The Letters of Master David of London: A New Edition and Study

Volume I: The Thesis

Catherine Elizabeth Healy

Thesis submitted in the School of History at the University of East Anglia in partial fulfilment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 2022

Abstract

This thesis provides a new edition and translation of the letter collection of Master David of London, with an accompanying study. It seeks to provide a new overview of David's career, as well as to situate his letter collection in its twelfth-century context.

Part one begins with a palaeographical and codicological study of the only surviving manuscript copy of the collection, including an analysis of the manuscript in its entirety and the other works contained within. It also offers an in-depth examination of the section containing David's collection.

Part two (chapters two and three) provides a new narrative account of David's life and career, based on this new edition of the collection, seeking to correct previous misreadings of the letters and to provide a fuller account of the later years of David's career. This section also aims to explore the historical context to letters in the collection that have no clear connection to David.

Part three (chapters four and five) seek to place David's collection in context amongst other twelfth-century letter collections. It does so firstly through direct comparisons between this collection and others. Secondly, the individual letters themselves are considered in more detail, with David's skills as a letter-writer and his adherence to the *ars dictaminis* particular subjects for scrutiny.

This thesis shows that David's letter collection was not a register, but rather a collection likely compiled by David himself, designed to provide a narrative of his career and reform his reputation in the aftermath of his dispute with his former patron, Bishop Gilbert Foliot of London.

Word count: 99, 384.

Contents

Acknowledgements

Writing this thesis has been a long and, at points, not very enjoyable journey, but there are many people who have helped and supported me along the way. First and foremost, thank you to my supervisor, Professor Nicholas Vincent. Nick has been a constant source of help, both academic and personal, and has supported me in all my many endeavours alongside the PhD. It was Nick who first introduced me to David and his Latin (and for that I am still deciding if I should thank him), but Nick was also, along with Dr Julie Barrau, the first person to tell me that I was capable of doing a PhD. I would never have imagined applying without their support and encouragement.

Thanks also go to my secondary supervisor Professor Tom Licence for his support throughout my MA, BA, and now the PhD. I started this PhD sceptical that I would ever be able to make sense of David's Latin; that it has been possible is thanks to Dr Stephen O'Connor, and to Dr Tom Rutledge and Dr John-Mark Philo for their guidance throughout the CHASE Latin course. Some very kind scholars have also offered advice along the way, including Professor Anne Duggan, Dr Julie Barrau, Dr Ian Wei, and Professor Teresa Webber.

The research required for this thesis was made possible by generous funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), through a Doctoral Training Partnership scholarship from the Consortium of Humanities and the Arts South East-England (CHASE). Thanks must go to everyone at CHASE, not only for funding this thesis but also for allowing me to take advantage of other developmental opportunities. I also owe a great deal of thanks to everyone at The Brilliant Club for their support throughout the PhD but especially in the final stages, in particular Dr Andrew Fleming, Phoebe Rudgard, Harriet Joseph, and David Jones.

I also want to thank all the friends who have supported me along the way. Firstly, (soon to be Drs) Ed Woodhouse and Sam Holmes, I am very glad we have had one another for support for the past ten and five years respectively. Dr Dan Booker has also been unceasingly patient in helping me get to grips with exchequer records. Thanks also to my very kind proof-readers, Dr Ben Tosland, Ruby Shaw, and especially Katy Scales who even willingly read an extra chapter!

Finally, thank you to my family. I am very glad my dad, Kevin, encouraged me to go to university and to UEA despite my initial reluctance. Thank you also to my mum, Sue, my aunt, Marie, my siblings Rachel and Daniel, and also to Jenny, Nuala, Reeva, and Joe. I would not have progressed to post-graduate study without all of your support and certainly would not have survived this PhD. Thanks especially to Marie for putting me up through the worst six months. Jenny will be especially pleased that I am finally finishing 'school'. The biggest thanks of all go to Tom, who has stuck with me throughout the entire PhD and supported me every step of the way. I suspect he is as relieved as I am that this thesis is finally complete.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandma, Kathleen (Cait), who was a strong believer in the importance of education.

