holy man who enriched his church by attracting pious oblations. The theme was a common one in Anglo-Norman England; and not only bishops could be described in this way (we have seen this already in Eadmer's account of Anselm's time as abbot of Bec). In his *Vita* of Herluin, the first abbot of Bec in Normandy (*BHL*, 3836), Abbot Gilbert Crispin of Westminster (*c.* 1085-1117/8) claimed that when the future archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury became a monk at Bec, he devoted himself to a life of contemplative obscurity. But this pious renunciation of the world made Lanfranc famous: 'Accurrunt clerici, ducum filii, nominatissimi scholarum Latinitatis magistri; laici potentes, alta nobilitate uiri multi pro ipsius amore multas eidem ecclesie terras contulere.'[46] Bec was thus enriched by Lanfranc's sanctity, as it would later be enriched by the holiness of Abbot Anselm.

Another example is the short *Life* of Wulfstan in the late-eleventh-century cartulary of Worcester cathedral priory (*BHL*, 8755), essentially a list of Wulfstan's territorial acquisitions in rhymed Latin prose, and an unrhymed version in Old English. The Latin (but, interestingly, not the Old English) version of this *Life* directly attributes these acquisitions to Wulfstan's sanctity.[47] The same link between piety and territorial acquisitions is apparent in the biography of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham examined later on in this chapter. These last two texts have a special significance. Both were almost certainly written before Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi* and *Historia novorum*, and so serve as a reminder that the

---

[45] Emma Cownie, *Religious Patronage in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135* (Woodbridge, 1998).

[46] Gilbert Crispin, *Vita Herluini*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia and G.R. Evans in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster* (London, 1986), 183-212, cc. 61-2. 'Clerics, the sons of dukes and the most famous masters of the schools of Latinity flocked thither. Powerful laymen and many men of high nobility offered many lands to the church for his [Lanfranc's] love.'

[47] *HC*, pp. 405-7: 'Ipse etiam servus Dei Wlstanus in hac, qua manemus, heremo adhuc manens, omnibus omnia fiebat, ut omnis Christo lucrari posset, ideoque, quicunque nomen eius vel facta audiebat, illum summopere diligebat. A Willelmo quoque rege ceteris amplius amabatur, ceteris amplius maioris et minoris glorie viris pro vite sue merito honorabatur. Cui poscenti dedit...' and there follows a list of the king's gifts to Worcester.

spiritual authority model of episcopal power did not begin with St Anselm's biographer (really, such a reminder is unnecessary: much of the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1, which showed bishops acting in a very similar way to Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan in their *Vitae*, was written well before 1100).[48]

<center>***</center>

We have seen three of the ways in which the subjects of three episcopal *Vitae* from Anglo-Norman England used their sanctity to achieve political, or worldly, ends: by deploying their moral authority against rebellion; by pious display in the courtroom; and by attracting royal or noble protection and largesse. Other examples of politically effective sanctity can be given from these *Vitae*. St Wulfstan's fame as a saint apparently allowed him to stamp out the Bristol slave trade, which even William the Conqueror could not stop.[49] St Gundulf was able to act as a mediator at the siege of Rochester in 1088 because his piety freed him from all suspicion of underhand dealing.[50] Once again we see saintly bishops accomplishing things impossible to their secular peers – even to the king. And all three of our authors emphasised their subjects' prophetic abilities.[51] This gave them an implicit influence over, or at least complicity in, events which in reality were entirely beyond their control. St Wulfstan could not prevent the Norman Conquest, but he could and did predict it (if the English would not give up their effeminate hairstyles).[52] St Anselm repeatedly warned that he would not be able to function as archbishop of Canterbury, making Anselm's failure there not his own fault, but that of those who forced him to accept the archbishopric.[53]

---

[48] See also the late tenth-century Wulfstan, *Life of Æthelwold*, c. 40: 'Exinde superna pietas sancto pontifici tantam contulit gratiam ut sublimes illi saecularium potestatum principes, duces, tyranni atque iudices et omnes qui ei hactenus contrarii et in uia Dei resistere uidebantur subito uelut oues ex lupis efficerentur et eum miro affectu uenerarentur, eiusque genibus colla summittentes ac dexteram illius humiliter exosculantes orationibus se uiri Dei in omnibus commendarent.'

[49] *VW*, ii.20.1. *Cf. GR*, iii.269.2.

[50] *VG*, c. 28.

[51] In addition to the examples cited below, see *VG*, cc. 38, 45, 48; *VW*, ii.2.1, ii.3.1, iii.21.4.

[52] *VW*, i.16.4.

[53] *HN*, pp. 36-7, 41-2, 67, 121; *VA*, pp. 83-4.

It should by now be clear that the authors of the contemporary *Vitae* consistently showed their subjects exercising spiritual authority in a political context. It should also be clear that in this respect the contemporary *Vitae* almost certainly do not reflect the reality of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. When they can be checked against other sources, their stories of saintly bishops exercising a special power inevitably appear to be just that – stories. And it is hardly likely that the *Vitae* were somehow closer to reality in the many cases where they are the only available source.

We have no way of knowing whether Eadmer, William of Malmesbury and the author of the *Vita Gundulfi* were deliberately attempting to mislead their readers, whether they thought that their distortions and exaggerations served a higher truth (*i.e.* that which should have been true), or whether they simply repeated stories which they had heard at second or third hand, and which had taken on a life of their own in the process of oral transmission. It is worth noting that – unsurprisingly – William Malmesbury, writing some thirty years after St Wulfstan's death (although with Coleman as intermediary), seems to have inflated and borrowed the most, while Eadmer, an eyewitness who actually knew St Anselm, is the most trustworthy of our authors. The *Vita Gundulfi*, written by a member of Gundulf's cathedral community some 15 years after his death, is somewhere between the two.

But even Eadmer can be shown to have misrepresented – consciously or unconsciously – the events which he saw and experienced with St Anselm. Eadmer's description of Anselm's trial at the 1095 council of Rockingham is a good example. Historical analysis of this episode has sometimes been confined to a paraphrase of Eadmer's *Historia novorum*.[54] But it is obvious from the *Historia novorum* itself that Eadmer failed to mention that, at the end of the council, Anselm, seeking to be reconciled with the king, promised to observe and defend all of the king's *usus ac leges*.[55] These 'uses and laws' seem to have confirmed William II as the absolute head of the English church, and to have restricted Anselm's (or any other bishop's) right of appeal to Rome against the English

---

[54] *E.g.* Frank Barlow, *William Rufus* (rev. edn.: London, 2000), pp. 339-42; Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec*, pp. 177-86.

[55] *HN*, pp. 83-4. According to Hugh de Flavigny, *Chronicon*, ed. G.H. Pertz in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores 8* (Hanover, 1848), 280-503, p. 475, Anselm had sworn *fidelitas* to St Peter and the pope, 'salva fidelitate domini sui regis'.

king.[56] These were essentially the issues which were discussed at Rockingham. By omitting this oath (maybe even capitulation), Eadmer transformed the council of Rockingham into a victory rather than a defeat for Anselm.

Eadmer's description of the beginning of the council is also of interest:

Fit itaque conventus omnium Dominico die in ecclesia quae est in ipso castro sita ab hora prima, rege et suis secretius in Anselmum consilia sua studiose texentibus. Anselmus autem, episcopis, abbatibus, et principibus ad se a regio secreto vocatis, eos et assistentem monachorum, clericorum, laicorum numerosam multitudinem hac voce alloquitur...[57]

According to Eadmer, the king did not summon the council; it 'was made'. And proceedings were initiated by Anselm. Anselm summoned the attendees to him, and he was the first to speak. But in reality the council must have met at the king's command. And it is clear from the continuation of Eadmer's text that the assembled nobles and bishops had actually gone first to the king to discuss publicly the case, and only after that to Anselm. Eadmer turned this initial hearing into a furtive conclave ('secretius', 'a regio secreto').

In all this, Eadmer did not write anything untrue. But he created an entirely false impression that Anselm was more in control of events, and that he was more powerful, than he was in reality. In Chapter 1 it was shown that writers in Anglo-Norman England routinely rewrote hagiographical texts in such a way as to give their saintly protagonists (mostly bishops) more control over events. In his *Historia novorum*, Eadmer applied a similar distortion in reporting the events which he himself had witnessed.

***

---

[56] Eadmer does not give the exact terms of the oath, but see *HN*, p. 84: 'Sed hanc pollicationem, hanc fidem, en tu patenter egrederis, dum Romam, non expectata licentia ejus, te iturum minaris.'
[57] *HN*, pp. 53-4. 'An assembly of everyone was made from the first hour on Sunday in the church which is in the castle itself, with the king and his men a little apart studiously weaving their plans against Anselm. Anselm, however, having called the bishops, abbots and princes to himself from

This analysis of the contemporary *Vitae* has obvious epistemological implications for our understanding of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. The conclusion to this chapter will discuss these implications. Now, however, it is necessary to examine the appearance of the spiritual authority model of episcopal (or rather ecclesiastical) power in three other sources from Anglo-Norman England: the chronicle of John of Worcester; William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*; and the short, near-contemporary, biography of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham embedded in the thirteenth-century Evesham chronicle. These three texts are a significant sample: John of Worcester represents a 'typical', and, so it is thought, rather dull, monastic chronicler from our period; the *Gesta pontificum* provides most of our narrative evidence for the episcopate of Anglo-Norman England; and the biography of Æthelwig demonstrates that monastic writers also showed abbots drawing political benefits from their piety, even abbots who had very little claim to sanctity (this was the case with Æthelwig). It was not always necessary to be a saint to exercise saintly power.

We begin with John of Worcester and an incident involving St Wulfstan which, like Wulfstan's suppression of the Northumbrian rebellion in 1066, has become part of the accepted narrative of English history.[58] John wrote that in 1088 the city of Worcester was threatened by a rebel army led by Bernard de Neufmarché, Roger de Lacy and Ralph Mortimer. Wulfstan, facing this threat, prepared himself to stand manfully for his *populus* and *civitas* like another Moses. As the garrison of Worcester and Wulfstan's own men went to face the enemy, Wulfstan blessed them, promising that neither sword nor adversary would harm them this day. And when Wulfstan heard that the rebels had been pillaging his church's lands, he launched a dire malediction against the impious plunderers, the effects of which were immediate and dramatic. The rebels were struck blind and paralysed, and butchered or captured by the episcopal and royal soldiers. The loyalists returned joyfully to Worcester, thanking Wulfstan for this (for them) bloodless victory.[59] Once again, sanctity had achieved what worldly power had not. This miracle almost makes Wulfstan into a kind of wizard.

---

the king's private chamber, addressed them and the present multitude of monks, clerics and laymen in the following manner...'

[58] Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 82. Mason, *Wulfstan*, pp. 142-5, tries to reconcile John of Worcester's story with a rationalistic explanation for the royalist victory.

[59] *JW*, vol. 3, pp. 54-6, *s.a.* 1088.

Whether it actually happened is another matter. Other sources seem to confirm the story, at least in part, but they come from the 1120s and 1130s.[60] Our (probably) earliest source, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, says that the the victory came '7 þurh Godes mildheortnisse 7 þurh þæs biscopas gearnunga', that is, by Wulfstan's encouragement rather than his excommunication.[61] Moreover, while the story appears in William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*, it is absent from the *Vita Wulfstani*. This may be because Coleman, the author of the original, Old English, version of Wulfstan's biography, was unwilling to show Wulfstan acting on behalf of the Norman regime;[62] or because the miracle was too 'secular' for inclusion in the *Vita Wulfstani* (not that it is very secular in John of Worcester's version). But a simpler explanation is that when Coleman wrote the original *Life* of Wulfstan this miracle had not yet been invented, and that, when William came to translate Coleman's work, he found no obvious place for it in his predecessor's narrative framework.

Again, we have an unprovable argument *ex silentio*. But the point is that even John of Worcester, that stolid and unimaginative translator of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* whose 'resolute if blinkered interest in the dates of men's deaths and the succession to ecclesiastical offices' left little room for 'a general view of the causes or purposes of human experience', was capable of portraying saintly bishops in much the same way as contemporary hagiography or episcopal *Vitae*.[63] John's famous story of Henry I's nightmare involving the three orders of society also deserves mention here.[64] John emphasised the king's weakness and vulnerability, while giving the bishops and abbots, who appeared to the king at the culmination of his dream, the most important place. While John did not specify what the peasants and knights seen by the king wanted from him, he made it clear that the churchmen were angry at the king's financial exploitation of the English

---

[60] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, vii.1; *GR*, iv.306.4. Orderic Vitalis implied that Wulfstan's anathema and prohibition were ineffective against the rebels: *OV*, vol. 4, p. 124.

[61] *ASC E*, p. 99, *s.a.* 1087: 'Ðas þing geseonde, se arwurða biscop Wlstan. wearð swiðe gedrefed on his mode, forðig him wæs betæht þe castel to healdene; þeahhweðer his hiredmen ferdon ut mid feawe mannan of þam castele 7 þurh Godes mildheortnisse 7 þurh þæs biscopes geearnunga ofslogon 7 gelæhton fif hundred manna 7 þa oðre ealle aflymdon.'

[62] But *cf*. Hugh M. Thomas, *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation, and Identity, 1066-c. 1220* (Oxford, 2003), p. 258.

[63] Martin Brett, 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. R.H.C Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), 101-26, pp. 124-5.

[64] *JW*, vol. 3, pp. 198-202, *s.a.* 1131.

church. When we are told that Henry I, having woken, resolved to redeem his sins by alms, this appears to be a direct capitulation to the ecclesiastics' demands. The story is reminiscent of some of the more radical hagiography discussed in Chapter 1, such as Osbern's *Vita Alfegi* with its emphasis on the inferiority of King Æthelred to the saintly Archbishop Ælphege of Canterbury.[65] The extent to which it reflects John of Worcester's own values (or those of his sources) is not clear. That Henry I had a nightmare is not implausible; but we have no way of knowing whether the king himself dreamed the literary overturning of royal power presented by John of Worcester.

William of Malmesbury was a far more literary author than John of Worcester. He is also far more important for our understanding of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England, thanks to his *Gesta pontificum Anglorum*. In the *Gesta pontificum*, William traced the history of the bishops of the English church from the conversion to his own day, and in so doing provided pen portraits of almost all of England's bishops from our period, frequently the only narrative evidence we have. William sometimes described these bishops achieving their political ends through spiritual authority. The two best examples are Bishop Ralph Luffa of Chichester (1091-1123) and Archbishop Ealdred of York (1061-9).

Apparently, Ralph Luffa's strength of spirit (*animi efficacia*) meant that he fearlessly stood up to William II on behalf of the persecuted Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. Later on, Ralph, with his religious contumacy, was the only one of the English bishops to resist Henry I's exorbitant taxation of priests in England. Ralph laid an interdict on his diocese in protest, an act of defiance which so impressed Henry I that he remitted the tax for Ralph (he also took pity on Ralph's small and impoverished diocese). So Ralph's religion, courage and innocence (*religio*, *animositas*, *innocentia*) meant that a king who took away from others gave to him. When the church of Chichester burnt down, Henry I restored it.[66] The parallel between Ralph Luffa in the *Gesta pontificum* and Gundulf in the *Vita Gundulfi* (and, more distantly, Eadmer and Wulfstan in their *Vitae*) should not go

---

[65] See also the accounts of the Danish king Swein's death in Hermann the Archdeacon, *De miraculis sancti Eadmundi* (*BHL*, 2395), ed. Tom Licence in *Hermann the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin: Miracles of St Edmund* (Oxford, 2014), forthcoming, cc. 5-8, and *JW*, vol. 2, p. 476 *s.a.* 1014. Compare especially *JW*, vol. 3, p. 200, *s.a.* 1131: 'Cessa, rex, cessa neminem persequi, ad lectum redi...' with Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 6: 'Cessa cessa tributum exigere...'

unnoticed. Once again, we have a pious bishop whose religious virtues gave him a special, and politically advantageous, relationship with the English king.

Archbishop Ealdred of York also objected to royal taxation, at least according to the *Gesta pontificum*. A new and unbearable tribute (*importabilis tributi pensum*) imposed by William the Conqueror prompted Ealdred to write to the king in protest. When the king insolently dismissed Ealdred's complaints, Ealdred responded by formally cursing him and all of his progeny, claiming that having given him his benediction (by performing his coronation), he could just as easily give him his malediction. Hearing of this curse, the king sent messengers to conciliate the archbishop. But Ealdred died before they reached him.[67] On another occasion Ealdred cursed Sheriff Urse d'Abitot of Worcester for defiling the cemetery of Worcester cathedral by building a castle there. Ealdred also prophesied that Urse's progeny would not long hold the land he had seized from St Mary and the church of Worcester. This prophecy eventually came true: when Urse's son Roger was dispossessed by Henry I, all Urse's land passed out of his (male) bloodline.[68]

None of this is implausible. William of Malmesbury's stories of Ealdred are hardly incredible, and it is tempting to believe that Ealdred was in the habit of indiscriminately excommunicating his political enemies. Historians have generally accepted the stories as truthful.[69] Similarly, there is no reason why Ralph Luffa should not have stood up to Henry I. But the *Gesta pontificum* is a notoriously unreliable source. Colin Flight has shown that William of Malmesbury's account of Bishop Ernulf of Rochester (1114-24) is highly inaccurate, even though William was in a position to know the truth.[70] James Campbell noted that William's attitude to the saints and miracles of his own period was far more credulous and accepting than his treatment of the Anglo-

---

[66] *GP*, ii.96.4-7.

[67] *GP*, iii.115.19-20.

[68] *GP*, iii.115.21-22. But the land then passed to Urse's daughters and their husbands Roger de Marmion and Walter de Beauchamp, so Ealdred's prophecy was not strictly accurate: K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, *Domesday People: A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in English Documents 1066-1166. I. Domesday Book* (Woodbridge, 1999), p. 439.

[69] Barlow, *English Church, 1000-1066*, pp. 88-9; Mason, *Wulfstan*, pp. 122-3.

[70] Flight, *Bishops and Monks*, pp. 52-3: 'Such errors concerning such recent events – events which happened within the last ten years – betray William's weakness for twisting the facts to make them fit some pattern which seemed right to him.'

Saxon past.[71] William's treatment of his written sources is also significant, for there it is possible to see just how much he exaggerated and harmonised the facts to fit his own ideas.

In the *Gesta pontificum*'s account of St Wulfstan, William of Malmesbury appears to have conflated two stories from the *Vita Wulfstani* in which Wulfstan's miraculous powers allow him to settle bitter and long-running feuds (it will be remembered that William had not yet translated the *Vita Wulfstani* into Latin when he wrote the *Gesta pontificum*, and that he was probably working from Coleman's Old English *Life* of the saint). It appears that William took features of two separate episodes and ran them together in order to create an event which never happened, but which seemed right to him.[72] Other details about Wulfstan in the *Gesta pontificum* but not in the *Vita Wulfstani* also appear to be embroideries. The claim (already mentioned) that Wulfstan regularly fell asleep during legal hearings (very similar to what Eadmer said about Anselm in the *Vita Anselmi*) is a good example.[73] And while in the *Vita Wulfstani* William of Malmesbury claimed that at the court at Petherton St Wulfstan was helped only by Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury, in the *Gesta pontificum* William claimed that even Lanfranc was against Wulfstan. The archbishop apparently wanted to depose Wulfstan for illiteracy.[74] This made Wulfstan's surprise victory over Archbishop Thomas even more dramatic. But an author who contradicts himself so blatantly hardly inspires confidence.

Still, William did have informants at Worcester who could have supplied him with this additional information. William's use of Eadmer's work is more significant. Eadmer claimed in his *Historia novorum* that Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury had once won a lawsuit against Odo of Bayeux after being encouraged by a vision of St Dunstan.[75] William generalised from this to claim that St Dunstan helped Lanfranc every time (*quotiescumque*) he clashed with Odo.[76] In a later section of the *Gesta pontificum*, based on Eadmer's work, William wrote that

---

[71] James Campbell, 'Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past', in James Campbell, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), 209-28, p. 222.
[72] *GP*, iv.142.1-3; *VW*, ii.15.1-6, ii.22.1-3.
[73] *GP*, iv.140.3.
[74] *GP*, iv.143.1-3. In *GR*, iii.303.1-2, William mentioned the charge of illiteracy, but not that Lanfranc had brought it.
[75] *HN*, pp. 17-8.
[76] *GP*, i.43.6-7.

when Anselm, then abbot of Bec, came to England in 1093, he went to the royal court:

> *Nec molles, ut alii, rimatus aditus, statim ut uenit pro sanctitatis reuerentia in interiora admissus est. Data secreti copia, cuncta quibus regem accusabat fama incunctanter aperuit, necessitates quoque suas modeste allegans. Ille, omnia negotia Beccensis aecclesiae ad arbitrium rectoris componens, ceterarum rerum amaritudinem cachinno dissoluit famae licentiae non se posse obuiare dictitans, ceterum sanctum uirum non debere illa credere.*[77]

Anselm's sanctity allowed him a more direct access to the king (William II) than others, as well as allowing him to defend the interests of his church (since William granted him everything he wanted). It also disposed William II to listen to, although not to act on, a general admonition from Anselm, which put him in a subordinate position to the saint. William was obliged to explain himself to Anselm, and not *vice versa*. His response was flippant, but he did not question Anselm's right to criticise him. Here we have an excellent example of a saint (though not yet a bishop) whose religious virtues allowed him to act effectively in the world.

This story is also in Eadmer's *Vita Anselmi*,[78] which must have been William of Malmesbury's source. In its essentials Eadmer's version is the same as William's. Anselm was received with great respect by the king; and he admonished the king 'de iis quae fama de eo ferebat'.[79] But there are differences. Firstly, Eadmer did not give William II's response to this admonition; William of Malmesbury did. Probably William of Malmesbury invented the king's jocular answer to Anselm; it is difficult to see how he could have known more than was written by Eadmer. Secondly, and more importantly, while William claimed that the king settled all of the business of Bec as Anselm desired, Eadmer claimed the

---

[77] *GP*, i.48.1. 'And not hewing out, as others, a soft entry, as soon as he came he was admitted – out of reverence for his sanctity – to the king's inner chambers. In private, he immediately revealed all of those things of which rumour was then accusing the king. He also humbly mentioned his own necessities. The king, settling all the business of Bec as Anselm wanted, countered the bitterness of the other matters with laughter, saying that he could not oppose the fame of his licentiousness, but that a holy man should not believe such things.'

[78] The incident is not, however in the *Historia novorum*: *HN*, pp. 28-31.

[79] *VA*, pp. 63-4. 'concerning the things rumoured about him'

opposite. According to Eadmer, Anselm put aside the business of Bec in order to admonish the king, and: 'Finito colloquio; divisi ab invicem sunt, et de aecclesiae suae negotiis ea vice ab Anselmo nichil actum.'[80] Here William of Malmesbury contradicted his source; and he did so in such a manner as to increase the political effectiveness of the saintly prelate. Eadmer hinted that Anselm's admonition irritated William II (hence Anselm's failure to further Bec's interests). William of Malmesbury made the king react almost positively to this admonition (excusing himself; favouring the affairs of Anselm's church).

In light of all this, William of Malmesbury's unsupported word should not be accepted uncritically. The *Gesta pontificum* shows how stories of holy prelates acting politically with moral authority could come into being through gradual exaggeration and inflation: a kind of historiographical Chinese whispers.[81] One of William's own stories may later have been treated in a similar way. A mid-twelfth-century chronicle from York recounts a similar incident to the *Gesta pontificum*: Archbishop Ealdred of York reacted to William the Conqueror's exactions by threatening him with a malediction in place of the benediction he had given him at his coronation. But according to the York author, Ealdred was so angered by the oppression of his men by the king's sheriff in York that he stormed down to London to curse William the Conqueror in person. William was so terrified by this that he prostrated himself before Ealdred. He not only restored all of the seized goods to Ealdred but also gave him the offending sheriff to punish as he saw fit (we are not told what Ealdred did with him). From that day no potentate (*nullus potentium*) dared to injure or to insult Ealdred or his men.[82]

Even on its own, the story is hardly plausible. The existence of essentially the same incident in far more prosaic form in the earlier *Gesta pontificum* makes it even more suspicious. Nevertheless, the York account of Ealdred's surprisingly rapid trip to London and humiliation of the king is repeated unquestioningly by

---

[80] *VA*, p. 64. 'The discussion being finished, they separated from each other, and Anselm did nothing for the affairs of his church on that occasion.'

[81] For another example of this process, see Monika Otter, '1066: The Moment of Transition in Two Narratives of the Norman Conquest', in *Speculum* 74 (1999), 565-86, pp. 570-1.

[82] *Chronica pontificum ecclesiae Eboracensis*, ed. Raine in *Historians of the Church of York*, vol. 2, 312-87, pp. 350-3. The story was repeated later in the twelfth century by William of Newburgh, *History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. P.G. Walsh and M.J. Kennedy (Warminster, 1988), c. 1.

several modern historians.[83] Whether the York chronicler got the story directly from William of Malmesbury is not clear. It may have circulated orally, and grown significantly in the years separating William's *Gesta pontificum* from the composition of the York chronicle. In any case, it provides a good example of how stories could be transmuted by the process of (possibly oral) transmission. Other stories from the *Vitae* and chronicles probably underwent a similar transmutation before they were ever written down; it is rare that their progress can be traced through more than one source. All this serves to highlight the dangers of narrative evidence: most chroniclers recounted events at second, third, or even fourth hand.

These stories about Ealdred have a further point of interest. Ealdred was not a saint, and there is no evidence that anyone ever claimed that he was. As 'the closest to a "prince-bishop" that England could produce',[84] Ealdred presumably had other ways of dealing with impertinent sheriffs than spiritual threats. And if William the Conqueror considered it necessary to conciliate Ealdred, this was probably because the wealthy archbishop was dangerous in a conventional sense as a focus for English resistance to Norman rule, rather than out of respect for his curse. Yet William of Malmesbury chose to portray Ealdred's political activity in entirely religious terms. His Ealdred reached for spiritual, not secular, tools.

A similar phenomenon is apparent in the final text to be discussed in this chapter: the near-contemporary biography of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham included in the thirteenth-century Evesham chronicle. Like Ealdred, Æthelwig was not a saint; and like Ealdred, he was prodigiously powerful in conventional, secular, terms. Æthelwig's connections, wealth and legal acumen, as well as his position as virtual justiciar of the West Midlands under William the Conqueror, were undoubtedly what allowed him to increase his abbey's possessions by about

---

[83] Catherine Cubitt, 'Archbishop Dunstan: A Prophet in Politics', in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot, 2008), 145-66, p. 155; Michael Lapidge, 'Ealdred of York and MS. Cotton Vitellius E. XII', in Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900-1066* (London, 1993), 453-67, p. 453; Mark Philpott, 'The *De iniusta uexatione Willelmi episcopi primi* and Canon Law in Anglo-Norman Durham', in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994), 125-37, pp. 135-6.
[84] Barlow, *English Church, 1000-1066,* p. 86.

two thirds in his twenty years as abbot (1058-78).[85] But Æthelwig's biographer took care to portray Æthelwig's land-grab as a function of his piety.

Apparently, the Norman Conquest terrified the English nobility. Bishops and abbots hid from William the Conqueror's persecution and ferocity. The only exception was Æthelwig. 'Confiding in the Lord', Æthelwig went to the king and 'by the gift of God's grace' won his friendship.[86] He was therefore able not only to retain his church's possessions, but to add to them, at a time when other ecclesiastics suffered major losses.[87] So here we have a prelate like Ralph Luffa in the *Gesta pontificum*, whose pious fearlessness impressed the king and brought him material benefits. Only after this did the author mention Æthelwig's secular prudence (*secularis prudentia*), on account of which the king made him his local deputy.[88]

Later, having expounded at length Æthelwig's charity, the author drew a causal link between Æthelwig's care for the poor and his ability to enrich his church: 'Et quoniam erat tam diuitibus quam pauperibus erogator largissimus, dedit ei diuina clementia copiam rerum maximam in omnibus. Ornamenta quoque acquisiuit plurima, uidelicet, casulas, cappas, pallia, crucem magnam...'[89] Because Æthelwig was willing to give his wealth away, he became even wealthier – another example of the paradoxical nature of the saintly power discussed in this chapter.

But Æthelwig's biographer did not see anything wrong with Æthelwig's use of 'secular' techniques. At the end of the text, he listed the lands which Æthelwig had acquired 'most laboriously and by redemption with much money'.[90] Nor did he deny Æthelwig's secular prudence (although he relegated it to second place). There is a sense that Æthelwig's biographer was going through the motions in linking Æthelwig's political successes to his piety; that this was simply

---

[85] H.B. Clarke, 'The Early Surveys of Evesham Abbey: An Investigation into the Problem of Continuity in Anglo-Norman England' (PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham, 1977), p. 110; Darlington, 'Æthelwig', pp. 5-10.

[86] *HAE*, c. 155. 'confidens in Domino', 'Dei gratia donante'

[87] *HAE*, c. 156.

[88] *HAE*, c. 156.

[89] *HAE*, c. 164. 'And because he was a most generous dispenser of largesse to both rich and poor, the divine clemency gave him a plentiful abundance in all things. He also acquired many ornaments, namely chasubles, copes, palls, a large cross...'

[90] *HAE*, c. 166. 'laboriosissime maximaque pecunia redimendo'

what was expected in the portrayal of ecclesiastics. If this is so, it suggests that not only was the spiritual authority model of episcopal (in this case ecclesiastical) power an inaccurate reflection of the political reality of Anglo-Norman England, it was sometimes not even an ideal. Rather, it was a routine trope which penetrated even the most apparently prosaic of our narrative sources.

Æthelwig's biography brings up another important point. Æthelwig was not a bishop. But his biographer showed him acting in essentially the same way that Wulfstan, Gundulf and Anselm acted in their *Vitae*. And the episcopal *Vitae* (especially the *Vita Anselmi*) do not make much of a distinction between their subjects' conduct before and after their accession to the episcopate. St Anselm's relationship as abbot of Bec with William the Conqueror appears to have been similar to that of Gundulf as bishop of Rochester with William II. As in Chapter 1, it is hard to distinguish episcopal power from the power of holy men in general. A comparison with the contemporary *Vitae* of other types of saint from both England and Europe might be instructive in this respect. Saintly hermits, at least, appear often to have been shown exercising a similar spiritual authority to Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan.[91] And according to some texts, pious monks were often able to get away with harshly criticising the kings of England.[92] How much truth there was in these stories, whether the spiritual authority of these monks and hermits was quite the same as that of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England, and just how widespread, chronologically and geographically, this notion was – these are all questions for further research.

<div align="center">***</div>

So, according to the narrative evidence for Anglo-Norman England, the respect in which certain pious bishops (and abbots) were held gave them a disproportionate political influence; and their piety impressed kings into giving them preferential treatment. But it would be entirely misguided to take this

---

[91] Tom Licence, *Hermits and Recluses in English Society, 950-1200* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 51-2.

[92] *OV*, vol. 2, pp. 270-8, vol. 5, pp. 284-8; Adam of Eynsham, *Magna vita Sancti Hugonis. The Life of St Hugh of Lincoln*, ed. Decima L. Douie and David Hugh Farmer, 2 vols (Oxford, 1985), vol. 1, p. 66.

evidence and make a romanticised version of medieval politics out of it, in which kings bowed down to saints and religious concerns dictated political conduct in a manner almost inconceivable today. Whenever these stories of saintly bishops in politics can be checked against other sources, they appear to be either false or exaggerated. Occasionally it is possible to show how authors took stories and twisted them to make the saint's action yet more dramatic. It would clearly be wrong to accept these inflated stories as fact. And we can hardly assume that the chroniclers were telling the truth in those cases where they cannot be checked.

It is not simply that the chronicles and *Vitae* are sometimes inaccurate. This would hardly be a surprise, and in that case there would be nothing wrong with Frank Barlow's carefree approach of accepting their testimony as 'typical', and so representative of what could have happened, even if not true in the individual case – essentially, true on average.[93] The problem is that they are systematically biased in one direction. Monastic texts (as almost all of our sources are) present a skewed worldview in which saintly bishops possessed a political importance which they did not have in reality. And the problem is not only that some historians have been content to repeat the dubious statements of tendentious authors as unfiltered truth (Emma Mason and Sally Vaughn are extreme cases of this; other examples are given above).[94] Even more careful scholars have sometimes fallen victim to the subtle monastic bias of our sources. H.E.J. Cowdrey's biography of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (1070-89) is a good example.[95]

---

[93] Barlow, *English Church, 1000-1066*, p. vii: 'As for treatment, in order to give as much life as possible to a study which inevitably inclines to generalization and abstraction, I have included all the concrete illustrations that I could find. Some – perhaps many – of these may not be historically true. But I hope I have avoided anachronism, and would justify them as typical, and so both instructive and recreational.' However, Barlow did discuss the prejudices of the narrative evidence in his introduction, pp. 23-9.

[94] Mason, *Wulfstan*; *eadem*, 'Wulfstan of Worcester: Patriarch of the English?', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin, 2006), 114-26; Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec*; *eadem*, 'Henry I and the English Church'. In the latter article, Sally Vaughn's principal source is not Eadmer but (for some unexplained reason) William of Malmesbury's adaptation of Eadmer in the *Gesta pontificum*. William of Malmesbury's tendency to expand imaginatively on his sources leads Vaughn to a somewhat excessive view of Anselm's political importance. Catherine Cubitt is another notable example. She treats monastic sources from Anglo-Norman England as unproblematic narratives of tenth-century history: 'Archbishop Dunstan'; *eadem*, 'Bishops and Succession Crises in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', in *Patterns of Episcopal Power*, ed. Körntgen and Wassenhoven, 111-26.

[95] For all of the following, Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 186-8.

Lanfranc and William the Conqueror apparently 'maintained a harmony and collaboration that have few if any parallels in the history of medieval Europe'. There was, however, a split between 'spiritual and moral matters' where William was deferential, even submissive, to Lanfranc, and 'secular and political affairs', where William was the undisputed master. Thus Cowdrey. In reality the divide is in the source material.

When Cowdrey describes 'William's unique receptivity to Lanfranc's admonition in spiritual matters' and Lanfranc's role as 'a spiritual monitor of kings', he uses narrative sources: general statements by Eadmer, William of Malmesbury and William de Poitiers (admittedly not a monk); the somewhat dubious claims of William of Malmesbury and Orderic Vitalis that Lanfranc brought up the Conqueror's sons; and the well known but late story from the *Vita Lanfranci* of a blasphemous jester whom the king had whipped at Lanfranc's command. When, on the other hand, Cowdrey discusses the 'matters of this world' where 'the king's word and judgement must be deferred to', he turns to Lanfranc's letters, where we read, for example, of Lanfranc's refusal to intercede with the king for the unjustly treated monk Ulrich, for 'against the king's command I presume to ask nothing and order nothing'.

It is worth noting that this letter, like most of the other letters cited by Cowdrey, seems to concern ecclesiastical rather than secular business. The records of Lanfranc's church councils, which the king dominated, certainly do. Again, the real distinction is in the source material. The reader of Lanfranc's letters looks in vain for the bold prelate of the chronicles – probably because this latter never existed. If Lanfranc actually did exercise a restraining and corrective influence on William the Conqueror, then it is odd that no trace of this exists in the strictly contemporary evidence. The one letter in which Lanfranc does offer his advice on kingship is addressed to a group of Irish kings. Certainly, if the chroniclers' statements (which Cowdrey takes at face value) are removed, a very different picture of the relationship between Lanfranc and William the Conqueror emerges. It is possible that historians, under the influence of the exaggerated statements of monastic writers, have tended to attribute a strong, but general and undefined, influence to egregious prelates such as Lanfranc which they simply did

not have. Walter Fröhlich's analysis of the 'special relationship' between Anselm as abbot of Bec and William the Conqueror is another example of this tendency. [96]

***

A famous paper by Timothy Reuter took British medievalists to task for their anti-literary stance; for seeking 'to go below the veil of contemporary narrative and reach down to what really happened'; for rejecting unreliable narrative sources in favour of 'reliable' charters and records; and so for replacing 'contemporary consciousness and rationality' with their own. [97] Certainly, this chapter's conclusion that twelfth-century narrative sources are fundamentally untrustworthy is hardly unusual in a British context. Similar arguments have recently been made by Mary Frances Giandrea and Ann Williams with regard to late Anglo-Saxon England. [98] Colin Flight's rabidly sceptical discussion of the *Vita Gundulfi* is perhaps the most extreme example: 'Quite bluntly, we cannot trust a word it says, unless we have some corroborating evidence; and if we possess such evidence, the *Vita Gundulfi* is redundant.' [99]

However, this chapter has positive as well as negative conclusions. It is true that, given the inaccuracy and systematic bias of monastic narratives, the rest of this thesis will, in general, construct its picture of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England from other sources. Charters, letter collections, *Domesday Book*, memoranda, conciliar legislation – this evidence is as full as the chronicles and *Vitae* and arguably closer to contemporary consciousness and rationality than the writings of a few cloistered and poorly informed monks. Hagiography, too, is a surprisingly rich source. The miracle collections from this period, although obviously problematic, contain much incidental detail which the authors are

---

[96] Walter Fröhlich, 'St Anselm's Special Relationship with William the Conqueror', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 145-58.

[97] Timothy Reuter, 'Modern Mentalities and Medieval Polities', in Timothy Reuter, *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), 3-18, pp. 9-11.

[98] Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture*, c. 1; Ann Williams, 'The Dangers of Invention: The Sack of Canterbury, 1011, and the "Theft" of Dunstan's Relics', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict in the Anglo-Norman World*, ed. Paul Dalton, Charles Insley and Louise J. Wilkinson (Woodbridge, 2011), 27-39.

unlikely to have simply invented. This must be used with caution, but it can be used.

But the *Vitae* and the chronicles have not simply been examined so that they can be rejected. As historical sources, and with their prejudices taken into account, they have some value. William of Malmesbury, for example, is unlikely to have made up the fact that St Wulfstan once dedicated a church to the Venerable Bede.[100] Moreover, in impugning the reliability of our authors, this chapter has also uncovered the way in which they thought that the world worked – or how they wanted the world to work. This is the positive conclusion mentioned above. It is in itself significant that monastic writers, when they presented certain bishops or abbots acting in a political manner, showed them using their religion as a political tool. All this is obviously linked to the idealisation of politically dominant holy men in the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1 of this thesis – unsurprising, since hagiographers, chroniclers and the authors of *Vitae* were in many cases the same people, or at least the same type of people, *i.e.* literate monks.

The reasons for these ideals are not entirely clear. They can hardly be taken as a reflection of the reality of Anglo-Norman England. In fact, it seems more likely that writers like Eadmer and William of Malmesbury attributed a wide-ranging spiritual authority to saintly bishops like Anselm and Wulfstan precisely because, in reality, such men were less respected, and less influential, than they believed was right. Other explanations are possible. Thomas Wünsch argues that, as a result of the Gregorian reform movement of the eleventh century, twelfth-century writers now considered it necessary to justify or to hide the involvement of holy bishops in secular politics, which was condemned as *iactantia* or *vana gloria*.[101] One way of getting around this problem would have been to make the bishops' actions in the world part of their holiness, and their political power a function of their sanctity. This is what the authors of our contemporary *Vitae* did. Another suggestion comes from Julie Potter: these *Vitae* may have been intended as a defence of monastic bishops.[102] St Anselm at least

---

[99] Flight, *Bishops and Monks*, pp. 37-48.

[100] *VW*, i.14.1.

[101] Thomas Wünsch, 'Der heilige Bischof – Zur politischen Dimension von Heiligkeit im Mittelalter und ihrem Wandel', in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82 (2000), 261-302.

[102] Potter, '*Vita Gundulfi*', pp. 98-100. See also Ruud, 'Monks in the World', pp. 247, 256.

was criticised in his lifetime for his excessive holiness; such humility and abstinence were laudable in a monk, but in an archbishop they were a fault; Anselm was too merciful to wrongdoers, and too trusting to defend his church's interests.[103] The contemporary *Vitae* answered such criticisms by showing how saintly monks could, by their very sanctity, make politically effective bishops.

An examination of episcopal *Vitae* from other periods and kingdoms might help to shed some light on this issue. If, for example, episcopal *Vitae* from France and Germany also showed their subjects exerting political control through their spiritual authority, it becomes harder to see the portrayal of Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan in their *Vitae* as a purely insular phenomenon, perhaps following changes in the social function of the episcopate in England after the Norman Conquest. Similarly, it would be interesting to trace the development of the theme of the politically dominant holy man through the *Vita* of Hugh of Lincoln – 'the hammer of kings' – and beyond.[104] But this falls outside the scope of the present thesis.

∗∗∗

---

[103] *VA*, pp. 79, 81-4. *Cf.* Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 420B, on a detractor of St Honorius: 'Derogabat quidam aemulus huic Sancto, praeferens illi quendam secularis opulentiae Episcopum, quia Ecclesiam Dei multis opibus et ornatibus extruxerit, cum istum tale aliquid utilitatis in vita sua fecisse nullum vestigium sit.'

[104] Karl Leyser, 'The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man', in *St Hugh of Lincoln: Lectures Delivered at Oxford and Lincoln to Celebrate the Eighth Centenary of St Hugh's Consecration as Bishop of Lincoln*, ed. Henry Mayr-Harting (Oxford, 1987), 49-73, examines similar incidents to those examined in this chapter, but (at p. 54) is far more optimistic about the source material. But *cf.* p. 60, where Leyser himself points out that Adam of Eynsham on one occasion gave a deliberately misleading version of events in order to maximise the political importance of Hugh's sanctity. See also Katharine Sykes, 'Sanctity as a Form of Capital', in *Studies in Church History 47: Saints and Sanctity*, ed. Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon (Woodbridge, 2011), 112-24. One obvious difference between Adam of Eynsham's *Magna vita sancti Hugonis* and the *Vitae* described in this chapter is the saint's use of humour, which is almost as important as his sanctity in winning him the goodwill of the kings of England: Adam of Eynsham, *Magna vita Hugonis*, vol. 1, pp. 116-8, is the most famous example. Wit was probably an important asset in medieval politics: *cf.* Gerald of Wales, *Vita s. Remigii* (*BHL*, 7146), ed. James Dimock in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, 8 vols (London, 1861-91), vol. 7, 1-80, pp. 58, 59-60, 63. See also below, n. 120.

Finally, it is necessary to consider where the preceding discussion of narrative sources from Anglo-Norman England leaves the spiritual authority (understood in a political sense) of the medieval episcopate and our analysis of episcopal power in general. The intention of this chapter was certainly not to deny that bishops ever used spiritual tools in a political context, or that saintly bishops were respected by their contemporaries, and so wielded a special political influence unavailable to those of less obvious holiness. It is simply that monastic narratives tend to attach an undue importance to these things, and that modern historians, by uncritically accepting the monks' stories, have tended to reproduce their disproportionate representation of the medieval world. Bishops and abbots certainly did, on occasion, excommunicate their political enemies,[105] and those of the king.[106] Sometimes laymen may have modified their conduct to avoid a bishop's curse.[107] Papal excommunications played a large, and often decisive, role in imperial politics from this period.[108] And the moral legitimacy which bishops conferred on kings by the rituals of coronation and crown-wearings could have served to bolster the laity's loyalty to those kings.[109] Finally, bishops appear to have been especially suited to certain political roles precisely because they were bishops. Their ecclesiastical status, which raised them somewhat above the cares of this world, made them ideal as peacemakers: unlike lay barons, bishops did not risk losing face by suggesting a compromise solution to a conflict.[110] And just

---

[105] *A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset*, ed. Joseph Hunter in *Ecclesiastical Documents* (London, 1840), 1-48, p. 17; *ASC E*, p. 89, *s.a.* 1070; *ASC D*, p. 85, *s.a.* 1071; *HC*, p. 276; *Liber Eliensis*, ed. E.O. Blake (London, 1962), cc. 96, 112.

[106] Lanfranc of Canterbury, *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. H. Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford, 1979), no. 33; *C&S*, vol. 1, no. 91, p. 606.

[107] Pavlac, 'Excommunication', p. 36; Myriam Soria, 'Les évêques assassinés dans le royaume de France (XIe-XIIe siècles)', in *Bischofsmord im Mittelalter*, ed. Fryde and Reitz, 97-120, p. 113. But *cf.* Elaine Treharne, 'A Unique Old English Formula for Excommunication from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 24 (1995), 185-211, pp. 196-7: 'The evidence provided by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle … and the need to reform and unify practices seen in the law codes of Wulfstanian influence, and later the Episcopal Laws of William I, would suggest that excommunication was not highly feared by some persistent offenders; on the contrary, it was ignored.'

[108] For an overview, see Karl Jordan, *Investiturstreit und frühe Stauferzeit 1056-1197* (Munich, 1970).

[109] On these rituals, see Janet Nelson, 'The Rites of the Conqueror', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 117-32.

[110] Paul Dalton, 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign', in *Viator* 31 (2000), 79-119; Sean Gilsdorf, 'Bishops in the Middle: Mediatory Politics and the Episcopacy', in *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf, 51-73; Ott and Jones, 'Introduction', p. 11. On the twelfth-century papacy's interest in creating peace in Europe, see Christopher Holdsworth, 'R. Allen Brown Memorial Lecture: Peacemaking in the Twelfth Century', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 1-17, at p. 10.

possibly bishops, protected by their ecclesiastical status, could act more boldly with the king than could lay nobles.[111]

But the real effects of much of this are uncertain; and the questions of episcopal peacemaking, episcopal excommunication and episcopal admonition deserve a fuller treatment (both geographically and chronologically) than is possible in this thesis. One distinction, however, is worth noting, a distinction already noted with regard to excommunication in twelfth-century England by Richard Helmholz.[112] According to the *Vitae*, saintly bishops exercised a special influence because they were saints; their spiritual authority was personal. But in reality it is more likely that the spiritual authority enjoyed by bishops in Anglo-Norman England was institutional, stemming from their episcopal consecration and position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and independent of the individual bishop's personal conduct (barring cases of blatant criminality). So even the dissolute gambler Bishop Herfast of Thetford and his simoniacal successor Herbert Losinga excommunicated their personal enemies;[113] and even the uxorious 'prince of publicans',[114] Bishop Ranulf Flambard of Durham, could back up his acts with threats of spiritual punishment for those who infringed them.[115] Of course, the curse of a saintly bishop may have been more feared than that of a dissolute curialist. But this is hard to prove.

With that, we leave the question of spiritual authority. The extent to which bishops in Anglo-Norman England enjoyed a special power stemming from their religious status (which we have called spiritual authority) is not clear. But spiritual authority was almost certainly less important in reality than in the *Vitae* and chronicles. The rest of this thesis analyses how bishops in Anglo-Norman England exercised their power on a national (Chapter 3) and then on a local

---

[111] Björn Weiler, 'Bishops and Kings in England, *c. 1066-c. 1250*', in *Religion and Politics in the Middle Ages: Germany and England by Comparison / Deutschland und England im Vergleich*, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven, forthcoming.

[112] Richard H. Helmholz, 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England', in *Journal of Law and Religion* 11 (1994-5), 235-53. Helmholz distinguishes between the conception of excommunication as a carefully applied judicial sanction, which came to predominate by the end of the twelfth century, and the earlier conception of excommunication as a prelate's personal curse.

[113] Herbert Losinga, *Epistolae*, ed. Robert Anstruther in *Epistolae Herberti de Losinga, primi Episcopi Norwicensis, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri, Prioris Cantuariensis* (New edn.: New York, 1969), 1-107, no. 36, pp. 70-2; Lanfranc, *Letters*, no. 42. For Herfast's gambling, see Lanfranc, *Letters*, no. 47.

[114] *AEp.*, no. 214.

[115] *Durham Episcopal Charters 1071-1152,* ed. H.S. Offler (Gateshead, 1968), nos 9, 14.

(Chapters 4-5) level. The minimal role played by spiritual authority in all this, and the manifest lack of political clout of saintly bishops like St Wulfstan, is probably the best indication that the spiritual authority model of episcopal power was little more than a dream shared by a few monastic writers (and it is significant that just one writer, William of Malmesbury, was responsible for about half of the incidents discussed in this chapter).[116]

Just how limited these ideas were is shown by the only non-monastic analogue to the contemporary *Vitae* which we have, Hugh the Chanter's *History of the Church of York*, probably written in the late 1120s, and consisting mostly of an account of the tribulations of Archbishop Thurstan of York (1114-40). Hugh, a canon of York, was not a monk. His writings display a noticeably more worldly, or curial, attitude than those of Eadmer, William of Malmesbury or Gundulf's biographer. According to Hugh, Thurstan started his career as a cleric in the household of William II, becoming a *secretarius* under Henry I. Thurstan was prudent and industrious in secular affairs; in things to be provided, organised or enacted, both at home and at war, he was curially efficient (*curialiter efficax*). Because of this the king loved him; and Thurstan was capable of much with the king: 'et apud ipsum [regem] plurimum poterat'. Hugh presented Thurstan's promotion to the archbishopric of York as the natural result of all this.[117] Later on, when Thurstan had quarrelled with Henry I over the issue of York's ecclesiastical status, he went into exile, eventually joining the household of Pope Calixtus II. All those whom Thurstan met in his exile loved him (*diligebant*), offering him their service and becoming enemies of his enemies. For Thurstan was always ready to gain friendship; if anyone did him a service, Thurstan always returned the favour; any gifts he received, Thurstan always answered 'non pariter set uberius'. Consequently, 'none of all those whom we know, among the mighty and the humble, among the religious and the secular, among monks and nuns, captured

---

[116] It is, however, possible that some bishops shared this vision. Maureen Miller's work on the episcopate in Italy is of interest here. She argues that Italian bishops began to emphasis their spiritual power, and to resort frequently to excommunication as a political tool, only in the thirteenth century, when they had lost most of their 'real power' within cities to the emerging communes: Maureen Miller, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (London, 2000), pp. 169, 253-5.

[117] Hugh the Chanter, *The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson, rev. M. Brett, C.N.L. Brooke and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1990), p. 56.

such friendship, by his largesse, by his service, and by anticipating others in honour.'[118]

The parallel between this and the contemporary *Vitae* is clear. An exceptional bishop furthered his political ends by winning the respect and friendship of others. We have a form of power based not on concrete resources but on personality. But while Anselm, Gundulf and Wulfstan apparently won the love of others by the attractive force of their sanctity, Thurstan did so by being useful to those he encountered. He was a perfect courtier.

A better parallel for Hugh the Chanter's Thurstan would be the subjects of the German episcopal *Vitae* studied by Stephen Jaeger. According to Jaeger, episcopal hagiography underwent a broad change in the Ottonian and Salian periods (approximately the tenth and eleventh centuries), at least as far as the description of the future bishop's life before his accession to the episcopate was concerned (Jaeger does not discuss the German bishops' conduct after their accession to the episcopate). While Merovingian or Carolingian *Vitae* had tended to idealise their subjects according to monastic or ascetic ideals, in the high medieval *Vitae* 'the description of the character and activities of the future bishop becomes almost wholly secularised.' The virtues praised were those of the court: affability, elegance of mores and eloquence. By them, the successful courtier won the affection of all, and especially of the ruler. In the twelfth century these ideals were near-universal: 'To such an extent had the model of the courtier bishop become entrenched and legitimate that it could be put forward uncritically by a monk favouring the church reform' (the monk in question was Ebo of Michelberg, the biographer of bishop Otto of Bamberg).[119]

As we have seen in this chapter and the previous one, English episcopal *Vitae* (and other monastic narratives) appear to have developed in exactly the opposite sense. By the twelfth century the model of the holy bishop or abbot had become dominant, and it was applied even to worldly ecclesiastics like Ealdred of York and Æthelwig of Evesham. Conversely, there are virtually no courtly

---

[118] *Ibid.*, pp. 114, 162. 'nemo omnium quos nouerimus, apud excelsos et humiles, apud religiosos et seculares, apud monachos et moniales, largiendo, seruiendo, honore preueniendo, tantam amiciciam uenatus est.'

elements in the *Vitae* examined in this chapter. Again, such differences between English and German sources are a matter for further research.

Hugh the Chanter's words cannot be verified any more than those of William of Malmesbury. We do not know whether he accurately represented Thurstan's conduct. Hugh's version of reality at least seems more likely. As we shall see in the rest of this thesis, the most politically successful of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England were the courtiers, those who served the king, and were served by him in their own affairs. Sadly, our sources say very little about how such courtier bishops interacted with the king, or about them in general.[120] But this should not blind us to their historical importance.

---

[119] C.S. Jaeger, 'The Courtier Bishop in *Vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', in C.S. Jaeger, *Scholars and Courtiers: Intellectuals and Society in the Medieval West* (Aldershot, 2002), 291-325, pp. 295, 318-9.

[120] There are two interesting exceptions. According to one, admittedly late, source, Bishop Walkelin of Winchester (1070-98) enraged William the Conqueror by taking undue advantage of the king's gift to Walkelin of as much of the king's wood at Hampage as his carpenters could take in three days. Walkelin placated the king by going before him in a *vetusta capa*, prostrating himself at his feet and offering to resign his bishopric. Walkelin's words may have been meant humourously, or as a reproach: 'Domine, novi quod multos habeas clericos et capellanos promovendos; et ob hoc contra me quaeris occasionem.' In any case they had the desired effect, and the king forgave him: *Annales monasterii de Wintonia*, ed. H.R. Luard in *Annales monastici*, 5 vols (London, 1864-9), vol. 2, 3-128, pp. 34-5. The similarities between this and the better known story of how the future Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (at that time prior of Bec) placated Duke William of Normandy by appearing before him on a lame horse (and then asking for a better one) are worth noting: Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 32-3. In both cases the quick wit of the cleric saved him; and in both cases there appears to have been an ostentatious display of poverty.