Abbreviations

AIP	*Acta Pontificum Romanorum inedita* 3 vols ed. J. Pflugk-Harttung (Tubingen, Stuttgart) 1881-1186)
Bernard Epistolae	*S. Bernardi Opera: Epistolae*, 2 vols ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais (Rome, 1974, 1977). Though a more recent publication features some of these editions along with French translations, as not all of the letters were reprinted I have chosen to refer to these earlier editions.
EEA	*English Episcopal Acta*
EHR	*English Historical Review*
GFL	*The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot, Abbot of Gloucester (1139-48), Bishop of Hereford (1148-63), and London (1163-87),* ed. A. Morey and C.N.L. Brooke (Cambridge 1967)
Heads	*The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, I. 940-1216,* ed. D. Knowles, C. N. L. Brooke, and V. London, 2nd ed. (Cambridge 2001)
J-L	*Regesta pontificum romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum datum MCXCVIII*, 2 vols, ed. P. Jaffé, S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, P. Ewald, and W. Wattenbach (Leipzig 1885-88)
LCA	*The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux* trans. C. Poling Schriber (New York 1997)
LCH	*The Letters and Charters of Henry II King of England 1154-1189*, ed. N. Vincent and others, 7 vols (Oxford 2020-2)
LDL	*Letters of David of London*, edited and translated in Appendix One of this thesis
Letters Arnulf	*The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux* ed. F. Barlow (London 1939)

LSB	Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux* trans. B. Scott James (Spencer MA 1953)
LJS	John of Salisbury, *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, 2 vols ed W. J. Millor, H.E. Butler, and C.N.L. Brooke (London and Oxford 1955-79)
MTB	*Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 7 vols ed. J.C. Robertson and J.B. Sheppard (London 1875-85)
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* [www.oxforddnb.com]
PL	*Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina*, 217 vols ed. J.P. Migne
PR	*Pipe Roll*, as published by the Pipe Roll Society and cited by regnal year.
PUE	*Papsturkunden in England*, 3 vols ed. W. Holtzmann (Berlin 1930-52)
St Paul	*Early Charters of the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London* ed. M. Gibbs (Camden 3rd series, London 1939)
WA Charters	*Westminster Abbey Charters 1066-c.1214*, ed. E. Mason, J. Bray, and D. J. Murphy (London 1988)

Introduction

Master David of London

Master David of London was a canon of St Paul's, London, a student of the schools of Paris and Bologna, a teacher, letter-writer, and advocate. He was the correspondent of popes, cardinals, and bishops. David was active in the mid to late-twelfth century, but would have left little trace of his life or activities were it not for the collection of his letters that survives in one manuscript copy within the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, (Vatican Latina 6024, henceforth V). This collection contains a number of missives written by David, some written to him or about him, and a number of miscellaneous letters which bear no clear connection to him, but which relate to events of the period. Whilst a small number of the letters have been printed in modern editions, the majority have only been edited once, and poorly (some might say abominably), by Francesco Liverani in 1863. In 1927, Zachary Brooke published a brief study of the collection, entitled 'The Register of Master David of London and the Part He Played in the Becket Crisis'.[1] This remains the only work of scholarship focused on David and his letter collection. Beyond this, only a few footnotes or passing mentions have been devoted to David in scholarship focused on other individuals or events of the time. David's role as envoy and advocate for the bishop of London, Gilbert Foliot (d.1187), has been noted,[2] as has his relationships with Bishops Arnulf of Lisieux (d.1184)[3] and Roger of Worcester (d.1179),[4] or his place in the chapter of St Paul's.[5] Certainly, David's career in the church did not reach any great height, and he never received an episcopate or archdeaconry, unlike various of his peers. Yet, his career in the service of some of the most influential bishops of twelfth-century England, and his letter collection shedding further light on this career, both deserve further study.

[1] Z. N. Brooke, 'The Register of Master David of London and the Part He Played in the Becket Crisis', *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole* ed. H. W. C. Davis (Oxford 1927).
[2] See for instance. A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and His Letters* (Cambridge 1965), 62, 102.
[3] See for instance. *LCA*, 196.
[4] M. Cheney, *Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179* (Oxford 1980), esp. 106, 207-8.
[5] See for instance. C.N.L. Brooke, 'The Earliest Times to 1485', *A History of St Paul's Cathedral and the Men Associated With It*, ed. W. R. Matthews and W. M. Atkins (London 1957), 35, 71, 73.