Chapter 3: Bishops, Kings and the Papacy

One of the peculiarities of the position of the medieval bishop was that, in the hierarchical society of the Middle Ages, he was bound up in two separate hierarchies. He owed obedience to his king as a feudal tenant; but as an ecclesiastic he was also subject to his archbishop, and ultimately to the pope. These dual loyalties could cause conflicts of obedience. They also opened means of political action to bishops which were unavailable to the lay nobility. This chapter examines this phenomenon, with especial reference to four bishops: Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury; Bishop Herbert Losinga of Thetford (later Norwich); William de Saint-Calais, bishop of Durham; and William's successor, Ranulf Flambard. It also considers Bishop Odo of Bayeux, a Norman prelate active in England in our period. These bishops have all been studied in isolation, but they have never been treated as a group, and so the surprising amount of common ground between them has often been overlooked.

Each of the five bishops discussed in this chapter came into conflict with the English king. And, leaving aside the Anglo-Saxon bishops deposed by William the Conqueror, they are the only bishops known to have done so in our period. In each of these conflicts, the papacy was involved, but in different ways. Anselm was dragged into conflict with the kings of England by his idealistic loyalty to the pope. Herbert Losinga, on the other hand, was forced to assert papal authority against the English king in order to save himself from deposition as a simoniac. And then we have William de Saint-Calais and Odo of Bayeux. These bishops took a more opportunistic approach to ecclesiastical authority. Accused of treason by the English king (their feudal lord), they tried to save themselves by claiming that, as bishops, they could only be tried in an ecclesiastical, ultimately a papal, court (*i.e.* that they were not subject to the king's judgement). Essentially, they attempted to remove themselves from the secular power structure and place themselves entirely within the ecclesiastical one. Ranulf Flambard appears to have made a similar appeal; but in other respects, his experience was closer to that of Herbert Losinga.

So this chapter shows how the dual ecclesiastical and secular role of the medieval bishop could be both a political burden (for Anselm and Herbert

Losinga) and a political asset (for the other three bishops; but also, in some respects, for Anselm and Herbert Losinga). The chapter also highlights the ultimate weakness of papal authority in Anglo-Norman England. The appeals of William, Ranulf and Odo of Bayeux against secular prosecution were dismissed. Anselm was unusual in his ideological adherence to Rome, while Herbert Losinga's vulnerability to ecclesiastical authority was due to his unusual and illegal (according to ecclesiastical law) purchase of his bishopric. The gradual penetration of England by papal authority in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is well attested.[1] While Anselm had few allies, by the 1160s about half of the English bishops were broadly favourable to Thomas Becket in his disputes with Henry II.[2] By the beginning of the thirteenth century, the majority of the English bishops felt themselves constrained to leave England when Pope Innocent III excommunicated King John over his refusal to accept Stephen Langton as archbishop of Canterbury.[3] This chapter provides a snapshot of the beginning of this process (although not the absolute beginning: some Anglo-Saxon parallels are mentioned in the conclusion).

But the chapter also makes wider points about episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. In this period, the English episcopate generally acted for the king. William de Saint-Calais is the only English bishop from our period known to have rebelled against his monarch.[4] A majority of the higher lay nobility, by contrast, opposed William II and Henry I in the 'Anglo-Norman civil wars' of 1088 and 1101.[5] Bishops also played a vital role in the day-to-day government of the kingdom, both at the king's court and in their dioceses. This episcopal royalism may have been politically decisive. It may have helped to keep the first three Norman kings of England on their thrones. But since, in this normal case, episcopal power was subsumed to the king's power, it is hard to trace its workings or significance. To look at how episcopal power worked in the high politics of

---

[1] For example, Brett, *English Church*, c. 2; Z.N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John* (rev. edn.: Cambridge, 1989), *passim*; Charles Duggan, 'From the Conquest to the Death of John', in *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, ed. C.H. Lawrence (rev. edn.: Stroud, 1999), 63-116, p. 77.

[2] Knowles, *Episcopal Colleagues*, pp. 101-2.

[3] W.L. Warren, *King John* (New edn.: London, 1997), pp. 169-70.

[4] Although Remigius of Lincoln came under some suspicion, either in 1075 or 1088: Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum,* vi.41, pp. 408-10; Lanfranc, *Letters*, no. 37.

[5] C.W. Hollister, 'The Anglo-Norman Civil War, 1101', in *EHR* 88 (1973), 315-34, pp. 317-21; Richard Sharpe, '1088 – William II and the Rebels', in *ANS* 26 (2004), 139-57, p. 143.

Anglo-Norman England, it is necessary to look at the exceptions: those bishops who pitted their power against that of the king.

What is striking in all five of the cases discussed in this chapter is this: conventional forms of power were of virtually no importance. None of these bishops lacked land, money or men, but these resources had little significance in determining their ability to stand up to their monarch. Nor did networks of alliances and patronage (another, slightly more abstract, form of power) play much of a part. The only ally whom our bishops called upon was the pope. And it is especially significant that the pope seems always somehow to have become involved when bishops clashed with their monarch. An appeal to his international authority was the only political tool with which the bishops could answer the overwhelming might of the English king.

In fact, it was not so much the pope himself who helped the bishops discussed in this chapter (not even Anselm), but something more immaterial. The ecclesiastical law to which William de Saint-Calais and Odo of Bayeux appealed, and the principle that a bishop was not subject to feudal (*i.e.* royal) justice, seem to have been accepted in England as binding even the king's hand. This principle could be answered, but only by a rivalling legal conception. Here we see how abstract ideas could have a real power, a power which, in some respects, allowed bishops to compete on the same level as kings. Such ideas could also exert power over bishops themselves: Herbert Losinga's tribulations were essentially due to changes in norms of ecclesiastical conduct over the eleventh century. The purchase of ecclesiastical office was no longer widely accepted. Similarly, it was Anselm's somewhat idiosyncratic theology which led him to attach such great importance to obedience to the pope, and which allowed the papacy to exert such power over Anselm.[6]

In all this, the present chapter forms a counterpart to Chapter 2. That chapter rejected the notion that shared norms and expectations (making contemporaries especially responsive to the words of certain charismatic individuals) gave some of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England a special, immaterial, kind of power. This chapter shows how such shared ideas both exercised a power of their own and influenced how contemporaries exercised

[6] Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, pp. 254-5.

power. But the way this worked in reality was vastly different to how it worked in hagiography.

It remains to set out the general structure of the chapter. This is simple. The five bishops under consideration will be discussed individually, in the following order: Anselm, Herbert Losinga, William de Saint-Calais (together with Odo of Bayeux), and then Ranulf Flambard. Before the conclusion, some Anglo-Saxon parallels will be considered. The chapter becomes gradually more technical (more concerned with specific details of chronology, narrative or ideology) as it goes on. This is a result of the differing secondary literatures on each of the bishops studied.

***

Of the bishops discussed in this chapter, most has been written about Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. The intention here is not to give a full account of Anselm's disputes with Kings William II and Henry I, or to pick between the rivalling interpretations of Anselm's political conduct advanced by Richard Southern, Sally Vaughn and others.[7] Rather, it is to make two simple and relatively uncontroversial points: firstly, that Anselm's loyalty to the papacy led him into conflict with the kings of England; and secondly, that Anselm also drew political advantages from this loyalty to the papacy. Popes Urban II and Paschal II were able to help Anselm in his struggles with William II and Henry I. And, before his final break with William II, Anselm may have been able to extract concessions from that king by threatening to appeal to the papacy against him.

---

[7] Southern, *Anselm and His Biographer*; *idem, A Portrait in a Landscape*; Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec*; *eadem*, *St Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A Study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women* (Turnhout, 2002). For an overview of the main differences between Southern and Vaughn, see Richard Southern, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An Examination of the Foundations' and Sally Vaughn, 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', in *Albion 20* (1988), 181-204 and 205-20 respectively. Michael Bruno, 'The Investiture Contest in Norman England: A Struggle between St Anselm of Canterbury and The Norman Kings: Part I', in *American Benedictine Review* 61 (2010), 119-37, does little to advance the debate, responding mainly to the long-superseded ideas found in Norman Cantor, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, 1958).

It will also be necessary to discuss the main source for Anselm's political career: Eadmer's *Historia novorum*, which was examined in Chapter 2. Comparison of Eadmer's work with other sources, in particular Anselm's own letters, underlines Chapter 2's principal conclusion: that such narrative accounts are systematically biased, and that too close a reliance on them can lead historians into error.

That Anselm's loyalty to the papacy (rather than to the English king) caused the conflict between him and Henry I is clear. To summarise: Pope Paschal II, following the policy of his predecessor Urban II, ordered Anselm not to consecrate any prelates who had previously been invested by or performed homage to Henry I. The king ordered Anselm to ignore this prohibition. Anselm, faced with a choice between his two masters, chose the pope, even though he had no personal interest in the issue of lay investiture,[8] and even though this earned him the hostility of the king and the other bishops. In 1103, Anselm was forced into exile. He was only able to return (in 1106) when the king and the pope had reached a compromise and the conflicting demands on Anselm's loyalties were removed.[9]

The roots of the earlier conflict between Anselm and Henry I's brother and predecessor William II are less clear. Eadmer, Anselm's companion and biographer, described it as another simple conflict of loyalties. According to Eadmer, the first real crisis between Anselm and William II came in 1095, with the Council of Rockingham. This assembly met expressly to determine whether Anselm could maintain his faith to the king of England at the same time as his obedience to the apostolic see (Anselm had enraged William II by asking for permission to go to Rome to receive his pallium from Pope Urban II, whom the king had not yet recognised as pope).[10] Anselm protested that it was possible for

---

[8] Anselm was indifferent to many of the issues which agitated the ecclesiastical reformers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, such as free elections of prelates, lay investiture, or the exclusion of laymen from ecclesiastical affairs: C.W. Hollister, 'St Anselm on Lay Investiture', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 145-58, pp. 151-5. And in certain matters, especially those concerning the rights of the church of Canterbury, Anselm's obedience to Rome was not absolute: Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, pp. 258-259.

[9] Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, pp. 297 *ff.*; Hollister, 'Anselm on Lay Investiture', pp. 149-150, 157-8; Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, pp. 291 *ff.*; Vaughn, *Anselm of Bec*, pp. 214 *ff.*.

[10] *HN*, p. 53.

him to preserve both loyalties. But he made it clear that, if the king forced him to choose, he would choose the pope.[11]

The second and final crisis in William II's reign came in 1097, when – still according to Eadmer – the king's mistreatment of the English church prompted Anselm to ask for permission to go to Rome to seek the pope's counsel. This request was in itself an implicit recognition of the supremacy of papal authority over that of the king, since it ascribed to the pope the right to correct the king. William II refused. Anselm responded by repeating his request. Eventually Anselm's importunity so irritated the king that he offered Anselm an ultimatum: Anselm must either promise never again to appeal to the see of St Peter or to Peter's vicar, or he must leave England at once and never return. Once again, Anselm was faced with a stark choice between his two masters, and once again he chose the pope. He went into exile, and only returned after William II's death in 1100.[12]

But Eadmer was writing with hindsight. He interpreted Anselm's quarrels with William II in the 1090s in the light of his later dispute with Henry I. This is evident from the introduction to his *Historia novorum*, where Eadmer claimed that Anselm opposed both William II and Henry I over the king's right to invest new bishops with their pastoral staffs.[13] The investiture of bishops was the major issue under Henry, but of no importance under William II, as is clear from Eadmer's own account.[14] Issues unrelated to papal authority and Anselm's divided loyalties soured relations between Anselm and William II.

Despite the efforts of some historians to defend William II's ecclesiastical policy, it is hard to deny that his treatment of the English church was both unusual and oppressive. In order to exploit the royal right to the revenues of vacant churches, William II refused to appoint new bishops and abbots; the appointments he did make were generally simoniacal; and he had the habit of simply demanding

---

[11] *HN*, p. 53: '...si probatum fuerit utrumque minime fieri posse, fateor malo terram tuam donec apostolicum suscipias exeundo devitare, quam Beati Petri ejusque vicarii oboedientiam vel ad horam abnegare.' See also *HN*, pp. 52-67; *VA*, pp. 85-7.

[12] *HN*, pp. 83-7; *VA*, pp. 88-93.

[13] *HN*, pp. 1-2.

[14] Southern, *A Portrait in a Landscape*, pp. 248, 415-6.

'gifts' from his prelates.[15] Anselm objected to this; William II objected to Anselm's objections. In Anselm's letters written up to 1097 (when he first went into exile), it is clear that he was more concerned about the king's enfeoffment of knights on archiepiscopal lands, excessive taxation and refusal to let Anselm hold a church council than about any conflicting demands on his obedience[16] (although Anselm's later letters tell a different story: not only Eadmer but his master could suffer from hindsight).[17] And the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, probably our earliest source apart from Eadmer, simply says that Anselm went into exile 'because he thought that this people did little according to right and his own will'.[18]

Still, if Anselm's papalism was not the only, or the main, cause of his disputes with William II, it must have been a factor. Eadmer can hardly have invented, for example, William II's ultimatum of 1097. Now we move onto the second of our two contentions about Anselm: that the papacy also helped Anselm in his conflicts with the English kings. Like the first contention, this is obvious in some respects, but less certain in others. Here too, Eadmer may have attached too much importance to Roman authority.

At the most basic level, Anselm's position as a member of the wider ecclesiastical hierarchy meant that he had an alternative pole of authority to the king of England. He could appeal against William II to the pope; and when Anselm finally went into exile in 1097 he had an obvious place of refuge at the

---

[15] C.W. Hollister summarised and countered the arguments of William II's defenders in 'William Rufus, Henry I and the Anglo-Norman Church', in *Peritia* 6-7 (1987-8), 119-34. Emma Mason's more recent attempts to rehabilitate William II fail to address Hollister's objections: 'William Rufus and the Benedictine Order', in *ANS* 21 (1999), 113-44; *eadem*, *William II: Rufus, the Red King* (Stroud, 2005), p. 139.

[16] *AEp.*, nos 176, 198.

[17] Especially informative is the difference between *AEp.* no. 206, sent from Lyons *c.* January 1098 to Pope Urban II, and *AEp.* no. 210, sent from Lyons at the end of 1099 or the beginning of 1100 to Pope Paschal II. In both of these letters Anselm recounts his tribulations in England, but only in the second one (no. 210) is the issue of papal authority made explicit. *Cf.* Thomas Krüger, *Persönlichkeitsausdruck und Persönlichkeitswahrnehmung im Zeitalter der Investiturkonflikte, Studien zu den Briefsammlungen des Anselm von Canterbury* (Hildesheim, 2002), pp. 34-5, where no. 210 is used without any reference whatsoever to no. 206 in order to argue that the dispute between Anselm and William II was above all a dispute about Anselm's obedience to the papacy.

[18] *ASC E*, p. 108, *s.a.* 1097. 'forþam him þuhte þet man on þisne þeodan lytel æfter rihte 7 æfter his dyhte dyde'. Similar explanations are found in Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, vii.19; *JW*, vol. 2, pp. 84-6, *s.a.* 1097. *OV*, vol. 4, pp. 176-8, 204-6, 250, attributed Anselm's exile to William II's abuse of the English church. So did William of Malmesbury, who also blamed the general immorality of William II's court: *GR*, iv.314-5. But Hugh the Chanter shared Eadmer's

papal court.[19] Anselm's reputation as a defender of the church's liberties also assured him a warm reception from continental prelates with similar views, most notably Archbishop Hugh of Lyons.[20] Without this network of support, it would have been far harder for Anselm to resist William II.

The papacy could also intervene in Anselm's favour against the English king. Against Henry I, Anselm was fighting Paschal II's battle rather than his own (as has been mentioned, Anselm himself probably cared little about lay investiture). So it is unsurprising that Paschal II took part in that dispute. But Urban II had tried to help Anselm in his more local quarrels with William II. In 1096, when Anselm was still in England, Urban seems to have sent his legate Abbot Jarento of Dijon to help Anselm in correcting William II's abusive treatment of the English church. The gesture was sincere, even if Jarento's mission came to nothing after the king bribed him.[21] Later, during Anselm's first exile, Urban II formally threatened to excommunicate William II, although William II was once again able to escape through bribery.[22] Some sympathetic bishops on the continent may also have taken action on Anselm's behalf. Archbishop Hugh of Lyons wrote a letter to William II ordering him to restore Anselm to his archbishopric.[23] And Frank Barlow suggests that when – either in 1098 or 1099 – Bishop Ivo of Chartres released the castellan Nivard de Septeuil from the oaths of allegiance he had sworn to William II, he did so in protest against his treatment of Anselm.[24] Although these were minor annoyances, they might have slightly hindered William II in his Norman ambitions.

However, the papacy may have been most useful to Anselm as an idea: as a spectre with which he could threaten the English king. Again, our source is Eadmer (the problems with this are considered below). In 1097, William II apparently decided to institute a law suit against Anselm, on the spurious grounds that the knights whom Anselm had sent to join the royal campaign of that year

---

hindsight: *History*, p. 22: 'Sicut fecerat Anselmus archiepiscopus Willelmo regi, sic fecit et regi Henrico, inuestituras prohibendo...'

[19] *Cf. Aep.*, no. 193, written in August or September 1095 to Pope Urban II, where Anselm already seems to be contemplating an exile at Rome.

[20] *E.g. HN*, pp. 90-1.

[21] Hugh de Flavigny, *Chronicon*, pp. 474-5; Barlow, *William Rufus,* pp. 364-5. Eadmer did not mention Jarento's legation.

[22] *HN*, pp. 106-7, 110-1.

[23] Edited in J.P. Gilson, 'Two Letters Addressed to William Rufus', in *EHR* 12 (1897), 291-2.

against the Welsh were 'neither equipped nor suitable'.[25] Anselm realised that under such a cruel and immoral king he had no chance of correcting the abuses which he saw everywhere in England and in the English church. He therefore resolved to seek 'the authority and the opinion of the apostolic see'.[26] At the Easter Court of 1097, where the matter of the unsatisfactory knights was to be discussed, Anselm asked the king for permission to go to Rome.[27] The king refused, but we are told that: 'his pro licentia dictis, statim omnis commentatio implacitandi Anselmum compressa omissa est, et nos immunes ab illa querela curia decessimus.'[28]

It would presumably have been inconvenient for William II to have Anselm appeal against him to the pope. As has been mentioned, when Anselm eventually did go to Rome, William was obliged to bribe the pope to escape excommunication. It appears that the king saw Anselm's request as a calculated manoeuvre or a threat; and that, in order to conciliate Anselm, William II was willing to make a concession to him on the matter of the knights. In the event, Anselm failed to take advantage of this concession. He appealed again and again until the king lost his temper and ordered Anselm out of the country – possibly this was what Anselm had always wanted. But William II had no way of knowing that Anselm would be so persistent.

Yet whether Eadmer reported these events accurately is uncertain. For 1097 we have no other source. But elsewhere Eadmer's words can be compared with those of Anselm himself, and the comparison is instructive. In his *Historia novorum* Eadmer recounted the lead-up to the council of Rockingham of 1095 in a similar manner to the dispute of 1097. Here too, the initial point of contention was apparently secular. Anselm refused to pay an extortionate royal tax (levied to pay for William II's expedition to Normandy in 1094). Anselm further irritated the king by criticising his abuse of the English church, and, having refused once again the king's demand for money, was banished from the royal court.[29] Anselm's

---

[24] Barlow, *William Rufus*, p. 394; Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae*, in *PL* 162, cols 11C-288B, no. 71.

[25] 'neque instructi neque idonei'

[26] 'auctoritatem et sententiam apostolicae sedis'

[27] *HN*, pp. 78-9.

[28] *HN*, p. 80. 'These things having been said about the permission [to go to Rome], the entire plan of prosecuting Anselm was immediately suppressed and omitted, and we left court free from that complaint.'

[29] *HN*, pp. 43-5, 48-52.

response to this was to ask William II for permission to go to Rome to collect his pallium from Pope Urban II. Since William II had not yet recognised Urban as pope, this gave rise to questions as to Anselm's respective loyalties with regard to the pope and the king, questions which the council of Rockingham was convened to discuss.[30] But in this tumult, the secular matter, Anselm's unpaid tax, appears to have been forgotten, even though the £500 or more which the king demanded from him was no small amount – just under half of the archbishop of Canterbury's annual landed income.[31] So although the case is less clear, it looks as if in 1095, as in 1097, Anselm was able to use papal authority as a trump card. By appealing to Rome, Anselm had the power to change the terms of, and to escalate, his dispute with the king. At least, the Anselm of Eadmer's *Historia novorum* had that power.

But a letter which Anselm wrote to Archbishop Hugh of Lyons between February and December 1094 tells a different story.[32] According to the *Historia novorum*, Anselm's request in January 1095 to go to Rome to fetch his pallium came as a bolt from the blue which shocked and infuriated the king and directly triggered the council of Rockingham. But in his letter to Hugh of Lyons, probably sent well before the clash described by Eadmer, Anselm made it clear that the question of the pallium was one which had already been under discussion for

---

[30] *HN*, pp. 52-3.

[31] Brett, *English Church*, p. 103 n. 1: in *Domesday Book* the archbishop of Canterbury's lands were valued at £1,170.

[32] *AEp.*, no. 176. In his translation, Walter Fröhlich dates this letter to January 1095, on the grounds that Anselm discussed his request to go to Rome to collect his pallium in it and 'Anselm first asked William II at Gillingham in January 1095, shortly after the King's return from Normandy, for permission to go to Rome to obtain the pallium'. Fröhlich's source for this is Eadmer. But the letter contains internal evidence dating it to no later than 4 December 1094. Anselm closed the letter as follows: 'Si metropolitanus sacratus episcopus per totum primum annum nec papam viventem nec pallium requiro, cum possum: iuste ab ipso honore removendus sum. Quod si hoc facere nequeo sine amissione archiepiscopatus, melius mihi est ut mihi violenter auferatur, immo melius est ut ego archiepiscopatum reiciam, quam apostolicum abnegem.' The way in which Anselm referred to this deadline of one year (by which an archbishop was obliged to travel to Rome for his pallium within one year of his consecration) strongly suggests that the period had not yet elapsed. Anselm was consecrated 4 December 1093. The letter must have been written after the assembly at Hastings of February 1094 to which both it and the *Historia novorum* refer (in his edition, Schmitt had dated the letter 'initio a. 1094'; this too is faulty). It should therefore be dated February 1094 x 4 December 1094. This letter also helps to clarify the extent to which Anselm saw himself as bound by obedience to the pope. He would prefer to lose his archbishopric than to deny the pope; but one has the impression that Anselm was less interested in defending the rights of the papacy than in using the rule as an excuse to resign his archbishopric. Anselm followed the above quote by writing that: 'Sic cogito et sic facere volo, si mihi non scribitis cur hoc facere non debeam'.

some time; that William II accepted Anselm's desire to go to Rome as essentially legitimate; and that Anselm was prepared to countenance a certain amount of delay in this matter if the king so willed it.[33] Anselm appears in 1094 to have been most concerned about the king's attempts to enfeoff his knights on the lands of the church of Canterbury, an issue which Eadmer glosses over. Eadmer's description of the mounting hostility between Anselm and the king, with its neat escalation from secular, to ecclesiastical, and then to papal issues, is a literary artifice. It cannot be used as evidence of a clever strategic invocation of papal authority by Anselm. It is possible that, if the epistolary evidence were fuller, Eadmer's account of events in 1097 could also be shown to be dubious.

As Chapter 2 showed, chroniclers like Eadmer could manipulate the facts to fit their own fixed ideas. Whether they did this consciously or not is unimportant. There is no way of knowing whether Anselm really could extort concessions from William II by threatening him with the prospect of a tedious appeal to Rome. Similarly, the extent to which Anselm's loyalty to the papacy caused his conflicts with William II is uncertain. But the two main contentions of this case study stand. Anselm's political problems with the kings of England were − at least partially − due to his outspoken determination to put his loyalty to the pope above his loyalty to the king. And the papacy − to a certain extent − was able to help Anselm in his conflicts with the kings of England.

Anselm's position was an unusual one. Most of the English bishops saw their first loyalty as being with the English king. Eadmer painted them as morally spineless opportunists who loved their feudal lord (and their own temporal prosperity) more than they loved God. He put words into their mouths to this effect.[34] But Eadmer was being unfair. That bishops owed absolute loyalty to the pope, that the pope had the right to dictate the law of the church, even that the pope had automatic authority over all Christians − none of this was self-evident in Anglo-Norman England. The writings of the Norman Anonymous, although not entirely typical, make this clear.[35] For Henry I's and William II's bishops the king,

---

[33] 'Locutus sum de pallio; noluit [William II] ut illud peterem, quamdiu ipse nullum reciperet apostolicum, aut ut saltem huius dilationis excusationem domno papae intimarem. Sustinui usque nunc consilio episcoporum propter vitandam infructuosam dissensionem, si forte deus aliquid interim operaretur, unde illi domni papae receptio persuaderetur.'

[34] *HN*, pp. 82-3.

[35] Norman Anonymous, Tracts 28, 29a.

divinely transfigured by his coronation, was the natural head of the English church. They would not have seen the dichotomy between the will of the king and the will of God, nor would they have necessarily identified the will of the pope with the latter.

Moreover, when William II asked the English bishops to deny the obedience which they owed to Anselm (this took place at the council of Rockingham in 1095), although they all obeyed, some were willing to incur the king's displeasure by denying only the obedience due to Anselm 'ex auctoritate Romani pontificis'; that is, not the obedience due to Anselm as archbishop of Canterbury.[36] Presumably they took their position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy and their obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors as seriously as Anselm did, and were not willing to compromise that obedience, even when ordered to do so by their feudal master. The difference was that, while Anselm saw the pope as the head of that hierarchy, they did not.[37]

Furthermore, Anselm was not quite as isolated as Eadmer, and Anselm himself,[38] claimed. William of Malmesbury wrote that Bishop Ralph Luffa of Chichester openly opposed (*in faciem resistit*) William II over his unfair treatment of Anselm. When the king answered with threats, Ralph fearlessly offered to resign his bishopric (we are not told how the king responded to this). Ralph was only forced to back down when Anselm's departure enervated his hope, and that of any other good men.[39] This may or may not be true (see Chapter 2). Bishop Herbert Losinga definitely asserted, albeit unwillingly, Urban II's authority against William II at the time of the council of Rockingham. Herbert is discussed in more detail below. But Eadmer did not mention either of these bishops in his account of William II's reign. Eadmer did mention that Bishops Osmund of Salisbury and Robert of Hereford eventually begged for Anselm's forgiveness for their betrayal of him at the council of Rockingham.[40] He also described how, under Henry I, the bishops-elect Reinhelm of Hereford and William Giffard of Winchester, perhaps in sympathy with Anselm, refused to be consecrated by

---

[36] *HN*, p. 65. 'from the authority of the Roman pope'

[37] Their position may have been made easier by the existence of two rival popes at this time: Urban II and Clement III, neither of whom had been accepted by William II.

[38] *AEp.*, no. 210: 'In omnibus his et similibus si consilium petebam, omnes de regno eius, etiam suffraganei mei episcopi, negabant se mihi consilium daturos, nisi secundum voluntatem regis.'

[39] *GP*, ii.96.4-5.

Archbishop Gerard of York.[41] William Giffard probably went to Rome with Anselm in 1103.[42] Abbot Richard of Ely also seems to have accompanied Anselm to Rome (although for more opportunistic reasons).[43] The 'nucleus of a papal party in England' is apparent.[44]

<center>***</center>

So Anselm was not the only English bishop in this period to consider himself bound by papal authority. But for Anselm's episcopal colleagues the choice between pope and king appears to have been less clear. They may have been genuinely unsure (although some probably were greedy opportunists). As stated in the introduction to this chapter, we are at the beginning of the penetration of England by papal authority. Such uncertainty is to be expected, and will become evident later on in this chapter, in particular in the section dealing with William de Saint-Calais.

The second of our case studies concerns Bishop Herbert Losinga of Thetford / Norwich (1091-1119). Like Anselm, Herbert found himself in a sticky situation, trapped between the conflicting demands for obedience from his feudal and ecclesiastical masters. But Anselm put himself in this position by his idealistic determination to obey the pope in all things. Herbert Losinga, on the other hand, was forced into it by political circumstances, and by Anselm himself. In many respects, Herbert's case may be taken as more typical than Anselm's. Later on, we shall see that Herbert's experience was surprisingly similar to that of Ranulf Flambard.

As with Anselm, the intention is not to give a full account of Herbert Losinga's career. That has been done.[45] Rather, it is to highlight Herbert's

---

[40] *HN*, p. 72.
[41] *HN*, pp. 145-6.
[42] *EEA 8: Winchester*, p. xxxii.
[43] *Liber Eliensis*, Appendix D, p. 413.
[44] Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy*, p. 163.
[45] James W. Alexander, 'Herbert of Norwich, 1091-1119: Studies in the History of Norman England', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 6 (1969), 115-232. See also Barbara

difficulties in juggling his feudal and his ecclesiastical loyalties, and the parallels between Herbert and the other bishops discussed in this chapter. It is simplest to do this by sketching the relevant facts.[46]

Herbert's difficulties stemmed ultimately from simony. In 1091 Herbert bought for himself the bishopric of Thetford and for his father the abbacy of the New Minster at Winchester. This extreme simony was acceptable in the relaxed milieu of William II's court (and doubly acceptable to the king who profited from it) but contrary to ecclesiastical law. Effectively it constituted a denial of the wider ecclesiastical (as opposed to the feudal) power structure, and, by extension, of the authority of the pope who headed that power structure. In 1094, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury began pressing William II for permission to hold a council of the English church. Simony would have been one of the issues raised at such a council, and the archsimoniac Herbert Losinga was in danger of losing his bishopric.[47] Herbert therefore took the desperate step of travelling to Rome – against the king's will – in order to clear himself. According to William of Malmesbury, Herbert surrendered the pastoral staff which he had sinfully purchased from the corrupt king of England and, having done penance, he received it again, presumably from the hand of Pope Urban II.[48]

This ritual resignation and reinvestiture by the pope seems to have been a fairly common manoeuvre of bishops accused of simony and fearing deposition.[49] It saved the bishop. But the price was the implicit recognition of the pope's authority to undo what a king or emperor had previously done, and hence the denial of that king's authority.[50] Herbert's alignment of himself with the papacy must have angered William II. It did not help that Urban II, whom William II had not even recognised as pope, appointed Herbert as papal legate over England. When Herbert returned to England, in late 1094 or early 1095, he was expelled by

Dodwell, 'The Foundation of Norwich Cathedral', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th ser. 7 (1957), 1-18, and Deirdre Wollaston, 'Herbert de Losinga', in *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996*, ed. Ian Atherton *et al.* (London, 1996), 22-35.

[46] For a more detailed account, see Tom Licence, 'Herbert Losinga's Trip to Rome and the Bishopric of Bury St Edmunds', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 151-68.

[47] Licence, 'Herbert Losinga's Trip', pp. 152-3.

[48] *GP*, ii.74.15.

[49] Timothy Reuter, '*Pastorale pedum ante pedes apostolici posuit*: Dis- and Reinvestiture in the Investiture Contest', in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford, 2001), 197-210.

[50] Reuter does not draw out this implication.

the irate monarch or by his representatives, who also seized the lands of Herbert's bishopric (if they had not been seized before then) and confiscated the papal letters which he was carrying.[51] Herbert had gone from one extreme to the other. As a simoniac, Herbert's excessive proximity to secular power had threatened his legitimacy as a bishop. Now his excessive proximity to papal authority threatened his position as one of the king's feudal barons.

However, Herbert was soon restored to the king's favour. The reconciliation probably took place at the Easter Court held at Winchester on 25 March 1095. Tom Licence speculates that William II may have been obliged to rehabilitate Herbert because a papal legate from Urban II (whom the king had at last acknowledged) was on his way to England, bearing a pallium for Archbishop Anselm. If he found that Herbert Losinga had been − for his obedience to the Roman church − expelled from his bishopric, there would be difficulties for the king.[52] If this was the case, then papal influence, or the threat of it, finally protected Herbert Losinga from the king's wrath.

Herbert's oscillation between his two masters is an extreme case. But it illustrates the sometimes unenviable political situation of the medieval bishop. Herbert Losinga's adherence to the papacy is unlikely to have been idealistic. In the reign of Henry I he was one of the royalists.[53] So in his motivations Herbert differed from Anselm. But both Anselm and Herbert show how papal authority, and the episcopate's dual ecclesiastical and secular function, could be a political burden for the medieval episcopate. Bishops were subject to two higher authorities, and when their two masters wanted different things they were either forced into conflict until these two masters were reconciled (like Anselm), or they had to plot a careful course between the two (like Herbert). In fact, Herbert was, like Anselm, a special case. Most of the English bishops under William II and Henry I could get away with ignoring papal authority when it conflicted with the king's will. Herbert was unlucky. He had made himself vulnerable to attack by purchasing his bishopric. But normally this would not have been a problem. Herbert cannot have expected William II to appoint an archbishop as zealously opposed to such abuses as was Anselm.

---

[51] Licence, 'Herbert Losinga's Trip', pp. 160-1.
[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 161-2.
[53] *HN*, pp. 132, 137-8.

***

The above discussion of Herbert Losinga and Anselm also shows how the peculiar political situation of the medieval bishop (between two masters) could be, to some extent, a political asset. The papacy helped Herbert Losinga out of a predicament into which it (and Anselm) had pushed him. Anselm did more for Rome than Rome did for him. Because of Anselm, William II was obliged finally to recognise Urban II as pope; and Henry I was forced, after a few years of intransigence, to come to a compromise over lay investiture. This chapter's other case studies give a clearer idea of the political benefits which medieval bishops could draw from their divided loyalties. William de Saint-Calais, Odo of Bayeux and Ranulf Flambard were all accused of treason – a feudal offence – by their feudal master – the English king. All three of them answered these charges in the same way (although this is less clear for Ranulf Flambard). They claimed that, as bishops, they were not subject to the king's feudal law; and that they could only be tried 'canonically', in an ecclesiastical court. They attempted to remove themselves from the royal, feudal power structure and put themselves into the ecclesiastical one.

This was pure opportunism. When it suited them, these bishops were perfectly capable of aligning themselves with the king and denying all obedience to the pope. What is significant is firstly that, when accused of treason, they thought an appeal to ecclesiastical authority their best strategy; and secondly, that the English king and his nobles considered themselves bound by abstract legal conceptions of ecclesiastical office which lifted churchmen above feudal jurisdiction (and hence feudal power). To break the resistance of William de Saint-Calais and Odo of Bayeux (Ranulf Flambard's case never came to a crisis), the English king was obliged to use not brute force, but legal and theological arguments of his own. In this, we see how political power in Anglo-Norman England did not always stem from land, men, political connections and money, but could also be immaterial. Commonly accepted ideas could have a real political force. However, the ideas in question were not the ideals of sanctity and of

episcopal moral authority discussed in Chapters 1 and Chapter 2, but legal concepts of episcopal office.

***

For William de Saint-Calais, bishop of Durham from 1080 to 1096, it is best to start with a brief outline of the relevant events. William de Saint-Calais was involved in the rebellion which in the spring and summer of 1088 came close to deposing the newly crowned King William II, and replacing him with his brother, Duke Robert of Normandy. William de Saint-Calais' exact role in this plot and his reasons for opposing William II are not clear, but it is known that shortly after the outbreak of hostilities the bishop left the royal court in suspicious circumstances and fled to Durham, which he fortified against the king. In September, a royal army sent to ravage his bishopric forced William de Saint-Calais to come to terms, and on 2 November 1088 he was tried before the king's court at Old Sarum. The rebellious bishop was found guilty and banished from England. He seems to have spent his exile in Normandy, whence he returned to England in 1091, having been restored to his bishopric by William II. According to Symeon of Durham, William regained the king's favour by causing the siege of one of the king's castles in Normandy to be lifted.[54] But the exact circumstances of this reconciliation are not clear.[55]

It is William's trial and the negotiations leading up to it which interest us here, and in particular the legal arguments deployed by William and his royalist opponents. At this point, it is necessary to say a few words about our source material. All this legal wrangling is recorded in a Durham tract, *De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi per Willelmum regem filium Willelmi magni regis* – and nowhere else.[56] The *De iniusta vexacione* was probably written by a member of William de Saint-Calais's household who accompanied him to

---

[54] Symeon, *Libellus de exordio*, iv.8.

[55] On William de Saint-Calais' career, see William Aird, 'An Absent Friend: The Career of Bishop William of St Calais', in *Anglo-Norman Durham*, ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 283-97. For the chronology of the rebellion in 1088, see Sharpe, '1088'.

[56] Bibliographical details can be found in the list of abbreviations under *DIV*.

Salisbury in 1088 and hence witnessed the scenes which he so vividly described.[57] But this does not necessarily make the *De iniusta vexacione* a reliable source: the discussion of Eadmer earlier in the present chapter highlighted the dangers of eyewitness testimony. Since there is no other evidence against which the *De iniusta vexacione* can be checked, the following analysis should be taken as entirely conditional on its veracity. However, even if the *De iniusta vexacione* is a complete fiction, it still has some value as an ideological source, and the conclusions arrived at here can still − *mutatis mutandis* − be applied to wider questions of episcopal power and papal authority in Anglo-Norman England.

Of the five bishops discussed in this chapter, William de Saint-Calais is the only one who resisted the English king in conventional, military, terms. Holed up in Durham, he was able to resist the king's men for some six months (admittedly because the king himself was busy with other rebels in the South). And there are indications in the *De iniusta vexacione* that William de Saint-Calais' men managed to cause some trouble for the king's followers.[58] Even the royal army sent against Durham in September 1088 could not totally defeat the bishop. The terms under which William agreed to stand trial, and the safe conduct which the royal generals offered him, seem to have been exceptionally generous − if the *De iniusta vexacione* can be trusted.[59] At his trial, William hinted that he could have held out for longer if he had wanted to.[60] All this strengthened William's negotiating position. William de Saint-Calais' close relations with the Scottish monarchy after his restoration in 1091 are also worth noting.[61] This was possibly a way of protecting himself from William II.

But William de Saint-Calais' main defence in 1088 was always a legal one. In his negotiations with the king (from early in 1088), he consistently argued that as a bishop he could not be tried *laicaliter*, *i.e.* in a feudal court. In his letters to the king, William claimed to be ready to answer the charges against him, but

---

[57] H.S. Offler objected to this attribution: 'The Tractate '*De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi*'', in *EHR* 66 (1951), 321-41; *DIV*, pp. 60-5. But these objections have been answered convincingly: Philpott, '*De iniusta uexatione*'.

[58] *DIV*, pp. 93-4, 96-7.

[59] *DIV*, pp. 79-80.

[60] *DIV*, p. 89: 'Domine mi rex, ego passus sum per tres seruientes uestros auferri michi terras et pecuniam ecclesie presentibus centum meis militibus, et in nullo uobis prorsus restiti.'

[61] G.W.S. Barrow, 'The Kings of Scotland and Durham', in *Anglo-Norman Durham,* ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 312-23.

insisted that the king give him justice 'secundum meum ordinem',[62] *i.e.* in an ecclesiastical court, or according to canon law. The king was unwilling to grant this. When William de Saint-Calais was eventually forced to stand trial at Old Sarum, he took the same line. He rejected the competence of the assembled court to judge him, alleging that it was not canonical, that is, not conducted according to the law of the church, to which William, as a bishop, was subject. His main objections were as follows: laymen were permitted to sit in judgement on him;[63] he and the other bishops were not allowed to wear their ecclesiastical vestments;[64] the other bishops of his province (York) were not present;[65] and, most importantly, William was being made to plead before his possessions, by which he meant his bishopric, had been restored to him.[66]

All of these objections were valid according to canon law. But they were dismissed (more on this later). Consequently, William de Saint-Calais refused to answer the charges against him, and declared his intention to travel to Rome to protest against the royal judgement. This simply irritated the king. For his contumacy, William was condemned to lose his fief.[67] He responded by appealing once again to Rome, 'where justice more than violence holds sway'.[68] William's possessions were confiscated, and it was only with great difficulty, after being subjected to various indignities by the king's ministers, that he himself was able to leave England, probably in December 1088.[69] It is unlikely that William actually went to the papal *curia* to appeal against the king. But he did obtain a letter of admonition from Pope Urban II protesting William's uncanonical trial, which the king, who had not yet recognised Urban as pope, almost certainly ignored.[70]

By his claim to be subject only to canon law William de Saint-Calais had essentially attempted to remove himself from the secular, royal, power structure. Canon law was external to the king's law, codified and promulgated by churchmen all over Europe. In the eleventh century this ecclesiastical law came to

---

[62] 'according to my order'
[63] *DIV*, pp. 82-3.
[64] *DIV*, p. 81.
[65] *DIV*, p. 86.
[66] This was a reference to the canonical principle 'spoliatus ante omnia restituendus': *DIV*, n. 77.
[67] *DIV*, pp. 85- 8.
[68] *DIV*, p. 90. 'ubi iusticia magis quam uiolencia dominatur'
[69] *DIV*, pp. 88-98.

be more and more identified with the authority of the Roman pope; and William finished by appealing directly to the pope against the king. This was a political strategy available only to ecclesiastics, but not, in William's case, a very successful one.

In fact, according to Mark Philpott, William de Saint-Calais' strategy was not only unsuccessful, but pointless. Philpott argues that, even if William de Saint-Calais' appeal to canon law had been accepted, it would not have done him any good. The canonical penalties for treason were harsh, as bad those a layman could reasonably expect: excommunication, deposition and lifetime confinement to a monastery. William de Saint-Calais 'could not have afforded to let his case come to trial, even under canon law'.[71] This, however, was the point. It is unlikely that William de Saint-Calais wanted his case to come to trial. At root, his appeal to canon law was almost certainly a means of prevarication. William probably intended to raise new objections to any trial offered him by the king.

William de Saint-Calais seems always to have had in mind the possibility of an eventual appeal to Rome, and the total denial of the king's jurisdiction over him. At Old Sarum, he quoted directly from the Pseudo-Isidorian canons: he would go to Rome to appeal to the pope, 'to whose disposition the major ecclesiastical causes and the judgement of bishops has been reserved by the ancient authority of the apostles, their successors and the canons'.[72] And in his first letter to the king (written from Durham in the spring of 1088) William declared that 'not all men are permitted to judge bishops'.[73]

William de Saint-Calais could have found objections to any court presided over by William II, indeed any court in England. Presumably, he intended to do so. He must have hoped that his cavils would eventually wear the king down so much that the charges against him would be dropped, or that the king would agree to restore him to his bishopric after a mock trial in which William ran no real risk. The letters (preserved in the *De iniusta vexatione*) which William wrote to the

---

[70] Printed in Stephen Kuttner and Robert Somerville, *Pope Urban II*, *the Collectio Britannica, and the Council of Melfi (1089)* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 153-5 (J-L 5397).

[71] Philpott '*De iniusta uexatione*', p. 135.

[72] *DIV*, pp. 86-7. 'cuius dispositioni maiores causas ecclesiasticas et episcoporum iudicia antiqua apostolorum eorumque successorum atque canonum auctoritas reseruauit'. For the provenance of the quote, see *DIV*, p. 87 n. 57.

[73] *DIV*, p. 75. 'non est enim omnium hominum episcopos iudicare'

king prior to his trial seem to suggest such a solution. One of them makes the usual demand for the restoration of William's possessions and justice according to his order.[74] But if the king would not restore his possessions, William was still prepared to come to the royal court under a safe conduct and, in the presence of the king's barons, to defend himself from the charges against him.[75] In a later letter to the king, William made another proposal:

> *Et si adhuc in sentencia illa ut me purgare debeam laico more perseueratis, de hoc prius paratus sum recto iudicio iudicari, ea quidem condicione ut si quis me iniusto iudicio opprimere uoluerit, securitate predicte pacis conseruata, liceat michi contradicere secundum recta iudicia mei ordinis in eo loco ubi canonice iudicatum fuerit.*[76]

William was willing to be judged as a layman, but only if he had the right of appealing against this judgement as an ecclesiastic.[77] This suggestion could be interpreted as mere insolence on William's part, but it may have been meant seriously. A 'trial with a safety net' was in some ways a sensible compromise. If William could answer the suspicions against him, the king could claim to have duly tried him (and he would not have lost face by letting off the rebellious bishop) and William could be rehabilitated. If not, William would return to Durham under a safe conduct and the overall situation would not be changed.

Another compromise solution was 'purgation' (*purgatio*). William de Saint-Calais closed his first letter to the king by writing that, until his possessions had been restored, he would enter no other plea 'apart from the defence of my purgation'.[78] Later, when William came to the royal court under a safe conduct (his possessions still had not been restored), he offered the king *purgacio sceleris et periurii*, although he refused to plead as a lay man (*laicaliter*) outside of this safe conduct.[79] William de Saint-Calais also offered purgation after judgement

---

[74] *DIV*, p. 76.

[75] *DIV*, pp. 76-7.

[76] *DIV*, p. 78. 'And if you still insist that I must purge myself as a layman, I am first prepared to be judged on this by a rightful judgement, on the condition that if anyone wants to oppress me with an unjust judgement, I will be allowed, with the security of the aforesaid peace preserved, to contest this according to the rightful judgement of my order in that place where it shall have been canonically judged.' Or perhaps: '…in that place which shall have been canonically assigned.'

[77] *Cf. DIV*, n. 24, where a slightly different interpretation of the passage is advanced.

[78] *DIV*, p. 77. 'preter purgacionis mee defensionem'

[79] *DIV*, pp. 77-8. 'purgation of the crime and the false oath'

had been passed on him at Salisbury and he had declared his decision to appeal to Rome. In this case, there is some indication of what the word means. William promised to show that he had always acted legally (*legaliter*) towards the king, warning him of the plot against him and personally talking the citizens of Canterbury, Dover and London out of joining the rebellion. William offered to prove this through the testimony of the king's barons and claimed that, if the king permitted, he would have many compurgators among the bishops 'ad hanc purgacionem faciendam'.[80]

Frank Barlow was not quite right to define this purgation as '[William's] unsupported oath as a bishop that he was innocent'.[81] William obviously intended to present actual evidence, and his oath would be backed up by that of others. Nor was purgation specifically ecclesiastical. One of William de Saint-Calais' letters (quoted above) used the verb *purgo* to refer to a lay judgement.[82] Laymen were also sometimes allowed to defend themselves by oath in Anglo-Norman England.[83]

The main difference between purgation and the feudal trial demanded by William II is revealed by the response of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury to William's final offer of purgation (*i.e.* the offer made after judgement had been passed on him): 'Melius ageres si in misericordia regis totum te poneres, et ego ad pedes eius libenter tui causa uenirem.'[84] It seems that purgation, as William meant it, did not involve placing oneself entirely in the king's mercy. Although witnesses were called and evidence was presented, the outcome was predetermined. It seems to have been a procedure whereby an individual was granted the right of 'proving' himself innocent by the oath and testimony of a certain number of his peers. Like the 'feudal trial with right of appeal to an ecclesiastical court reserved' which William de Saint-Calais had offered to the king, it was a compromise solution. Such purgation would allow the king to be seen to have subjected his bishop to judgement and thus save face without there

---

[80] *DIV*, pp. 91-2. 'in order to perform this purgation'
[81] Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, p. 282.
[82] *DIV*, pp. 78.
[83] Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings*, p. 180.
[84] *DIV*, p. 92. 'You would do better to put yourself entirely in the king's mercy, and I would gladly come to his feet on your behalf.'

having been any real danger for William de Saint-Calais. Again, however, the king was unwilling to accept such a compromise.

In short, William de Saint-Calais probably never wanted to be tried according to canon law. His appeals to it appear to have been a means of prevarication, designed to force the king into a compromise whereby William would be found innocent after a sham trial, or allowed to clear himself through the oath of his peers, rather than having to face the full force of royal justice. William's exaltation of Roman authority is unlikely to have been sincere: in 1095, he was, according to Eadmer, the most virulent upholder of the king's rights against Anselm of Canterbury and Pope Urban II. And William's final decision to appeal to the papacy against the judgement passed on him cannot be taken as corresponding to his original intentions. It seems to have been made in a fit of pique, after William had forced himself into a situation where no other course of action was possible. It is also significant that, even after William announced that he would seek true justice at Rome, he offered the king this purgation, which, as has been argued, almost certainly did not refer to an ecclesiastical or canonical hearing, but to a feudal practice.

William de Saint-Calais' gambit backfired. His fate might seem to be convincing evidence of the weakness of papal authority and canon law in Anglo-Norman England. However, the *De iniusta vexacione* hints that some at least of the king's supporters were willing to make allowances for the bishop. At one point, Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances suggested to the archbishops of York and Canterbury that they, with the bishops, abbots, and certain of the laymen, retire in order to determine whether William should be restored to his possessions before being made to plead.[85] This suggested limitation of the lay element of the court looks like a partial concession to William's complaint that laymen were being allowed to sit in judgement on him.[86] But Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury brusquely dismissed the idea.[87]

It is also worth noting that no one actually questioned the canonical principles invoked by William de Saint-Calais. Nor did anyone question his theoretical right, as a bishop, to trial in an ecclesiastical court. The case of Anselm

---

[85] *DIV*, pp. 84-5.
[86] *DIV*, pp. 82-3.

provides a parallel here: according to Eadmer, William II's partisans at the council of Rockingham seem to have accepted Anselm's implied invocation of the canonical principle that a bishop could only be judged by the pope; they were unable to find a response to it.[88] And when Anselm justified his obedience to Urban II by arguing that the power of binding and loosing was given to St Peter and his successors, and not to any emperor, king, duke or count, the royal party accepted his reasoning (again, according to Eadmer). They studiously attempted to find an answer which would please the king without openly contradicting 'the aforesaid judgements of God' (*praelibatae sententiae Dei*).[89]

What was denied in 1088 was William de Saint-Calais' right to an ecclesiastical trial under the given circumstances, rather than the right of bishops to ecclesiastical law in general. So, rather than showing its weakness, the *De iniusta vexacione* shows that canon law, and hence ecclesiastical authority (and by extension, that of the pope), was accepted as valid in England; and that the king and his advisors were unable to ignore this law.

They could, however, reason their way around it. Their arguments (or rather, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury's arguments – for he was the one that voiced them) were based on the dual nature of episcopal office, that is, the bishop's double role as one of the king's feudal barons and as the ecclesiastical head of his diocese. The reasoning ran roughly as follows: since the crime in question was feudal, and concerned the bishop's secular fief, William was being tried in his persona as the king's baron and not as a bishop; it was therefore proper that he be tried as a layman; moreover, William's protests that he had been disseised of his bishopric were invalid, as he had only been disseised of his lands, *i.e.* his fief, which had nothing to do with that bishopric; William's bishopric, *i.e.* his spiritual jurisdiction over his diocese and the church of Durham itself, was not in question and had not been touched.

---

[87] *DIV*, p. 85.

[88] *HN*, p. 61; Mark Philpott, 'Eadmer, His Archbishops and the English State', in *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell,* ed. John Maddicott and David Palliser (London, 2000), 93-107, pp. 104-7.

[89] *HN*, pp. 57-8.

When William claimed that he had been tried uncanonically, in a lay assembly, and against 'our law' (*lex nostra*), Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury summarised the royalist position:

> *Nos non de episcopio sed de tuo te feodo iudicamus, et hoc modo iudicauimus Baiocensem episcopum ante patrem huius rege* [*sic*: *recte* 'regis'] *de feodo quo, nec rex uocabat eum episcopum in placito illo sed fratrem et comitem.*[90]

Of the bishop's two personae, only one was in question, that of the king's baron. As this persona was entirely secular, it was fitting that William de Saint-Calais be tried as a layman.

Lanfranc's reference to the precedent provided by a bishop of Bayeux requires some explanation. In 1082, Bishop Odo of Bayeux, who since 1066 had been active in England as a vigorous agent of the Norman occupation, was arrested by his half-brother William the Conqueror. Just what Odo had done or planned to do is unknown, but the king took the matter seriously and incarcerated him (Odo was only freed in 1087 when the Conqueror himself died). Odo's trial in 1082 is reported by three chroniclers, all of whom wrote about 50 years after it, and whose accounts are not entirely concordant.[91] Two of them, however, do agree in reporting a claim of clerical immunity on Odo's part. Orderic Vitalis wrote that initially no one dared to lay their hands on Odo, and so the king himself grabbed hold of him. Odo protested that as a cleric and a minister of God he could not be judged without a papal judgement (*sine iudicio papae*). But William the Conqueror was ready for this: 'Ego non clericum non antistitem damno, sed comitem meum quem meo uice mea proposui regno; rationem commissae uillicacionis audire uolens comprehendo'.[92] William of Malmesbury gives much

---

[90] *DIV*, pp. 86-7. 'We are not judging you about your bishopric, but about your fief, and in this manner we judged the bishop of Bayeux before the father of this king concerning his fief, in reason of which the king did not call him bishop in that plea, but brother and earl.'

[91] For all this, see David Bates, 'The Character and Career of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux (1049/50-1097)', in *Speculum* 50 (1975), 1-20, pp. 15-7; *OV*, vol. 4, pp. xxvii-xxix, 40 n. 2.

[92] *OV*, vol. 4, p. 42. 'I condemn not a cleric or a priest, but I seize my earl, whom I made my deputy in my kingdom, wishing to hear an account of his stewardship.' *Cf.* Luke 16:2: 'Et vocavit illum, et ait illi: Quid hoc audio de te? *redde rationem villicationis tuae*: jam enim non poteris villicare.'

the same story, but attributes the legal sophistry by which Odo was imprisoned to Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury rather than to the king.[93]

It is a moot point whether Odo of Bayeux's imprisonment in 1082 actually was justified by the doctrine of divisible personae. One might suppose that, if there was such an obvious precedent, William de Saint-Calais would have been less surprised when the same arguments were used against him in 1088, especially since he had probably attended Odo's trial. But Odo's position as earl of Kent was more obviously distinct from his bishopric across the channel in Bayeux than the bishopric of Durham was from the fief attached to that bishopric. William de Saint-Calais may not have thought that the doctrine of divisible personae applied in his own case.

It is at least certain that Odo of Bayeux provided William de Saint-Calais with a precedent for his claims to episcopal immunity from royal judgement, and for his appeal to the pope against the king. Pope Gregory VII, presumably following an appeal by Odo's friends, sent out two letters deploring the king's disregard for divine law in imprisoning his half-brother. One letter was addressed to Archbishop Hugh of Lyons, the other to William the Conqueror himself.[94] There were other precedents. Bishop Æthelric of Selsey appears to have appealed to Rome against his deposition by papal legates (who were acting at William the Conqueror's request) in 1070. A letter of Pope Alexander II to the Conqueror orders that Æthelric be restored to his bishopric (*in pristinum locum*) and that his case be heard canonically by Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury.[95] There also exists a letter of Alexander II on behalf of an unnamed bishop (perhaps the same

---

[93] *GR*, iv.306.3-4. Lanfranc apparently reassured the worried monarch that 'Non episcopum Baicoarum capies, sed comitem Cantiae custodies'. But *cf.* ii.277.2-3, where we are told that William the Conqueror imprisoned Odo, 'prefatus non se Baiocarum episcopum sed comitem Cantiae prendere'. It seems likely that in the story as William of Malmesbury heard it, as here and as in Orderic Vitalis, the king himself thought up the rationale for Odo's imprisonment, and that William later altered the story to give Archbishop Lanfranc the deciding influence. For the tendency of William and other chroniclers to inflate the role played by bishops in political events, see Chapter 2. Odo's trial, but not his appeal to clerical immunity, is also described in *Warenne Chronicle*, pp. 26-8.

[94] *The Epistolae vagantes of Pope Gregory VII,* ed. and trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford, 1972), no. 53 (J-L 5253); *Das Register Gregors VII, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae selectae 2*, ed. E. Caspar, 2 vols (Berlin, 1920-3), vol. 2, pp. 630-1 (J-L 5254).

[95] Lanfranc, *Letters*, no. 7 (J-L 4695). There is no evidence that any such hearing ever took place. The problem may have resolved itself (from William I's point of view) with the death of Alexander II in 1072. Æthelric's deposition was finally confirmed in 1076: *C&S*, vol. 2, no. 93, p. 619.

Æthelric) who had been imprisoned by the king, and whose liberation Alexander had entrusted to Lanfranc.[96] And Abbot Robert of Saint-Evroult in Normandy had, when deposed by Duke William (the future Conqueror) in 1061, gone in protest to Rome.[97] There were even precedents from Anglo-Saxon England for an appeal to papal authority. These are discussed at the end of this chapter.

So the idea that a bishop or abbot could appeal to the pope against his king was not a new one in 1088, even if William de Saint-Calais only made his appeals with the intention of extracting concessions from William II (this could be compared to Anselm's strategic invocation of papal authority in 1094 and 1097 as recorded by Eadmer). What was new in William de Saint-Calais' case was that someone took the trouble to record the resulting discussions.

To return to the *De iniusta vexacione*: essentially, this tract recounts a clash between two competing notions of episcopal office. The first, that of William de Saint-Calais, viewed a bishop's office and possessions as a single and indivisible whole. The second, that of Lanfranc and the king, treated the bishop as two legal persons, the ecclesiastical leader and the feudal baron, who enjoyed different rights and were subject to different laws. Whether these conceptions represented the sincere opinions of anyone present at Old Sarum in 1088 is not clear. It is, however, ironic that modern historiography on the medieval bishop has tended to criticise those unenlightened scholars who in their books and articles treat the political and religious functions of the bishop in strict isolation.[98] From the *De iniusta vexacione*, it appears that this approach may not be quite so anachronistic as is often thought.

Lanfranc (at least, the Lanfranc of the *De iniusta vexacione*) was not the only contemporary to treat the bishop's two personae as essentially separable. This separability was implicit in the eventual compromise solution to the English investiture contest in 1107, by which Henry I gave up the practice of investing bishops as bishops (in their ecclesiastical persona) through their pastoral staffs, but was allowed to continue to receive homage from new bishops for the lands

---

[96] *Alexandri II pontificis romani epistolae et diplomata*, in *PL* 146, cols 1279B-1430C, no. 143 (J-L 4762): 'Praeterea de liberatione capti episcopi, quod experientiae tuae commisimus, valde miramur an hoc tua praetermiserit negligentia, an regis poenam adjiciens contempserit inobedientia.'

[97] *Gesta normannorum ducum*, vol. 1, pp. 152-4; *OV,* vol. 2, p. 90.

which they held from him (in their feudal persona). And before 1107, lay investiture was sometimes justified on the grounds that this investiture of bishops and abbots by kings with their pastoral staffs related only to the prelate's temporal position and not his priestly office: to his feudal and not his ecclesiastical persona.[99]

Elsewhere, the Norman Anonymous (writing between 1096 and 1106) explicitly formulated the idea that the dual personae of ecclesiastical figures were separable, and that this separation made them legally vulnerable. He used the idea of the pope's multiple personae to refute the notion that the pope is subject to no one's judgement:

> *Talis enim non simplex est, sed multiplex, et plures habens personas. Nam et summi pontificis personam habet et hominis, et uel homicide uel alterius peccatoris, eius uidelicet, quem se ipse fecit.*[100]

In his persona as the 'highest pontifex', the pope is naturally untouchable. But if he commits a crime then he does so in the persona of a sinner (and this persona cannot be the pope, for the pope is immune from sin). The man who is the pope is therefore to be judged and punished in that sinful persona, and not in his legally untouchable persona as pope.[101]

Here we see a meeting of politics and theology. Abstract conceptions of episcopal office could be deployed in a legal context with real effect. In 1088, they provided a means of circumventing William de Saint-Calais' appeal to canon law, an appeal which in itself was perfectly valid. How this idea of multiple personae was developed, and whether it was developed to meet a specific political

---

[98] See Introduction.

[99] Norman Anonymous, Tract 24a, p. 161, Tract 28, p. 297; Olivier Guillot, 'A Reform of Investiture before the Investiture Struggle in Anjou, Normandy and England', in *Haskins Society Journal* 3 (1991), 81-100.

[100] Norman Anonymous, Tract 1. 'Such a man is not simple, but multiple, having many personae. For he has the persona of the highest pontifex and that of a man, and even that of a murderer or other sinner, that is, of whomsoever he makes himself into.'

[101] See also Norman Anonymous, Tract 24a, p. 154, which discusses the twin personae enjoyed by both the priest Aaron and the king Saul: 'una [persona] ex natura, altera ex gratia.... una, qua per conditionem nature ceteris hominibus congrueret, altera, qua per eminentiam deificationis et uim sacramenti cunctis aliis precelleret'.

need, is not clear.[102] There is another way in which abstract notions of episcopal office may have helped to condemn William de Saint-Calais and Odo of Bayeux. The arguments of the Norman Anonymous cited above approach the idea, found in the writings of Isidore of Seville and elsewhere, that a king, or other ruler of men, can only be considered as such inasmuch as he behaves correctly, and that any misconduct on his part results in an automatic loss of authority.[103]

Contemporaries may have justified the harsh treatment of William and Odo on the grounds that their general behaviour (rather than their specific offence) was unbecoming of episcopal office and therefore obviated their episcopal status and privilege. It is only implicit in the *De iniusta vexacione* that William de Saint-Calais' excessive involvement in secular affairs prevented him from being treated as a bishop. But when writing about Odo of Bayeux, the chronicler Orderic Vitalis made the link obvious. Orderic had the dying William the Conqueror say that:

> *Euidenter patet quod Odo frater meus leuis est et ambitiosus, carnis inherens desideriis et immensis crudelitatibus, et numquam mutabitur a lenociniis et noxiis uanitatibus. Hoc perspicue in pluribus expertus sum; ideoque constrinxi non antistitem sed tirannum.*[104]

Because Odo was 'light and ambitious', and because of his cruel and worldly conduct, he was no longer a bishop. William the Conqueror may have been of this opinion; Orderic Vitalis almost certainly was. This is clear from the nomenclature which Orderic used for Odo. Normally Orderic referred to Odo as *presul* or some other ecclesiastical term. But when Duke Robert of Normandy, on Odo's advice,

---

[102] For antecedents, see Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957), pp. 49-52, 57-9, 61-86.

[103] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911), IX.iii.4: 'Reges autem a regendo vocati. Sicut enim sacerdos a sacrifando, ita et rex a regendo. Non autem regit qui non corrigit. Recte igitur faciendo regis nomen tenetur, peccando ammititur. Vnde et apud veteres tale erat proverbium: "Rex eris, si recte facias: si non facias, non eris."'. *Cf.* Cary J. Nederman and Catherine Campbell, 'Priests, Kings and Tyrants: Spiritual and Temporal Power in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*', in *Speculum* 66 (1991), 572-90, p. 579: 'just as "king" designates not merely any monarchic head of government but only one who rules in accordance with law on the basis of a good character, so "priest" properly denotes solely those occupants of clerical office who possess the "merit of the virtues . . . which the safety of subjects demands."'

[104] *OV*, vol. 4, pp. 98-100. 'It is clear that my brother Odo is light and ambitious, addicted to the pleasures of the flesh and to cruelty, and that he will never give up his panderings and harmful vanities. I have experienced this in many things. And therefore I did not imprison a priest but a tyrant.'

unjustly imprisoned Robert de Bellême and Henry, the future king of England, Odo, to whom Duke Robert committed the prisoners, became a *tyrannus* instead.[105] The perfidy of Odo's actions had presumably deprived him of his episcopal status. The notion that episcopal office and episcopal privileges were dependent on correct conduct will be important in the last of this chapter's case studies, on Ranulf Flambard of Durham.

<div align="center">***</div>

William de Saint-Calais was not the first English bishop to appeal to ecclesiastical law and the papacy against a judgement of the English king. Nor was he the last. It is worth noting here that the argument of the bishop's twin *personae* was not the only way of getting around such appeals of episcopal immunity from feudal prosecution. At the council of Northampton of 1164, Thomas Becket protested against Henry II's intention to try him in a feudal court for a feudal offence. One of the solutions proposed in 1164 (by Becket's fellow bishops) was that the king refrain from his feudal prosecution of Becket until the bishops had as a group accused him to the pope and obtained his deposition on canonical grounds. David Knowles noted that this procedure was very similar to that proposed by the mid-twelfth-century German author Gerhoh of Reichersberg for dealing with bishops who failed in their secular obligations. It paid more respect to papal authority and to canon law than Lanfranc's legal trick of 1088 (although Gilbert Foliot also used arguments based on the bishop's twin *personae* against Thomas Becket).[106] Given the growing importance of the pope in twelfth-century England, this is unsurprising.

It is also unsurprising that neither Odo of Bayeux nor William de Saint-Calais had much success in their appeals to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In eleventh-century England, papal authority was as yet weak and uncertain. But the case of William de Saint-Calais highlights the surprising power of canon law, and of legal

---

[105] *OV*, vol. 4, p. 148: '[Duke Robert] illos comprehendit, uinculis coartauit; et unum Baicis aliumque Noilleio sub manu *Baiocensis tiranni* custodiae mancipauit.'
[106] Knowles, *Episcopal Colleagues*, pp. 81-4, 152-4.

concepts in general, in Anglo-Norman England. While William de Saint-Calais' use of military power against William II was unsuccessful, his invocation of the immaterial principle of episcopal immunity from feudal prosecution seems to have caused the king some trouble. There is no way of knowing what would have happened if the royalists had not been able to override William's appeal by separating his feudal and ecclesiastical personae. Possibly, William would simply have been punished anyway. The king certainly had the physical means to do this. Abstract ideas were important, but probably not dominant. And the author of the *De iniusta vexacione* may have attributed an undue significance to such legal concepts, in the same way that the monastic authors of the texts discussed in Chapter 2 attributed an undue significance to the spiritual authority of certain charismatic holy men in Anglo-Norman politics. Literate monks may have found some comfort in the notion that mere words could constrain a king.

Nevertheless, it is significant in itself that William de Saint-Calais and other bishops could appeal to the pope and to canon law against their king, and that they thought this to be worth doing. For a bishop in political difficulties, this was an important weapon. Often, it is the only weapon we hear of bishops using.

<center>***</center>

The last of this chapter's case studies concerns Ranulf Flambard, bishop of Durham from 1099 to 1128. As with the other case studies, the intention is not to provide an account of the bishop's career in general, but to highlight certain aspects of one episode within it, namely Ranulf's brief loss of his bishopric between 1101 and 1102.[107] Ranulf Flambard was – according to the chronicles – the most maliciously inventive of William II's tax-collectors and advisors, and the linchpin of that king's tyrannical government. In 1099, William II rewarded Ranulf's loyal service by permitting him to pay £1,000 for the bishopric of

---

[107] Surveys of Ranulf's career are provided by: J.O. Prestwich, 'The Career of Ranulf Flambard' in *Anglo-Norman Durham,* ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 299-310; H.S. Offler, 'Ranulf Flambard as bishop of Durham (1099-1128)', in H.S. Offler, *North of the Tees: Studies in Medieval British History*, ed. A.J. Piper and A.I. Doyle (Aldershot, 1996), 14-25; Richard

Durham, but Ranulf was unable to enjoy the fruits of his simony for long. On 2 August 1100, the king died in a hunting accident, and his younger brother Henry seized the English throne. Henry I, seeking to gain support, promised to put an end to his predecessor's abuses, and found Ranulf Flambard to be a convenient scapegoat. Ranulf was thrown into gaol, becoming the first known inmate of the Tower of London, and – on 2 February 1100 – its first escapee.

Ranulf fled to Normandy where he helped Duke Robert, Henry I's brother, to organise an invasion of England. Robert's fleet landed at Portsmouth in the summer of 1101, probably on 20 July, but the imminent war was prevented when the two brothers came to a peaceful agreement, with Henry I buying out Duke Robert's rights in England.[108] As part of this agreement, Ranulf Flambard was reinstated as bishop of Durham; but he remained active in Normandy for the next five or six years, unlawfully occupying the see of Lisieux on which he tried to impose first his brother Fulcher, then his two under-age sons, and finally his clerk, William of Pacy. In 1107, however, with the appointment of John de Séez as bishop, Ranulf's brood was definitively forced out of Lisieux. From that point until his death in 1128, Ranulf's activities were concentrated on Durham and England.[109]

Ranulf's story presents several points of interest. C.W. Hollister thought that in 1101, 'for the first and last time', the feckless and inert Duke Robert of Normandy acted with decision, energy and vigour: 'The source of this suddenly effective leadership was Ranulf Flambard.'[110] The contrast with Robert's normal uselessness might be taken as a demonstration of the importance which episcopal advisors could play in Anglo-Norman politics, and it would explain the 'astonishing leniency'[111] with which Henry I treated the fugitive bishop, and his readiness to reinstate him. Henry presumably realised that Ranulf was too dangerous to have as an enemy. However, this interpretation is built on the assumption that Duke Robert was – as Orderic Vitalis described him – a brave but

---

Southern, 'Ranulf Flambard', in Richard Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970), 183-205.

[108] For these events, see Hollister, 'Civil War'.

[109] For Ranulf's Norman activities see William Aird, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy (c. 1050-1134)* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 211-2; *OV*, vol. 5, p. 322.

[110] Hollister, 'Civil War', pp. 322-3. *Cf.* pp. 326-7.

[111] Southern, 'Ranulf Flambard', p. 197.

idiotic and gullible spendthrift. It would be dangerous to build too much upon Hollister's suggestions.

For the present discussion, it is more important that when Ranulf was arrested by Henry I he appears to have reacted in exactly the same way as William de Saint-Calais and Odo of Bayeux did when they fell into the clutches of William I and William II: by claiming episcopal immunity from secular prosecution. Ranulf's appeals were only slightly more effective than those of William and Odo had been. Here too, the sources imply that the rogue prelate's improper and 'unepiscopal' behaviour meant that he forfeited his right to be treated as a bishop. Episcopal office was essentially conditional.

But Ranulf's case also contains an element not present in those of Odo and William de Saint-Calais. Even after his secular rehabilitation with Henry I, Ranulf seems to have been forced to undergo a canonical 'trial', ordered by the pope and administered by Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. Until Ranulf had responded to the ecclesiastical charges against him (that he had ascended uncanonically, that is, simoniacally, to the episcopate) his rehabilitation was not complete, and there is evidence that, symbolically at least, Ranulf only fully recovered the possessions of his bishopric after this hearing. Essentially, Ranulf Flambard found himself in a similar situation to that of Herbert Losinga: the uncomfortable situation of a bishop whose defiance of ecclesiastical law, and by implication the power of the Church as a whole, eventually caught up with him.

An advantage of discussing Ranulf's case is that it frees us from reliance on relatively late and doubtful chronicles. Most of the evidence comes from Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury's letter collection, and is virtually contemporary. The key document is a letter of Anselm to Pope Paschal II. Anselm informed Paschal, *inter alia*, that Ranulf Flambard, the 'most infamous prince of tax-collectors' (*publicanorum princeps infamissimus*), had been imprisoned. Ranulf, hearing of Anselm's recent return to England, had asked Anselm to come to his aid 'as to a bishop'. Anselm had sent four bishops to Ranulf with the message that if Ranulf wished to show that he had advanced to the episcopate in such a way that he deserved to be treated as a bishop then he was to have the freedom to do so. But the four bishops had declared Ranulf's response to their questioning unsatisfactory. Ranulf had then escaped and joined the king's enemies,

making himself a 'lord of pirates'. Anselm finished by asking the pope for advice in this matter. [112] He presumably wanted to know whether Ranulf could legitimately be deposed from his bishopric.

Anselm did not explicitly say that Ranulf had claimed ecclesiastical immunity from the jurisdiction of Henry I, but this is almost certainly what Ranulf wanted. In any case, it is clear that Ranulf was appealing to his ecclesiastical superior, the archbishop of Canterbury (who had, or at least wanted to have, jurisdiction over all of Britain), against his feudal overlord. Like Odo of Bayeux and William de Saint-Calais, Ranulf was trying to capitalise on his position as a member of the church's hierarchy. But Anselm refused to help Ranulf. He (Anselm) wrote to Paschal II that William II had made Ranulf bishop against the will of all religious men and against all justice; that Ranulf was tainted by simony and other crimes committed both before and during his episcopate; that he had been consecrated *inordinate*; and that when Ranulf was captured, his own archbishop (Thomas I of York) had confessed that he held Ranulf neither for a brother nor a bishop, since Ranulf's promises before his consecration had all been lies.[113]

Like the *De iniusta vexacione*'s description of William de Saint-Calais and Orderic Vitalis' description of Odo of Bayeux, Anselm's letter implies that Ranulf Flambard did not deserve to be treated as a bishop because he had not acted as one. But Ranulf's violation of ecclesiastical law, in particular his simony, seems to have been the real sticking point. Under a powerful and unconcerned king, Ranulf (like Herbert Losinga before him) had been able to ignore the wider law of the church, and hence the wider ecclesiastical power structure which imposed and enforced that law. When, however, Ranulf attempted to appeal to that power structure by asking for Anselm's help, his past conduct was a liability.

So Roman law and Roman power had some hold on such a worldly, even irreligious, bishop as Ranulf Flambard. Henry I did not imprison Ranulf because of his simony. As far as we know, he was only interested in Ranulf's secular offences. But because of Ranulf's simony, Anselm refused to help him 'as a bishop'. What such help would have consisted of, what Ranulf was expecting

---

[112] *AEp.*, no. 214.
[113] *AEp.*, no. 214.

from Anselm, and what Anselm would have been willing or able to do for Ranulf is not entirely clear. Neither is it clear just what Henry I wanted to do with Ranulf. Possibly he wished to try him as a lay baron, as William de Saint-Calais had been tried in 1088. The shakily enthroned Henry I could not afford to upset Anselm, and it is entirely possible that he would have released Ranulf if Anselm had demanded it, or that he would have allowed Anselm to try Ranulf in an ecclesiastical council, according to the canons. Perhaps the question is irrelevant: if Ranulf had behaved before his imprisonment in a manner acceptable to Anselm, he would probably never have committed the offences which led Henry I to imprison him in the first place.

So Ranulf Flambard's episcopal status did not protect him from Henry I. And the king seems to have reinstated Ranulf for purely political, secular, reasons. Either Ranulf was too dangerous to leave at large; or Robert Curthose had insisted on Ranulf's restitution to his bishopric during his peace negotiations with Henry I. In fact, Ranulf's position as a bishop made him more vulnerable in 1101 than a layman would have been. Ranulf was threatened not only by the king, but by Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury and Pope Paschal II, both of whom objected to Ranulf's simoniacal acquisition of his bishopric as well as to the secular offences for which Henry I had imprisoned him. Even after his reconciliation with Henry I, Ranulf was forced to satisfy his ecclesiastical superiors. It seems that Ranulf was only fully, that is, ecclesiastically, restored to his bishopric in the summer of 1102, more than six months after making peace with the king. The evidence for this is a little tangled, but in general clear enough.

Firstly, undated letters of absolution for Ranulf Flambard survive from Archbishops Gerard of York and Anselm of Canterbury. Edmund Craster (who edited these and other documents relating to Ranulf's episcopate) treated the letters of Anselm and Gerard together and assumed them to have been issued at the same time, but this is a mistake. Gerard's letter was addressed to Prior Turgot and the convent at Durham. It announced that Ranulf Flambard had been reconciled to, and absolved from any quarrel by, Henry I. Gerard had, with the assent of his fellow bishops, received Ranulf from the hand of the king that he might be restored to his seat (*i.e.* the church of Durham). Gerard added that he himself absolved Ranulf of any sins committed during his absence from Durham. He closed by asking the convent to receive and to obey Ranulf as a lord and

father.[114] Strictly speaking this letter is not really an absolution of Ranulf Flambard. Its main function was to attest the reconciliation between Ranulf and the king, which was almost certainly that of autumn 1101. Gerard's own absolution was of relatively little importance. The letter itself was probably issued soon or immediately after this reconciliation, since it refers to Ranulf as one who was still in exile.[115]

Anselm's letter, on the other hand, was almost certainly issued some time later than Gerard's. It addressed Ranulf personally, formally absolving him in the name of St Peter, and adding Anselm's personal absolution 'quantum tua expetit accusacio et ad me pertinet remissio'.[116] This letter must be later than two letters of Pope Paschal II, both of which are dated 15 April 1102 and both of which ordered a canonical trial of Ranulf Flambard. The first of Paschal's letters responded to various questions posed by Anselm, one of which concerned the recently reinstated Ranulf Flambard. Paschal ordered that, since Ranulf had 'according to our command'[117] been restored to his bishopric, his case was to be heard in Anselm's presence in a gathering of bishops. If Ranulf could not clear himself by the oath of seven fellow bishops,[118] he was to be sent to the pope; and if he refused to go to Rome, he was to be expelled from his bishopric and canonically replaced.[119] Paschal's second letter is addressed to Ranulf Flambard, ordering him to appear before Anselm.[120]

On their own, these two papal letters would be evidence of little more than Roman presumption. Paschal II may in 1101 have ordered Ranulf's restitution to his cathedral (presumably so that, having had his possessions restored, he could be tried canonically, in accordance with the principle of *exceptio spolii*). But no such mandate survives, and it is unlikely that Henry I would have been much swayed by it. Similarly, the fact that Paschal II ordered Ranulf to clear himself canonically before Anselm cannot be taken as evidence that any such hearing took

[114] Edmund Craster, 'A Contemporary Record of the Pontificate of Ranulf Flambard', in *Archaeologia Æliana* 4th ser. 7 (1930), 33-56, no. 19.
[115] 'de cuius absencia admodum contristatos vos esse cognovimus'
[116] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', no. 18. 'as much as the charge against you allows, and as much as the remission belongs to me'
[117] 'iuxta preceptum nostrum'
[118] 'nisi se septima sui ordinis manu expurgare potuerit'
[119] *AEp.*, no. 223.
[120] *AEp.*, no. 225.

place. But the existence of Anselm's absolution of Ranulf – if it is not a forgery – changes matters. Anselm can hardly have absolved Ranulf before Paschal sent his two letters. After all, Paschal was writing in response to Anselm's request for advice in this matter, a request which Anselm would not have made if he had already absolved Ranulf. The absolution must therefore come after Paschal's command that Anselm preside over a canonical trial of Ranulf Flambard. And it is hard to imagine that, having received such a command from the pope, Anselm would have absolved Ranulf, unless the canonical trial ordered by Paschal II had actually taken place.

We can therefore assume that Ranulf Flambard's case received some kind of canonical hearing, and that Anselm then formally absolved Ranulf in the name of the pope. This must have taken place after 15 April 1102 (the date of Paschal's letters). Whether Ranulf was in any real danger, that is, whether Henry I would have allowed Anselm to depose his newly reinstated bishop of Durham, is not clear. Nor is it obvious where this hearing took place, nor how it was conducted.

However, some light is shed on the matter by the well known series of royal writs ordering the restitution of Ranulf Flambard's lands. These writs have been widely exploited by historians; but what has not been noticed is that in the summer of 1102 they changed in character.[121] The first writ in the series, probably issued 3 September 1101, gave Ranulf all the 'lands and customs and laws and liberties' of which the church of Durham was seised on William II's death.[122] Two more writs, probably issued between October 1101 and May 1102, granted Ranulf all of his 'things' (*res*) in lands, men, mills and meadows, as well as his customs; Ranulf was also freed from the pleas of expedition (*de placitis expedicionis*), and those of Ranulf's men who had left his lands were ordered to return.[123] Another two writs, probably from early 1102, also returned Ranulf's *res*.[124] There then came an abrupt change. A writ (probably from June 1102) gave Ranulf his lands, men, things and customs, 'et omnes suas alias res et consuetudines que pertinent

---

[121] *E.g.* Offler, 'Ranulf Flambard', pp. 16-7.

[122] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', no. 13, and p. 43 for the dating; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 545. 'terrae et consuetudines et leges et quietudines'

[123] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', nos 11-2; *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 540-1. For the date of no. 11, see Hollister, 'Civil War', p. 326 n. 7. No. 12 was probably issued at the same time as no. 11, given its similar subject matter.

[124] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', nos 14-5; *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 560-1.

ad episcopatum suum'.[125] This was followed by two further writs from between July and Septmber 1102 ordering that Ranulf be reseised of all the lands pertaining to the bishopric (*ad episcopatum*) of Durham.[126] These three writs were the last general restorations of Ranulf's lands.[127] What connects them, and what separates them from the earlier writs, is their reference to Ranulf's bishopric, his *episcopatus*.

The significance of this difference is not clear. It is not possible to argue that from June 1102 the lands of Ranulf Flambard's bishopric, rather than his personal lands, were being restored, because at least two of the earlier writs obviously concern the possessions of the church of Durham.[128] The difference may only have been a semantic one. The first writ, issued (probably) on 3 September 1101, effectively restored everything to Ranulf: all of the church of Durham's 'terras et consuetudines et leges et quietudines'. The function of the later writs was to reinforce, clarify and geographically localise the command, which the king's agents may have been somewhat lax in carrying out. Interestingly, the writs mentioning Ranulf's *episcopatus* seem to concede the contention made by William de Saint-Calais and denied by Lanfranc in 1088, namely that a bishop's office is single and indivisible. In them, Ranulf's *episcopatus* encompassed not only the spiritual rights of the bishopric but the fief associated with it. Perhaps Anselm, having absolved Ranulf, persuaded the king to use the 'correct' terminology in drafting the writs for him.

---

[125] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', no. 17; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 575. 'and all other things and customs which pertain to his bishopric'. This writ contains a puzzling sentence: 'Et si ipse est dissaisitus de aliqua re, inde citissime resaisiatur postquam primitus erga me bene concordatus est.' Edmund Craster ('Contemporary Record', pp. 43-4) thought that this meant that the reconciliation between Ranulf and Henry I was not yet complete, presumably translating the sentence as 'And if he has been disseised of anything, may it be restored to him after he is first well reconciled with me.' But it seems more likely that the sentence has been garbled in transmission and that it originally read 'Et si ipse est dissaisitus de aliqua re postquam primitus erga me bene concordatus est, inde citissime resaisiatur.' This would be intended to protect Ranulf from the rapacity of overzealous royal officers who had ignored Ranulf's original restitution. The writ is preserved in the same form in two manuscripts, which perhaps tells against the hypothesis of textual corruption. But *cf.* no. 20, which also survives in two manuscripts and has obviously been altered (either added to, or slightly corrupted).

[126] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', nos 20-1; *Early Yorkshire Charters*, ed. William Farrer *et al.*, 11 vols (Edinburgh, 1914-63), vol. 2, no. 932; *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 589-90.

[127] With the exception of a much later writ of 1115-6: Craster, 'Contemporary Record', no. 30; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 1124.

[128] Craster, 'Contemporary Record', no 13. No. 15 orders that Ranulf be reseised 'de omnibus rebus sancti Cuthberti' in Yorkshire. Cuthbert was the patron saint of the church of Durham.

Whatever its real meaning, it is hard not to connect this shift in terminology with Anselm's absolution of Ranulf following some kind of canonical purgation. If this is so, then Ranulf's ecclesiastical trial must have taken place in the spring or early summer of 1102. This chronology would fit with Pope Paschal's letters. If they were sent 15 April 1102, they would have reached England sometime in May. The Whitsun court held at Westminster on 25 May 1102 presents itself as a possible venue for Ranulf's ecclesiastical trial and rehabilitation. And this would explain why he was not deposed or otherwise corrected at Anselm's council of Westminster of September 1102, where several other simoniacal prelates were deposed.[129] Ranulf's simony and prior misconduct had already been dealt with.

Taken as a whole, Ranulf Flambard's case provides a parallel to those of both William de Saint-Calais and Herbert Losinga. Like William de Saint-Calais, Ranulf attempted to protect himself from the king by appealing against him to the ecclesiastical power structure and probably denying the king's feudal jurisdiction over him. Like William de Saint-Calais, Ranulf failed in this appeal. But the reasons for his failure were different. Ranulf's ecclesiastical superiors, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury and Pope Paschal II, cut him loose. His simony (the result of excessive proximity to his secular master) alienated his ecclesiastical masters, and when Ranulf found himself at odds with the new king, they refused to help him. In fact, Anselm and Paschal continued to pursue Ranulf even after he had been reconciled with Henry I. So, like Herbert Losinga, Ranulf Flambard shows how the dual role of the medieval bishop could, politically speaking, be a positive disadvantage.

The experience of Ranulf Flambard also illustrates this chapter's principal contentions. It shows the real power of abstract principles in Anglo-Norman England. Ranulf would presumably have been protected from the king by his episcopal office (one set of principles), if he had not previously ignored ecclesiastical law (another set of principles). Ranulf Flambard's experience also demonstrates the relative weakness of papal authority in England in this period. Anselm, acting on Paschal II's orders, was able to bring about Ranulf's canonical trial. But this trial was probably a sham. Ranulf was absolved, despite his blatant

---

[129] *C&S*, vol. 2, no. 113, pp. 672, 674-5.

guilt (and he could probably have been deposed on other grounds than simony). Henry I was probably unwilling to let Anselm punish such an important member of the English episcopate.

<div align="center">∗∗∗</div>

It is not clear how typical the bishops discussed in this chapter were. The question is too broad to be answered here. However, any medieval bishop was theoretically bound up in two separate hierarchies of power. It is reasonable to suppose that bishops from other periods and other kingdoms faced the same problems, and attempted the same strategies as Anselm, Herbert, William and Ranulf. It is not hard to find examples from twelfth-century England. Thomas Becket provides an obvious parallel to St Anselm, as does his predecessor Theobald. Thomas Becket's experience also reflected, in some ways, that of William de Saint-Calais. We have already mentioned the plan of the royalist bishops at the Council of Northampton to counter Thomas Becket's episcopal immunity from feudal prosecution by appealing beforehand to the pope for his deposition. Another parallel to William II's prosecution of William de Saint-Calais is the arrest of the bishops of Salisbury, Lincoln and Ely by King Stephen in 1139.[130]

Yet in some ways the parallels from Anglo-Saxon England are more interesting. The links between the Anglo-Saxon church and Rome are well attested.[131] Indeed, in some respects the Norman Conquest represented (at least in the short term) a reduction of papal influence in England. Whether William the Conqueror actually did seek to isolate the English church from outside influence with his new customs is not clear.[132] But it is certain that far more English bishops

---

[130] Edmund King, *King Stephen* (London, 2010), pp. 107-14.

[131] For an overview, see Veronica Ortenberg, 'The Anglo-Saxon Church and the Papacy', in *The English Church and the Papacy*, ed. Lawrence, 29-62.

[132] For Eadmer's claims that he did, see *HN*, pp. 9-10.

and abbots attended papal councils in the fifty years before the Norman Conquest than in the fifty years after it.[133]

The papacy could play an important role in the careers of Anglo-Saxon prelates. In 1022, the expelled Abbot Leofwine of Ely was apparently reinstated at Rome, having cleared himself of those things of which he was accused.[134] Bishop Ulf of Dorchester, on the other hand, came close to having his pastoral staff broken by Pope Leo IX at the council of Vercelli in 1050. According to the E and F texts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Ulf was incapable of performing his duties, but escaped deposition by giving treasure (presumably to the pope).[135] Just possibly, this unfavourable account hides a ritual of resignation and reinvestiture similar to that later performed by Herbert Losinga.

The best Anglo-Saxon example is Robert de Jumièges, appointed bishop of London in 1044, and promoted to the archbishopric of Canterbury in 1051. Returning from Rome in 1051 with his archiepiscopal pallium, Robert refused to consecrate Spearhafoc, his successor as bishop of London, even though Spearhafoc had King Edward the Confessor's writ for his consecration. Robert claimed that the pope had forbidden him to consecrate Spearhafoc.[136] Spearhafoc was linked to the family of Earl Godwine, a powerful faction at the court of Edward the Confessor; this faction was opposed to the group of Edward the Confessor's Norman friends to which Robert de Jumièges himself belonged. Robert may have attempted, with some success, to involve the papacy in the factional politics of England (by accusing Spearhafoc to the pope). Or he may have been conscientiously following a papal command, even though this risked problems for him in England. Later on, when the tide in England had turned against Robert's Norman party, and Robert and his friends were forced into exile, he apparently went to Rome, where he protested to the pope against his treatment in England.[137] When Anselm of Canterbury went into exile in 1097, he may have had Robert's example in mind.[138]

---

[133] For example, *ASC E*, p. 79, *s.a.* 1046, p. 80 *s.a.* 1047.

[134] *ASC E*, p. 75, *s.a.* 1022.

[135] *ASC E*, p. 80, *s.a.* 1047; *ASC F*, p. 120, *s.a.* 1049.

[136] *ASC E*, p. 80, *s.a.* 1048.

[137] *GR*, ii.199.9; *GP*, i.22.2.

[138] Robert's case is more fully examined by Tom Licence, 'Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop in Exile (1052-1055)', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 42 (2013), forthcoming.

So there is much scope for further research on the question of papal authority and the medieval episcopate. Even from our period (*c.* 1066-1135) and from England, this chapter has not examined every possible example. According to John of Worcester, Bishop Walcher of Durham (1071-80) offered to purge himself according to a pontifical judgement (*iudicium pontificale*) after his archdeacon, Gilbert, arranged the murder of the local nobleman, Ligulf. And when Walcher met with Ligulf's angry friends and relatives at Gateshead, he refused to plead (*placitare*) in the open, but insisted on going into the church there.[139] Like his successor William de Saint-Calais, Walcher may have intended some kind of appeal to episcopal immunity, not from the king's feudal jurisdiction, but from the bloody Northumbrian politics of vendetta. In the event, neither Walcher's episcopal status nor his armed followers could save him from being hacked down by the vengeful northerners.

Bishop Hildebert of Le Mans (1096-1125, later archbishop of Tours) could also be compared to William de Saint-Calais. In 1099, William II accused Hildebert of complicity in a recent rebellion against him, and, rejecting Hildebert's offer of *legitima purgatio*, insisted that Hildebert clear himself by the ordeal of hot iron. It seems that, having consulted Ivo of Chartres, Hildebert refused to do this, on the grounds that ordeals and trials by battle were contrary to the law of the church (Hildebert also refused to satisfy the king by demolishing the towers of his cathedral, which the king thought had been used as fortifications against him). Hildebert was forced to accompany William II to England, but was later released by the king, probably in 1100. The exact details of this case are not clear, but it does not seem that William II was able to subject Hildebert to a feudal trial. Possibly, Hildebert's episcopal status protected him from the king, or the king had other reasons for sparing the bishop.[140]

Other bishops did not share Hildebert's scruples about trial by ordeal. When Bishop Remigius of Lincoln (1067-92) was accused of treason (possibly in 1088), he was cleared after one of his men underwent the ordeal of the hot iron on his behalf.[141] Whether this (that he was allowed to perform the ordeal vicariously)

---

[139] *JW*, vol. 3, p. 34, *s.a.* 1080.

[140] For all this, see *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium*, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru (Le Mans, 1901), pp. 402-4; Barlow, *William Rufus*, pp. 404-6; Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae*, no. 74.

[141] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum,* vi.41, pp. 408-10.

represented a concession to Remigius' episcopal status is not clear. This is another case where our sources are frustratingly laconic.

Remigius of Lincoln is also of interest as a parallel to Herbert Losinga. In 1072, at Rome, Remigius was accused of simony (he had earned his bishopric by service to William the Conqueror) and surrendered his pastoral staff to Pope Alexander II. Archbishop Thomas of York (1070-1100) also surrendered his staff; he was the son of a priest. However, Pope Alexander restored their staffs to the bishops at the request of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury.[142] This probably represents another formalised ritual of submission, not only to the pope, but also to Lanfranc. Since Lanfranc and Thomas were at that time competing for Remigius' diocese (whether it belonged to York or to Canterbury), this submission may have had a wider significance.[143]

Archbishop Thurstan of York (1114-40), on the other hand, furnishes a striking parallel with Anselm.[144] Like Anselm, Thurstan went into exile following difficulties in England. He too had his tribulations recorded by one of his companions. Thurstan's motivations were less lofty than Anselm's. Indeed, Anselm would not have approved of them: Thurstan refused to make a profession of obedience to Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury. But Thurstan's biographer Hugh the Chanter was careful to represent the conflict not as a petty dispute for primacy between two archbishoprics, but as one touching on issues of a bishop's ultimate loyalty. Thurstan – unlike Henry I or Archbishop Ralph – was willing always to submit himself to the judgement of the pope, and unwilling to offend God and the Roman church.[145] Ralph, on the other hand, publicly declared himself as subject only to the English king: if the pope himself ordered him, 'ore ad os', to consecrate Thurstan without a profession of obedience to Canterbury, he would not do it.[146] Thurstan's disputes with Canterbury are also of interest in that Pope

---

[142] *HN*, p. 11.

[143] See also Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 27. Bishop Herfast of Thetford laid his staff on the altar of the abbey of Bury St Edmunds to symbolise the renunciation of his claims over the abbey. But here the submission was not to the pope at all, but to Abbot Baldwin and his monks; and Herfast's staff may simply have served as a pledge for another staff which he had misappropriated from the abbey.

[144] Bishops Turgot of St Andrews and John of Glasgow are also of interest. After difficulties in Scotland, both of them decided to seek justice in Rome: *Historia regum,* ed. Arnold in *Symeonis opera omnia*, vol. 2, 3-283, pp. 204-5, 264.

[145] Hugh the Chanter, *History*, *passim.* and p. 70.

[146] Hugh the Chanter, *History*, p. 64. 'mouth to mouth', *i.e.* in person.

Calixtus II was eventually able to force the hand of Henry I and oblige him to receive Thurstan – consecrated by himself, against Henry I's will – back into England. The papacy's European influence was growing rapidly in this period.[147]

Finally, there is Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester (1062-95). Nicholas Brooks suggests that Wulfstan escaped William the Conqueror's purge of the English episcopate in the early 1070s not so much because of his reputation for holiness, but because his appointment as bishop in 1062 had been supervised by two papal legates, thus legitimising his position (other English bishops were deposed on the pretext that they had been consecrated by the schismatic Archbishop Stigand of Canterbury).[148] If Brooks is right in this, then of all the bishops in Anglo-Norman England, Wulfstan drew arguably the greatest benefits from papal authority.

This chapter has overlooked examples of papal involvement in the local disputes of the English episcopate in our period. This is deliberate. The topic is a large one and deserves separate treatment. Chapter 5 of this thesis touches on it with regard to the dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and the abbots of the monastery of St Augustine in that city. But it should be noted that the increasing tendency of squabbling prelates to appeal to papal authority in our period is, like the increasing influence of the papacy in Anglo-Norman England, historiographically well attested.[149]

<p align="center">∗∗∗</p>

---

[147] *Cf.* Denis Bethell, 'William of Corbeil and the Canterbury York Dispute', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 19 (1968), 145-59, pp. 157-8: 'The Canterbury-York dispute in this period was discussed and decided in Rome. That dispute and discussion marks the beginnings of a quite new period in Anglo-Papal relations, the age of appeals, of decretals, of frequent (and important) papal pronouncements.' See also Mary Cheney, 'Some Observations on a Papal Privilege of 1120 for the Archbishops of York', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 429-39, pp. 431-2.

[148] Nicholas Brooks, 'Introduction: How Do We Know about St Wulfstan?', in *Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 1-21, p. 2.

[149] Brett, *English Church*, pp. 50-62; Duggan, 'From the Conquest to the Death of John', pp. 83, 85.

This chapter's introduction set out three main contentions. The first was that the dual role (secular and ecclesiastical) of bishops in Anglo-Norman England was of fundamental importance in determining their political conduct. The chapter's four case studies have proven this beyond any reasonable doubt. It bears repeating that, with the exception of the Anglo-Saxon bishops deposed by William the Conqueror, and, just possibly, of Remigius of Lincoln, these were the only churchmen from our period to come into conflict with the English king. This makes it especially significant that, in each case, the papacy was somehow involved in the conflict. The problem for Anselm and Herbert Losinga was essentially one of divided loyalties. Ranulf Flambard and William de Saint-Calais (and Odo of Bayeux) are in some ways more interesting in that they treated these divided loyalties as a political resource. In their political conduct, bishops, with their dual loyalties, were subject to pressures from which laymen were free. Conversely, certain strategies (the appeal to ecclesiastical authority) were available to bishops which laymen could not hope to employ.

The second of this chapter's two contentions is similarly uncontroversial. Papal authority in Anglo-Norman England was as yet weak. It was only in specific – and rare – situations that English bishops felt the political influence of the papacy. And the papally centred ecclesiastical law, together with the new norms of ecclesiastical conduct advocated by the Gregorian reformers of the eleventh century, had little hold over most members of the English episcopate. Herbert Losinga's simony (one of the abuses castigated by the reformers) caused him some problems, but did not ultimately cost him his bishopric. Ranulf Flambard, another simoniac, seems to have got away with little more than a symbolic punishment. And the wider ecclesiastical hierarchy headed by the pope was unable to do very much for any of the bishops discussed in this chapter, even for Anselm. All this ties in with the ambivalent treatment of canon law in the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1. There was still a great deal of uncertainty about such matters; and it was such uncertainty which allowed the two rivalling conceptions of episcopal office voiced at the trial of William de Saint-Calais to flourish side by side.

But the third, and most important, of this chapter's contentions (the power of abstract concepts in Anglo-Norman England) is perhaps a little harder to swallow. One might question how much real influence abstract legal, or even

theological, principles could have had on the hard-headed Anglo-Norman nobility. Would William I, William II or Henry I really have let themselves be stopped by issues of ecclesiastical law? Would enough of the lesser nobility have paid attention to such issues to prevent these kings from doing what they wanted? It was convenient that a legal way around the troublesome appeals to episcopal immunity made by Odo of Bayeux or William de Saint-Calais could be found, but was this necessary? Odo of Bayeux, Ranulf Flambard and William de Saint-Calais were already in the king's hands; it is unlikely that they would be released on a technicality. This must remain uncertain. But it is significant that these rebellious bishops thought that they had something to gain from appealing to canon law and to their ecclesiastical privileges. And St Anselm at least appears to have been protected from the king by his episcopal status and the notion that a bishop was immune from feudal prosecution.

Moreover, the real power of abstract concepts in this period is evident in other, less doubtful, ways. As has been mentioned, Herbert Losinga's problems arose from changing norms of ecclesiastical behaviour, namely the hard line towards simony taken by Anselm and other eleventh-century ecclesiastics. Anselm was bound to the papacy by his own theology. Ranulf Flambard's unlawful behaviour (his failure to adhere to certain norms of conduct), together with his simony, deprived him of St Anselm's support. That ideas had a real power in other areas of Anglo-Norman politics can hardly be denied. The king, for example, was only king (and only had access to the resources of royal power) because of the idea that a son (or at least a relation) of the old king should succeed him. That something similar was the case with the episcopate should not be entirely surprising.

The suggestion that such abstract ideas were more important in the conflicts between these bishops and the English king than concrete forms of power (at least, concrete forms of power wielded by the bishops) may be controversial. But the facts, as expounded above, speak for themselves. William de Saint-Calais was the only one of our bishops to use such 'concrete' power against the king, and it helped him very little. Chapter 2 of this thesis rejected the idea that certain of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England wielded a special spiritual authority, an immaterial or social power based on shared expectations and values. This chapter has shown that, to a certain extent, bishops, through their

episcopal status and the rights associated with it, could hope to wield a similar, though more prosaic, form of power, at least in certain situations. But the reservation 'to a certain extent' is important. For even with the help of the papacy, and even with the idea that a bishop was immune from the king's secular jurisdiction, the bishops discussed in this chapter could do very little against their king. Royal power in Anglo-Norman England, more so than in the rest of contemporary Europe, was dominant. In general, the English bishops acted for the king, perhaps because they had no choice but to do so. The next chapter of this thesis, Chapter 4, expands on this theme, showing how, to achieve their goals at a local level, the best strategy for bishops was often to work through the king, essentially ignoring their own power resources. But since, as has been mentioned above, royal power came largely from an idea (the commonly accepted notion that certain lands belonged to a certain individual, whom the holders of other lands were bound to serve), Chapter 4 can also be taken as a partial confirmation of the arguments of the present chapter concerning immaterial power.

Chapter 4: Episcopal Power and Land (Case Studies: Dorchester / Lincoln and Worcester)

According to Paul Fouracre and Wendy Davies,

Land, in a pre-industrial society, was the source of (very nearly) all wealth; put simply, wealth brought you power because it allowed you to reward armed men who in turn allowed you to acquire further wealth in a variety of ways and defend the wealth you had.[1]

Similarly, Timothy Reuter wrote of the 'e=mc² equation' between property and power.[2] But there are some problems with this conception. Firstly, wealth did not always come from land. The bishops of Anglo-Norman England drew much of their income from the spiritualities: various tithes and offerings from their parishioners.[3] Legal jurisdiction may also have been profitable. Secondly, power did not only come from wealth, as Chapter 3 of this thesis demonstrated. In their conflicts with their king, English bishops were most able to protect themselves through abstract ideas and through appeal to a higher ecclesiastical authority; their land and wealth were largely irrelevant. This chapter examines episcopal landholding in the fifty years following the Norman Conquest. It argues that here too the link between land, wealth and power was neither absolute nor automatic.

The chapter consists of two case studies, looking at the dioceses of Dorchester / Lincoln and Worcester, and specifically at Bishop Remigius of Dorchester (1067-92), who moved the seat of the diocese to Lincoln in the early 1070s, Remigius' successor, Robert Bloet of Lincoln (1093-1123), and Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester (1062-95). It seeks to determine how the landed endowment of these dioceses changed in the years following the Norman Conquest, and what role the bishops had in this. It asks what power resources the

---

[1] Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre, 'Introduction', in *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge, 1995), 1-16, p. 2.
[2] Timothy Reuter, 'Property Transactions and Social Relations between Rulers, Bishops and Nobles in Early Eleventh-Century Saxony: The Evidence of the *Vita Meinwerci*', in *Property and Power*, ed. Davies and Fouracre, 165-99, p. 194. See also Fleming, *Kings and Lords*, p. xv: 'as the greatest source of wealth, land was almost exclusively the avenue to secular power.'
[3] John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 434 *ff*.; Brett, *English Church*, pp. 161 *ff*..

bishops deployed to protect their existing lands and to acquire new ones. Worcester and Lincoln were chosen as case studies for two reasons. Firstly, the source material is exceptionally rich for these dioceses, but it has not been fully exploited.[4] For Lincoln, David Bates' short study of Bishop Remigius provides a starting point, but very little has been written about Remigius' successor, Robert Bloet.[5] At Worcester, by contrast, a number of specialised studies exist,[6] as well as a biography of Bishop Wulfstan, but no attempt has been made to provide a general overview of the bishops' tenurial policy and means of action.[7]

The second reason for using Lincoln and Worcester as case studies is that Bishops Wulfstan of Worcester and Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln might be said to represent two extremes of the spectrum of episcopal conduct. Wulfstan typifies the otherworldly, saintly, element within the Anglo-Norman episcopate; he was also English. Remigius and Robert Bloet were administrative curialists and Norman. Perhaps because of this, the two dioceses had very different experiences of the Norman Conquest. Lincoln's territory grew prodigiously while Worcester suffered appreciable, though not disastrous, losses. Most dioceses, and most bishops, fell somewhere between these two poles.

A few methodological points need to be made at this point. This chapter uses the words 'land', 'estate', 'holding' and 'manor' interchangeably, in a non-technical sense, to mean a parcel of land of indeterminate size, generally

---

[4] For Lincoln, in addition to *Domesday Book*, we have a large collection of royal charters, and the *Lindsey Survey* (see list of abbreviations under *LS*). The *Lindsey Survey* makes it possible to extend our analysis beyond the Domesday terminus of 1086, and thus to discuss the activity not just of Bishop Remigius but of his successor, Robert Bloet. For Worcester we have the late-eleventh-century cartulary, *Hemming's Cartulary* (see list of abbreviations under *HC*). *Hemming's Cartulary*, and the earlier *Liber Wigornensis*, are described by Neil Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. XIII', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin and R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1948), 49-75.

[5] David Bates, *Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, 1067-1092* (Lincoln, 1992). See also Dorothy Owen, 'The Norman Cathedral at Lincoln', in *ANS* 6 (1984), 188-99.

[6] Ann Williams, 'The Spoliation of Worcester', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 383-408, is the most useful of these for our purposes.

[7] Emma Mason's general works on St Wulfstan say very little on the subject of landholding: 'Change and Continuity in Eleventh-Century Mercia: The Experience of St Wulfstan of Worcester', in *ANS* 8 (1986), 154-76; *eadem*, *Wulfstan*; *eadem*, 'Wulfstan: Patriarch of the English?'. Francesca Tinti, *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c. 870 to c. 1100* (Farnham, 2010) goes into exhaustive detail on individual estates but says little about Wulfstan's general policy or means of action.

corresponding to an entry in *Domesday Book*.[8] The tax assessments (in hides or carucates) and values given for these lands are taken from *Domesday Book* (the figures for 1086), apart from when later land surveys are being discussed. *Domesday Book's* abbreviation *TRE* ('tempore regis Eadwardi' or 'in the time of King Edward') sometimes occurs in this chapter as a useful shorthand by which to refer to information given by *Domesday Book* about pre-Conquest conditions.

More importantly, for simplicity's sake, the chapter does not attempt systematically to distinguish between the bishops' own lands, the lands of their bishoprics and those of their cathedral chapters. It is often difficult to trace these distinctions in the sources. They may not have been entirely clear to contemporaries, at least at the beginning of our period.[9]

It should also be noted that, although this chapter makes extensive use of *Domesday Book* and other record sources (charters, subsequent land surveys, texts from cartularies), it does not assume that these sources, simply because they are not literary, are reliable. *Domesday Book* is noted for its many inaccuracies, and charters were often forged. However, since the intention here is to a give a general overview of episcopal landholding rather than to unravel the precise history of individual manors, the errors which might creep in do not affect the substance of this chapter's arguments. And the possibility that charters and other texts from cartularies could be false is always considered in what follows. The mass of accumulated diplomatic scholarship has at least weeded out the more obvious falsifications.

***

---

[8] For the latest view on what – to contemporaries – a manor was, see C.P. Lewis, 'The Invention of the Manor in Norman England', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 123-50.

[9] Everett U. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the mensa episcopalis* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 8.

Domesday Book shows us that in 1066 Bishop Wulfwig of Dorchester held about 350 hides and 100 carucates of land, worth about £400.[10] In 1086, Wulfwig's successor, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln (the seat of the bishopric had been moved), held 474 hides and 282 carucates, worth £721 3s 4d.[11] Robert Bloet, Remigius' successor, continued this territorial aggrandisement. Since no national land survey survives from his episcopate, we cannot trace the overall expansion of the bishopric's possessions by Robert Bloet. But the *Lindsey survey* of 1115 x 1118 shows that, in the northern part of Lincolnshire which it covers, some 60 carucates of land had been added to the 90 carucates which Remigius held there in 1086.[12] And a series of royal writs in Lincoln's favour suggests that Robert Bloet was also able to enlarge his bishopric's possessions elsewhere.[13]

---

[10] This is a generous guess, based on my own calculations (using 1086 values). Bishop Wulfwig may have held much less land (about 310 hides and 30 carucates, worth about £340). The interpretation of *TRE* tenure in *Domesday Book* is notoriously tricky, and so it is impossible to give exact figures. Stephen Baxter, *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 219-66, and Edward Miller, *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely: The Social History of an Ecclesiastical Estate from the Tenth Century to the Early Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1951), pp. 50-60, attempt to unravel some of the issues. Bates, *Remigius*, p. 21, estimates that bishop Wulfwig of Dorchester's holdings in 1066 were worth approximately £529 (at 1086 values). Giandrea, *Episcopal Culture*, p. 204, gives a total of 389 hides and carucates, worth £214 (at 1066 values).

[11] Again, these are my own calculations. Bates, *Remigius*, p. 29, gives a value of £729.

[12] The lands belonging to Lincoln in the *Lindsey Survey* but not in *Domesday Book* are: Beelsby (1 carucate; *LS* 8,11; LIN 47,6); Claxby by Normanby (1 bovate; *LS* 7,2); Dunham (5 carucates, 3 bovates; *LS* 3,2; LIN 1,36); East Wykeham (2 bovates; *LS* 18,11); Fenton (2 carucates; *LS* 6,1); Friesthorpe (2 carucates, 1 bovate; *LS* 3,6; LIN 26,13); Hole (2 bovates; *LS* 9,12); Langton by Wragby (1 carucate, 2 bovates; *LS* 16,3; LIN 47,8-9); Market Stainton (3 carucates; *LS* 13,6; LIN 43,3); Marton (4 carucates; *LS* 6,1; LIN 26,32-4); Nettleham (12 carucates; *LS* 3,2; LIN 1,35); Newton (12 carucates; *LS* 6,1); North and South Carlton (7 carucates; *LS* 3,2; LIN 68,2-3); Ranby (3 carucates; *LS* 13,6; LIN 43,1); Ravendale (2 bovates; *LS* 8,11; LIN 47,7); Reasby (1 bovate; *LS* 16,3; LIN 1,37); Reepham (4 bovates; *LS* 3,2; LIN 43,5); Riseholme (6 bovates; *LS* 3,1; LIN 8,13); Scothern (2 bovates; *LS* 3,2; LIN 43,6); Snelland (2 bovates; *LS* 16,3); Stallingborough (2 bovates; *LS* 11,9); Swinthorpe (1 carucate; *LS* 16,3; LIN 1,37); Thorganby (5 bovates; *LS* 7,2; LIN 47,5); Wickenby (1 carucate; *LS* 16,3; LIN 1,37). The tax assessments given here are those from the *Lindsey Survey,* not *Domesday Book*.

[13] See below. However, the Leicestershire and Northamptonshire surveys (from the reign of Henry I) do not show any significant territorial gains for Lincoln when compared with *Domesday Book*: *The Leicestershire Survey, c. A.D. 1130,* ed. and trans. C.F. Slade (Leicester, 1956); *The Northamptonshire Survey,* trans. J.H. Round in *The Victoria History of the County of Northampton* (London, 1902), 357-92 (the Latin text is edited by K.S.B. Keats-Rohan in *Domesday People*, 98-117). Guilsborough and Boddington which appear in the Northamptonshire survey (pp. 369, 371) as Robert Bloet's property, but not as Remigius' in *Domesday Book*, appear simply to have been left out of *Domesday Book*.

The obvious question at this point is just how Remigius and Robert Bloet were able to do this. The answer is that there were three principal methods by which land passed into their hands. Two of these could be described as 'secular'; the third is clearly 'ecclesiastical'. William the Conqueror rewarded Remigius for his service to him just as he rewarded his lay followers: by granting him the land of dispossessed Englishmen. Robert Bloet also benefited from royal generosity. He too was a valued royal servant. However, both Remigius and Robert Bloet also acquired land by less legitimate means. They may have been 'noble-hearted and bountiful prelates';[14] but this did not prevent them from encroaching on the estates of their weaker neighbours. In all this, the conduct of Remigius and Robert Bloet was essentially secular. They profited from the Norman Conquest in the same way as the rest of the Norman nobility imported to England after 1066. But the first two Norman bishops of Lincoln also acquired land through the colonisation of religious institutions, namely the churches of Stow and Eynsham, to which a significant portion of Remigius' Domesday fief rightfully pertained. Here too, Remigius and Robert Bloet seem to have acted in a grasping and overbearing manner. But in this case it was their religious status which made the land grab possible.

These three means of acquiring land – royal grant, misappropriation (or personal initiative) and ecclesiastical empire building – are discussed in turn in what follows.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

The royal grants of land to Remigius and Robert Bloet are straightforward. William the Conqueror appears to have given Remigius all of the lands of two Englishmen: Barthi of Sleaford and Healfdene, just over 78 carucates and 8 hides, worth £77 in total.[15] Barthi and Healfdene had probably

---

[14] For James Dimock, Remigius was 'a noble-hearted and bountiful prelate', while Robert Bloet was 'a generous, noble-hearted, princely prelate, kind and loving and bountiful to all about him': *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, vol. 7, pp. xix, xxvii.
[15] Barthi's lands (all of which were held by Remigius in 1086) are LEC 3,11; LIN 7,38-43; 7,45-51; NTH 5,1-4. Bates, *Regesta*, no. 177, gave Sleaford to Remigius. Barthi's other lands were

forfeited their lands for resistance to the Normans. Other land held by Remigius in 1086 had been held by defeated rebels or by Earl (or King) Harold *TRE*. Wooburn in Buckinghamshire is the most important of these estates (8½ hides, worth £15).[16]

These forfeitures and regrants probably took place soon after Remigius' appointment as bishop of Dorchester in 1067. William the Conqueror claimed to have given Remigius Wooburn with his pastoral staff.[17] The late-twelfth-century chronicler Hugh Candidus thought that Healfdene's lands were awarded to Remigius before the death of Abbot Brandr of Peterborough on 30 November 1069.[18] Some of the lands, in particular those of Healfdene and Barthi, may have been intended to provide a territorial base around Lincoln, to which Remigius' bishopric was transferred in the early 1070s. We know that William the Conqueror gave 13 carucates (worth £11) at Welton and at Burton in Lincolnshire as a prebend for the new cathedral.[19] At the same time, he confirmed Remigius' possession of Leighton Bromswold in Huntingdonshire, which had been given to Remigius by Earl Waltheof 'by the king's hand'.[20]

These are the royal grants to Remigius for which we have evidence. Other acquisitions, which cannot be explained, may also have been given by the king. In any case, William the Conqueror's largesse to Remigius was substantial. The

---

probably included in this grant. On Healfdene, see *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a Monk of Peterborough*, ed. W.T. Mellows (London, 1949), p. 69; LIN CK67. The lands of Healfdene which Remigius held in 1086 are LEC 3,15; LIN 7,16; 7,18; 7,20; 7,22; 7,27; 7,30-3. 'Healfdene' also appears in *Domesday Book* as the *TRE* holder of lands which did not pass to Remigius. But the name was a common one: we may be dealing with more than one individual.

[16] BUK 3a,4; Bates, *Regesta*, no. 177. Earl Harold had held it *TRE*. Wooburn was probably accompanied by two small holdings in Buckinghamshire (two hides in total) held *TRE* by Harold's man Leofric: BUK 3a,3; 3a,5. See also CAM 3,1; 3,6 held *TRE* by Siward Barn, one of Hereward the Wake's followers. On Siward, see Ann Williams, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 34, 40, 57.

[17] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 177.

[18] *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*, p. 69.

[19] LIN 7,8-9; Bates, *Regesta*, no. 177; *The Registrum antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln*, ed. C.W. Foster and K. Major, 10 vols (Hereford, 1931-73), vol. 1, nos 30-1. Burton is not mentioned in these documents, but was a *soca* of Welton and can be assumed to have been included in the gift. Remigius also acquired several churches in Lincolnshire: Peter Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1998), p.154.

[20] HUN 2,8; Bates, *Regesta*, no. 177: 'Preterea deprecatione et exortatione Remigii episcopi concedo eidem ecclesie [of Lincoln] manerium quoddam quod vocatur Lestona quodque Waldeouus comes dudum per manum meam predicto episcopo dederat.'

combined lands of Healfdene and Barthi alone represented more than a tenth of the bishopric's wealth in 1086.

William II did not make any new grants of land to the bishopric of Lincoln (that we know of). But he did give Robert Bloet four churches.[21] And in 1093, he helped the newly elected Robert Bloet in his dispute with Archbishop Thomas of York. William II gave the abbey of St Germain in Selby and the church of St Oswald in Gloucester to Archbishop Thomas, and in return, Thomas renounced his old claims to archiepiscopal jurisdiction over Lincoln and permitted Robert to be consecrated as bishop of Lincoln by Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury. William II claimed to have done this 'for the sake of the same bishop Robert, because he had been my chancellor' – a good illustration of the favour enjoyed by royal servants in Anglo-Norman England.[22]

The York chronicler, Hugh the Chanter, later claimed that Robert had given William II £3,000 in order to obtain this judgement.[23] According to Henry of Huntingdon, Robert gave William II £5,000, 'which was seen as simony on the king's part, but justice on the bishop's'.[24] It should also be noted that John of Worcester claimed that Bishop Remigius had previously (in 1092) given William II an unspecified amount of money to let him proceed with the dedication of his cathedral church. Here too, Archbishop Thomas of York was the problem; he claimed that the church was in his diocese. Remigius' bribe, however, did not do him much good, since he died before the dedication could take place.[25]

So we see here the importance of money in winning over the king and acquiring royal favour in Anglo-Norman England. However, it is possible that any large sum of money given to William II by Robert Bloet in 1093 was actually a simoniacal payment for the bishopric itself.[26] As we saw in Chapter 3 with the cases of Herbert Losinga and Ranulf Flambard, simony was certainly not

---

[21] *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, no. 14.

[22] *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, no. 4. 'gratia eiusdem .Roberti. episcopi. quia cancellarius meus extiterat'

[23] Hugh the Chanter, *History*, p. 14.

[24] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, vii.3, p. 418. 'quod regi quidem simonie, presuli uero iusticie deputatum est'

[25] *JW*, vol. 3, p. 62, *s.a.* 1092. But *cf. GP*, iv.177.5, which does not mention any payment by Remigius.

[26] Henry of Huntingdon (*ibid.*) implied that the king, who had given the bishopric to Robert for nothing, made up for this oversight by taking the opportunity to extract money from him.

unknown in the court of William II. It is also possible that, in reporting a bribe paid by Bishop Remigius to William II for a favourable judgement against York, John of Worcester was confusing Remigius with his successor, Robert Bloet, and the better attested bribe which Robert paid to William II.

To return to our theme of the gifts of the kings of England to the bishops of Lincoln: in the last year of his life, Robert Bloet fell from grace. Henry I impleaded him twice, afflicting him with disgrace and heavy damages. Henry of Huntingdon saw Robert in tears over the penury to which he had been reduced; he had been forced to dress his servants in cheap woollen robes.[27] However, before this, Henry I seems to have continued his predecessors' policy of generosity to the bishopric of Lincoln. In addition to certain minor properties,[28] Henry I and his queen Matilda gave Robert Bloet Nettleham in Lincolnshire (17 carucates, worth £30),[29] all the lands of a certain Gladwin (presumably dead without an heir),[30] and more churches.[31] Henry I also granted the valuable manor of Spaldwick, but this was to compensate Robert Bloet for the elevation of the abbey of Ely into a bishopric in 1109 and the resulting diminution of the diocese of Lincoln.[32]

That Remigius and (to a lesser extent) Robert Bloet benefitted from royal patronage is to be expected.[33] It was a medieval king's duty to enrich churches. Emma Cownie's study of monastic patronage in Anglo-Norman England has demonstrated that kings tended to be most generous to those churches whose rulers were in some way useful to them.[34] Remigius and Robert Bloet – archetypical curial or administrative bishops – were undoubtedly useful to the

---

[27] Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, De contemptu mundi, cc. 1-2, pp. 586-8.

[28] *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, nos 16-7, 43. There are also Snelland, Wickenby, Reasby and Swinthorpe, held by Robert Bloet 1115 x 1118 but not, it seems, by Remigius in 1086: *LS* 16.3. Their exact identification is not clear, but the best match in *Domesday Book* is the royal property at LIN 1,37. If the identification is correct, they probably represent another royal gift to Lincoln.

[29] LIN 1,35; *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, no. 15. Nettleham probably came with its 8 carucate appendage Dundam: LIN 1,36. Interestingly, Remigius had claimed two bovates of land in Nettleham in 1086: LIN CW7.

[30] *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, no. 72; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 1030. The writ is addressed to the barons of Yorkshire and Nottinghamshire, but no Gladwine held land in either of these counties in 1086 (at least, not according to *Domesday Book*).

[31] *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, nos 19, 36, 41, 45, 67-8

[32] Not that Lincoln lost a great deal thereby: see Dorothy Owen, 'Introduction: The English Church in Eastern England, 1066-1100', in *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), 1-13, p. 6.

[33] But on some occasions royal favour worked against the bishops of Lincoln: see Bates, *Remigius*, pp. 22-3.

Conqueror and his sons. They also obviously needed land. The old bishops of Dorchester had mostly held land in the south of their diocese. To support the new cathedral of Lincoln (in the north), a new territorial basis was required. A comparison with the diocese of Winchester is instructive here. Bishop Walkelin of Winchester (1070-98) was also a royal favourite, and an administrative bishop,[35] but he received very little land from the Conqueror or from William II.[36] Unlike Remigius and Robert Bloet, he did not need it. The bishopric of Winchester was already rich enough.

<center>***</center>

All this highlights the central importance of royal power in Anglo-Norman England. Remigius and Robert Bloet were able to fulfil their political goals on a local level (the territorial augmentation of their bishopric) by serving the king at a national level. The direct link between land, wealth and power is absent, unless we suppose that these apparent gifts had actually been paid for by the bishops: we have already seen that Robert Bloet may have bribed William II for help against Archbishop Thomas of York. Even so, the opportunity to buy land (or one's bishopric, or privileges) from the king would in itself have represented a kind of royal patronage; royal favour would still have been an essential factor in the acquisition of land by Remigius and Robert Bloet.

However, Robert and Remigius also acted on their own behalf. There is evidence that both bishops took forceful and possibly violent steps to acquire new lands, sometimes lands to which they had no right.[37] That they were able to get away with this may well have been because of their high standing with the king (this will become clearer in the second of our two case studies). But the

---

[34] Cownie, *Religious Patronage*, *passim*.

[35] Walkelin was one of William the Conqueror's chaplains before being made bishop; he was prominent in the government of England under William II: Stephanie Mooers Christelow, 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: Ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', in *ANS* 22 (2000), 49-69, pp. 57, 61.

[36] V.H. Galbraith, 'Royal Charters to Winchester', in *EHR* 35 (1920), 382-400, pp. 382-3. The diocese of Winchester actually lost land after the Conquest: see below, n. 169.

[37] Bates, *Remigius*, pp. 21-3, does not take this possibility into account.

techniques they used to claim land are of interest, in that they demonstrate the resources bishops used to wield power at a local level.

We do not always know just what Remigius and Robert Bloet did. A large chunk of Remigius' fief in 1086 (19 hides, 42 carucates and 2 bovates, worth £25 10s 12d) had been held *TRE* by Sheriff Godric and Alwine Deule, two brothers of Bishop Wulfwig of Dorchester, Remigius' predecessor. Godric and Alwine had held some of this land as men of Bishop Wulfwig, but some of it they had held independently (with rights of alienation), or from King Edward.[38] Remigius probably claimed, on the strength of the link to Bishop Wulfwig, that all of the land of Godric and Alwine rightly pertained to the bishopric. Elsewhere, Remigius appears to have been able to assert his full lordship over land where Bishop Wulfwig had only had the soke, or the commendation of its holder (*i.e.* the land itself had not been leased from Dorchester).[39] Here Remigius profited from the tenurial confusion following the Norman Conquest. He might have shared in this confusion. But just how and where Remigius established his possibly dubious rights to these lands is not clear.

In other cases more is known. Sometimes Remigius consciously encroached on other people's property. According to Hugh Candidus, after William the Conqueror gave the confiscated lands of Healfdene to Remigius, Abbot Brandr of Peterborough (1066-9) took pity on Healfdene (his relative), and gave him the abbey's manor of Dunsby to hold at farm. But Remigius stole (*abstulit*) this land too, even though it belonged to Peterborough.[40] The story may be true. Dunsby was definitely disputed between Lincoln and Peterborough in 1086. One of the Lincolnshire *clamores* (in *Domesday Book*) says that the land

---

[38] Some examples will illustrate this. Godric held Buckland from his brother, Bishop Wulfwig, and 'non potuit dare uel uendere praeter ejus licentiam': BUK 3a,2. It was almost certainly the same Godric who held Riseley and 'quod voluit facere potuit': BDF 4,3. At Tempsford we are told that 'Aluuinus deule tenuit. homo regis fuit. et quod uoluit de ea facere potuit', while according to the entry for Easton, 'Hanc terram tenuit Aluuinus deule homo episcopi Lincoliensis. et quod uoluit de ea facere potuit. Soca tamen semper episcopi fuit': BDF 4,2; 4,6. See also BDF 4,1; 4,7-8; HUN 2,5; 2,9; LEC 3,5-10; 3,12-3. As has been mentioned, *Domesday Book*'s account of *TRE* conditions is problematic. For the identification of Godric and Alwine as brothers of Bishop Wulfwig: BDF 16,4; BUK 3a,2. *Domesday Book* itself generally names Godric and Alwine by their first names only. In identifying these men as Godric the sheriff and Alwine Deule, I have followed the editors of *Domesday Book*.
[39] *E.g.* CAM 3,2.
[40] *Chronicle of Hugh Candidus*, p. 69.

was not Peterborough's *TRE*.[41] This is not necessarily proof of Remigius' innocence, since the bishop may have been able to use his influence to convince the Domesday jury of his (again, possibly dubious) right to Dunsby.

Remigius also victimised the abbey of Ely, and here the evidence is less doubtful. Domesday Book tells us that a hide, a virgate and two parts of one virgate at Histon had been held by Ely's beekeeper *TRE*, but 'hanc terram inuasit episcopus .R. super abbatem. ut hund[redum] testatur.'[42] The injustice of Remigius' tenure of this land was recognised at an inquiry into the lands of Ely held in 1071 x 1075. The fact that Remigius was one of the judges at this inquiry may explain why the land was not returned to the abbey after the hearing.[43]

But monasteries like Ely and Peterborough could defend themselves, to a certain extent. Remigius may have preyed mostly on middling Anglo-Saxons who had little chance of standing up to him. *Domesday Book*'s account of Remigius' fief enumerates a number of lands (40 carucates, 4 bovates and 5 hides, worth £38 16s) held *TRE* by various Englishmen, the possession of which in 1086 by Remigius cannot be explained.[44] Some of these lands may have been held as tenancies of the bishop of Dorchester before the Conquest. Subtenants of Remigius' known antecessors, Healfdene and Barthi, may have held others. Remigius may also have bought some of this land: *Domesday Book* mentions a land purchase by Remigius, albeit from a Norman.[45] In one case, however, we have what looks like evidence of Remigius' efforts to force out an Anglo-Saxon landholder.

A number of lands in Lincolnshire were held *TRE* by 'Arnketil'. By 1086 these properties were mostly divided between various Normans, but Arnketil seems still to have possessed a few small pieces of land for himself.[46] Assuming all (or at least some) of the Domesday references to Arnketil are to the same

---

[41] LIN CK45.

[42] CAM 3,5. Translated by the editors as 'Bishop R[emigius] annexed this land in the Abbot's despite, as the Hundred testifies.'

[43] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 117. No. 121, a later writ, essentially a list of people who were unjustly holding land from Ely, includes the following entry: 'Remigius episcopus i hidam'.

[44] LEC 3,14; 3,16; LIN 7,14-5; 7,17; 7,19; 7,21; 7,23-6; 7,28; 7,34-7; 7,52-3; 7,58; NTT 6,6; 6,8-9; 6,11; OXF 6,16.

[45] LIN 51,12.

[46] LIN 3,20; 3,35; 4,4; 7,53; 7,57; 12,7; 18,28; 30,19; 31,9; 56,19; 67,5. It is not clear whether Arnketil still held the small properties LIN 68,26; 68,32; 68,34 in 1086.

person,[47] he appears to have been an English landholder who never rebelled against the Conqueror, and so, rather than losing his lands *en masse*, was gradually ejected from them. Bishop Remigius of Lincoln may have contributed to this process.

Arnketil is named by *Domesday Book* as the *TRE* tenant of two of Remigius' estates in Lincolnshire: Redbourne and Silk Willoughby.[48] One of the Lincolnshire *clamores* sheds some light on Remigius' acquisition of Arnketil's land at Silk Willoughby. Remigius' claim concerning the *soca* of Arnketil in Rauceby Hundred (a hundred in Domesday Lincolnshire was a unit of 12 carucates, not the jurisdictional area which the word meant in the rest of England) was apparently unjust, 'quia ipse [Remigius] de terra eiusdem Archil n[ihil] habuit nisi .x. bouatas de dominico in escangio. et tota alia terra liberata. est dunelmensi episcopo.'[49] Rauceby Hundred was listed among the lands of the bishop of Durham. Within it lay a jurisdiction (*soca*) of Silk Willoughby (the property which Arnketil had held *TRE* and which Remigius held in 1086).[50] The exact circumstances of this dispute and the terms of the exchange whereby Remigius acquired 10 bovates of Arnketil's land are not clear. But it is tempting to think that Remigius and the bishop of Durham (William de Saint-Calais, whom we met in Chapter 3) were squabbling over the land of a dispossessed Englishman.

A further *clamor* seems to record Remigius' attempt to take another of Arnketil's lands. In Quarrington, Remigius claimed to have given a pledge for (or given in pledge: 'clamat se invadiasse') Arnketil's land, but Arnketil denied this and held the land from the king.[51] Presumably this land was the bovate at Quarrington listed by Domesday Book as an outlier of the king's manor of Kirkby-la-Thorpe (although Arnketil's tenancy is not mentioned).[52] What *invadio*

---

[47] In fact, it is likely that there was more than one Arnketil: Arnketil Barn ('Archilbar') appears at LIN 16,49, and Arnketil of Withern at CS39.

[48] LIN 7,53; 7,57.

[49] LIN CK13. Translated by the editors as 'because he only had 10 bovates himself from the lordship of the same Arnketil's land in exchange, and the whole of the other land was delivered to the Bishop of Durham.'

[50] LIN 3,37.

[51] LIN CK33.

[52] LIN 1,1. The abbey of Ramsey also had a manor at Quarrington, which it held *TRE*. For disputes involving this manor, see LIN 10,1-3; 42,9; CK32. And Remigius also acquired land at Quarrington which had belonged to Barthi of Sleaford in the reign of King Edward: LIN 7,48. I have assumed these holdings at Quarrington to be distinct from Arnketil's land there, but this could be incorrect.

means in this context, and hence the basis of Remigius' claim, is not clear. Perhaps Remigius claimed to have paid some kind of fine or geld owed by Arnketil and hence to be entitled to his land; possibly this was the fine by which Englishmen were required to buy back their lands from the Conqueror in 1067.[53] In any case, this appears to be an example of Remigius' efforts to extend his lordship, against the will of the existing tenant of the land.

Whether this is taken as evidence that Remigius misappropriated the land of vulnerable Anglo-Saxons depends, to a certain extent, on one's assumptions as to how bishops in Anglo-Norman England acted. Innocent explanations for the *clamores* discussed above could certainly be found. However, taken cumulatively with Remigius' definite occupation of land rightfully belonging to Ely and possible occupation of land belonging to Peterborough, they appear more significant. And we shall see that Remigius' dealings with the churches of Stow and Eynsham were not entirely honest. But if Remigius did take land to which he had no right, frustratingly little is known about how he did so.

The evidence for the exercise of personal (perhaps illegitimate) initiative in the acquisition of land by Remigius' successor, Robert Bloet, is similarly ambiguous and incomplete. There are two principal sources.

The first of these is a writ of Henry I, dateable either 1115 x 1116 or 1120 x 1121.[54] Henry I made it known that the plea between Robert Bloet and Abbot Hugh of St Augustine's (1108-26) had been settled in his court. The land of Royton (part of the abbot's manor of Lenham in Kent) was of the fief of St Augustine, and the bishop of Lincoln was to hold it from the Abbot of St Augustine's. Robert was to perform the service due for the land 'preter wardam [et] expeditionem' in his lifetime.[55] But if Robert's heir (presumably his successor as bishop of Lincoln) held the land, the service was to be done 'plenarie cum warda et expeditione'.[56] Presumably Robert had somehow encroached upon the

---

[53] Williams, *The English*, pp. 8-10. *Cf. Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*, ed. David C. Douglas (London, 1932), pp. xcvii-xcix.

[54] *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 1283. The writ has not been printed. All of the quotes given below come from London, BL, Cotton MS Claudius D. x, fo. 217r (a thirteenth-century cartulary known as 'The Red Book of St Augustine's').

[55] 'except castle guard and military service'

[56] 'fully, with castle guard and military service'

abbey's land, and this judgement represented a compromise between him and the abbot.

What exactly Robert had done, and why he was attempting to acquire land in Kent, is not clear. However, the final provision of Henry I's writ is worth noting: 'si autem dedero emptiones episcopi alteri quam heredi episcopi; qui predictam terram clamet; teneat inde abbas ei rectum in curia sua.'[57] Robert's purchases (*emptiones*) may have been numerous. There is nothing odd in the idea that the bishop used his money to acquire new lands. It is slightly more surprising that the king considered it his right to resume these purchases after the bishop's death, if he so willed. But what is most significant is that Henry I foresaw the possibility of rival claims to this land. The king's words are a little opaque. The abbot of St Augustine's was perhaps expected to compensate any previous tenants of Royton whom Robert had displaced. Perhaps the king was prepared to award Royton to any such claimant, should he emerge. In any case, this writ of Henry I suggests that Robert Bloet acquired land on his own initiative (by occupation and by purchase); and that the land which he acquired may not always have been rightfully his.

Our second source is the *Lindsey Survey*, which permits a surprising amount of precision in considering Robert Bloet's acquisitions in the small section of Lincolnshire which it covers.[58] As has been mentioned, by the time of the *Lindsey Survey* (1115 x 1118) Robert Bloet (or possibly Remigius between 1086 and his death in 1092, or both bishops) had acquired twenty-five new properties in Lindsey, assessed at almost 60 carucates. Six of these properties (19 carucates and 6 bovates) were probably given by Henry I.[59] Five small lands (2 carucates and 7 bovates) cannot be identified in *Domesday Book*.[60] It is impossible to explain how they came into Robert's hands. This leaves fourteen

---

[57] Either 'If I give the bishop's purchases to another heir, who claims the aforesaid land, the abbot is to do him right in his court' or 'If I give the bishop's purchases to another heir, the abbot is to do right in his court to the man who claims the aforesaid land'.

[58] The tax assessments given in what follows are those from the *Lindsey Survey*; these are not always the same as those found in *Domesday Book*. No values are given, as no values are given in the *Lindsey Survey*.

[59] See above, n. 28 and n. 29.

[60] Claxby by Normanby (*LS* 7,2), East Wykeham (*LS* 18,11), Fenton (*LS* 6,1), Hole (*LS* 9,12) and Stallingborough (*LS* 11,9).

lands (35 carucates and 6 bovates), which were held in 1086 by four individuals: Svartbrandr,[61] Kolsveinn,[62] Ranulf de Saint-Valery,[63] and Waldin Ingeniator.[64]

All four of these men were dead by 1115. All but Svartbrandr had a designated heir who held most of his lands by the time of the *Lindsey Survey*. However, none of these heirs was the son of the 1086 holder.[65] This is significant. It seems that Robert Bloet was somehow able to muscle in on these disputed, or uncertain, inheritances.[66] Possibly, the new heirs were not secure enough to resist Robert, who simply installed himself as landlord. Possibly, the lands were gifts, by which Robert Bloet's favour and support in the county court (maybe against other prospective heirs) was obtained. It is worth noting that the *Lindsey Survey* often mentions that the heir held the land in question from Robert Bloet. Perhaps they sought out Robert Bloet as a feudal overlord and patron in order to profit from his influence. In any case, in Lindsey at least, such dealings represented an appreciable source of wealth for the bishop of Lincoln.

The cumulative evidence of these examples shows that Remigius and Robert Bloet were not simply the passive recipients of royal goodwill. They took action, at least sometimes, in order to gain new lands for their bishopric and for themselves. This personal initiative may have been comparable to royal largesse as a source of wealth for the first two Norman bishops of Lincoln. However, just what the bishops did (and hence the nature of the power which they employed) is

---

[61] North and South Carlton: *LS* 3,2; LIN 68,2-3.

[62] Friesthorpe (*LS* 3,6; LIN 26,13); Marton (*LS* 6,1; LIN 26,32-4); Newton-on-Trent (*LS* 6,1); Riseholme (*LS* 3,1; LIN 8,13). The 12 carucates at Newton-on-Trent described in the *Lindsey Survey* as a 'hundred' cannot be identified with any single property in *Domesday Book*. Most of the Newtons in Lincolnshire are too small. However, Kolsveinn held $30^2/_3$ bovates at Newton in 1086 and 20 more bovates at Oseby and Threekingham pertained to the manor: LIN 26,40-2. We are still far from the desired total, but some of Kolsveinn's other lands could have been added to produce the 'hundred' of 12 carucates.

[63] Market Stainton (*LS* 13,6; LIN 43,3); Ranby (*LS* 13,6; LIN 43,1); Reepham (*LS* 3,2; LIN 43,6); Scothern (*LS* 3,2; LIN 43,6).

[64] Beelsby (*LS* 8,11; LIN 47,6); Ravendale (*LS* 8,11; LIN 47,7); Thorganby (*LS* 7,2; LIN 47,5); Wragby with its outlier Langton by Wragby (*LS* 16,13; LIN 47,8-9).

[65] Kolsveinn was succeeded by his son Picot, who died early in the reign of Henry I and was succeeded by his daughter, the wife of Robert de La Haye; Ranulf de Saint-Valery was succeeded by Gilbert de Neville; Waldin Ingeniator was succeeded by Simon fitz William, probably the son of the William who held land from Waldin in 1086: Keats-Rohan, *Domesday People*, pp. 175, 352, 446.

[66] *Cf.* J.C. Holt, 'The Introduction of Knight-Service in England', in J.C. Holt, *Colonial England, 1066-1215* (London, 1997), 81-103, p. 88, on the vulnerability to fragmentation and erosion of baronies which descended indirectly.

less clear. Actual violence is never mentioned, although Remigius' occupation of Ely's land at Histon and (possibly) Peterborough's land at Dunsby must have involved at least the threat of violence.[67] The bishops' wealth may also have helped. Remigius purchased land, and may have laid down a pledge for the land of Arnketil. The *emptiones* of Robert Bloet mentioned in Henry I's writ (discussed above) may have been extensive. Robert may also have bought some of the lands he acquired in Lindsey. But a general, and hard to define, influence in county affairs was probably equally important. This may have driven the Lindsey heirs to seek Robert Bloet as their lord. This may have allowed Remigius to turn minor rights over certain properties into full possession. If Remigius actually did steal Dunsby from Peterborough, this is what convinced the Domesday jury to say that Peterborough had no right there.

***

Up to this point, we have seen how Remigius and Robert Bloet acted in an essentially secular manner. Laymen were also granted land by the king. Laymen also preyed on other landholders. But the bishops' colonisation of the community of canons at Stow and the monastery of Eynsham was a purely ecclesiastical manoeuvre.

In 1066, both Stow and Eynsham appear to have been independent religious institutions, although the bishop of Dorchester had two thirds of Stow's altar offerings and four ploughlands there (*terra quattuor aratrorum*).[68] In 1086,

---

[67] Some churchmen may have taken a more aggressive approach to land disputes: *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis: The History of the Church of Abingdon*, ed. and trans. John Hudson, 2 vols (Oxford, 2002-2007), vol. 1, pp. 372-4, vol. 2, pp. 14-6.

[68] On the abbey of Eynsham, see Alan Hardy *et al.*, *Aelfric's Abbey: Excavations at Eynsham Abbey, Oxfordshire, 1989-92* (Oxford, 2003), p. 10. The situation at Stow was more complicated. The community of canons there may originally have been founded by Bishop Eadnoth II of Dorchester (1034-49), but it was refounded and reendowed in the 1050s by Earl Leofric and his wife Godgifu; the archbishops of York may also at some point have taken control of, or at least laid claim to, Stow: Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, pp. 182-8; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, pp. 246-52. S1478 sets out the bishop of Dorchester's rights at Stow after the endowment by Leofric and Godgifu. The best edition is in *C&S*, vol. 1, no. 73, pp. 538-43. Bates, *Remigius*, p. 30, writes that the bishop of Dorchester had two thirds 'of all [Stow's] revenues', a conclusion which could be drawn from S1478's somewhat ambiguous phrasing. Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, p. 184, considers

both Stow and Eynsham (and their extensive endowments) were treated as Remigius' personal property. The lands of Stow and Eynsham were assessed at approximately 63 carucates and 74 hides, worth about £160 – about a fifth of Lincoln's total landed resources in 1086.[69]

Two writs of William the Conqueror help to show how this came to pass. The first, dateable 1070 x April 1072, confirmed the gifts of Godgifu (Lady Godiva) to Stow, which she and her husband Earl Leofric had refounded in the 1050s. These were Newark, Fledborough, Brampton and Well Wapentake. The church of Stow was to have these lands, and the wapentake, as fully as Godgifu had them in the time of King Edward, 'and as Bishop Remigius can demonstrate that they rightly belong thereto'.[70] Remigius' unexpected appearance here suggests that he was already taking an interest in the church of Stow and in its lands, perhaps setting himself up as its patron. But this first writ did not mention any rights enjoyed by Remigius over or in Stow.

The second writ of the Conqueror is dateable 1070 x 1087. It confirmed Godgifu's endowment of Stow, and also granted to Stow the church of Eynsham with its lands. A monastery was to be founded (presumably at Stow). William the Conqueror claimed to grant this at Bishop Remigius' request. But he did not allow Remigius any special lordship over the new abbey. The abbey was to remain in the royal demesne (*dominium*), just as any other abbey in England. And the king bought out the old rights of the bishops of Dorchester in Stow by his gift of the manor of Sleaford to Remigius.[71] The new abbey was clearly intended to be an independent foundation, holding all the lands of both Eynsham and Stow. Why

that the bishops of Dorchester were to have two thirds of the food-rents from Stow's original endowment only (and not the lands granted by Leofric and Godgifu). See also Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, p. 329 n. 195. But two post-Conquest documents indicate that it was specifically the offerings to Stow's altar to which the bishops were entitled: Bates, *Regesta*, no. 277, and *Eynsham Cartulary*, ed. H.E. Salter, 2 vols (Oxford, 1907-8), vol. 1, no. 5 (calendared in *EEA 1: Lincoln*, no. 3). These documents (unlike S1478) also mention the bishop's plough lands.

[69] LIN 7,1-7; 7,10-13; 7,55; NTT 6,1-4; 6,13-4; OXF 6,3; 6,6-8; 6,11; 6,14. However, this assumes that Great Milton (40 hides, worth £30) was one of Eynsham's manors, and the only evidence for this is a fake charter of William II: *Registrum antiquissimum*, vol. 1, no. 3.

[70] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 276. 'and swa Remig biscop gesweotelian mæg þat rihtlice þær to geberige'

[71] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 277: 'Preterea concedo predicte ecclesie [to the church of Stow], deprecatione Remigii episcopi, Egneshamnensem ecclesiam cum terris quas modo possidet, tali pacto ut ibi abbas per meum consilium ordinetur, qui res ecclesiarum sapienter tractet. Abbatia autem in meo dominio maneat sicut cetere per Angliam. Et ne quis ulla occasione querelam adversus ipsam abbatiam habeat, concedo pro commutatione altaris de Stou, et quatuor carrrucarum terre que pertinent ad episcopium, episcopis Lincolnie Slatforde predium bonum.'

Remigius encouraged the king to grant Eynsham to Stow is less clear. David Bates suggests that the foundation of a monastery at Stow in Lincolnshire was intended to help Remigius in his translation of his bishopric from Dorchester to Lincoln.[72] But it is hard to see why a bishop would have needed a monastery in the immediate vicinity of his cathedral church. Such a situation might have produced conflict for offerings between the cathedral chapter and the monks.

From here we arrive at the situation described in *Domesday Book*. In 1086, both Stow and Eynsham were treated as Remigius' private property (with the exception of Eynsham's manor of Mickleton in Gloucestershire).[73] They were described in the bishop's fief, and some of their land appears to have been used to enfeoff Remigius' knights.[74] It is true that a monk called Columbanus held some of Eynsham's manors as Remigius' tenant.[75] And a certain Robert the priest had apparently become a monk at Stow.[76] The religious life was not entirely dead at either Stow or Eynsham, and Remigius may have made some effort to introduce monasticism at Stow (previously a college of secular canons). But this was hardly the independent abbey envisaged by the Conqueror. Stow and Eynsham should not have been in Remigius' fief in the first place. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that Remigius had ignored William the Conqueror's direct order to use the lands of Stow and Eynsham to refound the monastery at Eynsham, and that instead of this Remigius had kept tight control over both churches, diverting their resources to his own ends. By 1086, this situation may have been in place for more than a decade. As the first writ of the Conqueror discussed above shows, Remigius had been somehow involved with the church of Stow since at least the early 1070s.

The next development came in 1091, when Remigius issued a charter announcing his intention to refound the desolate church of Stow, to give up the old episcopal rights to Stow's altar offerings (and the four ploughlands), to endow the new monastery with Eynsham's possessions, and to install Columbanus as

---

[72] Bates, *Remigius*, p. 31.

[73] GLS 18,1.

[74] LIN 7,2; 7,13; NTT 6,13-4; OXF 6,11; 6,14. H.E. Salter thought that these entries meant that the men in question held of the monk Columbanus (overseer of the church of Eynsham) and that Columbanus held of Remigius: *Eynsham Cartulary*, p. ix. But none of the entries in question make any mention of Columbanus. Still, it is possible that the king had imposed a *servitium debitum* on the monastery of Eynsham and that the men enfeoffed on Eynsham's land were, legitimately enough, expected to fulfil it.

[75] OXF 6,6-8.

abbot there. Finally, Remigius was going to carry out William the Conqueror's orders, four years after that king's death. Someone wishing to defend Remigius might claim that this had always been Remigius' intention, and that it had taken Remigius this long to find sufficient recruits for his new monastery. Another explanation is that the aging Remigius finally repented of his abuse of the two churches. A more cynical interpretation is that it was only the Domesday inquest (and the subsequent compilation of *Domesday Book*) which revealed to the king (by now William II) Remigius' exploitation of Stow and Eynsham, and that the king had ordered him to stop this exploitation (although no royal writ survives on this subject). In any case, Remigius did not follow the Conqueror's original plan exactly. William the Conqueror had specified that Stow should be as independent as any other abbey. Remigius stressed that Stow should be subject only to the bishop of Lincoln 'as to a lord, rather, as to a founder, in eternity'.[77]

It is not clear from this whether Remigius intended Stow to be a proprietary church belonging to the bishop of Lincoln, or simply a church under Lincoln's special jurisdiction. In any case, Remigius did not have much time to implement his plan. He died in 1092, a year after issuing the foundation charter for Stow. Remigius' successor, Robert Bloet, altered Remigius' plans. He moved the monks back to Eynsham (if they had ever left there), and kept Stow and its lands for himself. As compensation, he gave Eynsham various lands and tithes, mostly in Cambridgeshire. This was a fair exchange, and sensible from Robert's point of view. He retained the lands of Stow, which were close to Lincoln, while getting rid of distant (and therefore hard to exploit) lands in Cambridgeshire.[78] But Robert seems to have been remiss in implementing the agreement. A writ of William II, probably dateable to summer 1094, ordered Robert to reimburse fully Abbot Columbanus for the lands which he had had at Stow, 'quia aliter non consensi te facere mutationem loci'.[79] Robert probably ignored this admonition. In a charter of 25 December 1109, confirming the possessions of Eynsham, including the lands given by Robert Bloet in exchange for Stow, Henry I began by

---

[76] LIN 7,55.

[77] *Eynsham Cartulary*, vol. 1, no.5, calendared in *EEA 1: Lincoln*, no. 3. 'utpote domino, immo ut conditori, in eternum'. Two writs of William II confirm the foundation of a monastery at Stow: *Eynsham Cartulary*, vol. 1, nos 4, 26.

[78] As noticed by Gerald of Wales, *Vita Remigii*, c. 21.

[79] *Eynsham Cartulary*, vol. 1, no. 6. 'because I did not allow you to carry out the relocation in any other way'

declaring that he had decided to restore and to confirm (*redintegrare et confirmare*) the abbey of Eynsham, which remained 'up to now desolate and dissipated'.[80] This suggests that Robert had continued to divert some of the lands and revenues of the monastery to his own ends, while leaving the monks there insufficiently provided for.[81]

Ultimately, the acquisition of Stow and Eynsham by the first two bishops of Lincoln was a temporary one. In terms of territory there was no net gain. Robert Bloet ended up with the possessions of Stow, but he had had to exchange possessions of equal value for them. But the bishops had been able to exploit the lands of Eynsham for at least ten, and possibly more than thirty, years. Moreover, William the Conqueror's plan had been for a monastery with no special links to the bishopric of Lincoln. But Henry I's charter of 1109 contained the following stipulation: 'Hec autem abbatia tota est in manu et potestate Lincolniensis episcopi constituendi abbatem canonice assensu et consilio regis.'[82] According to Gerald of Wales, Robert Bloet reserved for himself the donation of the pastoral staff to the abbots of Eynsham and the principal disposition and oversight (*principalis dispositionis ac provisionis honorem*) over the monastery. [83] According to William of Malmesbury, Robert Bloet's bowels (*uiscera*) were buried at Eynsham, the rest of the body being taken to Lincoln (but this might have been a practical, rather than a sentimental decision: Robert died at Woodstock, very near Eynsham, but far from Lincoln).[84] In Eynsham, the bishops of Lincoln had gained a 'personal monastery'. Lincoln's rights over the abbey were confirmed at the end of the twelfth century when, according to Adam of Eynsham, Richard I unsuccessfully challenged Bishop Hugh of Lincoln's right to be Eynsham's patron.[85] This patronage brought financial benefits – for instance, the right to administer the abbey and its revenues during vacancies – but its

---

[80] *Eynsham Cartulary*, vol. 1, no. 7; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 928. 'hactenus desolatam et dissipatam'

[81] Some of the gossip repeated by William of Malmesbury suggests that Robert was not popular at Stow or at Eynsham: *GP*, iv.177.7β.1-2. Robert apparently claimed that he was doing a great service to the monks of Eynsham if he allowed them even to stay alive: *GP*, iv.177.6.

[82] The exact sense of the Latin is not entirely clear. A possible translation is 'This abbey is entirely in the hand of the bishop of Lincoln, who has the the power of appointing the abbot with canonical consent and the king's advice.'

[83] Gerald of Wales, *Vita Remigii*, c. 21. 'the honour of principal disposition and provision'

[84] *GP*, iv.177.7.

[85] Adam of Eynsham, *Magna vita Hugonis*, vol. 2, pp. 39-42.

greatest importance to the bishops may, eventually at least, have been spiritual or personal.

It is hard to say what allowed Remigius and Robert Bloet to colonise Stow and Eynsham. It is unlikely that they used force or gold or their men to exert control over these churches. Royal support may have been a factor. But we have seen that William the Conqueror wanted the new monastery to be independent (the fact that he specified this may suggest that he suspected Remigius of designs upon the churches). William II intervened to stop Robert Bloet's exploitation of Eynsham, as, probably, did Henry I. The most likely explanation is probably that there was simply no one to stop Remigius from taking over Eynsham and Stow. The Eynsham monks may have been dispersed after the Norman Conquest.[86] Even if they were not, they may have welcomed Remigius. A bishop and king's favourite was a formidable patron. The same goes for the canons of Stow. It is also worth noting that the extensive possessions which Godgifu gave (and which William the Conqueror confirmed) to Stow may not actually have passed to the monks before the Norman Conquest and Remigius' intervention.[87] If Remigius diverted to his own ends some of the land which he himself had won back for the canons of Stow, the canons probably thought that this was a price worth paying.

So in the case of Stow and Eynsham, it may be inappropriate to talk of episcopal power at all. Remigius and Robert Bloet may have been able to exploit the lands of these churches not because of any resources which they deployed or any action which they took, but because of favourable circumstances – because no one prevented them from doing so. Of course, their status as bishops made their involvement in the churches' affairs at least partially legitimate. For a layman to colonise religious institutions would have been scandalous; such a colonisation would probably not have been permitted. Here, as in Chapter 3, we see how episcopal status opened up for bishops certain courses of action denied to the lay nobility.

∗∗

---

[86] *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 39. But this is a late source.
[87] Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, p. 185.

It might be objected that much of the foregoing analysis was built on insinuation and fixed ideas about the predatory nature of Normans, and Norman bishops, in the eleventh century. It is possible to find excuses for Remigius and Robert for almost all of the individual instances of rapacity (or what looks like rapacity) discussed above: Hugh Candidus might have lied about Remigius' occupation of Dunsby; Remigius might have taken Ely's land at Histon by mistake; Arnketil and other apparently displaced Englishmen might have been allowed to continue as Remigius' subtenants, or they might have sold their land to him freely; the inheritances which Robert Bloet appears to have invaded might represent royal gifts or honest purchases; Remigius and Robert Bloet might have retained Stow and Eynsham in their hands for religious reasons.

But the cumulative picture is of two Norman bishops who worked hard to expand their bishopric's territorial basis (and were helped immensely by the king in this), and who may not have been entirely scrupulous in doing so. What Robert and Remigius themselves thought about all this is not clear. But it is worth noting that they were by no means exceptional. Other bishops enlarged their bishoprics in the three ways identified here: by royal grant; by personal initiative; and by colonising religious houses.

Bishop Walcher of Durham (1071-80) was granted a significant number of lands by William the Conqueror, probably in order to secure his position in the unstable North.[88] Bishop Osbern of Exeter (1072-1103) enriched his church with some £55 worth of land, probably the lands of dispossessed Englishmen granted to him by William the Conqueror before his promotion to the episcopate. Osbern had been a chaplain of the Conqueror.[89] Here we see again the benefits of royal service. Bishop William of London (1051-75) acquired thirty-nine estates in Essex and Hertfordshire after the Norman Conquest, mostly the estates of smaller landholders. William seems to have purchased most of these lands, but the

---

[88] William Aird, *St Cuthbert and the Normans: The Church of Durham, 1071-1153* (Woodbridge, 1998), p. 90; Edmund Craster, 'The Red Book of Durham', in *EHR* 40 (1925), 504-32, p. 529. But Durham also lost land after the Conquest: Edmund Craster, 'The Patrimony of St Cuthbert', in *EHR* 69 (1954), 177-99, pp. 194-5.

[89] D.W. Blake, 'Osbern, Bishop of Exeter 1072-3', in *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art* 114 (1982), 63-9, pp. 63-5.

circumstances are unknown.[90] It is possible that he was able to take advantage of the insecurity of middling Englishmen after 1066. The bishopric of Wells also prospered after the Norman Conquest: an endowment of 220 hides in 1066 had become 282 hides by 1086.[91] And the annexation of wealthy abbeys was a common ploy of bishops in Anglo-Norman England. Of course, Remigius and Robert Bloet did not plan to move their bishopric to Stow or Eynsham. In this they differed from John of Bath, Herfast and Herbert of Thetford, Robert de Limesey of Coventry and Hermann of Sherborne.[92] A closer parallel might be with Bishop Roger of Salisbury's (1107-39) exploitation of the abbey of Malmesbury.[93]

Nor were these new phenomena. In 1066, the bishopric of East Anglia had £157 10s worth of land; its possessions in 1086 were worth £426 4s. Much of this had actually been acquired before the Norman Conquest by the Anglo-Saxon bishop Aelmær (in 1066 these acquisitions were considered as Aelmær's personal property, not the property of the bishopric).[94] And the landed possessions of abbeys could grow, thanks to royal or noble patronage, even more dramatically in the Anglo-Saxon period. Bury in the first half of the eleventh century,[95] Abingdon in the mid tenth century,[96] and Ramsey slightly later[97] are good examples.[98] Even the colonisation of independent churches (like Stow and Eynsham) was nothing new. The Anglo-Saxon bishops of many dioceses, including Dorchester, had acquired much of their wealth by annexing minster churches and appropriating

---

[90] Taylor, 'Endowment and Military Obligations of the See of London', pp. 305-8.

[91] Simon Keynes, 'Giso, Bishop of Wells (1061-88)', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 203-71, pp. 248-9.

[92] For an overview of the transfer of bishoprics in eleventh-century England, see Charles Insley, 'Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict*, ed. Dalton, Insley and Wilkinson, 40-60, pp. 64-5.

[93] Edward Kealey, *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England* (London, 1972), pp. 111-2.

[94] Dodwell, 'Honour of the Bishop of Thetford / Norwich', pp. 185-7; James Campbell, 'The East Anglian See before the Conquest', in *Norwich Cathedral*, ed. Atherton *et al.*, 3-21, p. 19.

[95] See Tom Licence's introduction to the forthcoming *Hermann and Goscelin: Miracles of St Edmund*.

[96] *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 1, pp. cxxxvii-cxliii.

[97] J. Ambrose Raftis, *The Estates of Ramsey Abbey: A Study in Economic Growth and Organization* (Toronto, 1957), pp. 6-21.

[98] See also Edmund King, *Peterborough Abbey, 1086-1310: A Study in the Land Market* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 7-11.

their resources. [99] Perhaps significantly, Stow and Eynsham had once been minsters.

In fact, Lincoln's rapid territorial expansion after the Norman Conquest should be seen as something old rather than something new. The Anglo-Norman period was the last period in which this was possible. By the early twelfth century, the estates of English bishoprics and abbeys had often crystallised into the form which they would have centuries later at the Reformation. [100] In the Anglo-Saxon period, by contrast, episcopal and abbatial estates had fluctuated frequently and dramatically. [101] Anglo-Saxon abbeys in particular sometimes lost wealth at an alarming rate. [102]

As far as our theme of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England is concerned, the territorial augmentation of the diocese of Lincoln by its first two bishops leads to no firm conclusions. However, it is worth noting that concrete resources (land and wealth) were of comparatively little importance in giving Remigius and Robert Bloet the power to acquire new lands. Robert and Remigius acquired land in three ways, of roughly equal importance: royal grant; personal initiative, possibly involving the misappropriation of other people's land; and the colonisation of the churches of Stow and Eynsham. Only in the second of these did the bishops' existing land and wealth certainly play a major part, and even here there were other factors. Royal friendship for Robert and Remigius may have made it difficult for their opponents to obtain favourable judgements against them, or to have them enforced. This appears to have been the case with the abbot of Ely's land at Histon.

Of course, the king's favour may sometimes have had to be bought: we saw this with Robert Bloet's payment of £3,000 (or £5,000) to William II. It is possible that Remigius and Robert made other similar payments. They may have

---

[99] Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*, pp. 328-9; Francis Du Boulay, *The Lordship of Canterbury: An Essay on Medieval Society* (London, 1966), pp. 23-4; Christopher Dyer, *Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society: The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540* (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 13-5.

[100] *E.g. The Black Book of St Augustine, Canterbury*, ed. G.J. Turner and H.E. Salter, 3 vols (London, 1915-24), vol. 1, p. xlii; Clarke, 'Early Surveys', p. 152; Du Boulay, *Lordship of Canterbury*, p. 47; Dyers, *Lords and Peasants*, p. 55.

[101] *E.g.* Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984), pp. 107, 313. See also below, n. 172 and n. 173.

[102] *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 1, pp. cxliv-cxlv; Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, pp. 180-2.

had to buy some of the land which the kings of England gave them. But as was argued previously, the opportunity to buy land from the king could in itself be a form of patronage and a manifestation of royal favour. And if Robert and Remigius found it necessary to deploy their material wealth to win over the English king, then this further underlines the first conclusion of this case study: the central importance of royal power in Anglo-Norman England.

Sometimes, however, the bishops acted against the king's will: this was certainly the case with their treatment of Stow and Eynsham. And sometimes the success of Robert and Remigius in the tenurial rough-and-tumble of Anglo-Norman England may have been due neither to royal favour nor to their use of their existing land and wealth, but to more intangible factors. At Stow and Eynsham, the bishops' ability to acquire land may simply have been the product of circumstances. This may also have been the case elsewhere. The unrest following the Norman Conquest provided a unique opportunity to hoover up the lands of smaller landholders. Nevertheless, it was necessary to know how to exploit these circumstances. Here, the bishops' power may largely have been due to their personal attributes, to their legal skills and to a kind of ruthlessness by which they manufactured opportunities to enrich themselves. At this point, this can only be a suggestion. But in the second part of the chapter we shall meet an individual whose personality and talents did – at least according to one source – make him inordinately powerful: Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham.

**

The second of this chapter's two case studies, concerning the diocese of Worcester, will take a similar approach to the first. It will start by laying out what happened, before trying to determine how it happened, and what this tells us about episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. It concentrates on Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester, a contemporary of Bishop Remigius of Lincoln. Wulfstan's successor Samson (1096-1112) was roughly contemporary with Robert Bloet of

Lincoln, but, for practical reasons, Samson is not covered here.[103] The landed endowment of the church of Worcester changed little under Samson, and the sources do not give us much of an idea of how Samson sought to defend and augment his church's possessions.[104]

As has been mentioned, Wulfstan of Worcester presents a contrast to the first two Norman bishops of Lincoln in a number of ways. This is especially true when landholding is considered. Put simply, while Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln were beneficiaries of the Norman Conquest, Wulfstan of Worcester was a victim of it. The late-eleventh-century cartulary from Worcester (*Hemming's Cartulary*) contains a narrative account of the lands stolen from the church over the eleventh century. Its author was the monk Hemming, who eventually rose to be subprior of the cathedral chapter at Worcester.[105] Using Hemming's account in conjunction with *Domesday Book* (and assuming Hemming to have been mostly truthful), it is possible to determine that the church of Worcester lost some 30 hides of land between 1066 and 1086.[106] Just under 20 more hides were lost and then recovered.[107] *Hemming's Cartulary* does contain a list of lands supposedly

---

[103] On Samson's career in general, see V.H. Galbraith, 'Notes on the Career of Samson, Bishop of Worcester (1096–1112)', in *EHR* 82 (1967), 86–101.

[104] For developments during Samson's time, see the survey of the bishopric's land in Worcestershire *c.* 1115 in *HC*, pp. 313-5, as well as *EEA 33: Worcester*, nos 24, 26; *Cartulary of Worcester Cathedral Priory*, ed. R.R. Darlington (London, 1968), nos 6, 18, 35, 53 (also pp. l-li), 270 (*cf.* p. xxxi and no. 447).

[105] J.F.A. Mason, 'Hemming (*fl. c.*1095)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Goldman (online edn.: www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12893, accessed 30 August 2013).

[106] Alton (2 hides; *HC*, p. 255; WOR 15,4); Astley (6 hides; *HC*, pp. 255-6; WOR 15,9); Hadzor (2 hides; *HC*, pp. 262-4; WOR 20,6); Hampnett (10 hides; *HC*, p. 281; GLS 41,1); Ribbesford (*HC*, 256; WOR 1,2). Some of lands counted here may actually have been lost before the Norman Conquest: Lower Sapey (3 hides; *HC*, p. 255; WOR 19,9); Milecote (3 hides; *HC*, pp. 278-9; *HAE*, cc. 157-8; WAR, 36,2); Shelsey (1 hide; *HC*, p. 251; WOR 19,6); Weston (*HC*, p. 272; *HAE*, c. 170; probably GLS 12,17 or GLS 62,5). Ann Williams is almost certainly wrong to identify 'Westun' as Westmancote in Worcestershire: 'Spoliation', pp. 393, 406; WOR 2,28. *Hemming's Cartulary* tells us that 'Westun' manor was in Gloucestershire: *HC*, p. 272. The lands listed here may not reflect the true extent of Worcester's losses. The account in *Hemming's Cartulary* was only intended to cover the lands of the monks, not those of the bishop himself. Other lands may have been lost and not recorded. Queenhill (1 hide; WOR 2,36; HEF 1,45) may be one of them. It is listed with the lands of the church of Worcester, but in 1086 was in the hands of the king. Ralph de Bernay – described in *Hemming's Cartulary* as a despoiler of the church of Worcester – had held it.

[107] Bengeworth (4 hides; *HC*, pp. 278-9; WOR 2,75; 10,12); Bredicot (3 hides; *HC*, 265-6; WOR 2,60); Cotheridge (1 hide; *HC*, p. 254; WOR 2,14); Himbleton and Spetchley (3½ hides; *HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,70); Pendock (2 hides; *HC*, pp. 249-50; WOR 2,26); Whittington (2 hides; *HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,5); Witley (1 hide; *HC*, pp. 256-7; WOR 2,8); Wolverton (2 hides; *HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,4). However, Pendock might actually be WOR 2,62 and Whittington might be WOR 2,58. Most

acquired by Wulfstan from William the Conqueror.[108] But these acquisitions were not numerous enough to offset Worcester's losses. Moreover, most of them were probably actually reacquisitions. William the Conqueror apparently returned (*reddidit*) Grimley, Mitton and Easton (14 hides in total) to Wulfstan. *Domesday Book* seems to treat these lands as *TRE* possessions of the church of Worcester; they could have been taken by Normans after 1066 and then recovered.[109] Even Alveston and Cookley Wood, which William the Conqueror gave (*dedit*) to Wulfstan, may actually have been reacquisitions.[110] Alveston had certainly been a possession of Worcester in the tenth century; *Domesday Book* suggests that the church still had some interest there in 1066.[111] Cookley Wood was part of Wolverton, a possession of Worcester both *TRE* and in 1086.[112]

The church of Worcester's territorial losses after 1066 were not catastrophic. They represented about 10% of the bishopric's endowment (in 1086) of just over 576 hides, worth about £388.[113] Moreover, only lands held by tenants of the church were affected. The church's demesne was left mostly unscathed.[114] Wulfstan may also have been able to compensate for these losses by extending his jurisdictional and financial rights over the church of Worcester's private hundred of Oswaldslow.[115] Nevertheless, Hemming felt them deeply. And they were accompanied by another development, one probably more worrying for Bishop

---

of these lands are claimed as losses in *Hemming's Cartulary*, but appear as possessions of the bishop or monks of Worcester in 1086 in *Domesday Book*.

[108] *HC*, pp. 405-7. Wulfstan's brother, Prior Ælfstan of Worcester, apparently acquired Lench, 'Dunham-stede' and 'Peceslea' for the church: *HC*, p. 407, but these lands cannot be identified. The Lench in question may have been misappropriated from the abbey of Evesham: see below, n. 139.

[109] *HC*, p. 407; GLS 3,5; WOR 2,23; 2,66. William the Conqueror also returned the two 'Linderycgeas' and Penhyll, which cannot be found in *Domesday Book*. Mitton, along with certain other lands, had apparently also been restored to the church of Worcester by Archbishop Ealdred of York (1061-9); we are not told whether this happened before or after the Norman Conquest: *HC*, p. 395.

[110] *HC*, p. 407. For Cookley Wood, see also Bates, *Regesta*, no. 345. For Alveston, see also *EEA 33: Worcester*, no. 8.

[111] WAR 3,4; S1310; S1318; S1350.

[112] WOR 2,83.

[113] The bishop himself held 222 hides worth £208.05; the cathedral monks had 80.5 hides worth £52.5; and the church's tenants had 272.87 hides worth £127.05: John Hamshere, 'The Structure and Exploitation of the *Domesday Book* Estate of the Church of Worcester', in *Landscape History* 7 (1985), 41-52. Dyer, *Lords and Peasants*, pp. 36-8, gives a total of 580½ hides, 241¾ held by the bishop, 79½ by the monks, and 259¼ by tenants.

[114] Williams, 'Spoliation', p. 392.

[115] Patrick Wormald, 'Lordship and Justice in the Early English Kingdom: Oswaldslow Revisited', in *Property and Power*, ed. Davies and Fouracre, 114-36; Tinti, *Sustaining Belief*, pp. 60-1.

Wulfstan and his monks. By 1086, virtually all of the church's Anglo-Saxon tenants had been replaced by Normans,[116] sometimes against Wulfstan's will.[117] Wulfstan's relationship with these Norman was probably different to the relationship he had had with his English tenants. The Normans were apparently lax in performing the service which they owed to the bishop.[118] And the terms on which they held land from Worcester may (eventually at least) have been fundamentally different.[119] As Chapter 5 will suggest, much of a bishop's power stemmed from the networks of tenants and dependents which he headed. The radical change in these networks at Worcester (and elsewhere) must therefore have affected the bishop's power.

Domesday Book, Hemming's account, and other documents in *Hemming's Cartulary* give us quite a good idea of how Wulfstan lost these lands and tenants, and how he attempted to remedy the situation. A *caveat* is necessary here. Much of what follows is based on Hemming's testimony, testimony which is clearly *ex parte*, written some years after the events in question, in places demonstrably inaccurate,[120] and possibly just as fantastical and unreliable as the monastic narratives discussed in Chapter 2. But Hemming is often our only source. The following analysis is therefore heavily conditional upon Hemming's veracity, in the same way that Chapter 3's discussion of the trial of William de Saint-Calais was conditional upon the veracity of the tract *De iniusta vexacione Willelmi*

---

[116] WOR 2,1-85. Only five men with English names held land from Wulfstan in 1086, and none of them held very much: GLS 3,3, 3,5; WAR 3,7; WOR 2,20, 2,33; 2,55-7. But some of Wulfstan's Norman tenants had English subtenants: WOR 2,18, 2,52. There may have been other, unrecorded, English subtenants on Worcester's estates. *Domesday Book* does not normally record this third level of land tenure: see Ann Williams, *The English*, c. 4, especially p. 89.

[117] See below.

[118] *HC*, pp. 253-4, 257-8; Williams, 'Spoliation', pp. 398, 407-8.

[119] This depends on the exact nature of the introduction of knight service into England. A century after J.H. Round's famous article, there is still no scholarly consensus. The most recent contribution to the debate is Nicholas Brooks, 'The Archbishopric of Canterbury and the So-Called Introduction of Knight-Service into England', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 41-62. A document from one of the thirteenth-century cartularies of the abbey of St Augustine's is also worth mentioning here. Abbot Scotland (1070-87) gave a certain Hugh 2 sulungs of land to hold as a knight, 'et [Hugh] dabit decimam omnium rerum suarum que in eadem terra fuerint scilicet messium ouium lane porcorum. animalium. caseorum et ceterorum que ipse in dominio habuerit. francigene quicquam de terra illa quicquam ab eo tenuerint. eandem prescriptam conuentionem quam et ipse custodient. *angli uero ibidem degentes consuetam annonam reddent usque dum legitime ab omnibus angligenis decima reddatur et ipsi eam tunc daturi*': London, BL Cotton MS Julius D. ii, fo. 104v. Similar agreements are found at fos 107v, 107v-108r: 'si qui franci fuerint in istis terris; decimam dabunt. Angli uero; secundum suum morem faciant donec melius fit.'

[120] Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', pp. 64-5.

episcopi. At the very least Hemming's writings provide an engaging picture of how one contemporary thought that power worked at a local level in Anglo-Norman England.

It is simplest to look first at how Wulfstan lost land, and then at how Wulfstan reclaimed the land which he had earlier lost, even though in reality these two processes were roughly concurrent.

***

Hemming blamed most of Worcester's territorial losses after the Norman Conquest on three men. In light of the conclusions of the first part of this chapter, it may be significant that all three of them were trusted servants of William the Conqueror: William Fitz Osbern, Orderic Vitalis' 'primus et maximus oppressor Anglorum',[121] William the Conqueror's companion at Hastings and right-hand man in England;[122] Urse d'Abitot, the first Norman sheriff of Worcester;[123] and Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham (1058-78), the king's justiciar in the West Midlands, in fact, if not in name.[124]

Hemming's account of these men's depredations shows the wide variety of ways in which one could misappropriate land in Anglo-Norman England. William Fitz Osbern and his associate, Sheriff Ralph de Bernay of Hereford, simply helped themselves to the land of Wulfstan's tenants, often violently.[125] Their actions must date to the first few years of Norman rule; William died in 1071. Abbot Æthelwig's methods, on the other hand, were more peaceful. Æthelwig sometimes

---

[121] *OV*, vol. 2, p. 318. 'first and greatest oppressor of the English'

[122] On William, see C. P. Lewis, 'William fitz Osbern, earl (d. 1071)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Goldman (online edn.: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9620, accessed 23 August 2013).

[123] On Urse, and his brother Robert, see Emma Mason, 'Brothers at Court: Urse de Abetot and Robert Dispenser', in *ANS* 31 (2009), 64-89.

[124] On Æthelwig, see Darlington, 'Æthelwig', pp. 10-18.

[125] A certain Æthelric, for example, had held land as a tenant of the church of Worcester, 'et postea comes Willelmus, ipso Ægelrico vivente, hec omnia diripuit, et sue potestati subjecit': *HC*, p. 266. See also pp. 249-50, 255-7, 262-4.

co-operated with Wulfstan,[126] and some of the lands which he took from the bishopric may originally have been given or lent to him by Wulfstan in return for Æthelwig's support in other matters.[127] On another occasion, however, Æthelwig stole Wulfstan's land by poaching one of his tenants: this case is discussed below.

The last of Hemming's three villains was Urse d'Abitot, who did not take Wulfstan's lands at all, at least not in the sense of entirely alienating them from the church of Worcester. Instead, Urse and his brother, Robert Dispenser, waited for Wulfstan's tenants to die or to retire, and then inveigled themselves into the vacant tenancies.[128] They seem to have continued this process of gradual encroachment even after the Domesday inquest of 1086. In a survey of the bishopric's lands from *c.* 1115, Walter de Beauchamp (who had inherited Urse's, and some of Robert's, lands) appears as Worcester's tenant for about 20 hides which had been in the church's demesne in 1086.[129]

Nevertheless, diverse as their methods were, William, Urse and Æthelwig all seem to have taken advantage of their position as royal servants to enrich themselves at Wulfstan's expense. For Æthelwig and William Fitz Osbern this can only be an assumption, albeit a strong one. But for Urse d'Abitot – or rather, for Urse's brother Robert Dispenser – we have a striking description of how royal favour worked in practice. According to Hemming, a man named Godric Finc had previously held the land of Charlton as Bishop Wulfstan's tenant. When Godric

---

[126] *HAE*, c. 157. *Cf. EEA 33: Worcester,* no. 7; *VW,* i.15.1-2.

[127] On Æthelwig, see *HC*, pp. 270-3. The Evesham chronicle says that the lands in question had been unjustly held by the bishops of Worcester and were restored to Evesham by Æthelwig: *HAE*, c. 170. Milecote (WAR 36,2) appears to have been leased to Æthelwig by Wulfstan in exchange for the permanent gift of two smaller lands, 'Bisepedun' and 'Cagecot' (not in *Domesday Book*), and never returned: *HC*, pp. 278-9; *HAE*, cc. 157-8. Daylesford and Evenlode (WOR 2,42-4) also seem to have been leased to Æthelwig, possibly before the Norman Conquest: *HC*, p. 272; *HAE*, c. 167; Clarke, 'Early Surveys', pp. 100, 469.

[128] *HC*, pp. 261, 267-8, 268-9, 269. 'Retirement' refers to individuals such as Kenward who 'morte sibi super veniente' returned his land at Laugherne to the church of Worcester: *HC*, 252-3. See also pp. 250-1, 252-4, 257-8. The one exception was the half of Bengeworth which had been held by Azor, which Urse took by force, while Azor was still living: *HC*, p. 269. But Azor was a rebel; as sheriff of Worcestershire, it was Urse's duty to seize his lands: WOR 9,1; Williams, 'Spoliation', pp. 394, 397.

[129] 5 hides in Blockley (WOR 2,38-44; *HC*, p. 313; *cf. HC*, pp. 303-4); 5 hides in Fladbury (WOR 2,15-21; *HC*, p. 313); 5 hides in Hartlebury (WOR 2,82; HC, p. 316); 2 hides 1 virgate in Northwick (WOR 2,48-61; *HC*, p. 314); 3 virgates at Wick Episcopi (WOR 2,6-14; *HC*, p. 313). Walter de Beauchamp's 1½ hide in Hallow with Broadwas was probably omitted by *Domesday Book* (WOR 2,68-71; *HC*, p. 314). The 5 hides which Walter de Beauchamp held in Ripple (in

died, Wulfstan took Charlton back into Worcester's demesne. But since certain Frenchmen wanted to take the land for themselves, Wulfstan appealed to the king (William the Conqueror). Wulfstan gave the king a splendid golden chalice, in return for which the king gave Wulfstan a sealed writ. Thus strengthened, Wulfstan was able to hold Charlton for a while. Later on, however, Robert Dispenser (Urse d'Abitot's brother), helped by the queen, entered into the land, 'and so we lost it'.[130] This situation was probably repeated countless times at Worcester and elsewhere. Robert was also able to install himself as Wulfstan's tenant for Elmley through the king's power (*per potentiam regis*).[131] Royal favour allowed men like Urse and Robert to ride roughshod over normal practice. A man like Wulfstan, even with the king's writ on his side, was powerless to withstand the king's own men.

So an examination of Bishop Wulfstan's territorial losses reinforces the first conclusion of the first part of this chapter. Those most able to acquire (or to misappropriate) land in Anglo-Norman England were those who, like Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln, stood closest to the king, even if the initiative taken by these individuals in acquiring land was also important.

However, it is also worth noting the way in which Hemming described Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham's legal abilities. According to Hemming, Æthelwig began to grow in secular power after the Norman Conquest created a power vacuum in the West Midlands by removing the region's English nobility. Æthelwig's influence came from his inventiveness (*ingenium*), cunning (*calliditas*) and knowledge of secular law (*scientia secularium legum*).[132]

In one case, Hemming went into more detail about Æthelwig's methods: a certain Ærngrim had held half of the village of Bengeworth as a tenant of the church of Worcester; the other half had been held from Worcester by Azor. When Urse d'Abitot confiscated Azor's half of the village (because Azor was a rebel, although Hemming does not mention this),[133] Ærngrim seems to have become alarmed lest the same thing happen to him. He sought the help (*suffragium*) of

---

addition to the 1 hide he had inherited from Urse) were probably those which had belonged to Siward in 1086 (WOR 2,13-7; *HC*, p. 314).

[130] *HC*, pp. 268-9. 'sicque eam perdidimus'

[131] *HC*, pp. 267-8.

[132] *HC*, p. 271.

Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham, 'who, because of his very great secular prudence, was at that time the judge of almost all England, and highly honoured by the king'.[134] Having gained this help, Ærngrim transferred his service for Bengeworth to the abbot. That is, he agreed to hold his land as a tenant of Æthelwig rather than of Wulfstan. The church of Worcester consequently lost control (*dominatio*) of Bengeworth.

Ærngrim presumably considered Æthelwig more capable than Wulfstan of protecting him from the Normans. But, according to Hemming, Ærngrim himself did not profit from this treachery: Æthelwig later expelled him from the land. The neighbouring landholders (*vicini*) decried this as unjust, but Æthelwig silenced them with his affluent eloquence (*affluens eloquentia*) on account of which even the Normans (*Franci*) feared him.[135]

It is implicit in this account that Æthelwig's influence came, at least in part, from the position to which the king had appointed him: 'iudex fere totius Anglie'. But, according to Hemming it was Æthelwig's legal knowledge and secular prudence which made him powerful, and his eloquence (presumably in legal rhetoric) that made him feared. These attributes would have allowed Æthelwig to win court cases; and as we shall see in what follows, legal hearings were where much of the uncertainty over landholding in post-Conquest England was resolved, justly or unjustly. A man who could obtain verdicts favourable to himself and his friends would clearly be a dangerous opponent and a desirable patron.

Two points follow from this. Firstly, it is worth noting that once again concrete power resources were – at least in Hemming's account – relatively unimportant. Æthelwig undoubtedly had money, land, friends and relatives. These resources must have played their part in Æthelwig's territorial acquisitions. The Evesham chronicle lists the lands which Æthelwig acquired 'a rege Æduuardo et

---

[133] See above, n. 128.

[134] 'qui illis temporibus pro nimia seculari prudentia judex fere totius Anglie erat, et a rege plurimum honorabatur'

[135] *HC*, pp. 269-70. Clarke, 'Early Surveys', pp. 405-6, rejected the story found in *Hemming's Cartulary*. But his reasons for doing so are invalid. He made the dangerous assumption that *Domesday Book's* failure to give details on the *TRE* status of Evesham's half of Bengeworth meant that it had been acquired before 1066; and he assumed that Bengeworth's presence in a long list of lands which Æthelwig acquired 'a rege Æduuardo et ab aliis bonis hominibus laboriosissime maximaque pecunia redimendo' meant that Æthelwig had actually bought the land there.

ab aliis bonis hominibus laboriosissime maximaque pecunia redimendo'.[136] But for Hemming, the root of Æthelwig's power lay in his personal attributes – in his mind. Once again, churchmen in Anglo-Norman England did not gain land exclusively by having land. According to the 'e=mc^2 equation' between land and power, Wulfstan, with the extensive estates of the church of Worcester at his disposal, ought to have been as powerful as Æthelwig.

The second point is that Æthelwig's legal power also serves to highlight the critical importance of royal power in Anglo-Norman England. Without a widespread system of courts, without the extraordinary legal inquiries which characterised the Conqueror's reign, without a widely accepted body of law, and without a king able to enforce it, Æthelwig's skill at law would have been useless. Arguably, the effectiveness of Æthelwig's legal acumen also demonstrates the importance of abstract concepts in constituting and directing power in Anglo-Norman England: it is not so much that a strong king enforced the law as that contemporaries voluntarily submitted themselves to ideas of legal practise.

**

Hemming's account and our other sources do not give us a complete picture of how Bishop Wulfstan lost land, and gained unwanted tenants, after the Norman Conquest. Some questions are left unanswered. Some of Worcester's manors, for example, were held in 1086 by Normans not mentioned by Hemming.[137] Often we can only speculate as to how they acquired them. And Hemming's descriptions themselves are often vague. It is not clear what he meant when he claimed that William Fitz Osbern took a manor by force. Was the force merely threatened, or was it applied in practice? Did the previous holder of the manor fight back? How many people were involved in the action?[138]

---

[136] *HAE*, c. 166. 'from King Edward and from other good men, most laboriously, and by redemption with much money'
[137] *E.g.* WOR 2,21; GLS 3,7.
[138] *Cf.* Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 36.

Nevertheless, the evidence we have leads to two conclusions. Firstly, royal favour appears to have been highly important in allowing one to amass land in Anglo-Norman England. This is what the first section of this chapter argued. Secondly, legal ability – at least according to Hemming – was a highly significant form of power. An analysis of Bishop Wulfstan's efforts to retake the lost lands of his church leads, as we shall see, to similar conclusions. Here the evidence is also incomplete. Again, some questions must remain unanswered. Even so, it is possible to point to three principal means of action which Wulfstan employed in defence of his church's possessions.[139]

Firstly, Wulfstan reorganised Worcester's archive. Two new cartularies were compiled during his episcopate, at his instigation (though only one was finished before his death).[140] The monks of Worcester also embarked on a major campaign of charter forgery under Wulfstan. Of the forty-two charters in the late-eleventh-century *Hemming's Cartulary*, twenty-two are demonstrably false. Fifteen of these do not appear in the early-eleventh-century *Liber Wigornesis*, and so probably represent recent falsifications.[141] However, it is difficult to know how much all this helped. There is no evidence that Wulfstan ever presented charters, forged or otherwise, as proof of Worcester's land claims, still less that such charters worked in Wulfstan's favour. Wulfstan may not even have known that his monks were falsifying documents; and these forgeries may never have been

---

[139] There is no evidence that Wulfstan employed the kind of personal initiative discussed above in relation to Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln. However, *HC*, p. 407, tells us that Wulfstan's brother, Prior Ælfstan of Worcester, acquired various lands, among which was Lench. This Lench may rightfully have been a possession of the church of Evesham. Several manors in Worcestershire were called Lench. In 1086, the church of Worcester held Cleeve Prior with Lench for 10½ hides: WOR 2,76. Cleeve Prior was probably 10 hides; Lench was probably ½ hide: *The Victoria History of the County of Worcester*, ed. J.W. Willis Bund, 4. vols (London, 1901-24), vol. 1, p. 297 n. 5. Now, two dubious charters preserved at Evesham grant the abbey 5 hides at Lench: S226; S1058. This is unlikely to refer to Evesham's manor of Church Lench, which was assessed at 4 hides: WOR 10,16. Evesham's manor of Atch Lench, assessed at 4½ hides in 1086, is a more likely candidate, especially since Atch Lench was adjacent to Cleeve Prior: WOR 2,76 note; 10,14. It is possible that Evesham had once held all 5 hides at Atch Lench, and that Prior Ælfstan of Worcester somehow abstracted half of one of them and annexed it to Worcester's adjacent manor of Cleeve Prior – perhaps in response to Abbot Æthelwig's seizure of Worcester lands. See also Bates, *Regesta*, nos 136-7; Clarke, 'Early Surveys', pp. 233-4, 487-8; *HC*, pp. 316, 428.
[140] Francesca Tinti, 'From Episcopal Conception to Monastic Compilation: Hemming's Cartulary in Context', in *Early Medieval Europe* 11 (2002), 233-61; *eadem*, '*Si litterali memorie commendaretur*: Memory and Cartularies in Eleventh-Century Worcester', in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen Baxter *et al.* (Farnham, 2009), 475-97.

intended as a serious means of defending Worcester's possessions. Many of them concern lands which, as far as we know, were not contested in the eleventh century.[142] Conversely, no forgeries were created for many of the lands which were disputed.[143] Chapter 5 will return to this theme, arguing that historians may have overstated the importance of falsified documents and campaigns of record-keeping as a means of protecting ecclesiastical patrimonies. In light of all this, it must remain uncertain whether monastic literacy was a real source of power for Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester (in terms of landholding). Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln appear to have needed neither forgeries nor cartularies.[144]

The second means of action which we know Wulfstan to have employed was via money. We have already seen how – according to Hemming – Wulfstan on one occasion bought a royal writ to ward off certain Frenchmen intent on occupying his lands. Wulfstan probably made similar use of his church's wealth on other occasions, and with more success. According to his charter giving land at Alveston (Warwickshire) to the monks of Worcester, Wulfstan had recovered that manor from William the Conqueror 'by great effort, and by the giving of money'.[145] In his charter founding a priory on the episcopal manor of Westbury-on-Trym, Wulfstan claimed that some of the land there 'had been occupied and plundered by laymen',[146] and that he had recovered it partly by lawful right (*legali iure*) and partly by 'the price of my money' (*pecunie mee ... pretio*).[147]

Unfortunately, we have no way of knowing how much money Wulfstan expended in defence of his church's lands. But it is significant that, in two of the three examples of – essentially – bribery mentioned above, the king received the

---

[141] False charters in *Liber Wigornensis*: S107, S120, S145, S180, S401, S402, S1329. False charters *not* in *Liber Wigornensis*: S60, S61, S75, S104, S118, S121, S179, S181, S195, S201, S205, S211, S216, S406, S633.

[142] S60, S61, S126, S633, S1261.

[143] S118, for example, asserts Worcester's right to Hampton and Bengeworth, two manors disputed between Wulfstan and the Abbots of Evesham. But no forgeries appear to have been made for other manors contested with Evesham. *Hemming's Cartulary* contains no identified forgeries relating to Weston, Milecote or Acton Beauchamp, although it does contain the bounds (unattached to any charter) of three hides at Acton: S786. The monks of Worcester had genuine documents relating to Daylesford (S215, S1340) and Evenlode (S109, S1325), but they did not bother to include them in *Hemming's Cartulary*.

[144] Although their predecessors at Dorchester did keep records: John Blair, 'Estate Memoranda of *c.* 1070 from the See of Dorchester-on-Thames', in *EHR* 116 (2001), 114-32.

[145] *EEA 33: Worcester*, no. 8. 'maximo labore et pecunie donatione'

[146] 'impedita et direpta erat a laicis hominibus'

[147] *Ibid.*, no. 11.

money. Wulfstan must have felt that royal favour was worth paying for, and that the best way of achieving his local goals was to obtain the king's goodwill. He may have been correct: as has been mentioned, *Hemming's Cartulary* contains a list of lands which William the Conqueror apparently gave or restored to the church of Worcester (including Alveston).[148] Again, we see the centrality of royal power in Anglo-Norman England. This brings us to the third and last of Wulfstan's known means of action: litigation, and appeals to the king's courts and the king's law.

According to the twelfth-century Rochester cartulary known as the *Textus Roffensis*, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (1070-89) recovered diverse lands for the bishopric of Rochester 'quasi quadam placitorum violentia'.[149] Wulfstan defended the lands of his church with a similar 'violence of pleas'. Between 1066 and 1086, Wulfstan participated in at least four extraordinary legal assemblies. The first of these, the meeting of the royal court at Petherton where Wulfstan established his right to the villages of the church of Worcester unjustly detained by Archbishop Thomas of York, was discussed in Chapter 2. The second assembly is mentioned only in *Domesday Book*. Wulfstan apparently proved his right to Alveston in Warwickshire at an assembly of four counties under Queen Matilda.[150] As has been mentioned, Wulfstan also apparently used his money to acquire Alveston, as well as being given the manor by the king. We see here how the recovery or the acquisition of lands in Anglo-Norman England could be a long and complicated process.

The third and fourth assemblies which Wulfstan used to recover his church's possessions are better documented. They concern the manors of Hampton and Bengeworth disputed between the bishopric of Worcester and the abbey of Evesham. At some point between 1083 and 1085, William the Conqueror, responding to a complaint by Wulfstan,[151] ordered Bishop Geoffrey of Coutances to settle the dispute between Wulfstan and Abbot Walter of Evesham. It took two sessions for the *magnus conventus* gathered by Bishop Geoffrey to decide that the manor of Bengeworth was rightfully a possession of the church of

---

[148] *HC*, p. 407.

[149] *Textus Roffensis*, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1720), p. 142.

[150] WAR 3,4.

[151] This is clear from the Conqueror's writ ordering the assembly: '…et ut plene episcopus Wlstanus suam rectitudinem habeat stude': Bates, *Regesta*, no. 347.

Worcester, but that Abbot Walter should be allowed to hold it as Wulfstan's tenant; and that the manor of Hampton was rightfully a possession of the church of Evesham, but that it belonged to the bishop of Worcester's private hundred of Oswaldslow.[152] However, the status of the manors of Hampton and Bengeworth was contested once again at the time of the Domesday survey in 1086, and the case was heard before the Domesday commissioners for Worcestershire. The commissioners ratified the verdict reached under Geoffrey of Coutances.[153]

Extraordinary legal assemblies – usually gatherings of several shire courts convened by royal delegates – were common in Anglo-Norman England.[154] The judgements of these hearings were not always permanent, nor were they universally heeded. The famous series of land pleas held at Ely during William the Conqueror's reign exemplifies this.[155] So does the dispute over Hampton and Bengeworth discussed above: Abbot Walter of Evesham seems to have refused to acknowledge the judgement concerning Bengeworth and Hampton reached under Geoffrey of Coutances. Even after this judgement had been ratified by the Domesday commissioners in 1086, Hampton and Bengeworth remained contentious.[156] But Walter's obstinacy was not entirely unjustified. The judgement reached under Geoffrey of Coutances (that Bengeworth belonged to Worcester) had itself violated the verdict of an earlier assembly, held at *Ildebeorga* under Bishop Odo of Bayeux between 1078 and 1082, that Bengeworth was the property of Evesham.[157] It was probably near-impossible for post-Conquest judges to determine which side was in the right in such cases: Hampton and Bengeworth

---

[152] Bates, *Regesta*, nos 347-9.

[153] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 350; WOR Worcester H5. On the pleas over Hampton and Bengeworth in general, see Wormald, 'Lordship and Justice'. However, Wormald (at p. 123) was wrong about the nature of Bishop Wulfstan's claim over the manor of Hampton. Worcester *did* claim land (rather than just jurisdiction) at Hampton, and at least one document from Worcester existed to back this claim: the forgery S118. The claim is also made in the (dubious) plea record, Bates, *Regesta*, no. 349. In fact, it is in itself implausible that Wulfstan would have claimed only the hundredal jurisdiction over Hampton. The rationale of the bishop of Worcester's private hundred of Oswaldslow was that all of the land within it belonged to the bishop: WOR 2,1. Wulfstan's claim that Hampton was part of Oswaldslow automatically entailed a claim to outright possession.

[154] *E.g.* Bates, *Regesta*, no. 118; *English Lawsuits from William I to Richard I*, ed. R.C. van Caenegem, 2 vols (London, 1990-1), vol. 1, nos 185, 232, 256, 287.

[155] Edward Miller, 'The Ely Land Pleas in the Reign of William I', in *EHR* 62 (1947), 438-56, pp. 451-2.

[156] For the later dispute over these lands, see Chapter 5, n. 32 and n. 136.

[157] Bates, *Regesta*, nos 134-5. *Ildebeorga* was the geographical conjuncture of Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Gloucestershire and Oxfordshire: WOR 10,12 note.

both seem to have been disputed by Worcester and Evesham even before the Norman Conquest. [158]

So the system of extraordinary legal assemblies was not perfect, nor was it entirely effective. Judgements could always be disputed. Nevertheless, it represented an important means for Bishop Wulfstan of reclaiming the lost possessions of his church. The four assemblies discussed above may represent the tip of an iceberg of litigation. It is only by a chance reference in *Domesday Book* that we know of the assembly of four counties presided over by Queen Matilda. Wulfstan's involvement in other assemblies may not have been recorded. It seems, likely, for example, that Wulfstan was at the assembly of several counties (four, five or seven, depending on the source) at *Ildebeorga* convened by Odo of Bayeux after the death of Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham in 1078, even though none of the sources recording this meeting mention Wulfstan's presence.[159] The purpose of the assembly was to determine the legitimacy of Æthelwig's landed acquisitions; Wulfstan almost certainly had something to say on this subject.

The manors of Daylesford and Evenlode, which Hemming accused Æthelwig of stealing from Worcester (Æthelwig probably installed himself as tenant against Wulfstan's will),[160] may have been restored to Wulfstan at *Ildebeorga*. According to *Domesday Book* and the Evesham land surveys, the abbey had held Daylesford and Evenlode from the bishop of Worcester, until Odo of Bayeux took them from the abbey (almost certainly at *Ildebeorga*).[161] In 1086, Evenlode and Daylesford were held by Bishop Wulfstan, with Stephen son of Fulcred as tenant at Daylesford.[162] However, since this Stephen could have been forcibly enfeoffed with Worcester's land by Odo of Bayeux, Wulfstan may simply have swapped one unwanted tenant (Abbot Walter) for another.

A further legal inquiry could have been held after Roger de Breteuil, the heir of William Fitz Osbern, was imprisoned and forfeited his lands for his involvement in the 1075 rebellion against William the Conqueror. The object of

---

[158] The evidence is discussed by Clarke, 'Early Surveys', pp. 426-32.

[159] *HAE*, cc. 173-4; *HC*, p. 273. But *cf.* WOR 10,11-12 note, on the sequence of events. Bates, *Regesta*, nos 134-5 and WOR 10,12 also concern this hearing. For a full discussion, see Clarke, 'Early Surveys', pp. 111 *ff.*.

[160] *HC*, p. 272.

[161] WOR 2,44; Clarke, 'Early Surveys', p. 473.

[162] WOR 2,42-3.

such an inquiry would have been to determine the legitimacy of William Fitz Osbern's acquisitions, in the same way that the assembly at *Ildebeorga* was convened to investigate the acquisitions of the deceased Abbot Æthelwig. Six of the nine lands which Hemming accuses William Fitz Osbern and Ralph de Bernay of stealing appear in *Domesday Book* as possessions of Bishop Wulfstan.[163] That Wulfstan asserted his right to them at some kind of extraordinary legal assembly is perhaps the most plausible explanation of this state of affairs.

Wulfstan must also have defended his church's land at regular meetings of the shire court, but this routine activity has left fewer traces in the sources.[164] However, even if litigation was important in Wulfstan's defence of his church's lands, it is difficult to say just how episcopal power worked in this legal context, and what exactly Wulfstan did during these assemblies. A narrative survives of one of Wulfstan's pleas against Abbot Walter of Evesham, but this is probably a forgery.[165] It seems to disagree with the pair of writs which announce the result of the plea in making it a total (rather than a partial) victory for Worcester.[166] And although the narrative is found in the same manuscript as the writs, it was clearly added to it some time later than they were.[167] It would therefore be dangerous to use it, as Ann Williams and Patrick Wormald have done, to construct a picture of Wulfstan's legal conduct.[168] Almost certainly, Wulfstan used money to make his arguments more acceptable; undoubtedly, he called on his friends and tenants to

---

[163] Himbleton and Spetchley (*HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,70); Pendock (*HC*, pp. 249-50; WOR 2,26 or WOR 2,62); Whittington (*HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,5 or WOR 2,52); Witley (*HC*, pp. 256-7; WOR 2,8); Wolverton (*HC*, p. 266; WOR 2,4).

[164] See *VW*, i.15.1; *GP*, iv.140.3.

[165] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 349.

[166] Bates, *Regesta*, nos 348, 350. These writs made a clear distinction between Bengeworth, which was to be held by Abbot Walter as a fief from Worcester, and Hampton, 'unde episcopus diracioncinavit [*sic*] socam et geldum et expeditionem et cetera mea [the king's] servitia ad suum hundred, et ciricescot et sepulturam ad suam villam pertinere.' But according to the narrative (no. 349) Wulfstan claimed from Abbot Walter 'sacam et socam et sepulturam et circsceat et requisitiones et omnes consuetudines faciendas ecclesiae Wigornensi in hundredo de Oswaldeslawe et geldum regis et seruitium et expeditiones in terra et in mari, de xv hidas de Hantona et de iiii^or hidis de Benningewrde quas debebat abbas tenere de episcopo, sicut alii feudati ecclesie ad omne debitum seruitium regis et episcopi libere tenent.' Wulfstan was apparently awarded everything which he wanted. Here Hampton and Bengeworth seem to be treated equally. Wulfstan seems to have claimed both of them as fiefs of Worcester. It is unlikely that the relative clause 'quas debebat abbas...' referred only to the four hides at Bengeworth; there is no reason to assume that this was the case.

[167] The narrative is written in a different hand to that of the writs, and it is separated from them by a copy of William II's writ demanding a feudal relief from the church of Worcester's tenants following Bishop Wulfstan's death in 1095: Ker, 'Hemming's Cartulary', p. 53

bear witness on his behalf. He may have used charters; these charters may have been concocted for him by his monks. But we cannot go beyond these suppositions.

Nevertheless, it is significant in itself for our understanding of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England that so much of Wulfstan's activity in defence of his church's lands took place in these delegated royal assemblies. It further underlines the importance of royal power in Anglo-Norman England, even in purely local affairs (even if royal judgements and royal writs were sometimes ignored). It also demonstrates the real power of abstract notions of law and right. Arguably, Wulfstan regained some of his church's lost possessions not by using any concrete resources or by taking any particular action – in fact, not through his own power at all – but passively. The lands were restored to the church of Worcester because it was recognised that they had belonged to the church of Worcester in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and the time of King Edward was commonly accepted in Anglo-Norman England as a legal base point for determining the justice of land claims. Of course, initiative could be taken within this framework. One could misrepresent the pre-Conquest situation; and it was necessary to bring one's claims before a friendly court. Nevertheless, it is possible that Wulfstan's own abilities and resources as bishop of Worcester were in some respects of secondary importance in allowing him to reclaim lost lands. Wulfstan may have recovered these properties simply because he had a commonly accepted right to them.

***

There is nothing unusual about what happened to the estates of the bishopric of Worcester after 1066. Other bishops lost land to the Normans.[169]

---

[168] Wormald, 'Lordship and Justice', p. 123-5; Williams, 'Cunning of the Dove', pp. 33-8.

[169] Selsey / Chichester: SUS 9,11; 9,60. Winchester (mainly before the accession of the Norman Bishop Walkelin in 1070): Galbraith, 'Royal Charters to Winchester', p. 384, nos 34-6; Alexander Rumble, 'The Purpose of the *Codex Wintoniensis*', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 153-66, pp. 159-60. Abbeys also lost land after the Conquest: *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 1, p. cli; Sandra Raban, *The Estates of Thorney and Crowland: A Study in Medieval Monastic Land Tenure* (Cambridge,

Even Remigius of Lincoln lost some estates, although in his case the losses were more than offset by territorial gains elsewhere.[170] The abbey of Ely is another example of a religious institution whose Anglo-Saxon tenants were comprehensively replaced by Normans.[171] Moreover, as at Lincoln, the tenurial upheavals at post-Conquest Worcester were not a new phenomenon. The pre-Conquest bishops of Worcester had also lost land.[172] In fact, the church of Worcester appears to have been steadily losing land since its initial endowment in the ninth century.[173] It is also worth noting that one of Hemming's three main villains for the post-Conquest period, Abbot Æthelwig, was an Englishman, and that some of Æthelwig's depredations probably took place before the Norman Conquest. The pre-Conquest bishops of Worcester had also sometimes been forced to accept tenants whom they did not want,[174] although the scale and ethnic dimension of the changes at Worcester after 1066 were admittedly new.

***

It is striking that, although Wulfstan's experience of landholding after the Norman Conquest was in some ways the exact opposite of that of Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln, our analysis of it has led to very similar conclusions to those suggested by the earlier discussion of Robert and Remigius. It would be natural to consider Worcester's territorial losses and Lincoln's territorial gains after the Norman Conquest as results of the Norman Conquest. But, as we have seen, this would be incorrect. Such fluctuations in ecclesiastical landholding also took place in Anglo-Saxon England (obviously, for secular landholders the Norman Conquest *was* cataclysmic). The replacement of Anglo-Saxon tenants by Normans at Worcester was new; and it should be noted that most of Remigius of Lincoln's tenants in *Domesday Book* were also Norman. However, the

---

1977), pp. 21-32; Frank Stenton, 'St Benet of Holme and the Norman Conquest', in *EHR* 37 (1922), 225-35.
[170] BDF 24,23; 28,2; 34,2; LIN 12,59; 12,89; CK65; CK67.
[171] *Liber Eliensis*, c. 116; Miller, *Abbey and Bishopric of Ely*, pp. 67-9.
[172] M.K. Lawson, 'The Collection of Danegeld and Heregeld in the reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut', in *EHR* 99 (1984), 721-38, p. 729 and n. 12.
[173] Dyer, *Lords and Peasants*, pp. 11-2.
[174] Baxter, *Earls of Mercia*, p. 175.

significance of these changes in ecclesiastical tenancy is hard to gauge: the nature of the legal, social and emotional bonds between lords and their men both before and after the Norman Conquest is not entirely clear. Chapter 5 of the present thesis considers these bonds, although only for the post-Conquest period.

This chapter's two case studies also arrived at similar conclusions about episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. The chapter echoes, in some respects, Stephen Baxter's arguments concerning the Anglo-Saxon earls of Mercia. The earls were apparently 'powerful, yet vulnerable'; their tenurial resources were 'considerable but insecure'.[175] Their vast estates were given to them by the king; and the king could take these lands away. To build up their landed power, earls had to compete at the king's court for the king's favour – or for control over the king himself.[176] All this applied equally to the bishops of Anglo-Norman England.[177] They too owed their appointment to the king. And we have seen that the ability of the bishops discussed in this chapter to defend and protect their landed possessions hinged largely on their standing with the English king. Even Bishop Wulfstan, hardly a curial bishop, acted through the king, either by direct petition or by appealing to the king's law. When Wulfstan lost land, he lost it to royal servants. It seems that these men were able to prey on the church of Worcester because of their high standing with the king.

However, our case studies have also shown the importance of other forms of power, ones not considered by Baxter. Wulfstan's recovery of certain of his church's lands may have been principally due to the commonly accepted ideas of tenurial right by which he claimed them, rather than to any resources employed by Wulfstan himself. Similarly, Abbot Æthelwig's legal power required commonly accepted notions of law in order to function. All this reinforces the arguments of Chapter 3 concerning the genuine power of abstract concepts in Anglo-Norman England in determining episcopal conduct and means of action.

The importance assigned by Hemming to Æthelwig's legal knowledge and skill at pleading is also worth noting. Even without his land and wealth, Æthelwig would presumably have had a certain power. This was a kind of charismatic

---

[175] *Ibid.*, p. 125.

[176] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-71.

[177] Frank Barlow drew parallels between earls and bishops in Anglo-Saxon England: *English Church, 1000-1066*, p. 97.

power, although one very different to the spiritual authority discussed in Chapter 2. Arguably, much of the power of Remigius and Robert Bloet was also charismatic (that is, derived from their personalities). It may have been a kind of ruthless energy and ambition which let them encroach on the lands of their weaker neighbours, and which prompted their annexation of the churches of Stow and Eynsham. The royal favour which these two bishops enjoyed, and their promotion to the episcopate in the first place, was probably also due to their character. Other examples of prelates whose personal attributes and knowledge made them powerful can be given. The ability of Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds to win over successive kings of England, and hence to defend his abbey's possessions, was clearly linked to his skill as a doctor (from which the kings profited).[178] Abbot Faricius of Abingdon and Bishop John of Bath were also former royal doctors, who enjoyed royal favour and were conspicuous in enriching their churches.[179]

Where does this leave the notion, with which this chapter started, of a direct link between land, wealth and power? Obviously, wealth was on some occasions important in constituting landed power. Remigius certainly bought land, as did Robert Bloet. Wulfstan certainly used money to defend his church's possessions. And without money neither Remigius, Robert Bloet nor Wulfstan would have been able to participate in the local politics, or the legal processes, of Anglo-Norman England. But this chapter has shown that wealth and land were not particularly important in determining a bishop's ability to acquire more land or to retain his existing possessions. Royal favour, personal ruthlessness, legal acumen and the justice of one's claims all seem to have been more important. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the bishops discussed in this chapter used their land to make themselves militarily powerful, or that they exploited the military power accruing to them from their military tenants in order to advance their local interests.

However, land and wealth had their uses, and it is worth noting here that these resources permitted certain actions (and thus conferred certain types of power) which the charisma and royal favour discussed above did not. Money and

---

[178] Antonia Gransden, 'Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065-1097', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 65-76, p. 66.

the food rents from land were necessary to support a bishop and his household, and for a bishop to function as a bishop at the most basic level. Money was also required for all of the projects to which bishops probably devoted the majority of their mental energy, and which they themselves probably saw as their defining achievements as bishops: the foundation of churches, the patronage of religious houses, the expansion of their cathedral chapters, and – most importantly in this period – the construction of new cathedrals. A bishop's legal acumen and the royal favour he enjoyed would not allow him to do these things (unless the king actually gave the bishop money),[180] in the same way that Bishop Wulfstan's money was useless in preventing the royal favourite Robert Dispenser from installing himself on his land at Charlton.

It is not so much that land and wealth did not give a bishop power, while royal favour and legal acumen did, as that these differing resources gave bishops differing, limited, types of power, which were useful for differing purposes. We have seen this already in Chapter 3. The power that a bishop drew from his place in the wider hierarchy of the European church was limited, in that it could only be used in ways of which that wider hierarchy (and in particular, the pope) approved. Chapter 5 will return to this theme of limitation with regard to the power that bishops drew from their tenants.

---

[179] R.A.L. Smith, 'John of Tours, Bishop of Bath 1088–1122', in *Downside Review* 70 (1942), 132–41; *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 2, pp. xlvi-li.
[180] William the Conqueror apparently promised to help Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds in the construction of a new abbey church: Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 39.

Chapter 5: Bishops, Abbots and Their Men (Case Study: Canterbury)

On an unspecified day in the early 1070s, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (1070-89) and his monks planned to move the bodies of St Dunstan and their other saints out of the soon to be demolished east end of their cathedral to a temporary home in the oratory of St Mary.[1] But the ceremony was interrupted by a group of Lanfranc's knights, who had recently killed two relatives of Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's (1070-87). Lanfranc's murderous knights feared for their lives, although it is not said whether they feared judicial or informal vengeance. They refused to leave St Dunstan or to let him go from them. Abbot Scotland and 'all of those whose right it was to remit this vengeance'[2] were summoned, but refused to pardon the knights. So Dunstan was translated, while the feud remained unresolved. But that very night Scotland and his relatives were tortured, terrified and severely burnt by a vision of St Dunstan. At the break of day they rushed into the cathedral to pardon the murderers of their relatives and to seek the forgiveness of the saint whose sanctuary they had disrespected.

This story comes from Osbern of Canterbury's collection of the miracles of St Dunstan (*BHL*, 2345).[3] Like many miracle stories from Anglo-Norman England, it offers us a tantalising nugget of information bereft of its context. Osbern was present at Dunstan's translation. He could presumably have explained why Archbishop Lanfranc's knights had killed Abbot Scotland's relatives, what those knights could have expected to happen to them without Dunstan's miraculous intervention, how often the armed retainers of religious institutions in Anglo-Norman England took up arms against each other – and the extent to which bishops and abbots became involved in these feuds.[4] But these details were

---

[1] On this building work, see Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 104-5.

[2] 'omnes ii quorum interfuit vindictam donare'

[3] Osbern of Canterbury, *Miracula s. Dunstani*, ed. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan*, 69-161, c. 17, p. 143.

[4] Eadmer of Canterbury later reworked the story for his own collection of St Dunstan's miracles: *Miracula s. Dunstani* (*BHL*, 2347), ed. and trans. Turner and Muir in *Eadmer: Lives and Miracles of Oda, Dunstan and Oswald*, 160-211, c. 17. He also mentioned the translation (though not the feud) in his *Epistola ad Glastonienses*, ed. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan*, 412-22, pp. 413-4. According to Eadmer, only one nephew of Abbot Scotland was slain, and it was two brothers of the dead man who, together with Scotland, refused to pardon the murderers. Eadmer also thought

irrelevant to his hagiographical purpose. Such scuffles may have been common. Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester's knights were apparently willing to undergo trial by battle against Ranulf, the brother of Abbot Walter of Evesham. Their singling out of Ranulf may point to genuine personal animosity.[5] Bishop Walcher of Durham provides a more dramatic example. His failure to control his violent retainers, and to prevent their assassination of the local nobleman Ligulf, led to his own violent death at Gateshead in 1080.[6]

In fact, many of the quarrels between bishops, abbots, archbishops and lay nobles over land, jurisdiction and status in Anglo-Norman England may be better understood as the prelates becoming entangled in conflicts between their tenants, servants and other dependants. This chapter explores this hypothesis with regard to one such quarrel: that between the archbishops of Canterbury and the abbots of St Augustine's. This dispute arose not so much from the conscious policy of the abbots and the archbishops as from the agitation of their subordinates, in particular the two communities of monks at the cathedral (known as Christ Church) and the abbey. In some respects, archiepiscopal and abbatial policy may have been dictated by these subordinates. Chapter 3 argued that episcopal power was fundamentally limited, in that bishops were only considered to enjoy episcopal status when they acted in accordance with certain norms. This chapter argues that archiepiscopal and abbatial ('prelatial') power was limited in that it was constituted by, and exercised through, a prelate's subordinates. These subordinates had minds and agendas of their own, which they sought to impose on their lords.

The chapter also considers the nature of the dispute between Christ Church (*i.e.* the cathedral) and St Augustine's. The abbey and the archbishopric came into dispute at virtually every level. Land, jurisdiction, rights over land, the possession of relics, ecclesiastical precedence, and even liturgy, were all contentious. Although they have acknowledged the possible links between these different

---

that Scotland and his nephews were already present at the translation. Osbern had implied that they were not initially there, and had to be summoned: Scotland and his men 'were called' (*vocati sunt*). There is no way of knowing which hagiographer was right.

[5] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 349.

[6] Symeon, *Libellus de exordio*, iii.23; *JW*, vol. 3, p. 32, *s.a.* 1080; *Historia regum*, pp. 208-11.

disputes,[7] scholars have generally treated them in isolation.[8] This chapter takes a more holistic approach. At Canterbury, there appears to have been a broad trend away from secular issues towards ecclesiastical ones, and in particular the status of the abbey of St Augustine's with regard to its diocesan, the archbishop of Canterbury. This is observable elsewhere. The disputes between the bishops of Worcester, Lincoln and East Anglia and the abbeys of Evesham, Ely and Bury St Edmunds respectively all followed roughly the same pattern. The conclusion to this chapter will explore these parallels, and suggest reasons for this trend.

A qualification needs to be made at this point. Although this chapter discusses the dispute between Christ Church and St Augustine's, it would be wrong to consider the relationship between the two churches as essentially and permanently hostile.[9] In some matters, such as the elevated status of the city of Canterbury, Christ Church and St Augustine's were natural allies.[10] The two communities of monks regularly joined together for special occasions (for instance, for Archbishop Anselm's reception of his pallium in 1095).[11] The St Augustine's hagiographer Goscelin of Saint-Bertin dedicated his account of the translation of St Augustine in 1091 to Archbishop Anselm,[12] and at least one monk of St Augustine's was upset enough about Anselm's terminal illness to see the archbishop in a vision.[13] Monks (and clerics) seem on occasion to have passed

---

[7] Paul Hayward, 'Gregory the Great as "Apostle of the English" in Post-Conquest Canterbury', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 19-57, p. 30; Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 170 n. 124.

[8] Paul Hayward's series of three articles on St Augustine's concentrates on liturgical and ecclesiastical issues: 'An Absent Father'; 'Gregory the Great'; 'Some Reflections on the Historical Value of the So-Called *Acta Lanfranci*', in *Historical Research* 77 (2004), 141-60. So does H.E.J. Cowdrey's *Lanfranc* (pp. 167-72). Bruce O'Brien, 'Forgery and the Literacy of the Early Common Law', in *Albion* 27 (1995), 1-18, concentrates on secular issues. Ann Williams, 'The Anglo-Norman Abbey' in *The English Heritage Book of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, ed. Richard Gem (London, 1997), 50-66, takes a wider view, but is limited by the format of the volume, and by space (the essay considers all aspects of the Anglo-Norman abbey, not just the dispute with Christ Church).

[9] The same goes for other contemporary disputes between bishoprics and monasteries: Brett, *English Church*, p. 137.

[10] Martin Brett, 'Gundulf and the Cathedral Communities of Canterbury and Rochester', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 15-26, pp. 20-5.

[11] *HN*, p. 72; Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Translatio sanctae Mildrethae uirginis cum miraculorum attestatione*, ed. D.W. Rollason in *Mediaeval Studies* 48 (1986), 154-210, c. 19, p. 179; Hériman de Tournai, *Les Miracles de sainte Marie de Laon*, ed. and trans. Alain Saint-Denis (Paris, 2008), p. 168.

[12] Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 411D.

[13] *VA*, p. 155.

between the two monasteries, with or without the consent of their superiors.[14] Relationships between the archbishops and the abbots could also be close. Abbot Scotland died with Archbishop Lanfranc performing his obsequies.[15] And Scotland and Lanfranc had co-operated at least once, going together to William the Conqueror to secure the pardon of a thief who had claimed the sanctuary of St Augustine.[16] According to one source, Archbishop Ralph (1114-22) was so impressed by a miracle of the St Augustine's saint Adrian that he ordered that Adrian's feast day be solemnly observed throughout his diocese.[17]

The structure of this chapter is simple. The chapter looks at four of the matters disputed between Christ Church and St Augustine's: the revenues of the port of Sandwich; land on the neighbouring Isle of Thanet; the possession of the relics of St Mildreth of Thanet; and the ecclesiastical status of the abbey of St Augustine's with regard to the cathedral church. These disputes were linked, and largely concurrent, but it is simplest to examine them separately. Since the earliest known clash between the abbey and the cathedral concerned the port of Sandwich, we shall start there.

***

---

[14] A monk of Christ Church, possibly the hagiographer Osbern, who fled to St Augustine's when persecuted by his prior, but later left that monastery, presumably to return to Christ Church: Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Libellus contra inanes sanctae virginis Mildrethae usurpatores*, ed. M.L. Colker, in *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977), 68-97, pp. 89-90; Rubenstein, 'Osbern', pp. 33-4. A former monk of Christ Church who, returning to Canterbury after various adventures in Denmark, seems to have gone to St Augustine's rather than Christ Church: Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 424A-F. A cleric from Christ Church who was accused of theft and fled to St Augustine's: Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 425B-E.

[15] Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 443C-D.

[16] Goscelin, *Translatio Mildrethae*, c. 23, p. 190. However, H.E.J. Cowdrey's suggestion that Archbishop Lanfranc helped Abbot Scotland in recovering the lost lands of his abbey is unfounded: *Lanfranc*, p. 170. Lanfranc did stop the port-reeve Bruman from taking tolls from foreign merchants on the lands of Christ Church and St Augustine's; but he may have done this purely for himself, with St Augustine's an incidental beneficiary. And the 1077 writ of William the Conqueror addressed to Lanfranc and others ordering that Abbot Scotland be reseised of the borough of Fordwich (Bates, *Regesta*, no. 83) means nothing. The Conqueror routinely addressed diocesan bishops in his writs. Similarly, the fact that Lanfranc was present at the county court when St Augustine's right to eight prebends at Newington was established (Bates, *Regesta*, no. 88) is insignificant. As the diocesan, Lanfranc was expected to be there.

[17] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Translatio sancti Adriani* (*BHL*, 3743), in London, BL, Cotton MS Vespasian B. xx, fos 241v-248v, at fo. 248r-v. The author of this section of the text may have been

Sandwich lies on the south bank of the river Stour, near to its mouth on the east coast of Kent. In the eleventh century, the Stour had a second mouth at Roculf to the northwest. The area cut off from the mainland by the Stour was, and still is, known as the Isle of Thanet. Sandwich was a convenient stopping point (or refuge in case of bad weather) for ships coming up from the English Channel and heading along the Thames to London. The tolls from these ships made Sandwich a valuable possession.[18]

In 1023, King Cnut gave Sandwich, as well as privileges and tolls associated with the port, to Christ Church.[19] Cnut's son and successor, Harold Harefoot (1037-40), took Sandwich back into his own hands. This was possibly an honest mistake, for when Archbishop Eadsige (1038-50) of Canterbury complained about this seizure Harold returned Sandwich to Christ Church. However, before this restitution Harold had given a third of the tolls from Sandwich to the abbey of St Augustine's. This appears to be the origin of the later dispute. Abbot Ælfstan of St Augustine's (1023x7-1045/6) asked Archbishop Eadsige to allow him to keep his third share of the tolls. But although Eadsige was willing to grant this, the cathedral community (*hirede*) refused. Ælfstan then asked for permission to make a wharf (*hwerf*) on his manor of Minster, on the Isle of Thanet. Unsurprisingly, the Christ Church community refused this too: a port on the manor of Minster-in-Thanet would have been in direct competition with Sandwich. Ælfstan ignored this refusal and went ahead anyway with his plans for a rival port, digging a ditch at Ebbsfleet, right across the Stour from Sandwich, although apparently the scheme came to nothing: 'for he toils in vain who toils against Christ'.[20]

All this comes from an anonymous memorandum from Christ Church (S1467).[21] But the memorandum's version of events is probably a simplification.

---

a continuator rather than Goscelin himself. In the manuscript, the concluding miracles look like a slightly later addition, and their literary style differs from that of the preceding text.

[18] For background, see Helen Clarke *et al.*, *Sandwich, 'The Completest Medieval Town in England': A study of the Town and Port from Its Origins to 1600* (Oxford, 2010).

[19] S959. The actual extent of the rights given by Cnut is unknown. See Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 292-4; Clarke *et al.*, *Sandwich*, p. 29; Du Boulay, *Lordship of Canterbury*, p. 35.

[20] 'forþam he swingð eall on idel þe swincð ongean Cristes willan'

[21] See also Clarke *et al.*, *Sandwich*, pp. 29-30.

Domesday Book records that Edward the Confessor restored Sandwich to Christ Church.[22] And between 1070 and 1082 Odo of Bayeux granted (or restored) houses and customs there to Christ Church.[23] Sandwich was also listed in an obituary of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury (1070-89) among the lost lands which William the Conqueror restored to Christ Church.[24] Furthermore, at some point before 1086, St Augustine's had acquired 30 *mansurae*, a field and a church in Sandwich (Sandwich itself still belonged to Christ Church).[25] All this suggests further controversy over the port. Most importantly, if Abbot Ælfstan of St Augustine's did give up his plans to replace Sandwich with his own port (and thus to divert the tolls of shipping to himself), then these plans were revived after the Norman Conquest. Two writs of William II (dateable 1087 x 8 or 1091 x 5) confirm to Abbot Wido (also known as Guy; 1087-93) and the monks of St Augustine's 'omnes rectitudines suas ad Eastanores, tam in aqua quam in terra'; they were to have 'terram illam et totum littus usque in medietatem aquae'.[26] 'Eastanores' is Stonar, a part of St Augustine's manor of Minster on the Isle of Thanet located across the Stour from Sandwich.[27]

These writs, with their reference to jurisdiction over water, seem to indicate that St Augustine's was claiming certain (though unspecified) rights over shipping or wreck on the Stour. One of the writs says that it was the men of London who contested St Augustine's rights over Stonar in the reign of William II

[22] KEN 2,2.

[23] Bates, *Regesta*, nos 71-2.

[24] John Le Patourel, 'The Reports of the Trial on Penenden Heath', in *Studies in Medieval History*, ed. Hunt, Pantin and Southern, 15-26, p. 25. This list of recovered lands was later interpolated into the reports of the trial at Penenden Heath (version I(a) in Bates, *Regesta*, no. 69). It is presumably for this reason that Clarke *et al.* write that in 1072 (the year of the Penenden Heath hearing) Lanfranc claimed Sandwich as having been lost to his church, possibly seized by Odo of Bayeux shortly after 1066: *Sandwich*, p. 30. But this is incorrect. Sandwich does not appear in the earliest reports of the trial at Penenden Heath, and there is no reason to think it was discussed on that particular occasion.

[25] These holdings do not appear in *Domesday Book* itself, or in the *Domesday monachorum*, but in a survey from St Augustine's: *An Eleventh-Century Inquisition of St Augustine's, Canterbury*, ed. Adolphus Ballard (London, 1920), p. 20. But other evidence corroborates St Augustine's acquisition of a church in Sandwich: Clarke *et al.*, *Sandwich,* pp. 31-8. This church may have been disputed in the reign of Henry I: *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 1314.

[26] *Regesta*, vol. 1, nos 371-2, printed in Thomas of Elmham, *Historia monasterii sancti Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (London, 1858), pp. 355-6. 'all their rights at Stonar, in water and on land'; 'that land and the whole shore, up to the middle of the water'

[27] The settlement of this dispute by William II's justiciars at Stonar is narrated by William Thorne, *Cronica de rebus gestis abbatum sancti Augustini Cantuariae*, ed. Roger Twysden in *Historiae*

(the other does not name St Augustine's adversaries). But it is easy to see how the monks of Christ Church might have had their own objections to a port at Stonar.

The dispute over Sandwich flared up again in the reign of Henry I. Now a new issue had emerged: the ferry across the Stour. At some time between 1116 and 1118, William, son of Henry I, addressed a writ to his namesake, Sheriff William of Kent. Sheriff William was to make Hamo son of Vitalis and the reputable neighbours of Sandwich (*probi vicini de Sandwich*) tell the truth about St Augustine's boat. Two further writs, one of William (Henry I's son) and one of Queen Matilda, announced the result of this inquest: since the abbot of St Augustine's (Hugh) was seised of the boat when the king last left England (in 1116), the boat and his other *res* were to be restored to him until the king's return, when the case would presumably be reopened for a more definitive judgement.[28]

Again, these writs do not mention the monks of Christ Church or the archbishop of Canterbury. But it is hard to think of anyone else who would have contested St Augustine's right to have a boat at Sandwich. The Christ Church monks claimed to have the exclusive right to operate a ferry over the Stour (and so to profit therefrom); the monks or men of St Augustine's had presumably started to operate their own ferry service there. And this ferry figures in the next piece of evidence, an account of a plea held at Sandwich in 1127 from a now-lost custumal of Sandwich (a shortened version, from the Christ Church archives, still exists).[29] Henry I apparently ordered that a gathering of wise men be summoned from the area around Sandwich to determine the rights of Christ Church and St Augustine's. By the testimony of twenty-four respectable locals (and by the oath of twelve of the king's men of Dover) it was determined that all the tolls and customs of Sandwich, on both sides of the river (*ex utraque parte fluminis*), and the ferry there, belonged to the archbishop of Canterbury and his monks.

This would seem to have been a total victory for Christ Church. But it is unwise to accept without reservation partisan narratives of this type. A writ of

---

Anglicanae Scriptores X. (London, 1652), cols 1757-2207, at col. 1793, where it is dated, probably incorrectly, to 1090.

[28] *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 1189-91, printed in Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, pp. 353-4. It seems that an inquest into St Augustine's customs in Newington was carried out at the same time: *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 1192-3.

[29] *English Lawsuits*, vol. 1, no. 254A-B; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no 1154. The document is discussed extensively by O'Brien, 'Forgery'.

Henry I dateable 1129 x 33 suggests that the Sandwich case was not entirely settled by the plea of 1127. It confirms the rights of St Augustine's at Stonar in the same terms as the two writs of William II cited above, giving St Augustine's possession 'usque in medietatem aquae'. [30] This appears to contradict the narrative's claim that Christ Church was awarded all tolls and customs 'ex utraque parte fluminis'. Of course, this writ, recorded only in St Augustine's sources, could itself be a forgery. In any case, the status of the port of Sandwich remained contentious. It was still being disputed in the thirteenth century. [31]

None of the documents cited above is beyond suspicion, and the foregoing summary of the dispute over Sandwich should be taken as a conditional outline rather than an exact reconstruction. Nevertheless, there are some important points to be drawn from it. Firstly, this dispute is a good example of the type of protracted squabble, spanning the Norman Conquest, into which religious institutions could be drawn. The dispute between Worcester and Evesham over Hampton and Bengeworth (discussed in Chapter 4) is another example. The bishops of Worcester and the abbots of Evesham were already arguing over the possession of these manors before the Norman Conquest. It was only at the end of the thirteenth century that the abbey of Evesham finally took control of them. [32]

Secondly, the litigation over Sandwich provides an important illustration of the relative unimportance of forged charters in deciding such disputes. Christ Church had genuine charters for Sandwich, and backed them up with forgeries, but according to the 1127 plea record, the case was settled by oral testimony and that alone. [33] We shall return to this point later in this chapter.

Thirdly, the dispute over Sandwich shows the central importance of royal authority in Anglo-Norman England. The monks of St Augustine's had most success when the king of England was at loggerheads with the archbishop of Canterbury. St Augustine's rights at Stonar were confirmed by William II, a king

---

[30] *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 1644, printed in Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, p. 360.

[31] *The Victoria History of the County of Kent*, ed. William Page, 3 vols (London, 1908-32), vol. 2, p. 129.

[32] The history of these manors is tangled and obscure; the existing secondary literature does not fully take into account the contested nature of the hundredal jurisdiction over them. In addition to the works cited below in n. 136, see *Victoria History of the County of Worcester*, vol. 2, pp. 397-9, 405.

[33] As noticed by O'Brien, 'Forgery', pp. 9-10.

whose relationship with Christ Church and Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury was hardly perfect, and were (conditionally) confirmed again in 1116-8, when Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury was irritating Henry I with his stubborn demands for a profession of obedience from Archbishop Thurstan of York.[34] It was only in 1127, when Ralph's successor, William de Corbeil, had come to a compromise (although a shaky one) with Thurstan over the issue of primacy,[35] that the hearing of the Sandwich case, deferred in 1116-8 until the king's return from Normandy and which should therefore have taken place in 1120, went ahead. Chapter 4 argued that the ability of Bishops Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln to achieve their political goals at a local level (the acquisition of lands for their church) stemmed from their ability to win the king's favour at a national level. With the Sandwich dispute we see something similar. This is another point to which we shall return.

However, the greatest significance of the dispute over Sandwich is that it demonstrates how ecclesiastical lords in eleventh- and twelfth-century England had, in their local dealings, to act through a whole network of underlings and dependants; and how those men acted through their overlords. It will be remembered that Archbishop Eadsige was ready to grant Abbot Ælfstan his third of the toll from Sandwich, a compromise which would have prevented the later dispute. But he could not, because the cathedral chapter of Christ Church refused, even though Ælfstan and Eadsige offered them £10 for their acquiescence.[36] And the 1127 plea record's description of the initial usurpation of rights by St Augustine's suggests that the initiative was taken not by the monastery's abbots, or even the monks, but by its secular dependants. We are told that Sandwich, with its tolls and customs, had been given to Christ Church by Cnut:

> *nuper autem quidam considerantes ex altera parte portus, in terra abbatis*
> *Sancti Augustini que vocatur Stonore, esse locum abilem navium*
> *stacionem sereno tempore, domunculas sibi propter naves advectantes*
> *ibidem fecerunt: ex quo accidit ut theoloneum et consuetudines a navibus*

---

[34] For this dispute, see Hugh the Chanter, *History*; Margarete Dueball, *Der Suprematstreit zwischen den Erzdiözesen Canterbury und York, 1070-1126* (Berlin, 1929).

[35] Hugh the Chanter, *History*, pp. 208-14; Bethell, 'William of Corbeil', p. 156. Despite this settlement, there were arguments over the archbishop of York's right to have a cross carried before him in the province of Canterbury at the Christmas court of 1126: Hugh the Chanter, *History*, p. 216; *JW*, vol. 3, pp. 164-6, *s.a.* 1126.

que ibidem applicuerant homines Sancti Augustini ab exteris clancule acciperent, quas ministri de Sandewych et Sandewici portus accipere deberent.[37]

It is not clear who the *quidam* were who decided to build houses at Stonar. But the quoted text implies that they were different from the men of St Augustine's who began demanding customs from the ships which landed there and later began to operate their own ferry between Thanet and the mainland. This looks like a case of ground-level opportunism by minor ecclesiastical tenants and servants. It is possible that such petty opportunism lay behind other land disputes in Anglo-Norman England, and that modern historians should be cautious about viewing these conflicts in terms of the conscious policy of bishops, nobles and other landlords.

A parallel, though possibly unreliable, example comes from a thirteenth-century revision of the late-twelfth-century Abingdon chronicle. The abbey of Abingdon's manor of Cuddesdon was adjacent to the bishopric of Lincoln's manor of Great Milton. At some time between 1067 and 1070, the men of the bishopric (at that time of Dorchester) wished to destroy the sluice of Abingdon's mill at Cuddesdon, and were opposed by the men of the abbey. These ground-level tensions led to a confrontation at Cuddesdon between Abbot Ealdred of Abingdon and Peter, the administrator of the vacant diocese of Dorchester. Peter arrived with a multitude of armed men, while Ealdred was supported by a wedge (*cuneus*) of devoted laymen and monks, and the relics of St Vincent. On this occasion the case was decided in Abingdon's favour by a miraculous earthquake which terrified Peter and his supporters.[38]

However, Cuddesdon became contentious again in the reign of Henry I. In 1105, and again in 1108, the men of Robert Bloet of Lincoln destroyed the dam (*clausura*) of Abingdon's mill there (our source for this is the Abingdon chronicle

---

[36] S1467. Eadsige was also a benefactor of St Augustine's: S1401; Thorne, *Cronica*, col. 1784.

[37] *English Lawsuits*, no. 254, p. 216. 'But recently, certain men, seeing from the other side of the port that in the land of the abbot of St Augustine called Stonar there was a suitable place for ships to dock in calm weather, built themselves houses there on account of the ships which arrived. From this it happened that the men of St Augustine secretly accepted tolls and customs from the ships which landed there, from the strangers, which the *ministri* of Sandwich and the port of Sandwich should have accepted.'

[38] *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 1, pp. 272-4.

itself). This time, the dispute did not escalate, as Robert Bloet forced his men to repair the damage they had caused.[39] Here it seems that the bishop had to intervene to prevent his subordinates from stirring up trouble. This too may have been common. One of the reasons Eadmer gave for St Anselm's constant itineration as archbishop of Canterbury was that, if he had stayed continually in Canterbury, he would have been unable to protect his men from oppression by *prepositi*, presumably the reeves Anselm had set over Canterbury's manors.[40]

<center>***</center>

The dispute over Sandwich is the best attested of the land disputes between Christ Church and St Augustine's. But there were others. Sometimes, the evidence shows only that there was a dispute, and gives no details as to its cause or progress. Kennington, a Kentish manor of four sulungs with a value of £12 10s in *Domesday Book* and held by Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's in 1086, is just possibly the 'Chinton' which appears in a list compiled in the 1070s of lands which had been unjustly stolen from Christ Church.[41] Similarly, the borough of Fordwich appears in *Domesday Book* as a possession of St Augustine's, but with no explanation why Archbishop Lanfranc refused to do service for his seven *mansurae* there.[42] In one case, however, hagiographical sources give us a fuller picture.

As has been mentioned, the Isle of Thanet was divided from the Kentish mainland (and from Christ Church's port of Sandwich) by the river Stour. In 1086, and probably also in 1066, Thanet was divided into two manors: Monkton,

---

[39] *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 172-4.

[40] *VA*, p. 71

[41] David C. Douglas, 'Odo, Lanfranc, and the Domesday Survey', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait,* ed. J.G. Edwards, V.H. Galbraith and E.F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), 47-57, p. 52; KEN 7,28. However, Du Boulay, *Lordship of Canterbury*, p. 39, identifies 'Chinton' as Kennington near Chart, in Wallenberg.

[42] KEN 7,10; *The Domesday monachorum of Christ Church Canterbury*, ed. David C. Douglas (London, 1944), p. 84. But *cf. An Eleventh-Century Inquisition of St Augustine's*, pp. xxv-xxvi, 17-8: it is possible that it was the burgesses of Fordwich, rather than the abbot of St Augustine's, who suffered from Lanfranc's refusal to do service.

eighteen sulungs valued at £40 belonging to Christ Church;[43] and Minster, forty-eight sulungs valued at £100 belonging to St Augustine's.[44] The evidence that Christ Church and St Augustine's disputed the borders of these manors, and that Christ Church made a tenuous claim to ownership of the entire manor of Minster, is inconclusive, but worth considering for the light it sheds on the human side of eleventh-century land disputes.

Given the proximity of the Isle of Thanet and Sandwich, the tension between Christ Church and St Augustine's over the former almost certainly had something to do with the better known dispute over the latter. St Augustine's proposed rival to the port of Sandwich was, as has been mentioned, located on the abbey's manor of Minster-in-Thanet. And Christ Church obtained Sandwich about the same time that St Augustine's obtained Minster-in-Thanet (the first half of the eleventh century). The rights of the churches in this area were not yet well established. The monks of St Augustine's may have felt that their possession of Minster (and the ancient church of St Mildreth on Thanet) entitled them to a share of the tolls on ships passing through the Stour.[45] But these links are only speculative: they are not mentioned explicitly in our sources.

Two miracle stories provide the main evidence for a land dispute on Thanet. The first miracle story comes, like the story with which this chapter opened, from the *Miracula Dunstani* of Osbern, a monk of the cathedral at Canterbury. Apparently, Osbern was once strolling by the shore on the Isle of Thanet with a certain knight 'who had invited me there for his defence'.[46] Osbern was presumably helping the knight in some legal case. As the two men walked, their conversation turned to St Dunstan, and the knight recalled an earlier case in which Osbern had helped him. The abbot of St Augustine's, while he lived (the reference is almost certainly to Abbot Scotland who died in 1087), had always been hostile to the knight, whose inheritance he wished to steal. But the knight, having invoked St Dunstan on the eve of the plea, and having been consoled in a

---

[43] KEN 3,7. In 1066, the manor had been assessed at 20 sulungs worth £20. The reduction in sulungs does not indicate a loss of land, but a reduction in its tax assessment. This was common on the Kentish lands of Christ Church: Colin Flight, 'A List of the Holders of Land in Kent, *c*. 1120', in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 125 (2005), 361-79, p. 365. See also SUR 2,1-6; SUS 2,1-2; 2,5-10.

[44] KEN 7,8.

[45] *Anglo-Saxon Charters of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanet*, ed. Susan Kelly (Oxford, 1995), p. xx n. 20; Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', p. 30.

[46] 'qui me pro defensione sui invitaverat'

vision by the saint, won the case. As he recounted this miracle, the knight grew pale at his own ingratitude to Dunstan.[47]

We do not know the name of the knight, nor the nature of his links to Christ Church and the archbishop of Canterbury. The knight does, however, appear to have lived on the Isle of Thanet, since his house was near to where Osbern spoke with him. If he lived on St Augustine's manor of Minster (he may have been one of the three men-at-arms which *Domesday Book* lists there), then it seems that the archbishop or the monks of Canterbury were, through the monk Osbern, helping one of the tenants of the abbot of St Augustine's against his master. If the knight lived on Christ Church's manor of Monkton (but *Domesday Book* records no knightly tenants there), then we see one of the archbishopric's tenants participating in its disputes. In either case, Osbern gives us an interesting glimpse into the local politics of eleventh-century Kent.

Possibly the knight was trying to change his allegiance, for whatever reason, from St Augustine's to Christ Church. This happened elsewhere in Anglo-Norman England. Chapter 4 discussed Abbot Æthelwig of Evesham (1058-78), whom the monks of Worcester accused of poaching their church's tenants, and of thereby stealing the lands which those tenants had held from the bishopric of Worcester.[48] The second of our two miracle stories concerning the Isle of Thanet involves another tenant, albeit one lower down the social scale, who tried to switch overlords. This time our source is a hagiographer employed by the monks of St Augustine's, the Fleming Goscelin of Saint-Bertin.

According to Goscelin, a peasant (*rusticus*) held land from St Augustine's on Thanet. He also held land from Christ Church, seemingly also on Thanet, but perhaps elsewhere.[49] When the reeves (*prepositi*) of St Augustine's demanded the tax due (*debitus census*) from this peasant, he refused, claiming that the land in question did not belong to St Mildreth (*i.e.* to St Augustine's; the abbey owned Mildreth's old church on Thanet) but to Christ Church, and that he was ready to prove this by his oath. On the day set for the hearing of the case, the peasant

---

[47] Osbern, *Miracula Dunstani*, c. 24, pp. 156-8. The story is discussed from a narratological perspective by Rachel Koopmans, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 2011), pp. 18-25.

[48] *HC*, pp. 269-71.

attempted to fool the judges. Having put earth from land which undoubtedly belonged to Christ Church in his shoes, he stood on the disputed property and swore that he stood on the land of Christ Church. But the trick failed, when – through the power of St Mildreth – the peasant's eyes fell out.[50]

Leaving aside this vindictive miracle, Goscelin's story provides a plausible enough picture of small-scale jurisdictional disputes in eleventh-century England. Of special significance is the initiative taken by the peasant. Perhaps he felt that Christ Church would demand less rent from him. Once again, it is possible to provide a parallel to this incident. According to Abbot Geoffrey of Burton, two villagers living under the law of an earlier abbot of Burton (also called Geoffrey; 1085-94), in the village of Stapenhill, ran away to the neighbouring village of Drakelow, desiring to remain under the power of the baron, Roger the Poitevin. The matter escalated. Roger, having been stirred up by the peasants, sent men to raid the abbey's lands; sixty of them were shamefully put to flight in a brawl with ten of the abbey's knights.[51] Unlike the rustic of Thanet, these peasants seem only to have wanted to transfer themselves, and not the land they held.[52] But in both cases, the initiative was taken by the peasants. And the role of the fugitive peasants in exciting Roger the Poitevin against the abbot (Roger apparently threatened to murder Abbot Geoffrey) is especially significant.[53]

To return to the dispute on Thanet: from its position near the end of Goscelin's *Translatio et miracula sanctae Mildrethae* (*BHL*, 5961), it would appear that the events behind the story of the deceitful peasant were fairly recent when Goscelin was writing (*c*. 1090).[54] But it is impossible to date the incident

---

[49] 'Rusticus possederat agrum de Christi Ecclesia, habebat et partem de beate Mildrethe possessione in Taneto sua'

[50] Goscelin, *Translatio Mildrethae*, c. 32, pp. 202-3. Note this miracle's similarity to Byrthferth, *Vita Ecgwini*, iv.10.

[51] Geoffrey of Burton, *Life and Miracles of Saint Modwenna*, pp. 192-8.

[52] Other churchmen in Anglo-Norman England may have had problems with fugitive peasants (or fugitive tenants in general): *e.g.* Galbraith, 'Royal Charters to Winchester', no. 45; Craster, 'Contemporary Record', nos 12, 20-1, 23-4, 29.

[53] Geoffrey of Burton, *Life and Miracles of Saint Modwenna*, p. 192. See also pp. 204-6: a certain forester of Robert de Ferrers, Osmund, took every possible opportunity to harm the abbey of Burton, 'uerba deferens de abbate ad dominum quibus discordiam inter eos per mendacia fabricabatur'. He persuaded his lord to seize woodland belonging to the abbot – but did not escape without divine punishment.

[54] David Rollason, the editor of the *Translatio*, dates it 1087 x 1091, but Richard Sharpe considers it to be somewhat later: 'Goscelin's St Augustine and St Mildreth: Hagiography and Liturgy in Context', in *Journal of Theological Studies* new ser. 41 (1990), 502-16, pp. 509-10. It is possible

specifically. The first plea involving Osbern, the knight of Thanet and Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's must have taken place before Scotland's death in 1087. The second plea, in which Osbern was defending the knight, and which provided the occasion for the knight's narration of the first plea, must have happened after Scotland died. Again, however, it is impossible to be more specific. Nor is it clear how common such incidents were. These two episodes may represent the tip of an iceberg of petty intrigues and squabbling over Minster and Monkton, or they may have been isolated oddities. In any case, they provide another illustration of the active involvement of minor ecclesiastical tenants in their masters' land disputes, and of the initiative which they could take therein.

One other document may be relevant here. A writ of Henry I, from 1107 or 1108, granted Abbot Hugh and the monks of St Augustine's the land which Hugh had redeemed (*disvadiavit*) from a certain Wibert in Thanet.[55] If this Wibert was the Wibert who appears as a tenant and a knight of the church of Canterbury in the *Domesday monachorum*,[56] then we may have another case of a tenancy disputed between the bishopric and the abbey. Just possibly, Wibert was the knight of Osbern's miracle story.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

This is not all that can be said about the dispute over the Isle of Thanet. The monks of Christ Church appear to have wanted the whole island for themselves, including St Augustine's manor of Minster-in-Thanet. The evidence for this is oblique, but clear enough. Here, the secular dispute over land on Thanet was closely linked to an ecclesiastical dispute over the possession of the relics of St Mildreth. And once again the dispute appears to have been instigated not by the

---

that this miracle was not in the original version of the *Translatio*, and represents a subsequent addition. In BL, Cotton Vespasian B. xx, the earliest manuscript, its entry in the contents list (like the entries for the chapters following it) is written in lighter ink and a different hand to the rest of the text: Goscelin, *Translatio Mildrethae*, p. 155 n. 3.

[55] *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 873, printed in Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, p. 360.

[56] *Domesday monachorum*, pp. 83, 105.

archbishops of Canterbury or the abbots of St Augustine's, but by their underlings.

To understand what follows it is necessary to realise that St Augustine's possession of the manor of Minster-in-Thanet was connected with the abbey's possession of the body of St Mildreth, ancient abbess of the church of Minster-in-Thanet, whose relics had been translated to St Augustine's in the reign of Cnut, probably on 18 May 1030.[57] How exactly the abbey of St Augustine's acquired Minster is not clear.[58] But by the reign of Edward the Confessor, the monks of St Augustine's appear to have been claiming that they owned Minster on the strength of their possession of the relics of Mildreth.[59] And in a later forgery, the monks made Edward the Confessor say that he gave the Isle of Thanet to St Augustine's because St Mildreth rested there.[60] This must have made it especially distressing for the monks of St Augustine's when the clerks of the church of St Gregory in Canterbury – a satellite of the cathedral – started claiming that they, and not the abbey, possessed the true relics of Mildreth.[61]

Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury had founded the church of St Gregory as a community of clerks to fulfil pastoral functions among the citizens of Canterbury.[62] In 1085, Lanfranc ordered the translation of two ancient corpses

---

[57] Sharpe, 'The Date of St Mildreth's Translation'.

[58] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin claimed that St Augustine's acquired half of Minster by an exchange of lands, and that the other half was given by King Cnut before Mildreth's translation, although the abbey's possession of the land was later contested: *Translatio Mildrethae*, cc. 6, 9, pp. 164, 166-7. But the monks of St Augustine's may actually have seized Minster on the strength of their possession of Mildreth's relics in the reign of Edward the Confessor. Susan Kelly discusses the unpromising evidence: 'Some Forgeries in the Archive of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress des Monumenta Germaniae historica*, ed. Horst Fuhrmann *et al.*, 5 vols (Hannover, 1988), vol. 4, 347-69, pp. 358-60.

[59] See S1472, a record (although perhaps not an entirely reliable record) of the settlement of a dispute between Abbot Ælfstan and the priest Leofwine in 1044 or 1045 over St Mildreth's property.

[60] S1048, printed in *Charters of St Augustine's*, no. 34, pp. 123-4: 'Quoniam quidem in eadem ecclesia [St Augustine's] supradictus rex [King Æthelbert of Kent] conditus iacet eiusque stirpis progenita Deo dilecta requiescit uirgo Mildryþa, ego etiam eiusdem regis stemmate ortus et regno eius Deo iuuante potitus, Tanatos insulam trado [to St Augustine's]'. See also S990 (*Charters of St Augustine's*, no. 33, pp. 121-2), a forged charter of Cnut, which gives to St Augustine's 'corpus sancte Mildryþe gloriose uirginis cum tota terra sua infra insulam Tænæt et extra, cum omnibus consuetudinibus ad suam ecclesiam pertinentibus'.

[61] On the link between the possession of relics and land in general, see David Rollason, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 208-14.

[62] This foundation may in itself have upset the abbot and monks of St Augustine's. St Gregory's was intended, *inter alia*, as a burial church for the townspeople, a role which up to that point St

from his church at Lyminge (Kent), to the church of St Gregory. One of these bodies was that of St Eadburg, the other was unidentified. The unknown saint lay at St Gregory's for almost three years before the priests there made the unexpected and fraudulent claim that these bones were actually those of St Mildreth, or, as they called her, Mildburga.[63] Such disputes over the relics of saints were common in this period. The dispute over the relics of St Mildreth at Canterbury is unusual only in having been narrated, possibly inaccurately, by Goscelin of Saint-Bertin. Goscelin's tract *Libellus contra inanes sanctae virginis Mildrethae usurpatores* (*BHL*, 5962) is obviously *ex parte*: Goscelin was a monk of St Augustine's. Nor does it give a particularly coherent narrative. Nevertheless, it has several points of interest.

Firstly, it should be noted that Goscelin, and others, saw the connection between the fraudulent claim to the relics of St Mildreth by the priests of St Gregory's, and a fraudulent claim to the possession of her lands (*i.e.* St Augustine's manor of Minster-in-Thanet): 'Ferebatur autem causa uirginalis hereditatis supplantandae huiusmodi fallaciam confictam fuisse.'[64]

Secondly, the Mildreth controversy is another case in which ecclesiastical subordinates caused difficulties for their superiors. It is possible that the priests of St Gregory's were acting without Archbishop Lanfranc's knowledge in professing to have the relics of St Mildreth.[65] And according to Goscelin, after Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's complained to him, Lanfranc forbade the clerks of St Gregory's from publicising their impudent claims. But this prohibition was only

---

Augustine's seems largely to have fulfilled: Brooks, *Early History*, p. 36; Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 169; Margaret Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1977), p. 188; Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', p. 38. Some historians have seen the dedication to St Gregory (the man who had originally sent St Augustine on his mission to England) as a further provocation, for it 'implied a claim to Canterbury's early past of which the abbey felt itself to be the principal custodian': Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 169; Gibson, *Lanfranc*, p. 188.

[63] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, c. 4, p. 71. This is a contentious account, but other evidence confirms it: Robin Fleming, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman Cartulary', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture*, ed. Hollister, 83-115, pp. 100-1; Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', p. 39.

[64] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, c. 21, p. 90. 'It was said that such a fallacy had been put together in order to usurp the virgin's inheritance.'

[65] But *cf.* Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, p. 169: 'It cannot have been without Lanfranc's knowledge and complicity that, some two years later, the clerks of St Gregory's brought, not from Minster-in-Thanet but from Lyminge, what they claimed to be the relics of St Mildreth and the next abbess of Minster, St Eadburg.'

partially effective. The clerks continued making trouble.[66] The role of a certain monk of Christ Church whom Goscelin singled out as the initiator and standard-bearer (*inceptor et signifer*) of the Gregorian presumption is also significant. This monk, who has been speculatively identified with the aforementioned hagiographer Osbern,[67] apparently propagated the priests' lies with public preaching and fantastical writings.[68] He too seems to have ignored a formal prohibition of his activities.[69] If this was Osbern, then it appears that the hagiographer was something of a troublemaker: we have already seen him intimately, though obscurely, involved in litigation against Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's concerning the Isle of Thanet.

Thirdly, and finally, the Mildreth controversy shows how such ecclesiastical disputes could involve not only monks and priests, or ecclesiastical tenants, but the laity in general. Goscelin claimed that the clerks of St Gregory's sought to win over the *rude uulgus*, *ambigua plebs* and *plebicula* with their public preaching.[70] The monks of St Augustine were forced to respond in kind.[71] The clerks may even have been successful in their publicity campaign. According to Goscelin, the latest celebration of the 1030 translation of St Mildreth to St Augustine's was disrupted by 'quidam Gregorianae importunitatis acerrimi fautores'.[72] His phrasing suggests that these *fautores* were not the clerks of St Gregory themselves, but others – who exactly is not clear. It would seem that the dispute over St Mildreth's relics involved not only the cathedral and the abbey, but the whole town of Canterbury.[73]

It should be noted that it was not only at Canterbury that quarrelling churchmen struggled for the hearts and minds of the local populace. When, for example, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury tried to settle the dispute between the cathedral church at Exeter and a cell of the abbey of Battle in that city, he ordered

---

[66] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, c. 1, p. 70.

[67] Rubenstein, 'Osbern', p. 34.

[68] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, c. 21, pp. 89-90.

[69] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, c. 21, p. 89. See above, n. 14, for his later travails.

[70] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores*, cc. 1, 4, 21, 23, pp. 70, 73, 89, 91.

[71] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores,* c. 23, p. 91.

[72] Goscelin, *Libellus contra usurpatores,* c. 26, p. 95. 'certain hardened supporters of the Gregorian importunity'

[73] And David Rollason has argued that the abbots and monks of St Augustine's took steps to gain the allegiance of the people of the Isle of Thanet after Mildreth's translation to St Augustine's in 1035: *The Mildrith Legend*, p. 67.

Bishop Osbern of Exeter (1072-1103), *inter alia*, to allow the monks to ask for the townspeople's help in building a new church.[74] Here we see just why it was important for churchmen to attract popular support. Lay donations were valuable but finite. They could not be infinitely shared. And in the dispute over the relics of St Mildreth, the laity had an additional importance. Whether relics were genuine or not was a matter of public opinion. There was no formal means of proof.[75] Local opinion was also important in disputes over land (which, by implication, the Mildreth controversy was). In contemporary records of such disputes, judgements are often reached by the testimony of respectable locals.[76] If the clerks of St Gregory's had been able to convince the populace that they, and not the monks of St Augustine's, had the relics of St Mildreth, this might have strengthened the position of Christ Church in any challenge to St Augustine's tenure of Minster-in-Thanet.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

The links between the disputes over Sandwich, the Isle of Thanet and Mildreth's relics are clear enough. But how all this was linked to St Augustine's slightly later claims to freedom from the diocesan jurisdiction of the archbishops of Canterbury is less immediately apparent. Some possible connections are suggested in the conclusion to this chapter. Before this, however, it is necessary to sketch the general outline of the dispute over the ecclesiastical status of St Augustine's in our period. This quarrel provides further evidence for this chapter's main hypothesis, namely that the dispute between Christ Church and St Augustine's arose not so much from the conscious policy of archbishops and abbots as from the agitation of their subordinates, in this case, their monks. It also shows what we have seen already with the litigation over Sandwich: that success in such disputes often depended on one's ability to obtain a favourable verdict

---

[74] *AEp.*, no. 172. See also *AEp.*, no. 226; *EEA 11: Exeter*, nos 4-8; Blake, 'Osbern', pp. 67-8; Brett, *English Church*, pp. 93-4.

[75] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin claims that St Mildreth's relics were confirmed to be at St Augustine's by an ordeal (of water, undertaken by a boy on behalf of St Gregory's; he floated), but this did not silence the lying clerks: *Libellus contra usurpatores,* c. 20, pp. 87-9.

[76] *E.g.* Bates, *Regesta*, nos 69, 225, 349.

from the king's court, and that this depended largely on one's personal standing with the king. The production and the modification of written evidence, by contrast, was of comparatively little importance.

The ecclesiastical status of the abbey of St Augustine's with regard to the archbishops of Canterbury was first contested, that we know of, in 1087, with the accession of Abbot Wido (*alias* Guy). The events following Wido's election seem to confirm the points made earlier in this chapter; the active part played in them by the laity of Canterbury is of particular interest. However, they are narrated in one source only: the *Acta Lanfranci*, an anonymous addition in Latin to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* made at Christ Church. The historical value of the *Acta Lanfranci* has been questioned. A short digression will therefore be necessary in order to consider this text's authenticity.

The statements of the *Acta Lanfranci* with regard to St Augustine's have often been summarised by historians.[77] For the argument which follows, a further summary is necessary. The reader learns that, after the death of Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's in 1087, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury examined and blessed (*sacrauit*) a certain Wido as abbot of St Augustine's 'in sede metropoli', that is, in the cathedral at Christ Church. The next day, Lanfranc and Odo of Bayeux led Wido to the abbey of St Augustine's, commanding the monks to receive him as their abbot. The monks of St Augustine refused. Lanfranc was able to bring the rebellious monks into line by imprisoning some and temporarily exiling others: the remainder consented to accept Wido. But that same year, Lanfranc was obliged to have a certain monk named Columbanus publicly whipped and degraded for having plotted Wido's murder. After Lanfranc's death in 1089, the monks of St Augustine's openly stirred up the citizens (*ciues*) of Canterbury against Wido. An armed band stormed Wido's house. Wido only just escaped alive, fleeing to the cathedral. His household, who had tried to fight back, were less fortunate. Bishops Walkelin of Winchester and Gundulf of Rochester, with certain noblemen (*nobiles*), were sent to suppress the uprising. They were relatively merciful. The guilty citizens of Canterbury lost their eyes, but not their lives, and to spare the reputation of the monastic order the monks of St

---

[77] *E.g.* David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England: A History of Its Development from the Times of St Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940-1216* (2nd edn.: Cambridge, 1963), pp. 115-6; Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 168-9, 171; Barlow, *English Church, 1066-1154*, p. 165.

Augustine's received discipline (*i.e.* were beaten) privately (this was at the petition of the monks of Christ Church). They were then 'divided through the churches of England', and twenty-four monks of Christ Church admitted in their place, together with Christ Church's subprior, Anthony.[78]

This story appears to offer us a vivid glimpse into the surprisingly brutal world of eleventh-century ecclesiastical politics. But Paul Hayward has dismissed it as 'a complex web of half-truths'.[79] He dates the *Acta Lanfranci* to 1108-14, about twenty years after the events described, and relates them to the 1107-8 dispute between Christ Church and St Augustine's over the blessing of Abbot Hugh de Flori (1108-26).[80] Hayward does not claim that the *Acta*'s version of events is entirely false: 'it seems highly likely that Abbot Guy [*i.e.* Wido] was blessed by Lanfranc in the cathedral and that protests of some kind ensued when he was brought to the abbey.' But he doubts the *Acta*'s account of violent unrest at Canterbury, and in particular of the introduction of twenty-four Christ Church monks into St Augustine's.[81]

It is worth re-examining the grounds for this scepticism. Hayward's arguments are based principally on a lack of corroborating evidence for the *Acta Lanfranci*'s more spectacular assertions.[82] It is true that the Christ Church monk, Eadmer, failed to mention these events in his *Historia novorum*. But, though surprising, this is not inexplicable. The events at St Augustine's took place before the appointment of Eadmer's hero, Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, and were external to his main theme, Anselm's disputes with William II and Henry I. William of Malmesbury's failure to repeat such scandalous gossip in his *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* is harder to explain. But unlike Eadmer, William was not a monk of Canterbury. He may not have heard of the incident.

Hayward also points out that the subprior of Christ Church, Anthony, who was apparently transferred to St Augustine's, is addressed as subprior of Christ

---

[78] The *Acta Lanfranci* can be found in *ASC A*, pp. 84-9. It is cited hereafter as '*Acta Lanfranci*'. The section concerning St Augustine's is on pp. 87-9. 'Deinde diuisi sunt per ecclesias Anglie, et loco illorum .xx.iiii. monachi ecclesie Christi admissi, cum priore nomine Antonio, qui subprioratus officio Cantuarie fungebatur.'

[79] Hayward, '*Acta Lanfranci*', p. 160.

[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 150-4.

[81] *Ibid.*, pp. 159-60.

[82] *Ibid.*, pp. 156-9.

Church in a letter of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury from *c*. 1095, and no later than 1096.[83] But this evidence is similarly inconclusive. When unruly monks were sent to other monasteries for punishment, they were generally allowed to return after a few years. The hagiographers Osbert of Clare and Osbern of Canterbury are two examples of this.[84] By 1096, the dispersed monks of St Augustine's may have been allowed to return; and the twenty-four Christ Church monks, with their subprior Anthony, may have been brought back to the cathedral. This could have happened after Abbot Wido's death in 1093.[85]

So Paul Hayward's hypothesis (that the events narrated in the *Acta Lanfranci*, as far as St Augustine's is concerned, are largely fictional) remains unproved. Moreover, it has its own problems. Hayward suggests two possible motivations for the author of the *Acta Lanfranci*: either he wrote before the judicial hearing concerning the blessing of Abbot Hugh de Flori (in 1108), in order to provide the Christ Church monks with 'ammunition' against the monks of St Augustine's by painting them as 'troublemakers and disturbers of the king's peace'; or he wrote later, in which case 'the author was giving vent to his personal resentment at the abbey's success [in the dispute].'[86] The second of these suggestions cannot be disproved, even if it seems unlikely that the *Acta Lanfranci* was written solely for the vindictive satisfaction of a monk of Christ Church who hated the monks of St Augustine's and enjoyed the idea of their being brutally punished. But the suggestion that the *Acta Lanfranci* represents a legal forgery is more questionable.

Firstly, it should be noted that the *Acta*'s view of church-state relations would have been entirely objectionable to the court of Henry I (where the dispute over Abbot Hugh's blessing was heard). Archbishop Lanfranc was made uniquely responsible for the election of Abbot Wido, and even for the succession of King

---

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 158; *AEp.*, no. 182.

[84] Frank Barlow, 'Clare, Osbert of (d. in or after 1158)', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Goldman (online edn.: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5442, accessed 15 August 2013); Rubinstein, 'Osbern', pp. 28-31.

[85] The paleographic evidence does not suggest a major change of personnel at St Augustine's *c*. 1090: Richard Gameson, 'English Manuscript Art in the Late Eleventh Century: Canterbury and Its Context', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 95-144, pp. 122-3. However, this too can be explained by the dispersed monks' having returned soon afterwards. In any case, the number of monks working as scribes was small, and it is often hard to fix the provenance of manuscripts, reducing the significance of this evidence.

[86] Hayward, '*Acta Lanfranci*', p. 154.

William II.[87] Secondly, the author of the *Acta Lanfranci* failed to provide the precedent which Anselm and the Christ Church monks required. In 1107-8, the dispute turned on the venue of Abbot Hugh's abbatial blessing. Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury demanded that Abbot Hugh receive his blessing in the cathedral at Canterbury; the monks of St Augustine's wanted Hugh to be blessed in his own abbey. It is true that the *Acta Lanfranci*'s author placed Abbot Wido's blessing in the cathedral. But this is one of the few parts of the *Acta Lanfranci*'s treatment that Hayward sees as being corroborated by other sources: Wido probably was actually blessed by Lanfranc in the cathedral.[88] When, however, the author of the *Acta Lanfranci* described the blessing of Wido's predecessor, Scotland, he simply wrote that Scotland was blessed at Canterbury (or just possibly at London), without specifying whether this was in the cathedral or at St Augustine's.[89] It is hard to see why a forger would have neglected to insert the three or four words which would have placed Scotland's blessing in the cathedral at Canterbury and thus have provided his side with the clear and decisive precedent which it needed, while going to the trouble of inventing a bloody quarrel over Abbot Wido, especially since this invention concerned events well within living memory (some 20 years previously), and could have been easily refuted by anyone over the age of 35 living in Canterbury. If the author of the *Acta Lanfranci* was a forger, he was not a particularly competent one (although incompetent forgers did exist).

---

[87] *Acta Lanfranci*, p. 87.

[88] Hayward, '*Acta Lanfranci*', pp. 155-6. He bases this on Goscelin of Saint-Bertin's silence concerning Wido's blessing.

[89] *Acta Lanfranci*, p. 85: 'Post dies paucos [Lanfrancus] in Lundonia Osbernum, Essecistrensi episcopum et Cantuarie Scotlandum, ecclesie Sancti Augustini abbatem, sacrauit.' The exact meaning of this sentence is not clear. It seems most likely that the apparently dative adjective 'Essecistrensi' is actually a mistake for the accusative 'Essecistrensem', and that 'Cantuarie' is in the locative case (a usage found frequently in the *Acta Lanfranci*). This would produce the translation: 'After a few days, Lanfranc blessed Bishop Osbern of Exeter in London, and, in Canterbury, Scotland, abbot of the church of St Augustine's.' However, Paul Hayward and H.E.J. Cowdrey interpret this sentence as meaning that Scotland was blessed at London, along with Bishop Osbern of Exeter: *Lanfranc*, p. 168; '*Acta Lanfranci*', p. 156. Presumably they see 'Cantuarie' as being either genitive (so that Abbot Scotland 'of Canterbury', or 'of the church of St Augustine of Canterbury', was blessed at London), or dative (so that Abbot Scotland of St Augustine's was blessed 'to Canterbury'). But if 'Cantuarie' is in the genitive case, then its position within the sentence is odd; the word-order of the *Acta Lanfranci* is generally fairly straightforward. 'Cantuarie' in the dative would make more sense. 'Essecistrensi' would then mean 'to Exeter', and the sentence could be translated as 'After a few days, Lanfranc blessed, in London, Bishop Osbern to Exeter (or 'to the church of Exeter') and Abbot Scotland of the church

There is no way of proving the *Acta Lanfranci*'s truthfulness. But this source should probably not be dismissed out of hand as a fabrication. Its author may have exaggerated, but there is no reason to deny that the events he described (the rebellion of the monks, then of the townspeople; the public mutilation of the latter, and the dispersal of the former) actually happened.

<center>***</center>

This digression, and the defence of the *Acta Lanfranci*, were necessary for the wider arguments of this chapter. The events of 1087-*c.* 1090, as described in the *Acta Lanfranci,* represent the first public challenge to Christ Church's ecclesiastical authority over St Augustine's. And once again, we see that it was not so much the heads of religious institutions who came into conflict with each other as their subordinates. Abbot Wido himself was happy to be elected by Lanfranc and blessed in the cathedral church. But the monks of St Augustine's rejected him. The violent involvement of the people of Canterbury in the conflict is also noteworthy. As with the controversy over St Mildreth, we see how the laity could become actively involved in ecclesiastical disputes.

It is not clear just what was at stake in 1087.[90] Lanfranc's unilateral election of Wido as abbot must have offended the monks of St Augustine's. But we do not know whether they also objected to Wido's having been blessed in the cathedral church, rather than in the abbey of St Augustine's. In either case, Lanfranc may have been arrogating new rights to himself, rights which his predecessors had not enjoyed. Wido's predecessor Scotland was appointed by William the Conqueror; Lanfranc probably blessed him in St Augustine's abbey and not the cathedral.[91] Earlier procedure is less clear.[92] Æthelsige (1061-

---

of Saint Augustine to Canterbury'. However, the use of the city-related adjective ('Essecistrensis') on its own to mean the city itself, or its church, would be highly unusual.

[90] Knowles, *Monastic Order*, pp. 115-6, saw the conflict as pitting English monks and townspeople against a Norman archbishop and his Norman nominee as abbot. But the monks of St Augustine's do not seem to have objected to their previous abbot, the equally Norman Scotland. *Cf.* Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 169-70.

[91] See above, n. 89.

?1067),[93] the last Anglo-Saxon abbot, may have been a man of Archbishop Stigand of Canterbury, appointed through his influence; but no one was likely to cite Stigand as a precedent.[94]

It is worth noting that, at this point, it would be wrong to speak of the dispute over St Augustine's 'exemption' from the diocesan authority of the archbishops of Canterbury. Lanfranc's heavy handed treatment of St Augustine's went far beyond diocesan jurisdiction. There is no indication in the *Acta Lanfranci* that the monks denied Lanfranc's right to bless their abbot, or even to do so in the cathedral church. There is a slight possibility that St Augustine's was at least partially exempt in the years before the Norman Conquest. Goscelin of Saint-Bertin claimed that Abbot Æthelsige was awarded the right to wear certain of the *episcopalia* by Pope Alexander II (the *episcopalia* were ecclesiastical vestments worn by bishops, and sometimes granted to favoured, often exempt, abbeys).[95] And historians have generally seen a privilege of Pope Agatho to Abbot Hadrian from 679, making the monastery subject only to the apostolic see, as authentic; or at least, as not obviously spurious.[96] But it is impossible to speak with any certainty on this matter. Goscelin may have been lying, and Agatho's privilege, if it actually was genuine, may have been forgotten by 1066.

The dispute over St Augustine's ecclesiastical status was re-opened in the reign of Henry I. As was often the case in such disputes, the trigger was the accession of a new abbot, Hugh de Flori (1108-26). Abbot Wido had died in 1093, and the abbey lay vacant until at least 1105, when Pope Paschal II demanded that Henry I fill the vacancy.[97] When exactly Henry I obeyed and appointed Hugh as

---

[92] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin claimed that Abbot Wulfsige was blessed at St Augustine's, and Abbot Æthelsige 'in palatio regis', but he can hardly be trusted: *Historia translationis*, pp. 432E, 433E; *Translatio Mildrethae*, c. 19, p. 179.

[93] Æthelsige fled from England after the Norman Conquest, but when exactly he did so is not clear; Abbot Scotland replaced him in 1070: *Heads of Religious Houses*, ed. Knowles, Brooke and London, p. 36.

[94] *ASC E*, *s.a.* 1061; Kelly, 'Some Forgeries', p. 365.

[95] Goscelin, *Historia translationis*, p. 433E.

[96] JL 2105a, printed in *Cartularium Saxonicum: A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, ed. Walter de Gray Birch, 3 vols (London, 1885-93), no. 38; Kelly, 'Some Forgeries', p. 348; *Charters of St Augustine's*, p. xv; Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century: The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in the Hilary Term, 1943* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 177-90. Agatho also specified that the monks were to elect their abbots freely from their own number, and that no one was to celebrate mass in the abbey unless invited by the abbot and monks.

[97] *AEp.*, no. 351.

abbot is not clear. In any case, Hugh had to wait for the return of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury from exile in 1106 (and the resolution of the English investiture controversy by the concordat of London in 1107) to be formally blessed as abbot. In 'the fast of the tenth month' (*jejunio decimi mensis*) of 1107, Hugh became a priest, a necessary prerequisite for his abbatial blessing. However, the blessing was further delayed when the monks of St Augustine's affirmed that their abbot should be blessed not in the cathedral at Christ Church but in his own abbey.[98]

The Christ Church monk Eadmer is our only source for these events. According to him, the case was heard at the royal court at the beginning of Lent 1108. The privileges cited as evidence by the monks of St Augustine's were condemned by the king and his nobles as 'nulla vel non rata',[99] probably rightly: the surviving charters of St Augustine's relevant to this matter are almost all manifest forgeries. Nevertheless, Henry I pronounced in St Augustine's favour. He asked Anselm, through intermediaries, to bless Abbot Hugh in his own abbey, 'according to ancient custom'.[100] When Anselm refused to do this, it was agreed that, as a compromise, Anselm should bless Hugh in the bishop of Rochester's chapel at Lambeth, where Anselm was then staying. The blessing went ahead on 27 February 1108.[101]

---

[98] *HN*, pp. 187-8. Paul Hayward ('*Acta Lanfranci*', pp. 153-4) thinks that Eadmer's chronology is compressed and incorrect, and that the dispute over Abbot Hugh's blessing was actually concurrent with (and related to) Archbishop Anselm's dispute with Henry I over lay investiture. Pope Paschal II apparently took Anselm's side, and Henry I 'used a show of support for the monks of St Augustine's as a way of increasing the pressure on Anselm to make concessions on the pivotal issue of investiture'. But it is hard to see how the issue of Hugh's blessing could have been raised until the question of lay investiture was settled. Before that, Anselm would have refused to bless Hugh under any circumstances. Anselm's absence from England was another obstacle. Hayward's one piece of evidence is Pope Paschal II's letter ordering Henry I to end the vacancy at St Augustine's (*AEp.*, no. 351). This apparently represented a papal intervention in Anselm's favour. However, contrary to Hayward's clear statement, Paschal's letter does not actually mention Abbot Hugh. Nor does it say anything about the venue of the blessing of a new abbot. It simply deplores the fact that for many years the abbey of St Augustine's has been 'sine rectoris solatio'. This probably means that no abbot whatsoever had been appointed when the letter was written (1105, according to Walter Fröhlich in his translation of Anselm's correspondence). It is, however, possible that – as Hayward suggests – Hugh was appointed as abbot in 1100 or 1101, when Henry I filled the other eleven bishoprics and abbacies which were vacant at the death of William II.

[99] 'none or not approved'

[100] 'ex antiqua consuetudine'

[101] *HN*, pp. 188-91; *Regesta*, vol. 2, no. 871.

Three points. Firstly, the monks of St Augustine's wanted surprisingly little. Other monasteries demanded not only that their abbot be blessed in his own abbey, but that he be blessed by whichever bishop they chose (*i.e.* not the diocesan).[102] Nor did the St Augustine's monks – at least according to Eadmer – object to the profession of obedience made by Hugh to Anselm. Nor is there any evidence that the monks of St Augustine's were openly challenging any of Canterbury's other diocesan rights over them at this point (such as chrism payments, or the attendance of their priests at archiepiscopal synods). And there is still no mention of exemption in the strict sense (the removal of St Augustine's from the diocesan jurisdiction of the archbishops of Canterbury).

Secondly, it was the monks, and not Abbot Hugh himself, who contested the venue of the abbatial blessing. Hugh appears in Eadmer's account only at the beginning, when he is elected, and at the end when, the conflict having been resolved, he is blessed as abbot. All the protests came from the monks; and it was a deputation of those monks who went to London clutching their privileges to fight the case before the king. Once again, we see ecclesiastical underlings dragging their superiors into dispute.

Thirdly, it is significant that Henry I seems initially to have pronounced in favour of St Augustine's (or to have taken the monks' side), even though the abbey's documentary evidence had been dismissed. As was argued earlier in this chapter, it is possible to overestimate the importance of written evidence, and the manufacture of such evidence, in medieval disputes. That Henry I favoured St Augustine's in 1108 could be because he disliked Archbishop Anselm, who had caused him a serious amount of trouble over lay investiture.[103] Whether either side had written evidence, even whether either side was in the right, may have been a secondary consideration.

The next development in the St Augustine's dispute came later on in the reign of Henry I, and during the abbacy of Hugh de Flori. On 3 March 1120, Pope Calixtus II issued a bull in favour of St Augustine's, declaring the abbey free from all service, 'secular obedience' and 'canonical [*i.e.* ecclesiastical] laws'.

---

[102] *E.g. Liber Eliensis*, c. 118, p. 201.

[103] Another possible sign of Henry I's disfavour for Anselm is that, even after 1106, Anselm's familiars rarely found advancement in England, unlike those of other archbishops: *EEA 28: Canterbury*, p. xxxix.

Specifically, no one was to celebrate mass in the abbey unless invited by the abbot or monks; the abbey was to be allowed to ring its bells when it wanted (rather than after the cathedral) on the feast days of the saints whose relics it had; and it was freed from that extortion of 'rams, bread and drink' (the customary payment traditionally made to Christ Church in exchange for chrism). The monks of St Augustine's were also to have the right of freely electing their abbots; and their abbots were to be blessed in the abbey and nowhere else. A mandate to Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury repeated the provisions about bell-ringing and customary renders.[104]

When the ringing of St Augustine's bells and the chrism renders first became contentious is unknown.[105] In any case, this was a major coup for St Augustine's. We have virtually no information as to how this privilege was obtained. But the series of forgeries produced by St Augustine's in the Anglo-Norman period appears to have been important. Calixtus II claimed to be confirming privileges granted by Popes Boniface, Adeodatus, Agatho and John. Copies of forged privileges by all of these popes appear in the St Augustine's manuscript BL, Cotton Vespasian B. xx, probably compiled in the first quarter of the twelfth century.[106] Although these privileges were not good enough for the

---

[104] *Papsturkunden in England*, ed. Walther Holtzmann, 3 vols (Berlin, 1935-52), vol. 1, nos 10-1, pp. 231-4 (J-L 6878-9). The freedom of St Augustine's from chrism payments did not necessarily represent a special privilege for the abbey. Such payments had been papally prohibited for some time: *Epistolae pontificum Romanorum ineditae*, ed. Samuel Loewenfeld (Leipzig, 1885), no. 94, p. 47 (J-L 4558); *Alexandri II epistolae*, no. 63, cols 1347D-1349B (J-L 4657). It is perhaps significant that when Archbishop Thurstan of York returned to England in 1121, having been in exile at Pope Calixtus II's court, he abolished the customary payments for chrism in his diocese: Hugh the Chanter, *History*, p. 166 n. 5.

[105] Ecclesiastical renders owed by St Augustine's to Christ Church – in money and in kind - are mentioned in *Domesday monachorum*, p. 78. Later (almost certainly false) St Augustine's tradition accuses Abbot Scotland of giving up many of his church's privileges which had been enjoyed by his Anglo-Saxon predecessors at Lanfranc's request, including the monks' right to ring the abbey's bells when they wanted: Thorne, *Cronica*, cols 1790-2; Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, p. 344. The story (that Scotland gave up St Augustine's privileges) may already have been current in the twelfth century. It appears in an unpublished tract (*Breuis annotatio iniuriarum monasterio beati Augustini illatarum de archiepiscopis et de presbiteris et parochianis eorum*) found in the fourteenth-century *White Book of St Augustine's*: London, The National Archives, MS E 164/27, fos 30r-35r (using the medieval foliation on the top right of each leaf; this is the foliation used by Adolphus Ballard in *An Eleventh-Century Inquisition of St Augustine's*). The dating of the tract is not clear; but its list of popes who gave privileges to St Augustine's stops at Eugenius III, who died in 1153: fo. 33r.

[106] For discussion of the St Augustine's forgeries, see Kelly, 'Some Forgeries'; Levison, *England and the Continent,* pp. 174-233. See also the extensive literature on the contemporary series of forgeries from Christ Church, most recently contributed to by Robert Berkhofer, 'The Canterbury

royal court in 1108, they appear to have fooled the (theoretically) much more experienced eyes of the papal curia in 1120.

However, it is worth looking at the wider context of Calixtus' bull. In 1120, Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury was very much *persona non grata* in papal circles. He had refused to consecrate the papal favourite, Thurstan, archbishop-elect of York, without a profession of obedience, even when ordered by papal mandate to do so. On 20 March 1120, soon after the bull in favour of St Augustine's was issued, Calixtus issued an important bull (*Caritatis bonum*) in favour of Thurstan and the church of York, and against Archbishop Ralph.[107] Abbot Hugh of St Augustine's or his representatives must have been fighting their case at the same time as, and possibly together with, Thurstan (although neither of the two sources for the Canterbury-York dispute at this time, Eadmer's *Historia novorum* and Hugh the Chanter's *History of the Church of York*, mention St Augustine's in connection with it).

As in 1108, it seems that the monks of St Augustine's faced a favourable court in 1120, a court which would probably have been willing to ratify any document, however dubious, in order to spite the archbishop of Canterbury. All this ties in to what we have already seen in the dispute over Sandwich. In ambiguous cases, the success or failure of an ecclesiastical institution's claims at the royal or papal court may have had less to do with right, evidence or testimony than with the judge's disposition towards the plaintiffs.

The judgement of Calixtus II, however it was obtained, is as far as it is worth tracing the St Augustine's exemption dispute. This is not because the judgement marked the final victory of St Augustine's. On the contrary, just five years later the blessing of Abbot Hugh II (1126-51) was delayed when Archbishop William of Canterbury (1123-36) claimed that this should be done in Christ Church;[108] and under Archbishop Theobald (1139-61) the customary renders for chrism became an issue once again.[109] It is possible that the privilege

---

Forgeries Revisited', in *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007), 36-50; *idem*, 'Confessions of an Anglo-Norman Forger', in *ANS* 36 (2014), forthcoming.

[107] This privilege is discussed by Cheney, 'Some Observations'.

[108] Thorne, *Cronica*, cols 1798-9.

[109] Avrom Saltman, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1956), pp. 66-8.

of Calixtus was never really observed.[110] But it would take us far beyond the scope of this thesis to examine the full development of this dispute. What we have already seen is enough to support this chapter's key points about episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England.

***

This chapter has not examined every aspect of the dispute between Christ Church and St Augustine's in the Anglo-Norman period. Several historians have suspected that there was a certain amount of liturgical rivalry between the abbey and the cathedral. Early in the eleventh century, the monks of Christ Church may have stopped commemorating various saints associated with St Augustine's in favour of their own Dunstan and Elphege.[111] And the day chosen by Abbot Ælfstan of St Augustine's to translate St Mildreth to his abbey in 1030, 18 May, has been seen as a deliberate provocation of the cathedral: this was the day before the feast of Christ Church's St Dunstan.[112] Then the abbey of St Augustine's may have attempted to promote its saint, Augustine, as the 'apostle of the English', an epithet which had generally been reserved for St Gregory.[113] Archbishop Lanfranc's rededication of his cathedral to the Holy Trinity has been seen in turn as an attempt to outdo St Augustine's in prestige;[114] while the promotion of the cult of St Gregory by Lanfranc's successor Anselm was apparently intended to counter the St Augustine's monks' arrogation of apostolic status to their patron.[115] And the Christ Church hagiographer Eadmer's *Life* of Peter, the first abbot of St

---

[110] For the subsequent course of the St Augustine's exemption dispute, see T.C.R. Crafter, 'Henry II, the St Augustine's Dispute and the Loss of the Abbey's Mint Franchise', in *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500-1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, ed. Barrie Cook and Gareth Williams (Leiden, 2006), 601-16; Eric John, 'The Litigation of an Exempt House: St Augustine's, Canterbury, 1182-1237', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 39 (1956-7), 390-415; David Knowles, 'The Growth of Exemption', in *Downside Review* 50 (1932), 201-31, 396-436, pp. 401-15.

[111] Brooks, *Early History*, p. 265; Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', p. 30.

[112] Sharpe, 'Goscelin's St Augustine and St Mildreth', p. 503.

[113] Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', pp. 26-32; Shannon Ambrose, 'The Social Context and Political Complexities of Goscelin's Sermon for the Feast of St Augustine of Canterbury, the "Apostle of the English"', in *Studies in Philology* 109 (2012), 364-80.

[114] Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 107, 182.

[115] Hayward, 'Gregory the Great', pp. 40-55.

Augustine's, might have been meant as a satirical attack upon this saint.[116] It is also possible that the new abbey at St Augustine's begun by Abbot Scotland was intended to eclipse Archbishop Lanfranc's smaller cathedral church, and that Abbot Wido's grand translation of his abbey's saints in 1091 (a consequence of this building work) was staged as a public demonstration of the abbey's historical greatness in comparison with the cathedral and her less ancient, less numerous and less prestigious saints.[117]

But it is hard to prove that any of these moves were consciously hostile. The theory of liturgical rivalry raises a number of questions. If, for example, the attribution of apostolic status to St Augustine reflected a bid for liturgical dominance by the abbey, then it is strange that St Augustine first appears with this title in a Christ Church pontifical of the late tenth century.[118] It has seemed better to stick to clear instances of explicit conflict. Some other possible aspects of the dispute between Christ Church and St Augustine's have been overlooked for this reason, such as the possible dispute over the customs owed to St Augustine's from its priests (presumably from the churches owned by the monastery),[119] and the question of lingering resentment over Archbishop Cuthbert's (740-60) usurpation of the right of the abbey of St Augustine's to be the resting place of the archbishops of Canterbury.[120]

---

[116] Hayward, 'An Absent Father'.

[117] Richard Sharpe, 'The Setting of St Augustine's Translation, 1091', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 1-14, pp. 4-6.

[118] Alan Thacker, 'In Gregory's Shadow? The Pre-Conquest Cult of St Augustine', in *St Augustine and the Conversion*, ed. Gameson, 374-90, p. 385.

[119] See, for example, *Regesta,* vol. 2, no. 1078, printed in Thomas of Elmham, *Historia*, p. 361, from Henry I to Bishop Ralph of Rochester: 'Tene plene rectum inter abbatem de sancto Augustino et inter archidiaconum de Cantuaria, de sacerdotibus abbatiae sancti Augustini; ut abbas ita juste habeat consuetudines suas de presbyteris suis, sicut Scollandus abbas melius habuit.' The compiler of a list of churches in the fourteenth-century *White Book of St Augustine's* complained that the churches of Newington, Lenham, Fordwich and Faversham were paying chrism pence to Christ Church, even though they should have been subordinate to the abbey of St Augustine's. This list may be, partially, of eleventh-century origin. It is translated by Tim Tatton-Brown, 'The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the Eleventh Century', in *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition, 950-1200*, ed. John Blair (Oxford, 1988), 105-18, pp. 116-7. Abbot Scotland had proven his claim to (*diraciocinavit*) one of these contentious churches (Newington) in the reign of William the Conqueror: *An Eleventh-Century Inquisition of St Augustine's*, p. 4. See also Bates, *Regesta*, nos 69 (Version 1a), 73, 81, 88; *Regesta*, vol. 2, nos 1140-2, 1157, 1192-3, 1643, 1779.

[120] Brooks, *Early History*, p. 81.

Furthermore, no attempt has been made to trace the ultimate cause of the tensions between St Augustine's and Canterbury. The real reasons for the emergence of the dispute over St Augustine's ecclesiastical relationship to Christ Church should probably not be sought in Anglo-Saxon Canterbury, but in Anglo-Norman England. It is well known that English monasteries first started claiming exemption, or rights associated with exemption, from their diocesan bishops in the period immediately after the Norman Conquest (or these rights only began to be contested by bishops after the Conquest).[121] The monks of St Augustine's were by no means precocious in this. The exemption claims of Bury,[122] Ely,[123] and possibly Glastonbury,[124] were all publicly aired before 1100. The monks of Evesham were at least considering such claims by this point.[125]

This type of dispute over ecclesiastical status was almost unknown in Anglo-Saxon England. Nor were such disputes only between abbeys and their diocesan bishops. The strife between Canterbury and York over Canterbury's primatial status, the dispute between Canterbury and the bishops of London and Chichester over the status of the archbishopric of Canterbury's churches in those dioceses,[126] and the poorly documented attempts of the bishops of Durham and Lincoln to free themselves from the profession of obedience owed to the archbishops of York and Canterbury respectively[127] – all this, together with the quarrels over exemption, constituted a single phenomenon, a phenomenon which can be linked to a greater desire for legal definition in the Anglo-Norman as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon church. It is not clear whether this was the result purely of the Norman Conquest, or whether the English church would eventually have moved in this direction anyway.

---

[121] On such exemption disputes in England, Knowles, 'Growth of Exemption' remains vital. For the wider context, see Ludwig Falkenstein, *La papauté et les abbayes françaises aux XIe et XIIe siècles. Exemption et protection apostolique* (Paris, 1997).

[122] *HN*, pp. 132-3; Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 27.

[123] *Liber Eliensis*, c. 118, p. 201.

[124] William of Malmesbury, *An Early History of Glastonbury*: *An Edition, Translation and Study of William of Malmesbury's 'De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie'*, ed. and trans. John Scott (Woodbridge, 2009), c. 76. This is hardly a reliable source. But Cowdrey, *Lanfranc*, pp. 125-6, accepts the story as substantially authentic.

[125] O'Rourke, 'Hagiography and Exemption'. Worcester's diocesan rights over Evesham were first openly contested (that we know of) in 1130: Ivor Atkins, 'The Church of Worcester from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century. Part 2: The *familia* from the Middle of the Tenth to the Beginning of the Twelfth Century', in *Antiquaries Journal* 20 (1940), 1-38, 203-29, pp. 226-9.

[126] *AEp.*, nos 170-1, 200; *HN*, pp. 21, 45-7; Lanfranc, *Letters*, no. 30.

[127] Symeon, *Libellus de exordio*, Continuation, p. 272; *HN*, p. 47.

In the case of bishops and abbots, the drive after the Norman Conquest (including, but not ending with, Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury's programme of ecclesiastical reform for England) to clarify and regularise the position of bishops within their dioceses, with the accompanying extension of diocesan authority and the tools of diocesan government (archdeacons, rural deans, regular synods), must have caused problems as bishops ran into the ancient and poorly defined privileges enjoyed by certain abbeys, and sought to suppress them as irregularities, and as the abbeys responded by seeking formal recognition of their status. It is also possible that English monks took advantage of the ignorance of many Normans to claim more for themselves than was their due; and that ideas of monastic exemption imported from the continent (which may not have been widespread in Anglo-Saxon England) gave them the means of doing this.[128]

However, as we have seen, the Anglo-Saxon abbots of St Augustine's and archbishops of Canterbury also found themselves in conflict, not over issues of ecclesiastical status, but over secular matters: land and revenues. In our period, the ecclesiastical issues became more prominent, but the secular disputes were not forgotten. As has been mentioned, the port of Sandwich was still contentious in the thirteenth century. In these concurrent secular and ecclesiastical disputes, and in this broad shift from secular to ecclesiastical issues, Christ Church and St Augustine's were typical. In the late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman periods, the abbots of Evesham and the bishops of Worcester were frequently at loggerheads over land and jurisdiction over land.[129] These disputes continued into the thirteenth century, but increasingly the abbey's attempts to prove itself exempt from Worcester's diocesan jurisdiction came to determine relations between the abbey and the bishopric.[130] Similarly, the abbey of Ely seems to have disputed land with Bishop Remigius of Lincoln before the question of the abbot's benediction became contentious.[131] And *Domesday Book* shows how Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds competed for power and influence with Bishop

---

[128] Patrick Wormald suggested something similar with regard to judicial liberties: 'Lordship and Justice', pp. 133-4.

[129] *HC*, pp. 270-3; Darlington, 'Æthelwig', pp. 6-10; Mason, *Wulfstan*, pp. 126-7, 135-9; Williams, 'Cunning of the Dove', pp. 33-7; *eadem*, 'Spoliation', pp. 393-4; Wormald, 'Lordship and Justice'.

[130] The main source is *HAE*. See also David Cox, 'St Oswald of Worcester at Evesham Abbey: Cult and Concealment', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002), 269-85; Jane Sayers, '"Original", Cartulary and Chronicle: The Case of the Abbey of Evesham', in *Fälschungen*, ed. Fuhrmann *et al.*, vol. 4, 371-95.

[131] See Chapter 4.

Herfast in East Anglia at the same time as fighting off Herfast's claims to ecclesiastical lordship over the abbey. [132] The efforts of Herfast's successor, Herbert Losinga, to promote his manor of Hoxne as the site of the martyrdom of King Edmund (Bury's patron saint), and concurrently as a commercial centre, seem to represent a dual temporal and spiritual attack on the prestige of the abbey. [133] A Norman parallel is provided by the rivalry in our period at Rouen between the cathedral church and the abbey of St Ouen over diverse matters: land, relics, ecclesiastical status and even architecture. [134]

In his study of the growth of monastic exemption in England, David Knowles showed that exemption disputes often started with the attempts of a bishop simply to take control of an abbey (that is to claim concrete possession of it), or with the attempts of the monastery to avoid the material inconveniences caused by the bishop's interference in its affairs, before moving onto the finer point of the abbey's status in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. [135] That so many of these exemption disputes were also accompanied (mainly in their opening phases) by land disputes adds a further nuance to Knowles' argument, with its broad movement from temporal to more purely ecclesiastical concerns. All this may reflect changing conceptions of ecclesiastical office in the eleventh and twelfth centuries following the efforts of the eleventh-century reform movement to separate ecclesiastical and temporal matters. Alternatively, it can be explained in purely English terms. As mentioned in Chapter 4, ecclesiastical landholding became less volatile after our period. Property changed hands less frequently than before, and in smaller quantities. Under these conditions, there was less scope for bishops and abbots to squabble over their possessions – and so they jockeyed for position in the domain where this was still possible, that of ecclesiastical status.

[132] Vanessa King, 'Share and Share Alike? Bishops and Their Cathedral Chapters: The Domesday Evidence', in *ANS* 18 (1996), 138-52, at p. 146. See also Christine Senecal, 'Bishops as Contenders for Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Bishopric of East Anglia and the Regional Aristocracy', in *Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power: Western Europe in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, Henk Teunis and Andrew Wareham (Turnhout, 1999), 89-106.

[133] Susan Edgington, 'The Entrepreneurial Activities of Herbert Losinga, Abbot of Ramsey (1087-91) and First Bishop of Norwich', in *Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 266-74, pp. 272-4.

[134] Richard Allen, 'The *Acta archiepiscoporum Rotomagensium* and Urban Ecclesiastical Rivalry in Eleventh-Century Rouen', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict*, ed. Dalton, Insley and Wilkinson, 77-97, pp. 77-8. A parallel to the violent events described in the *Acta Lanfranci* comes in the form of a riot at the abbey on the feast day of St Ouen in 1073, in the course of which the townspeople took up arms and attacked the archbishop.

It is hard to determine whether there were any direct links between the secular disputes between bishoprics and monasteries and the ecclesiastical disputes over exemption. Did the former ever give rise to the latter, or were they unrelated phenomena with separate causes? There is little evidence for any links at Canterbury; but elsewhere there are a few tantalising scraps. The lengthy dispute between Worcester and Evesham over land entailed a dispute over hundredal jurisdiction: the monks and abbots of Evesham appear to have annexed the contested manor, Bengeworth, to their private hundred of Fishborough (later Blackenhurst) as a prelude to claiming it as their exclusive possession.[136] Evesham's control of the hundred of Fishborough / Blackenhurst may have been linked to Evesham's claim to exemption: the monks later claimed to have special rights over the churches in an area corresponding more or less to the private hundred.[137] It seems that the monks wanted an area of total secular and ecclesiastical control. The abbey of Ely is another example. William the Conqueror's series of writs for Abbot Symeon of Ely (1082-93) appears to lump the issue of Symeon's abbatial blessing (which he was unwilling to receive from the diocesan, Bishop Remigius of Lincoln) together with the secular concerns of the abbey.[138] A forged charter of Edward the Confessor in favour of the same abbey seems to link the abbot of Ely's right to be blessed by a bishop of his choice to the abbey's secular liberty (that is, its area of private jurisdiction).[139] Barbara Rosenwein has drawn attention to the significance of the links between

---

[135] Knowles, 'Growth of Exemption', pp. 424-5.

[136] In 1086, Bengeworth was still part of Worcester's private hundred of Oswaldslow and a possession of the church of Worcester. Half of the village was held by Urse d'Abitot, the other half by the Abbot of Evesham. At some point, perhaps before 1107, Evesham's private hundred of Fishborough was expanded to include Bengeworth (and a number of other manors), and its name changed to Blackenhurst (on this, see H.B. Clarke, 'Evesham J and Evesham L: Two Early Twelfth-Century Manorial Surveys', in *ANS* 30 (2008), 62-84, at pp. 67-8). At some point before 1166, the abbey of Evesham seems to have stopped doing service to Worcester for Bengeworth. Evesham did not owe any knight service to the bishop of Worcester in the *Cartae baronum*: *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall, 3 vols (London, 1896), vol. 1, pp. 300-1. It is likely that the two processes were linked: the rationale of private hundreds like Worcester's hundred of Oswaldslow or Evesham's hundred of Fishborough / Blackenhurst was that all of the land within them belonged to a single holder.

[137] David Cox, 'The Vale Estates of the Church of Evesham, *c*. 700-1086', in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 5 (1975), 25-50, p. 34.

[138] Bates, *Regesta*, nos 123, 125-7.

[139] S1051, printed in *Liber Eliensis,* pp. 161-3.

monastic exemption and jurisdictional immunities.[140] The important but obscure nature of these links in an English context is a question for further research.

<center>***</center>

Finally, it is necessary to return to this chapter's arguments about the nature of episcopal power. Like Chapter 4, this chapter showed the importance of royal favour in the local politics of Anglo-Norman England. In the dispute over Sandwich, the monks of St Augustine's and Christ Church frequently sought the English king's writ and judgement. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that favourable verdicts generally went to whichever side the king was more favourably disposed to at the time, even when these verdicts contradicted earlier judgements. Royal favour (or rather, royal disfavour for Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury) may also have secured the judgement in St Augustine's favour in the matter of Hugh de Flori's blessing in 1108. Similarly, Calixtus II's 1120 privilege for St Augustine's was probably granted not because of the justice of St Augustine's case, but in order to spite Archbishop Ralph of Canterbury.

This chapter has also suggested that written evidence and forgeries may have been relatively unimportant in deciding disputes in Anglo-Norman England. Here the negative evidence from Canterbury is paralleled elsewhere. As Chapter 4 mentioned, none of the accounts of Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester's legal activity mention his use of charters, even though his church was well provided with both forgeries and genuine documents. Other accounts of legal inquiries say nothing about written evidence.[141] Sometimes charters, even forgeries, are mentioned in plea records.[142] But it is not always clear that such documents were decisive in settling disputes. In 1081, for example, Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds apparently defended his abbey from Bishop Herfast of Thetford's attempts to take control of it by presenting a royal court with (probably fake) documents of King

---

[140] Barbara Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 11-2, 213-4.
[141] *E.g.* Bates, *Regesta*, nos 69, 225.
[142] *E.g. English Lawsuits*, nos 4, 18, 43, 89, 130, 246, 257.

Cnut and Edward the Confessor. [143] But Herfast's claims over Bury were manifestly unjust; furthermore, Baldwin was the king's doctor and a royal favourite. Baldwin would probably have won the case anyway. The forgeries may simply have given the king's court an excuse to pronounce judgement in his favour. In light of all this, it would be dangerous to assume, as some historians have done, that documentary proof was vitally important in protecting the lands and privileges of religious insitutions. [144]

But the main point of this chapter has been to demonstrate that the eleventh- and twelfth-century dispute (rather, disputes) between Christ Church and St Augustine's should be understood as a conflict not between ecclesiastical potentates, but between the personnel comprising the institutions headed by them; and that the archbishops of Canterbury and the abbots of St Augustine's were often unable to stop their subordinates, both lay and ecclesiastical, from fomenting hostility between the cathedral and the abbey. It seems unlikely that Canterbury was unusual in this respect. But our sources are less rich elsewhere, and normally we can only speculate at the involvement of knights, lay servants and the general public in other ecclesiastical disputes.

It is, however, worth noting that Eadmer of Canterbury blamed the eleventh- and twelfth-century primacy dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York on the pushy canons of York who filled their archbishops' ignorant heads with lies about York's status. [145] The York author Hugh the Chanter, by contrast, blamed the monks of Canterbury. [146] Possibly Hugh and Eadmer were simply reluctant to criticise the archbishops themselves and so criticised their advisors. But it is possible that cathedral chapters really did have a significant part to play in dictating episcopal and archiepiscopal conduct. [147]

---

[143] Bates, *Regesta*, no. 39 (a probably spurious account of the plea); Hermann, *De miraculis*, c. 27.
[144] *E.g.* Sarah Foot, 'Bury's Armoury of Charters', in *Bury St Edmunds and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Tom Licence (Woodbridge, 2014), forthcoming; David Roffe, 'The *Historia Croylandensis*: A Plea for Reassessment', in *EHR* 110 (1995), 93-108, pp. 107-8: 'Comprehensive charters were vital, and the monks used all material available to produce them.' But *cf.* Fleming, 'Christ Church's Cartulary', pp. 85, 103-6; Kelly, 'Some Forgeries', p. 368; *Black Book of St Augustine*, vol. 1, pp. xvii-xix.
[145] *HN*, pp. 203, 209-10, 238.
[146] Hugh the Chanter, *History*, pp. 20-2, 26.
[147] But Eadmer, *Vita Bregowini*, c. 14, pp. 146-7, suggests that sometimes the monks of Christ Church flattered the will of their archbishop.

Certainly, a hostile chapter could make life difficult for a prelate. According to the *Liber Eliensis*, when Abbot Symeon of Ely accepted consecration at the hands of Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, against the abbey's ancient privileges, his monks ostracised him: 'portas ei offirmant, ostia claudunt, non ut patrem, non ut fratrem, non salutem ut hospitem suscipiunt, sed ut hostem repellunt.'[148] It appears that Symeon was effectively unable to run his monastery. He eventually had to bring in monks from Winchester to help him in its administration.[149] As an abbot Symeon had to live in closer proximity to his monks than did bishops to their monks or canons.[150] But the case of Archbishop Gerard of York shows that even archbishops could suffer at the hands of their chapters. In a letter to Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, Gerard complained about his canons, who opposed his efforts to enforce clerical celibacy in his diocese. Their opposition is unsurprising, since it was the licentiousness of the canons themselves that Gerard was most concerned about.[151] Gerard's unpopular policy may have made him the victim of slanderous and scurrilous gossip at York, principally, that he practised the black arts and died in mysterious circumstances. According to William of Malmesbury, the canons initially refused to bury Gerard in their cathedral.[152] Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury may himself have had difficulty with his chapter. During his unpopular exile in the reign of Henry I, Anselm would not allow the monk Farman to transfer from Christ Church to another church; Anselm feared that other members of his cathedral chapter would abandon him if he provided such a precedent, and this could not occur without great scandal and dissolution.[153]

To a certain extent, episcopal power was constituted by a bishop's network of tenants, dependants and followers. Cathedral chapters, at least secular chapters,

---

[148] *Liber Eliensis*, c. 118, p. 202. 'They blocked up the doors to him, and closed the portals; they received him not as a father or a brother, not as their salvation and a guest, but they repelled him as an enemy.'
[149] *Liber Eliensis*, c. 133, p. 213.
[150] Other abbots had problems with their monks. Thurstan of Glastonbury is the most famous example: David Hiley, 'Thurstan of Caen and Plainchant at Glastonbury: Musicological Reflections on the Norman Conquest', in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 72 (1986), 57-90, pp. 57-8, 82-4, 89. See also *GP*, v.271.9, on the scurrilous and malicious verses a certain monk of Malmesbury composed concerning his deceased abbot, Godfrey. Another abbot of Malmesbury, Brihtwold, who had alienated the church's possessions, was counted as a revenant after his death; his body was exhumed and thrown into a marsh: *GP*, v.258.1-4.
[151] *AEp.*, no. 255.
[152] *GP*, iii.118*.2-3.

performed essential administrative functions; a bishop's paid servants enacted his will in various matters; and the men who held land from a bishop were obliged to perform service for him in return. This service could be military, allowing the bishop to supply his quota of knights (or scutage) for the king's feudal host. But it could also take the form of rent, adding to the bishop's financial resources.[154] More importantly, the tenants of bishops and abbots often appear to have been obliged to accompany their master 'to his pleas', and to defend his interests in shire and other courts.[155] As Chapter 4 suggested, a key part of a bishop's power at a local level may have been his ability to sway the opinion of legal assemblies. A bishop's tenants, bound to support him in such matters, would help him to acquire such influence.

The links between prelates and their men may sometimes have been deeply felt. Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester regularly dined with his knights.[156] Symeon of Durham told the story of a vision seen by the knight Boso, from which it is apparent that Boso was personally acquainted with a number of Durham's cathedral monks. And when Boso reported the vision to the cathedral prior and then to Bishop William, the prior took his story seriously enough to investigate the facts revealed to Boso.[157] Goscelin of Saint-Bertin described a miracle involving a knight who had been brought up 'in curia sancti Augustini' – presumably in the monastery of St Augustine's.[158] Abbot Reginald of Abingdon

---

[153] *AEp.*, no. 355.

[154] Service could also include various errands: Blair, 'Estate Memoranda', pp. 119-20; *Chronicon abbatiae Rameseiensis*, ed. W. Dunn Macray (London, 1886), pp. 250-1; *EEA 8: Winchester*, no. 37; Frank Stenton, *The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066-1166* (2nd edn.: Oxford, 1961), pp. 176-7.

[155] London, BL, Harley MS 3763, fos 88v, 93v (thirteenth-century cartulary of the abbey of Evesham); *Black Book of St Augustine*, vol. 2, pp. 462-3; *Chronicon abbatiae Rameseiensis*, pp. 260-1; *EEA 28: Canterbury*, no. 36; *Feudal Documents from Bury St Edmunds*, no. 132. It may or may not be significant that most examples of this are of abbatial, rather than episcopal tenants. Some tenants may have been legal specialists. When, for example, William II sold the church of Sutton to the abbey of Abingdon, he asked Abbot Reginald to retain its holder, the cleric Ælfwig. Reginald was happy to do this: 'Erat enim legibus patrie optime institutus': *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 2, p. 36.

[156] *VW*, iii.2.1-3; iii.16.1.

[157] Symeon, *Libellus de exordio*, iv.9.

[158] Goscelin, *Translatio Adriani*, fos 246v-247r. See also Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia maior de miraculis sancti Augustini* (*BHL*, 779), in *AS*, May, vol. 6, 397-411, c. 7, p. 401B-D: 'Erat vir in curia Sancti Augustini a pueritia enutritus, studio Augustiniensis Abbatis Wlfrici inter praecipuos Londoniae sublimatus, nomine Elfnothus.' This Ælfnoth was important enough for William the Conqueror to take with him to Normandy (probably in 1067). Ælfnoth was shipwrecked while returning, and saved by St Augustine.

was apparently ready to put up £500 as a surety to save his knight and son-in-law, Rainbald, from imprisonment at the hands of William II.[159]

However, these links, and these networks of followers, also constrained bishops. Episcopal dependants often demanded that bishops deploy their wealth and landed resources in certain ways. According to Eadmer, after Anselm became archbishop of Canterbury, those who had loved him previously now began to demand lands, horses and money from him. When they did not get what they wanted, they assaulted Anselm's men, abused Anselm and made extravagant threats against him.[160] The hordes of relatives who appear to have followed new bishops, hoping for advancement, also represented a possibly unwelcome, but hard to deny, claim on a bishop's resources.[161] And as this chapter has shown, ecclesiastical tenants and servants acting on their own behalf often involved their superiors in conflicts in which they themselves had very little interest.

Essentially, archiepiscopal, episcopal and abbatial power was limited. Chapter 3 showed that, to a certain extent, bishops had power only to act within certain normative restraints; they lost authority when they broke certain rules of episcopal conduct. This chapter has argued that in some cases prelates were forced, or at least encouraged, to act in accordance with the will of those who were nominally subject to them. Most historical literature treats bishops and noblemen in Anglo-Norman England as essentially free agents, but this may not have been the case, or, at least, only to a certain extent, or only when they wanted to act in a certain way.

---

[159] *Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis*, vol. 2, p. 54.

[160] *VA*, pp. 81-2.

[161] Pope Alexander III apparently said that 'filios episcopis Dominus abstulit, nepotes vero diabolus dedit': Gerald of Wales, *Vita Remigii*, p. 66. Not that episcopal sons were much rarer than episcopal nephews in Anglo-Norman England. *Durham Episcopal Charters*, no. 23, is a particularly good example of the kind of influence a bishop's relatives could exert on him.

Conclusion

The first chapter of this thesis compared episcopal hagiography from Anglo-Norman England with episcopal hagiography from Anglo-Saxon England. It showed that hagiographical ideals of episcopal conduct and episcopal power changed in England at some point in the eleventh century. Hagiographers now gave more control over events, as well as a more public role, to saintly bishops. They were also more concerned to show their subjects acting in accordance with ecclesiastical law. The exact reasons behind these changes are not clear: the Norman Conquest and the eleventh-century reform of the European church are two possible explanations, but other factors may also have been at work. The rest of the thesis can be understood as an attempt to determine how exactly the reality of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England reflected these hagiographical developments.

Chapter 2 dismissed any notion of a simple link between hagiographical ideal and historical reality. The Anglo-Norman hagiography examined in Chapter 1 often portrayed saintly bishops as politically central figures with a special moral influence which made them inordinately powerful – sometimes more powerful than the kings of England. Chapter 2 showed that the narrative sources describing the deeds of bishops in Anglo-Norman England show saintly bishops (and other prelates) acting in the same way as the hagiographical saints from Chapter 1, using their saintliness as a kind of political tool. But where these sources can be checked, almost all of their stories involving bishops can be shown to be fictitious or exaggerated. It is unlikely that bishops in Anglo-Norman England actually exercised a charismatic saintly power. The new ideal of the politically dominant holy man did not correspond to the real emergence of such figures. The monastic authors of the *Vitae* and chronicles discussed in Chapter 2 and the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1 did not reflect the reality of Anglo-Norman England in their works. They may even have been protesting against that reality. The ideal of the politically dominant holy man may have appealed to them precisely because pious bishops in Anglo-Norman England were not – in their opinion – accorded sufficient respect.

But Chapter 3 complicated our view of ideal and reality in Anglo-Norman England. While Chapter 2 showed how hagiographical ideals of episcopal power misrepresented the reality of it, Chapter 3 looked at ways in which the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1 actually did reflect political developments in Anglo-Norman England. Hagiographers in this period paid new attention to issues of ecclesiastical law and authority, even if they were somewhat ambiguous about the status of this law. Chapter 3 showed how these issues, and this ambiguity, became increasingly important in determining the political conduct of the English episcopate in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Some bishops may have been constrained by papal authority in a manner unthinkable in earlier periods. On the other hand, the increasing respect for canon law in Anglo-Norman England may have opened up new modes of political conduct to bishops, and made them less vulnerable to the whims of the English monarchy.

All this should be taken as a warning to any historians using normative sources in their analyses of medieval political conduct. It is often unclear where these norms came from, and how they related to actual behaviour. Their relationship to contemporary reality is obscure and, as we have seen, sometimes self-contradictory. Another problem, not considered by the present thesis, is the possibility that bishops in Anglo-Norman England consciously modelled their conduct on the hagiographical ideals discussed in Chapter 1; the relationship between ideal and reality could be two-directional. This question deserves further consideration, but for Anglo-Norman England there is no firm evidence with which to answer it. Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury, for example, may have read the works of the hagiographer Osbern, but we do not know what he thought of them.

Chapter 3, together with Chapters 4 and 5, also contributed to the empirical view of episcopal power which underlies this thesis. Essentially, these three chapters responded to the following question: if the narrative texts discussed in Chapter 2 are intrinsically untrustworthy, and if the model of charismatic episcopal power found in them (and the hagiography discussed in Chapter 1) must be rejected as a monastic fantasy, then how did episcopal power work in Anglo-Norman England?

Chapters 3 to 5 did not cover every possible aspect of episcopal power in this period. But they did seek, in their variety, to give a representative view. Chapter 3 examined how episcopal power functioned in the realm of high politics, at a national level. Chapters 4 and 5 looked at how episcopal power functioned on a local level, with respect to landholding and the monastic order. The dioceses selected for the case studies of Chapters 4 and 5 allowed us to consider bishops from a variety of backgrounds. As was pointed out in Chapter 4, Wulfstan of Worcester was almost the exact opposite of Remigius and Robert Bloet of Lincoln. It is encouraging that, despite this diversity, the findings of these chapters concerning episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England are relatively consistent. Three points need to be made here.

Firstly, Chapters 3, 4 and 5 highlighted the dependence of episcopal power on royal power. The bishops discussed in Chapter 3 were unable to resist the English king in any sustained manner, and in trying to do so they were unusual. Bishops normally acted for the king. Chapters 4 and 5, on the other hand, showed that the simplest way for bishops in Anglo-Norman England to achieve their local political objectives was to seek the king's favour and support. Appeals to the king's law and courts were also critical, as we saw in the case of Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester. This is relatively unsurprising. The dominant position of the monarchy in Anglo-Norman England is a historiographical commonplace. Continental bishops may have been more reliant on their own resources and on other alliances (with, for example, the secular nobility). This, however, is a question for further research.

Secondly, Chapters 3 and 4 showed that the basis of episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England was often immaterial. Concrete resources – lands, money and armed retainers – were relatively unimportant. The bishops discussed in Chapter 3 were most able to resist the might of the English king by appealing to legal ideas of episcopal status and episcopal immunity from secular prosecution. Even William II seems to have recognised this immunity in principle. And Chapter 4 suggested that those people (including bishops) most able to acquire land in Anglo-Norman England were those who won the king's favour; this favour presumably depended on their individual talents by which they made themselves useful to the king. Personality could be a real source of power. The power which the monk Hemming attributed to the legal expertise of Abbot

Æthelwig of Evesham is also worth noting. In addition to this, Chapter 4 confirmed Chapter 3's arguments about the importance of abstract notions in determining episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England. It was probably by appealing to such notions that Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester was able to regain some of the lands which his church lost after the Norman Conquest.

However, Chapters 4 and 5 downplayed the importance of another type of immaterial power: monastic literacy, manifested in monastic forgery. There is little evidence that the ability of churches to produce spurious title deeds for their lands, or for those lands which they desired, gave them an edge in the tenurial disputes of Anglo-Norman England.

The third and final point to be made here is that, in a number of respects, episcopal power in Anglo-Norman England was fundamentally limited. Bishops had to abide by certain norms of conduct, or they risked losing their episcopal privileges and presumably their moral authority as bishops. We saw this in Chapter 3: Ranulf Flambard seems to have lost his episcopal immunity from feudal justice because of his exploitative service as William II's tax-gatherer (his simony was also an issue). Chapter 5, on the other hand, showed how bishops may have been constrained by their tenants, cathedral chapters and other dependents. These men may have been able to influence and direct episcopal policy. In particular they may often have dragged bishops into disputes in which they themselves had little interest. Finally, Chapter 4 closed by suggesting that certain power resources could only be used in pursuit of certain ends. Wealth, for example, helped bishops in their building projects, but not necessarily in protecting bishops from feudal prosecution. Conversely, legal skill and a spotless reputation, but no money, would not have been much use to a bishop who needed to erect a new cathedral.

A secondary objective of this thesis was to trace how episcopal power changed in eleventh-century England, and what importance the Norman Conquest may have had in this. Although the results are a little ambiguous, they tend to de-emphasise the importance of the Norman Conquest as a causal factor. Chapter 3 suggested that the Norman Conquest may, initially at least, have interrupted the steady growth of papal authority in eleventh- and twelfth-century England. Chapter 4 suggested that, if the Norman Conquest brought changes in episcopal

landholding in England, then the most important of these changes may actually have taken place some time after the Conquest, with the stabilisation of ecclesiastical estates. Chapter 5 argued that disputes between bishoprics and abbeys generally expanded to encompass questions of monastic exemption after the Norman Conquest; but that the Norman Conquest itself may not have caused this. As with the hagiographical trends discussed in Chapter 1, the eleventh-century movement for ecclesiastical reform, and developments associated with it, may have been the cause.

Obviously, the intention here was not to produce any definitive solution of the debates over change and continuity in Anglo-Norman England. And a full examination of the Anglo-Saxon situation lies outside the scope of this thesis. Similarly, although it was possible to make a few suggestions about the subsequent development of episcopal power in England (the increasing importance of papal authority and canon law in determining the political choices open to bishops in the twelfth century is the most significant of these), these can only be suggestions until confirmed or disproven by further research. This study has at least provided a firm basis for comparison with other periods.

The present thesis has also provided an example for the systematic study of power in the Middle Ages. Admittedly, its conceptualisation of power has been intentionally simplistic. This allowed us to proceed directly to the analysis of contemporary action, and to avoid ambiguities. Yet one might object that the thesis has ignored one of the most important aspects of power as a concept. It has ignored what might be called systemic power, that is, the social, ideological and discursive constraints which shaped, directed and limited the courses of action open to contemporaries; essentially, the paradigm in which power was exercised, or, to use a frequently occurring metaphor, the rules of the game of power.[1] Certainly, this systemic power is important. But the neglect of it in this thesis can be justified. How can we know the rules of the game without examining, as has been done in this thesis, the ways in which the game was played, and the individual moves which the players made? And this thesis has hinted at systemic paradigms of power in its discussion of the limitations on episcopal power.

***

Finally, it is necessary to consider how this thesis has contributed to the wider debate on the medieval bishop. The Introduction mentioned the historiographical drive in recent years for a synthetic approach to the medieval bishop, treating the bishop's religious and secular functions as a unified whole. The thesis itself has tended to vindicate this approach. Chapter 3, for example, showed how the political conduct of bishops in Anglo-Norman England (with relation to the king) was dictated by their ecclesiastical status. Certain modes of political conduct were open to bishops and not to lay barons; conversely, as churchmen, bishops were subject to obligations to which laymen were not subject. Chapter 4 showed how something similar could be the case even in the 'secular' matter of landholding. The annexation of the churches of Stow and Eynsham, and of those churches' lands, by Bishops Robert and Remigius of Lincoln was only possible because they were churchmen. And Chapter 5 argued that, although disputes between bishoprics and abbeys in this period often concerned temporal issues, these secular quarrels were generally bound up with ecclesiastical ones.

So the political conduct of the bishops of Anglo-Norman England can never be understood in entirely secular terms, even when essentially secular matters (such as landholding or William de Saint-Calais' feudal treason) are being discussed. Whether the religious conduct of the bishops can be understood in wholly religious terms is less clear: due to its concern with power, this thesis has not examined the episcopate's religious functions in any depth. This is a question for further research.

However, the thesis also warned against too complete a fusion of the spiritual and temporal functions of the medieval bishop. Such a fusion may actually be somewhat anachronistic. Chapter 3 showed how contemporaries were capable of conceiving the bishop's ecclesiastical and feudal personae as legally separable. Chapter 2 showed that in some cases it may be a mistake to view the episcopate's political conduct in religious terms. Although the narrative sources from Anglo-Norman England show bishops using their spiritual authority as a

---

[1] Chess metaphors are also common, but should probably be avoided in a thesis concerning bishops.

political tool, there is very little evidence that bishops actually did this in our period, and even less evidence that this kind of spiritual authority could be politically decisive. And in some respects bishops did act in an essentially secular or feudal manner. The misappropriation of other people's land by Bishops Remigius and Robert of Lincoln is often indistinguishable from the misappropriation of land by laymen after the Norman Conquest.

In short, although it is a useful analytical tool, the tendency of recent historians to join the medieval bishop's two personae may not always be appropriate. The reality was more complicated. As we saw in our discussion of William de Saint-Calais' trial in 1088, the exact nature of episcopal office in the Middle Ages was not always fixed. There may not be a right or a wrong way of looking at the medieval bishop. His contemporaries, at least, may have viewed him in whichever manner was most convenient to them at any given time.

Abbreviations

AS   *Acta sanctorum*, ed. Jean Bolland *et al.*, 59 vols (Antwerp and Brussels, 1643-1883).

AEp   Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistolae*, ed. F.S. Schmitt in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 6 vols (Edinburgh, 1946-61), vols 3-5, trans. Walter Fröhlich in *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols (Kalamazoo, 1990-4).

ANS   *Anglo-Norman Studies,* ed. R. Allen Brown *et al.* (Woodbridge, 1978-).

ASC   *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, ed. David Dumville *et al.* (Cambridge, 1983-).

Bates, *Regesta*   *Regesta regum anglo-normannorum: The Acta of William I (1066-1087)*, ed. David Bates (Oxford, 1999).

C&S   *Councils and Synods, with Other Documents Relating to the English Church*, I , *A.D. 871-1204*, ed. M. Brett, C.N.L. Brooke and D. Whitelock, 2 vols (Oxford, 1981).

DIV   *De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi per Willelmum regem filium Willelmi magni regis*, ed. H.S. Offler, A.J. Piper and A.I. Doyle in *Camden Miscellany* 34 (Cambridge, 1997), 49-104.

EEA   *English Episcopal Acta*, ed. David Smith *et al.* (London and Oxford, 1980-).

EHR   *English Historical Review*

GP   William   of   Malmesbury,   *Gesta   pontificum*
                               anglorum: The History of the English Bishops, ed.
                               and   trans.   R.M.   Thomson   and   Michael
                               Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 2007).

GR   William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum:*
                               The History of the English Kings, ed. and trans.
                               R.A.B.   Mynors,   R.M.   Thomson   and   Michael
                               Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998-9).

HAE   Thomas of Marlborough, *History of the Abbey of*
                               Evesham, ed. and trans. Jane Sayers and Leslie
                               Watkiss (Oxford, 2003).

HC   *Hemingi chartularium ecclesiæ Wigornensis*, ed. T
                               Hearne, 2 vols (Oxford, 1723).

HN   Eadmer of Canterbury, *Historia novorum in Anglia*,
                               ed. Martin Rule (London, 1864).

JW   John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of*
                               Worcester, ed. R.R. Darlington and P. McGurk, vols
                               2-3 (Oxford, 1995-8).

LS   *Lindsey Survey,* ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, *Domesday*
                               People: A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in
                               English Documents 1066-1166: I. Domesday Book
                               (Woodbridge, 1999), 77-97, trans. C.W. Foster and
                               Thomas Longley in *The Lincolnshire Domesday*
                               and the Lindsey Survey (Gainsborough, 1924).

OV	Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969-81).
PL	*Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*, ed. J.P Migne, 217 vols (Paris, 1844-55).
Regesta	*Regesta regum anglo-normannorum, 1066-1154*, ed. H.W.C. Davis *et al.*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1913-69).
VA	Eadmer of Canterbury, *The Life of St Anselm*, ed. and trans. R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1962).
VG	*The Life of Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester*, ed. Rodney Thomson (Toronto, 1977).
VW	William of Malmesbury, *Vita Wulfstani*, ed. and trans. R.M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom in *William of Malmesbury: Lives of Saints Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract* (Oxford, 2002), 1-155.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

London, British Library

Cotton MS Claudius D. x

Cotton MS Julius D. ii

Cotton MS Vespasian B. xx

Harley MS 3763

London, The National Archives

MS E 164/27

Unpublished Theses

Allen, Richard, 'The Norman Episcopate, 989-1110' (PhD Thesis: University of Glasgow, 2009).

Clarke, H.B., 'The Early Surveys of Evesham Abbey: An Investigation into the Problem of Continuity in Anglo-Norman England' (PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham, 1977).

Crumplin, Sally, 'Rewriting History in the Cult of St Cuthbert from the Ninth to the Twelfth Centuries' (PhD Thesis: University of St Andrews, 2004).

Lewandowski, Charlotte, 'Cultural Expressions of Episcopal Power, 1070-*c*. 1150' (PhD Thesis: University of Birmingham, 2010).

Marritt, Stephen, 'The Bishops of King Stephen's Reign' (PhD Thesis: University of Glasgow, 1999).

Mesley, Matthew, **'**The Construction of Episcopal Identity: The Meaning and Function of Episcopal Depictions within Latin Saints' Lives of the Long Twelfth Century' **(**PhD Thesis: University of Exeter, 2009).

Vaughan, Alexander, 'The Production and the Historical Context of the *Vitae Dunstani* of Osbern, Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, *c.* 1090-*c.* 1130' (PhD Thesis: Cambridge, 2008).

Primary Sources

Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru (Le Mans, 1901).

Adam of Eynsham, *Magna vita Sancti Hugonis. The Life of St Hugh of Lincoln*, ed. Decima L. Douie and David Hugh Farmer, 2 vols (Oxford, 1985).

Adelard of Ghent, *Lectiones in depositione s. Dunstani*, ed. and trans. Lapidge and Winterbottom in *Early Lives of St Dunstan*, 111-45.

Alexandri II pontificis Romani epistolae et diplomata, in *PL* 146, cols 1279B-1430C.

An Eleventh-Century Inquisition of St Augustine's, Canterbury, ed. Adolphus Ballard (London, 1920).

Anglo-Saxon Charters of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury and Minster-in-Thanet, ed. Susan Kelly (Oxford, 1995).

The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, ed. David Dumville *et al.* (Cambridge, 1983-).

Annales monasterii de Wintonia, ed. H.R. Luard in *Annales monastici*, 5 vols (London, 1864-9), vol. 2, 3-128.

Anselm of Canterbury, *Epistolae*, ed. F.S. Schmitt in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi opera omnia*, 6 vols (Edinburgh, 1946-61), vols 3-5, trans. Walter Fröhlich in *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols (Kalamazoo, 1990-4).

'B', *Vita Dunstani*, ed. and trans. Lapidge and Winterbottom in *Early Lives of St Dunstan*, 1-109.

Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969).

The Black Book of St Augustine, Canterbury, ed. G.J. Turner and H.E. Salter, 3 vols (London, 1915-24).

Brevis relatio de Guillelmo nobilissimo comite Normannorum, ed. Elisabeth van Houts in *Camden Miscellany* 34 (1997), 5-48.

A Brief History of the Bishoprick of Somerset, ed. Joseph Hunter in *Ecclesiastical Documents* (London, 1840), 1-48.

Byrhtferth of Ramsey, *The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine*, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge (Oxford, 2009).

Capitula de miraculis et translationibus sancti Cuthberti, ed. Arnold in *Symeonis opera omnia*, vol. 1, 229-61, vol 2, 333-62.

Cartularium Saxonicum: A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History, ed. Walter de Gray Birch, 3 vols (London, 1885-93).

Cartulary of Worcester Cathedral Priory, ed. R.R. Darlington (London, 1968).

Chronica pontificum ecclesiae Eboracensis, ed. Raine in *Historians of the Church of York*, vol. 2, 312-87.

Chronicon abbatiae Rameseiensis, ed. W. Dunn Macray (London, 1886).

Councils and Synods, with Other Documents Relating to the English Church, *I*, *A.D. 871-1204*, ed. M. Brett, C.N.L. Brooke and D. Whitelock, 2 vols (Oxford, 1981).

De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi per Willelmum regem filium Willelmi magni regis, ed. H.S. Offler, A.J. Piper and A.I. Doyle in *Camden Miscellany* 34 (Cambridge, 1997), 49-104.

'The Digby-Gotha Recension of the Life of St Ecgwine', ed. Michael Lapidge in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 7 (1979), 39-55.

Domesday Book, ed. John Morris *et al.*, 34 vols (Chichester 1975-92).

Domesday Book: *The Leicestershire Survey, c. A.D. 1130,* ed. and trans. C.F. Slade (Leicester, 1956).

The Domesday monachorum of Christ Church Canterbury, ed. David C. Douglas (London, 1944).

Dominic of Evesham, *Vita s. Ecgwini episcopi et confessoris*, ed. Michael Lapidge in *Analecta Bollandiana* 96 (1978), 65-104.

Durham Episcopal Charters 1071-1152, ed. H.S. Offler (Gateshead, 1968).

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Epistola ad Glastonienses*, ed. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan*, 412-22.

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, ed. Martin Rule (London, 1864).

Eadmer of Canterbury, *The Life of St Anselm*, ed. and trans. R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1962).

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, ed. and trans. Bernard Muir and Andrew Turner (Oxford, 2006).

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita beati Bregowini Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, ed. B.W. Scholz in *Traditio* 22 (1966), 127-48.

Eadmer of Canterbury, *Vita sancti Wilfridi: The Life of St Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. Bernard Muir and Andrew Turner (Exeter, 1998).

Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS. Vesp. D. xiv, ed. Rubie Warner (London, 1917).

The Early Lives of St Dunstan, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 2012).

Early Yorkshire Charters, ed. William Farrer *et al.*, 11 vols (Edinburgh, 1914-63).

Encomium Emmae reginae, ed. and trans. Alistair Campbell and Simon Keynes (Cambridge, 1998).

English Episcopal Acta, ed. David Smith *et al.* (London and Oxford, 1980-).

English Lawsuits from William I to Richard I, ed. R.C. van Caenegem, 2 vols (London, 1990-1).

Epistolae pontificum Romanorum ineditae, ed. Samuel Loewenfeld (Leipzig, 1885).

Eynsham Cartulary, ed. H.E. Salter, 2 vols (Oxford, 1907-8).

Faricius, *Vita sancti Aldhelmi*, ed. Michael Winterbottom in *Journal of Medieval Latin* 15 (2005), 93-147.

Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, ed. David C. Douglas (London, 1932).

Folcard of Saint-Bertin, *Vita s. Johannis episcopi Eboracensis*, ed. Raine in *Historians of the Church of York*, vol. 1, 239-60.

Geffrei Gaimar, *Estoire des Engleis: History of the English*, ed. and trans. Ian Short (Oxford, 2009).

Geoffrey of Burton, *Life and Miracles of St Modwenna*, ed. and trans. Robert Bartlett (Oxford, 2002).

Gerald of Wales, *Vita s. Remigii*, ed. James Dimock in *Giraldi Cambrensis opera*, 8 vols (London, 1861-91), vol. 7, 1-80.

The Gesta Normannorum ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis and Robert of Torigni ed. and trans. Elisabeth van Houts (Oxford, 1995).

Gilbert Crispin, *Vita Herluini*, ed. Anna Sapir Abulafia and G.R. Evans in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster* (London, 1986), 183-212.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *The Hagiography of the Female Saints of Ely*, ed. and trans. Rosalind Love (Oxford, 2004).

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia maior de adventu sancti Augustini*, in *AS*, May, vol. 6, 375-95.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia maior de miraculis sancti Augustini*, in *AS*, May, vol. 6, 397-411.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia minor de vita sancti Augustini*, in *PL* 80, cols 743A-764B.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Historia translationis Augustini et aliorum sanctorum*, in *AS*, May, vol. 6, 411-43.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Libellus contra inanes sanctae virginis Mildrethae usurpatores*, ed. M.L. Colker, in *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977), 68-97.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, 'The Life of Saint Wulsin of Sherborne by Goscelin', ed. C.H. Talbot in *Revue bénédictine* 69 (1959), 68–85.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, 'Texts of Jocelyn of Canterbury Which Relate to the History of Barking Abbey', ed. M.L. Colker in *Studia monastica* 7 (1965), 383-460.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Translatio sanctae Mildrethae uirginis cum miraculorum attestatione*, ed. D.W. Rollason in *Mediaeval Studies* 48 (1986), 154-210.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Translatio sancti Adriani*, in London, BL, Cotton MS Vespasian B. xx, fos 241v-248v.

Goscelin of Saint-Bertin, *Vita Deo dilectae virginis Mildrethae* (*BHL* 5960), ed. Rollason in *The Mildrith Legend*, 105-43.

'Gregory of Ely's Verse Life and Miracles of St Æthelthryth', ed. Elizabeth Stevens and Pauline A. Thompson in *Analecta Bollandiana* 106 (1988), 333-90.

Gregory VII, *The Epistolae vagantes of Pope Gregory VII,* ed. and trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford, 1972).

Gregory VII, *Das Register Gregors VII, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae selectae 2*, ed. E. Caspar, 2 vols (Berlin, 1920-3).

Gregory the Great, *Expositio in librum beati Job*, in *PL* 74, cols 590C-1162B and *PL* 75, cols 9A-782A.

Hemingi chartularium ecclesiæ Wigornensis, ed. T Hearne, 2 vols (Oxford, 1723).

Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum: The History of the English People,* ed. and trans. Diana Greenway (Oxford, 2002).

Herbert Losinga, *Epistolae*, ed. Robert Anstruther in *Epistolae Herberti de Losinga, primi Episcopi Norwicensis, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri, Prioris Cantuariensis* (New edn.: New York, 1969), 1-107.

Hériman de Tournai, *Les Miracles de sainte Marie de Laon*, ed. and trans. Alain Saint-Denis (Paris, 2008).

Hermann the Archdeacon, *De miraculis sancti Eadmundi*, ed. Tom Licence in *Hermann the Archdeacon and Goscelin of Saint-Bertin: Miracles of St Edmund* (Oxford, 2014), forthcoming.

Historia de sancto Cuthberto: A History of Saint Cuthbert and a Record of His Patrimony, ed. and trans. Ted Johnson South (Woodbridge, 2002).

Historia ecclesie Abbendonensis: The History of the Church of Abingdon, ed. and trans. John Hudson, 2 vols (Oxford, 2002-2007).

Historia regum, ed. Arnold in *Symeonis opera omnia*, vol. 2, 3-283.

The Historians of the Church of York and Its Archbishops, ed. James Raine, 3 vols (1879-94).

Hugh Candidus, *The Chronicle of Hugh Candidus, a Monk of Peterborough*, ed. W.T. Mellows (London, 1949).

Hugh de Flavigny, *Chronicon*, ed. G.H. Pertz in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores 8* (Hannover, 1848), 280-503.

Hugh de Fleury, *Tractatus de regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate*, ed. Ernest Sackur in *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, *Libelli de lite*, 3 vols (Hannover, 1891-7), vol. 2.

Hugh the Chanter*, The History of the Church of York, 1066-1127*, ed. and trans. Charles Johnson, rev. M. Brett, C.N.L. Brooke and M. Winterbottom (Oxford, 1990).

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols (Oxford, 1911).

Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae*, in *PL* 162, cols 11C-288B.

John of Worcester, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, ed. R.R. Darlington and P. McGurk, vols 2-3 (Oxford, 1995-98).

Lanfranc of Canterbury, *The Letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. and trans. H. Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford, 1979).

Liber Eliensis, ed. E.O. Blake (London, 1962).

The Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey, ed. and trans. C.W. Foster and Thomas Longley (Gainsborough, 1924).

The Life of Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, ed. Rodney Thomson (Toronto, 1977).

'The Lives of St Osyth of Essex and St Osyth of Aylesbury', ed. Denis Bethell in *Analecta Bollandiana* 88 (1970), 75-127.

Memorials of St Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, ed. W. Stubbs (London, 1874).

Milo Crispin, *Vita Lanfranci,* ed. Margaret Gibson in *Lanfranco di Pavia e l'Europa del secolo XI nel IX centenario della morte (1089-1989)*, ed. G. d'Onofrio (Milan, 1993), 659-715.

'Norman Anonymous', *The Electronic Norman Anonymous Project: A Digital Edition*, ed. J.R. Ginther and T. O'Sullivan (online edn.: www.normananonymous.org, accessed September 2012-May 2013).

The Northamptonshire Survey, ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan in *Domesday People*, 98-117, trans. J.H. Round in *The Victoria History of the County of Northampton* (London, 1902), 357-92.

Odbert of Saint-Bertin, *Passio Friderici episcopi Traiectensis*, ed. Georg Waitz *et al.* in *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores 15,* 2 vols (Leipzig, 1925), vol. 1, 342-56.

The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles, ed. and trans. Elaine Treharne (Leeds, 1997).

The Old English Lives of St Margaret, ed. and trans. Mary Clayton and Hugh Magennis (Cambridge, 1994).

Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, 6 vols (Oxford, 1969-81).

Osbern of Canterbury, *Miracula s. Dunstani*, ed. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan*, 69-161.

Osbern of Canterbury, *Translatio sancti Ælfegi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi et martiris (BHL 2519)*, ed. and trans. Alexander Rumble and Rosemary Morris in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway* (London, 1994), 283-315

Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita sancti Alphegi*, in *PL* 149, cols 371-93.

Osbern of Canterbury, *Vita s. Dunstani*, ed. Stubbs in *Memorials of St Dunstan*, 69-128.

Osbert of Clare, *Vita beati Eadwardi regis Anglorum*, ed. Marc Bloch in *Analecta Bollandiana* 41 (1923), 5-131.

Osbert of Clare, *Vita Ethelberti*, ed. John Mayor in *Richard of Cirencester: Speculum historiale de gestis regum Anglie*, 2 vols (London, 1863-9), vol. 1, 262-94.

Papsturkunden in England, ed. Walther Holtzmann, 3 vols (Berlin, 1935-52).

Passio beatorum martyrum Ethelredi atque Ethelbricti (BHL 2641-2), ed. Rollason in *The Mildrith Legend*, 89-104.

The Red Book of the Exchequer, ed. Hubert Hall, 3 vols (London, 1896).

Regesta regum anglo-normannorum, 1066-1154, ed. H.W.C. Davis *et al.*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1913-69).

Regesta regum anglo-normannorum: The Acta of William I (1066-1087), ed. David Bates (Oxford, 1999).

The Registrum antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, ed. C.W. Foster and K. Major, 10 vols (Hereford, 1931-73).

Stephen of Ripon, *The Life of Bishop Wilfrid*, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave (Cambridge, 1927).

Sulcard of Westminster, *Prologus de construccione Westmonasterii*, ed. B.W. Scholz in *Traditio* 20 (1964), 59-91.

Symeon of Durham, *Libellus de exordio atque procursu istius hoc est Dunhelmensis ecclesie: Tract on the Origins and Progress of This the Church of Durham*, ed. and trans. David Rollason (Oxford, 2000).

Symeonis monachi opera omnia, ed. Thomas Arnold, 2 vols (London, 1882-5).

Textus Roffensis, ed. T. Hearne (Oxford, 1720).

Thomas of Elmham, *Historia monasterii sancti Augustini Cantuariensis*, ed. C. Hardwick (London, 1858).

Thomas of Marlborough, *History of the Abbey of Evesham*, ed. and trans. Jane Sayers and Leslie Watkiss (Oxford, 2003).

Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives: Vita sancti Birini, Vita et miracula sancti Kenelmi, and Vita sancti Rumwoldi, ed. and trans. Rosalind Love (Oxford, 1996).

Vita prima sancti Neoti, ed. Michael Lapidge in *ASC 17*, 109-42.

Vita s. Swithuni episcopi et confessoris, ed. and trans. Lapidge in *The Cult of Swithun*, 611-39.

Vita secunda sancti Neoti, in *AS*, July, vol. 7, 319F-329A.

The Warenne (Hyde) Chronicle, ed. Elisabeth van Houts and Rosalind Love (Oxford, 2013).

William of Malmesbury, *An Early History of Glastonbury*: *An Edition, Translation and Study of William of Malmesbury's 'De antiquitate Glastonie ecclesie'*, ed. and trans. John Scott (Woodbridge, 2009).

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum anglorum: The History of the English Bishops*, ed. and trans. R.M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 2007).

William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and trans. R.A.B. Mynors, R.M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom, 2 vols (Oxford, 1998-9).

William of Malmesbury, *Lives of Saints Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, ed. and trans. R.M. Thomson and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 2002).

William of Newburgh, *History of English Affairs*, ed. and trans. P.G. Walsh and M.J. Kennedy (Warminster, 1988).

William of Wycombe, *Vita domini Roberti de Betune Herefordensis episcopi*, ed. H. Wharton in *Anglia Sacra,* 2 vols (London, 1691), vol. 2, 295-322.

William Thorne, *Cronica de rebus gestis abbatum sancti Augustini Cantuariae*, ed. Roger Twysden in *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores X*. (London, 1652), cols 1757-2207.

Wulfstan of Winchester, *Life of St Æthelwold*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1991).

Secondary Literature

Aird, William, 'An Absent Friend: The Career of Bishop William of St Calais', in *Anglo-Norman Durham*, ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 283-97.

Aird, William, *Robert Curthose, Duke of Normandy (c. 1050-1134)* (Woodbridge, 2008).

Aird, William, *St Cuthbert and the Normans: The Church of Durham, 1071-1153* (Woodbridge, 1998).

Alexander, James W., 'Herbert of Norwich, 1091-1119: Studies in the History of Norman England', in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 6 (1969), 115-232.

Allen, Richard, 'The *Acta archiepiscoporum Rotomagensium* and Urban Ecclesiastical Rivalry in Eleventh-Century Rouen', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict*, ed. Dalton, Insley and Wilkinson, 77-97.

Ambrose, Shannon, 'The Social Context and Political Complexities of Goscelin's Sermon for the Feast of St Augustine of Canterbury, the "Apostle of the English"', in *Studies in Philology* 109 (2012), 364-80.

Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193, ed. David Rollason, Margaret Harvey and Michael Prestwich (Woodbridge, 1994).

Anglo-Norman Political Culture and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Proceedings of the Borchard Conference on Anglo-Norman History, 1995, ed. C.W. Hollister (Woodbridge, 1997).

Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin, 2006).

Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages, ed. Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek (Turnhout, 2007).

Atkins, Ivor, 'The Church of Worcester from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century. Part 2: The *familia* from the Middle of the Tenth to the Beginning of the Twelfth Century', in *Antiquaries Journal* 20 (1940), 1-38, 203-29.

Barlow, Frank, *The English Church, 1000-1066: A History of the Later Anglo-Saxon Church* (rev. edn.: London, 1979).

Barlow, Frank, *The English Church, 1066-1154: A History of the Anglo-Norman Church* (London, 1979).

Barlow, Frank, *William Rufus* (rev. edn.: London, 2000).

Barrow, G.W.S., 'The Kings of Scotland and Durham', in *Anglo-Norman Durham,* ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 312-23.

Bartlett, Robert, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225* (Oxford, 2000).

Bartlett, Robert, 'Rewriting Saints' Lives: The Case of Gerald of Wales', in *Speculum* 58 (1983), 598-613.

Bates, David, *Bishop Remigius of Lincoln, 1067-1092* (Lincoln, 1992).

Bates, David, 'The Character and Career of Odo, Bishop of Bayeux (1049/50-1097)', in *Speculum* 50 (1975), 1-20.

Baxter, Stephen, *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2007).

Berkhofer, Robert, 'The Canterbury Forgeries Revisited', in *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007), 36-50.

Berkhofer, Robert, 'Confessions of an Anglo-Norman Forger', in *ANS* 36 (2014), forthcoming.

Bethell, Denis, 'William of Corbeil and the Canterbury York Dispute', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 19 (1968), 145-59.

Bischofsmord im Mittelalter: Murder of Bishops, ed. Natalie Fryde and Dirk Reitz (Göttingen, 2003).

The Bishop: Power and Piety at the First Millenium, ed. Sean Gilsdorf (Münster, 2004).

The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages, ed. John Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot, 2007).

Blair, John, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005).

Blair, John, 'Estate Memoranda of *c.* 1070 from the See of Dorchester-on-Thames', in *EHR* 116 (2001), 114-32.

Blake, D.W., 'Osbern, Bishop of Exeter 1072-3', in *Report and Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature and Art* 114 (1982), 63-9.

Brett, Martin, *The English Church under Henry I* (Oxford, 1975).

Brett, Martin, 'Gundulf and the Cathedral Communities of Canterbury and Rochester', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 15-26.

Brett, Martin, 'John of Worcester and His Contemporaries', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. R.H.C Davis and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford, 1981), 101-26.

Brooke, Z.N., *The English Church and the Papacy from the Conquest to the Reign of John* (rev. edn.: Cambridge, 1989).

Brooks, Nicholas, 'The Archbishopric of Canterbury and the So-Called Introduction of Knight-Service into England', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 41-62.

Brooks, Nicholas, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984).

Brooks, Nicholas, 'Introduction: How Do We Know about St Wulfstan?', in *Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 1-21.

Bruno, Michael, 'The Investiture Contest in Norman England: A Struggle between St Anselm of Canterbury and The Norman Kings: Part I', in *American Benedictine Review* 61 (2010), 119-37.

Campbell, James, 'The East Anglian See before the Conquest', in *Norwich Cathedral*, ed. Atherton *et al.*, 3-21.

Campbell, James, 'Some Twelfth-Century Views of the Anglo-Saxon Past', in James Campbell, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), 209-28.

Canterbury and the Norman Conquest: Churches, Saints and Scholars, 1066-1199, ed. Richard Eales and Richard Sharpe (London, 1995).

Cantor, Norman, *Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135* (Princeton, 1958).

Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict in the Anglo-Norman World, ed. Paul Dalton, Charles Insley and Louise J. Wilkinson (Woodbridge, 2011).

Cheney, Mary, 'Some Observations on a Papal Privilege of 1120 for the Archbishops of York', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), 429-39.

Chibnall, Marjorie (as Marjorie Morgan), *The English Lands of the Abbey of Bec* (Oxford, 1946).

Christelow, Stephanie Mooers, 'Chancellors and Curial Bishops: Ecclesiastical Promotions and Power in Anglo-Norman England', in *ANS* 22 (2000), 49-69.

Clarke, H.B., 'Evesham J and Evesham L: Two Early Twelfth-Century Manorial Surveys', in *ANS* 30 (2008), 62-84.

Clarke, Helen *et al.*, *Sandwich, 'The Completest Medieval Town in England': A study of the Town and Port from Its Origins to 1600* (Oxford, 2010).

Clegg, Stewart and Mark Haugaard, 'Introduction: Why Power is the Central Concept of the Social Sciences', in *SAGE Handbook of Power*, ed. Clegg and Haugaard, 1-24.

Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop* (Oxford, 2003).

Cownie, Emma, *Religious Patronage in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135* (Woodbridge, 1998).

Cox, David, 'St Oswald of Worcester at Evesham Abbey: Cult and Concealment', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 53 (2002), 269-85.

Cox, David, 'The Vale Estates of the Church of Evesham, *c*. 700-1086', in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 5 (1975), 25-50.

Crafter, T.C.R., 'Henry II, the St Augustine's Dispute and the Loss of the Abbey's Mint Franchise', in *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500-1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, ed. Barrie Cook and Gareth Williams (Leiden, 2006), 601-16.

Craster, Edmund, 'A Contemporary Record of the Pontificate of Ranulf Flambard', in *Archaeologia Æliana* 4th ser. 7 (1930), 33-56.

Craster, Edmund, 'The Patrimony of St Cuthbert', in *EHR* 69 (1954), 177-99.

Craster, Edmund, 'The Red Book of Durham', in *EHR* 40 (1925), 504-32.

Crosby, Everett U., *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the mensa episcopalis* (Cambridge, 1994).

Cubitt, Catherine, 'Archbishop Dunstan: A Prophet in Politics', in *Myth, Rulership, Church and Charters: Essays in Honour of Nicholas Brooks*, ed. Julia Barrow and Andrew Wareham (Aldershot, 2008), 145-66.

Cubitt, Catherine, 'Bishops and Succession Crises in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century England', in *Patterns of Episcopal Power*, ed. Körntgen and Wassenhoven, 111-26.

Cubitt, Catherine, 'Wilfrid's "Usurping Bishops": Episcopal Elections in Anglo-Saxon England, *c.* 600-*c.* 800', in *Northern History* 25 (1989), 18-38.

Dalton, Paul, 'Churchmen and the Promotion of Peace in King Stephen's Reign', in *Viator* 31 (2000), 79-119.

Darlington, R.R., 'Æthelwig, Abbot of Evesham', in *EHR* 48 (1933), 1-22, 177-98.

Davies, Wendy and Paul Fouracre, 'Introduction', in *Property and Power*, ed. Davies and Fouracre, 1-16.

Die früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung im europäischen Vergleich, ed. Franz-Reiner Erkens (Cologne, 1998).

Dodwell, Barbara, 'The Foundation of Norwich Cathedral', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5th ser. 7 (1957), 1-18.

Dodwell, Barbara, 'The Honour of the Bishop of Thetford / Norwich in the Late Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', in *Norfolk Archaeology* 33 (1965), 185-99.

Douglas, David C., 'Odo, Lanfranc, and the Domesday Survey', in *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait,* ed. J.G. Edwards, V.H. Galbraith and E.F. Jacob (Manchester, 1933), 47-57.

Douglas, David C., *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact upon England* (London, 1964).

Du Boulay, Francis, *The Lordship of Canterbury: An Essay on Medieval Society* (London, 1966).

Dueball, Margarete, *Der Suprematstreit zwischen den Erzdiözesen Canterbury und York, 1070-1126* (Berlin, 1929).

Duggan, Charles, 'From the Conquest to the Death of John', in *The English Church and the Papacy*, ed. Lawrence, 63-116.

Dyer, Christopher, *Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society: The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540* (Cambridge, 1980).

Edgington, Susan, 'The Entrepreneurial Activities of Herbert Losinga, Abbot of Ramsey (1087-91) and First Bishop of Norwich', in *Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 266-74.

The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages, ed. C.H. Lawrence (rev. edn.: Stroud, 1999).

Falkenstein, Ludwig, *La papauté et les abbayes françaises aux XIe et XIIe siècles. Exemption et protection apostolique* (Paris, 1997).

Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongress des Monumenta Germaniae historica, ed. Horst Fuhrmann *et al.*, 5 vols (Hannover, 1988).

Fell, Christine, *Edward, King and Martyr* (Leeds, 1971).

Fenton, Kirsten, *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge, 2008).

Fenton, Kirsten, 'The Question of Masculinity in William of Malmesbury's Presentation of Wulfstan of Worcester', in *ANS* 28 (2006), 124-37.

Fischer, Ulrich, *Stadtgestalt im Zeichen der Eroberung: Englische Kathedralstädte in frühnormannischer Zeit (1066-1135)* (Cologne, 2009).

Fleming, Robin, 'Christ Church Canterbury's Anglo-Norman Cartulary', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture*, ed. Hollister, 83-115.

Fleming, Robin, *Kings and Lords in Conquest England* (Cambridge, 1991).

Flight, Colin, 'A List of the Holders of Land in Kent, *c.* 1120', in *Archaeologia Cantiana* 125 (2005), 361-79.

Flight, Colin, *The Bishops and Monks of Rochester, 1076-1214* (Maidstone, 1997).

Foot, Sarah, 'Bury's Armoury of Charters', in *Bury St Edmunds and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Tom Licence (Woodbridge, 2014), forthcoming.

Foucault, Michel, *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison* (Paris, 1975).

Fouracre, Paul, 'Merovingian History and Merovingian Hagiography', in *Past and Present* 127 (1990), 3-38.

Frank, Robert, 'Shrine Rivalry in the North Sea World', in *The North Sea World in the Middle Ages: Studies in the Cultural History of North-Western Europe*, ed. Thomas Liszka and Lorna Walker (Dublin, 2001), 230-42.

Fröhlich, Walter, 'St Anselm's Special Relationship with William the Conqueror', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 145-58.

Galbraith, John Kenneth, *The Anatomy of Power* (Boston, 1983).

Galbraith, V.H., 'Notes on the Career of Samson, Bishop of Worcester (1096–1112)', in *EHR* 82 (1967), 86–101.

Galbraith, V.H., 'Royal Charters to Winchester', in *EHR* 35 (1920), 382-400.

Gameson, Fiona, 'Goscelin's *Life* of Augustine of Canterbury', in *St Augustine and the Conversion*, ed. Gameson, 391-409.

Gameson, Richard, 'English Manuscript Art in the Late Eleventh Century: Canterbury and Its Context', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 95-144.

Garnett, George, *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession and Tenure, 1066-1166* (Oxford, 2007).

Giandrea, Mary Frances, *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2007).

Gibson, Margaret, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford, 1977).

Gillingham, John, 'Kingship, Chivalry and Love: Political and Cultural Values in the Earliest History Written in French: Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis*', in *Anglo-Norman Political Culture*, ed. Hollister, 33-58.

Gilsdorf, Sean, 'Bishops in the Middle: Mediatory Politics and the Episcopacy', in *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf, 51-73.

Gilson, J.P., 'Two Letters Addressed to William Rufus', in *EHR* 12 (1897), 291-2.

Goullet, Monique, *Ecriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de Vies saints dans l'Occident latin médiéval (VIIIe-XIIIe s.)* (Turnhout, 2005).

Goullet, Monique, 'Vers une typologie des réécritures hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France', in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'occident médiéval: transformations formelles et idéologiques*, ed. Monique Goullet and Martin Heinzelmann (Ostfildern, 2003), 109-44.

Gransden, Antonia, 'Baldwin, Abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065-1097', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 65-76.

Gransden, Antonia, *Historical Writing in England c. 550-c. 1307* (London, 1974).

Green, Judith, *Henry I: King of England and Duke of Normandy* (Cambridge, 2006).

Guillot, Olivier, 'A Reform of Investiture before the Investiture Struggle in Anjou, Normandy and England', in *Haskins Society Journal* 3 (1991), 81-100.

Hamshere, John, 'The Structure and Exploitation of the *Domesday Book* Estate of the Church of Worcester', in *Landscape History* 7 (1985), 41-52.

Hardy, Alan *et al.*, *Aelfric's Abbey: Excavations at Eynsham Abbey, Oxfordshire, 1989-92* (Oxford, 2003).

Hayward, Paul, 'An Absent Father: Eadmer, Goscelin and the Cult of St Peter, the First Abbot of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in *Journal of Medieval History* 29 (2003), 201-18.

Hayward, Paul, 'Gregory the Great as "Apostle of the English" in Post-Conquest Canterbury', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), 19-57.

Hayward, Paul, 'Some Reflections on the Historical Value of the So-Called *Acta Lanfranci*', in *Historical Research* 77 (2004), 141-60.

Hayward, Paul, 'Translation Narratives in Post-Conquest Hagiography and English Resistance to the Norman Conquest', in *ANS* 21 (1999), 67-93.

The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, I, 940-1216, ed. David Knowles, C.N.L. Brooke and Vera C.M. London (rev. edn.: Cambridge, 2001).

Helmholz, Richard H., 'Excommunication in Twelfth Century England', in *Journal of Law and Religion* 11 (1994-5), 235-53.

Hiley, David, 'Thurstan of Caen and Plainchant at Glastonbury: Musicological Reflections on the Norman Conquest', in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 72 (1986), 57-90.

Holdsworth, Christopher, 'R. Allen Brown Memorial Lecture: Peacemaking in the Twelfth Century', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 1-17.

Hollis, Stephanie, 'The Minster-in-Thanet Foundation Story', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), 41-64.

Hollister, C.W., 'The Anglo-Norman Civil War, 1101', in *EHR* 88 (1973), 315-34.

Hollister, C.W., 'St Anselm on Lay Investiture', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 145-58.

Hollister, C.W., 'William Rufus, Henry I and the Anglo-Norman Church', in *Peritia* 6-7 (1987-8), 119-34.

Holt, J.C., 'The Introduction of Knight-Service in England, in J.C. Holt, *Colonial England, 1066-1215* (London, 1997), 81-103.

Insley, Charles, 'Remembering Communities Past: Exeter Cathedral in the Eleventh Century', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict*, ed. Dalton, Insley and Wilkinson, 40-60.

Jaeger, C.S., 'The Courtier Bishop in *Vitae* from the Tenth to the Twelfth Century', in C.S. Jaeger, *Scholars and Courtiers: Intellectuals and Society in the Medieval West* (Aldershot, 2002), 291-325.

James, M.R., 'Two Lives of St Ethelbert King and Martyr', in *EHR* 32 (1917), 214-44.

Jenkins, Richard, 'The Ways and Means of Power: Efficacy and Resources', in *SAGE Handbook of Power*, 140-56.

John, Eric, 'The Litigation of an Exempt House: St Augustine's, Canterbury, 1182-1237', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 39 (1956-7), 390-415.

Jordan, Karl, *Investiturstreit und frühe Stauferzeit 1056-1197* (Munich, 1970).

Kantorowicz, Ernst, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, 1957).

Kapelle, William E., *The Norman Conquest of the North: The Region and Its Transformation, 1000-1135* (London, 1979).

Kealey, Edward, *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England* (London, 1972).

Keats-Rohan, K.S.B., *Domesday People: A Prosopography of Persons Occurring in English Documents 1066-1166. I. Domesday Book* (Woodbridge, 1999).

Kelly, Susan, 'Some Forgeries in the Archive of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury', in *Fälschungen*, ed. Fuhrmann *et al.*, vol. 4, 347-69.

Ker, Neil, 'Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A. XIII', in *Studies in Medieval History*, ed. Hunt, Pantin and Southern, 49-75.

Keynes, Simon, 'Giso, Bishop of Wells (1061-88)', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 203-71.

King, Edmund, *King Stephen* (London, 2010).

King, Edmund, *Peterborough Abbey, 1086-1310: A Study in the Land Market* (Cambridge, 1973).

King, Vanessa, 'Share and Share Alike? Bishops and Their Cathedral Chapters: The Domesday Evidence', in *ANS* 18 (1996), 138-52.

Knowles, David, *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge, 1951).

Knowles, David, 'The Growth of Exemption', in *Downside Review* 50 (1932), 201-31, 396-436.

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 edn.: Cambridge, 1963).

Koopmans, Rachel, *Wonderful to Relate: Miracle Stories and Miracle Collecting in High Medieval England* (Philadelphia, 2011).

Krüger, Thomas, *Persönlichkeitsausdruck und Persönlichkeitswahrnehmung im Zeitalter der Investiturkonflikte, Studien zu den Briefsammlungen des Anselm von Canterbury* (Hildesheim, 2002).

Kuttner, Stephen and Robert Somerville, *Pope Urban II*, the Collectio Britannica, *and the Council of Melfi (1089)* (Oxford, 1996).

Lapidge, Michael, *The Cult of St Swithun* (Oxford, 2003).

Lapidge, Michael, 'Ealdred of York and MS. Cotton Vitellius E. XII', in Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature, 900-1066* (London, 1993), 453-67.

Lapidge, Michael, 'The Medieval Hagiography of St Ecgwine', in *Vale of Evesham Historical Society Research Papers* 6 (1977), 77-93.

Lawson, M.K., 'The Collection of Danegeld and Heregeld in the reigns of Æthelred II and Cnut', in *EHR* 99 (1984), 721-38.

Le Patourel, John, 'Geoffrey of Montbray, Bishop of Coutances, 1049-1093', in *EHR* 59 (1944), 129-61.

Le Patourel, John, 'The Reports of the Trial on Penenden Heath', in *Studies in Medieval History*, ed. Hunt, Pantin and Southern, 15-26.

Les évêques normands du XIe siècle, actes du Colloque de Cerisy-la-Salle 30 sept.-3 oct. 1993, ed. Pierre Bouet and François Neveux (Caen, 1995).

Levison, Wilhelm, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century: The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in the Hilary Term, 1943* (Oxford, 1946).

Lewis, C.P., 'The Invention of the Manor in Norman England', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 123-50.

Leyser, Karl, 'The Angevin Kings and the Holy Man', in *St Hugh of Lincoln: Lectures Delivered at Oxford and Lincoln to Celebrate the Eighth Centenary of St Hugh's Consecration as Bishop of Lincoln*, ed. Henry Mayr-Harting (Oxford, 1987), 49-73.

Licence, Tom, 'Herbert Losinga's Trip to Rome and the Bishopric of Bury St Edmunds', in *ANS* 34 (2012), 151-68.

Licence, Tom, *Hermits and Recluses in English Society, 950-1200* (Oxford, 2011).

Licence, Tom, 'Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop in Exile (1052-1055)', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 42 (2013), forthcoming.

MacLaughlin, Megan, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122* (Cambridge, 2010).

Mann, Michael, *The Sources of Social Power*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1986-2012).

Marritt, Stephen, 'King Stephen and the Bishops' in *ANS* 24 (2002), 129-44.

Marritt, Stephen, 'Reeds Shaken by the Wind? Bishops in Local and Regional Politics in King Stephen's Reign', in *King Stephen's Reign (1135-1154)*, ed. Paul Dalton and Graeme White (Woodbridge, 2008), 115-38.

Mason, Emma, 'Brothers at Court: Urse de Abetot and Robert Dispenser', in *ANS* 31 (2009), 64-89.

Mason, Emma, 'Change and Continuity in Eleventh-Century Mercia: The Experience of St Wulfstan of Worcester', in *ANS* 8 (1986), 154-76.

Mason, Emma, *St Wulfstan of Worcester, c. 1008-1095* (Oxford, 1990).

Mason, Emma, *William II: Rufus, the Red King* (Stroud, 2005).

Mason, Emma, 'William Rufus and the Benedictine Order', in *ANS* 21 (1999), 113-44.

Mason, Emma, 'Wulfstan of Worcester: Patriarch of the English?', in *Anglo-Saxons*, ed. Keynes and Smyth, 114-26.

Miller, Edward, *The Abbey and Bishopric of Ely: The Social History of an Ecclesiastical Estate from the Tenth Century to the Early Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1951).

Miller, Edward, 'The Ely Land Pleas in the Reign of William I', in *EHR* 62 (1947), 438-56.

Miller, Maureen, *The Bishop's Palace: Architecture and Authority in Medieval Italy* (London, 2000).

Miller, Maureen, 'Masculinity, Reform, and Clerical Culture: Narratives of Episcopal Holiness in the Gregorian Era', in *Church History* 72, (2003), 25-52.

Moore, R.I., *The First European Revolution, c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000).

Nederman, Cary J. and Catherine Campbell, 'Priests, Kings and Tyrants: Spiritual and Temporal Power in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*', in *Speculum* 66 (1991), 572-90.

Nelson, Janet, 'The Rites of the Conqueror', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 117-32.

Norwich Cathedral: Church, City and Diocese, 1096-1996, ed. Ian Atherton *et al.* (London, 1996).

O'Brien, Bruce, 'Forgery and the Literacy of the Early Common Law', in *Albion* 27 (1995), 1-18.

O'Rourke, Samuel, 'Hagiography and Exemption at Medieval Evesham, 1000-1250: The Evidence of the *Vitae Ecgwini*', forthcoming.

Offler, H.S., 'Ranulf Flambard as bishop of Durham (1099-1128)', in H.S. Offler, *North of the Tees: Studies in Medieval British History*, ed. A.J. Piper and A.I. Doyle (Aldershot, 1996), 14-25.

Offler, H.S., 'The Tractate '*De iniusta vexacione Willelmi episcopi primi*'', in *EHR* 66 (1951), 321-41.

Orchard, Andy, 'Parallel Lives: Wulfstan, William, Coleman and Christ', in *Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 39-57.

Ortenberg, Veronica, 'The Anglo-Saxon Church and the Papacy', in *The English Church and the Papacy*, ed. Lawrence, 29-62.

Ott, John and Anna Trumbore Jones, 'Introduction: The Bishop Reformed', in *The Bishop Reformed*, ed. Ott and Jones, 1-20.

Otter, Monika, '1066: The Moment of Transition in Two Narratives of the Norman Conquest', in *Speculum* 74 (1999), 565-86.

Owen, Dorothy, 'Introduction: The English Church in Eastern England, 1066-1100', in *A History of Lincoln Minster*, ed. Dorothy Owen (Cambridge, 1994), 1-13.

Owen, Dorothy, 'The Norman Cathedral at Lincoln', in *ANS* 6 (1984), 188-99.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Lawrence Goldman (online edn.: www.oxforddnb.com, accessed August-September 2013).

Parisse, Michel, 'The Bishop: Prince and Prelate', in *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf, 1-22.

Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Western Europe, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven (Berlin, 2011).

Patzold, Steffen, *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008).

Pavlac, Brian A., 'Excommunication and Territorial Politics in High Medieval Trier', in *Church History* 60 (1991), 20-36.

Philpott, Mark, 'The *De iniusta uexatione Willelmi episcopi primi* and Canon Law in Anglo-Norman Durham', in *Anglo-Norman Durham*, ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 125-37.

Philpott, Mark, 'Eadmer, His Archbishops and the English State', in *The Medieval State: Essays Presented to James Campbell*, ed. John Maddicott and David Palliser (London, 2000), 93-107.

Potter, Julie, 'The *Vita Gundulfi* in Its Historical Context', in *Haskins Society Journal* 7 (1995), 89-100.

Prestwich, J.O., 'The Career of Ranulf Flambard' in *Anglo-Norman Durham,* ed. Rollason, Harvey and Prestwich, 299-310.

Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages, ed. Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre (Cambridge, 1995).

Raban, Sandra, *The Estates of Thorney and Crowland: A Study in Medieval Monastic Land Tenure* (Cambridge, 1977).

Raftis, J. Ambrose, *The Estates of Ramsey Abbey: A Study in Economic Growth and Organization* (Toronto, 1957).

Ray, Roger, 'Orderic Vitalis and William of Poitiers: A Monastic Reinterpretation of William the Conqueror', in *Revue Belge de philologie et d'histoire* 50 (1972), 1116-27.

Ray, Roger, 'Orderic Vitalis on Henry I: Theocratic Ideology and Didactic Narrative', in *Contemporary Reflections on the Medieval Christian Tradition: Essays in Honor of Ray C. Petry*, ed. George H. Shriver (Durham, 1974), 119-34.

Reuter, Timothy, 'Bishops, Rites of Passage, and the Symbolism of State in Pre-Gregorian Europe', in *The Bishop*, ed. Gilsdorf, 23-36.

Reuter, Timothy, 'Ein Europa der Bischöfe. Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms', in *Bischof Burchard von Worms, 1000–1025*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Mainz, 2000), 1-28.

Reuter, Timothy, 'Modern Mentalities and Medieval Polities', in Timothy Reuter, *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*, ed. Janet Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), 3-18.

Reuter, Timothy, '*Pastorale pedum ante pedes apostolici posuit*: Dis- and Reinvestiture in the Investiture Contest', in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford, 2001), 197-210.

Reuter, Timothy, 'Property Transactions and Social Relations between Rulers, Bishops and Nobles in Early Eleventh-Century Saxony: The Evidence of the *Vita Meinwerci*', in *Property and Power*, ed. Davies and Fouracre, 165-99.

Reynolds, Susan, 'Secular Power and Authority in the Middle Ages', in *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies*, ed. Huw Pryce and John Watts (Oxford, 2007), 11-22.

Robertson, Nicola, 'Dunstan and Monastic Reform: Tenth-Century Fact or Twelfth-Century Fiction?', in *ANS* 28 (2006), 153-67.

Roffe, David, 'The *Historia Croylandensis*: A Plea for Reassessment', in *EHR* 110 (1995), 93-108.

Roling, Bernd, 'Der Historiker als Apologet der Weltverachtung. Die ‚Historia Anglorum' des Heinrich von Huntingdon', in *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 33 (1999), 125-68.

Rollason, David, *The Mildrith Legend: A Study in Early Medieval Hagiography in England* (Leicester, 1982).

Rollason, David, *Saints and Relics in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 1989).

Rosenwein, Barbara, *Negotiating Space: Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Manchester, 1999).

Rubenstein, Jay, 'The Life and Writings of Osbern of Canterbury', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 27-40.

Rumble, Alexander, 'The Purpose of the *Codex Wintoniensis*', in *ANS* 4 (1982), 153-66.

Runciman, W.G., 'Accelerating Social Mobility: The Case of Anglo-Saxon England', in *Past and Present* 104 (1984), 3-30.

Ruud, Marylou, 'Monks in the World: the Case of Gundulf of Rochester', in *ANS* 11 (1989), 245-60.

The SAGE Handbook of Power, ed. Stewart Clegg and Mark Haugaard (London, 2009).

Saltman, Avrom, *Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury* (London, 1956).

Sawyer, Peter, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1998).

Sayers, Jane, '"Original", Cartulary and Chronicle: The Case of the Abbey of Evesham', in *Fälschungen*, ed. Fuhrmann *et al.*, vol. 4, 371-95.

Schütte, Bernd, 'Bischofserhebungen im Spiegel von Bischofsviten und Bistumsgesten der Ottonen- und Salierzeit', in *Die Früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung*, ed. Erkens, 139-91.

Senecal, Christine, 'Bishops as Contenders for Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Bishopric of East Anglia and the Regional Aristocracy', in *Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power: Western Europe in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, Henk Teunis and Andrew Wareham (Turnhout, 1999), 89-106.

Sharpe, Richard, '1088 – William II and the Rebels', in *ANS* 26 (2004), 139-57.

Sharpe, Richard, 'The Date of St Mildreth's Translation from Minster-in-Thanet to Canterbury', in *Mediaeval Studies* 53 (1991), 349-54.

Sharpe, Richard, 'Goscelin's St Augustine and St Mildreth: Hagiography and Liturgy in Context', in *Journal of Theological Studies* new ser. 41 (1990), 502-16.

Sharpe, Richard, 'The Setting of St Augustine's Translation, 1091', in *Canterbury and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Eales and Sharpe, 1-14.

Smith, R.A.L., 'John of Tours, Bishop of Bath 1088–1122', in *Downside Review* 70 (1942), 132–41.

Soria, Myriam, 'Les évêques assassinés dans le royaume de France (XIe-XIIe siècles)', in *Bischofsmord im Mittelalter*, ed. Fryde and Reitz, 97-120.

Southern, Richard, 'Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 4. The Sense of the Past', in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (1973), 243-63.

Southern, Richard, 'Ranulf Flambard', in Richard Southern, *Medieval Humanism and Other Studies* (Oxford, 1970), 183-205.

Southern, Richard, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1992).

Southern, Richard, *Saint Anselm and His Biographer: A Study of Monastic Life and Thought, 1059-c. 1130* (Cambridge, 1963).

Southern, Richard, 'Sally Vaughn's Anselm: An Examination of the Foundations' in *Albion* 20 (1988), 181-204.

St Augustine and the Conversion of England, ed. Richard Gameson (Stroud, 1999).

St Wulfstan and His World, ed. Julia Barrow and N.P. Brooks (Aldershot, 2005).

Stafford, Pauline, 'Archbishop Ealdred and the D Chronicle', in *Normandy and Its Neighbours, 900-1250: Essays for David Bates*, ed. David Crouch and Kathleen Thompson (Turnhout, 2011), 135-56.

Stafford, Pauline, 'Royal Women and Transitions: Emma and Ælfgifu in 1035-1042/1043', in *Patterns of Episcopal Power*, ed. Körntgen and Wassenhoven, 127-44.

Stanton, Robert, 'National Martyrs and Willing Heroes: Piety and Patriotism in Two English Saints' Lives', in *The Propagation of Power in the Medieval West: Selected Proceedings of the International Conference, Groningen 20-23 November 1996*, ed. Martin Gosman, Arjo Vanderjagt and Jan Veenstra (Groningen, 1997), 191-204.

Staunton, Michael, 'Trial and Inspiration in the Lives of Anselm and Thomas Becket', in *Anselm, Aosta, Bec and Canterbury: Papers in Commemoration of the Nine Hundredth Anniversary of Anselm's Enthronement as Archbishop, 25 September 1093*, ed. Gillian Evans and David Luscombe (Sheffield, 1996), 310-32.

Stenton, Frank, *The First Century of English Feudalism, 1066-1166* (2nd edn.: Oxford, 1961).

Stenton, Frank, 'St Benet of Holme and the Norman Conquest', in *EHR* 37 (1922), 225-35.

Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke, ed. R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin and R.W. Southern (Oxford, 1948).

Sykes, Katharine, 'Sanctity as a Form of Capital', in *Studies in Church History 47: Saints and Sanctity*, ed. Peter Clarke and Tony Claydon (Woodbridge, 2011), 112-24.

Tatton-Brown, Tim, 'The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the Eleventh Century', in *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition, 950-1200*, ed. John Blair (Oxford, 1988), 105-18.

Taylor, Pamela, 'The Endowment and Military Obligations of the See of London: A Reassessment of Three Sources', in *ANS* 14 (1992), 287-312.

Thacker, Alan, 'In Gregory's Shadow? The Pre-Conquest Cult of St Augustine', in *St Augustine and the Conversion*, ed. Gameson, 374-90.

Thomas, Hugh M., *The English and the Normans: Ethnic Hostility, Assimilation, and Identity, 1066-c. 1220* (Oxford, 2003).

Thomas, Hugh M., 'The Significance and Fate of the Native English Landholders of 1086', in *EHR* 118 (2003), 303-33.

Tinti, Francesca, 'From Episcopal Conception to Monastic Compilation: Hemming's Cartulary in Context', in *Early Medieval Europe* 11 (2002), 233-61.

Tinti, Francesca, '*Si litterali memorie commendaretur*: Memory and Cartularies in Eleventh-Century Worcester', in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen Baxter *et al.* (Farnham, 2009), 475-97.

Tinti, Francesca, *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c. 870 to c. 1100* (Farnham, 2010).

Townsend, David, 'Anglo-Latin Hagiography and the Norman Transition', in *Exemplaria: Journal of Theory in Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 3 (1991), 385-433.

Treharne, Elaine, 'A Unique Old English Formula for Excommunication from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 303', in *Anglo-Saxon England* 24 (1995), 185-211.

Tudor, Victoria, 'The Misogyny of Saint Cuthbert', in *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th ser. 12 (1984), 157-67.

Van Houts, Elisabeth, 'The Flemish Contribution to Biographical Writing in England in the Eleventh Century', in *Writing Medieval Biography, 750-1250: Essays in Honour of Professor Frank Barlow* (Woodbridge, 2006), 111-27.

Van Houts, Elisabeth, 'Historical Writing', in *A Companion to the Anglo-Norman World,* ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Elisabeth van Houts (Woodbridge, 2002), 103-21.

Vaughn, Sally, *The Abbey of Bec and the Anglo-Norman State, 1034-1136* (Woodbridge, 1981).

Vaughn, Sally, *Anselm of Bec and Robert of Meulan: The Innocence of the Dove and the Wisdom of the Serpent* (London, 1987).

Vaughn, Sally, 'Anselm: Saint and Statesman', in *Albion 20* (1988), 205-20.

Vaughn, Sally, 'Eadmer's *Historia novorum*: A Reinterpretation', in *ANS* 10 (1988), 259-89.

Vaughn, Sally, 'Henry I and the English Church: The Archbishops and the King', in *Haskins Society Journal* 17 (2007), 133-57.

Vaughn, Sally, *St Anselm and the Handmaidens of God: A Study of Anselm's Correspondence with Women* (Turnhout, 2002).

The Victoria History of the County of Kent, ed. William Page, 3 vols (London, 1908-32).

The Victoria History of the County of Worcester, ed. J.W. Willis Bund, 4. vols (London, 1901-24).

Vogtherr, Thomas, 'Zwischen Benediktinerabtei und bischöflicher Cathedra. Zu Auswahl und Amtsantritt englischer Bischöfe im 9.-11. Jahrhundert', in *Die früh- und hochmittelalterliche Bischofserhebung*, ed. Erkens, 287-320.

Walker, Ian W., *Harold: The Last Anglo-Saxon King* (Stroud, 1997).

Warren, W.L., *King John* (New edn.: London, 1997).

Weiler, Björn, 'Bishops and Kings in England, *c.* 1066-*c.* 1250', in *Religion and Politics in the Middle Ages: Germany and England by Comparison / Deutschland und England im Vergleich*, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Wassenhoven, forthcoming.

Weiler, Björn, 'William of Malmesbury, Henry I, and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*', in *ANS* 31 (2009), 157-76.

Weiler, Björn, 'William of Malmesbury on Kingship', in *History* 90 (2005), 3-22.

Williams, Ann, 'The Anglo-Norman Abbey' in *The English Heritage Book of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury*, ed. Richard Gem (London, 1997), 50-66.

Williams, Ann, 'The Cunning of the Dove: Wulfstan and the Politics of Accomodation', in *Wulfstan and His World*, ed. Barrow and Brooks, 27-39.

Williams, Ann, 'The Dangers of Invention: The Sack of Canterbury, 1011, and the "Theft" of Dunstan's Relics', in *Cathedrals, Communities and Conflict*, ed. Dalton, Insley and Wilkinson, 27-39.

Williams, Ann, *The English and the Norman Conquest* (Woodbridge, 1995).

Williams, Ann, 'The Spoliation of Worcester', in *ANS* 19 (1997), 383-408.

Wilson, Susan, *The Life and After-Life of St John of Beverley: The Evolution of the Cult of an Anglo-Saxon Saint* (Aldershot, 2006).

Wollaston, Deirdre, 'Herbert de Losinga', in *Norwich Cathedral*, ed. Atherton *et al.*, 22-35.

Wormald, Patrick, 'Lordship and Justice in the Early English Kingdom: Oswaldslow Revisited', in *Property and Power*, ed. Davies and Fouracre, 114-36.

Wünsch, Thomas, 'Der heilige Bischof – Zur politischen Dimension von Heiligkeit im Mittelalter und ihrem Wandel', in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82 (2000), 261-302.

Younge, George Ruder, '"Those were good days": Representations of the Anglo-Saxon Past in the Old English Homily on Saint Neot', in *Review of English Studies* 63 (2012), 349-69.