David's collection is also a valuable and underappreciated source of information for the period in question, occupying an almost unique position amongst contemporary letter collections. Many of the collections surviving from this period contain the letters of influential men (and the occasional woman), such as bishops or abbots. They were almost always the work of churchmen.[6] Yet David never held high office, so was unconcerned with the administration of a diocese, a matter which preoccupied twelfth-century bishops and often dominated their letters. Nor was he required to grapple with contemporary theological debates, though there are signs that he had an interest in this area. Instead, he was part of the group of middling clergy who, as the twelfth century wore on, were likely to have received their educations abroad, returning thereafter to England in search of favour, benefices, and promotion. For these men, employment sometimes came in the form of letter-writing or advocacy on behalf of their patrons. David certainly acted as an advocate, and it is very possible that he was also responsible for drafting correspondence in his patrons' names, given the lengths he went to within his own letters to display his Latin prowess. What makes David virtually unique amongst this group of men, however, is that we have remaining not one or two stray letters providing a glimpse into his life, but a full collection offering a group of letters that he wrote himself, along with many more that pertain to his career. If Peter of Blois (d.1212), a fellow canon of St Paul's, student of the schools, and paid letter-writer, stands out because of or perhaps despite his middling status among the clergy, then so too must David. Peter's life and letters have been the subject of many works of scholarship. But though we have fewer letters written by David, his collection deserves equal study.[7] Peter's collection says much of the epistolary training and anxieties of a middling cleric, yet the letters within were also heavily edited and many are either literary inventions or semi-fictitious, designed to display Peter's epistolary prowess.[8] David's letters were also subject to editing, but none it seems is

[6] A key exception to this are royal collections, such as that of Louis VII of France. For this see G. Teske, *Die Briefsammlungen des 12. Jahrhunderts in St. Viktor/ Paris: Entstehung, Überlieferung und Bedeutung für die Geschichte de Abtei* (Bonn 1993).
[7] For Peter see R. Southern, 'Blois, Peter of (1125 X 30-1212)', *ODNB*.
[8] Peter 'significantly' changed the content of his collection at least once during his lifetime, along with three or four smaller changes, and he changed the text of some individual letters. For this, see J. Cotts, *The Clerical Dilemma: Peter of Blois and Literature Culture in the Twelfth Century* (Washington DC 2009), 55 and L. Wahlgren-Smith, *The Letter Collections of Peter of Blois: Studies in the Manuscript Tradition* (Gothenburg 1993). For amendments to individual letters see instance. L. Wahlgren-Smith, 'Peter of Blois and the Later Career of Reginald fitzJocelin', *EHR* 111 (1996).

fictitious. Rather, they may have been preserved despite rather than because of the information they contained, which the compiler of the collection has sometimes attempted to obscure.

The carefully constructed letter collections of influential figures like bishops and abbots may have skewed our views on what letter collections of this time were like, and why they were compiled. What will become clear throughout this thesis is that less important individuals were just as keen to keep a written record of their activities. Though we do not have every letter that David sent or received, his letter collection provides a greater insight into the types of letters and documents that he deemed important, and chose to preserve.

Letters and Letter-Collections

It is important to begin by defining what is meant in this thesis by the terms 'letter' and 'letter collection'. Providing a definition for the former is, perhaps surprisingly, more difficult than the latter. This is both because scholars do not agree on a universal definition and also because 'letters' could take many forms in the Middle Ages. Letters could be written by one individual or more, and could be sent to one person or more. They could be brief missives, lengthy treatises, or - according to some definitions - administrative or legal documents. Therefore, there are questions over what constituted a letter. Should a missive that was never actually sent be called a letter? What about the draft version of a letter later sent in a different form? What if the written letter contained no actual information and simply accompanied an oral message? These are all questions that epistolary scholars must grapple with. But in some respects this is a pointless task for it is often impossible to determine what form of letter survives today, i.e. draft or rewritten semi-fictitious. In their essence, medieval letters were a form of communication which conveyed information, be it news or simply flowery sentiments. In many cases the letter-writer did not undertake the act of actual writing themselves, but would dictate to a scribe who produced the letter on their behalf. It was then conveyed to its intended recipient or destination by a trusted messenger, or simply a traveller going in the right direction, before being passed to its recipient/s and most likely being read aloud. Although the boundary was not always clear, letters were distinct from charters, which recorded legal transactions and had their own strict rules and frameworks of composition.

Defining a letter collection is rather an easier task. To borrow from Walter Ysebaert: 'A "letter collection" [should] be considered as a consciously composed collection of letters, for which the author(s) had a specific goal in mind.'[9] This goal could have been as simple as a desire to preserve a well-written letter, a collection of relevant decretals, or the record of one's own career.

The majority of twelfth-century letters do not survive in their original form, and some survive only as stray letters copied amongst other texts.[10] Most letters survive in collections preserved in just one or two manuscript copies. William Stubbs believed that medieval letter collections are:

> 'at first sight... disappointing', for they often do not convey the political and historical information that a political or constitutional historian would desire from their sources. Instead, they are filled with 'sentiment' and 'religious generalities'[11]

But this view is no longer a popular one amongst scholars and these 'sentiments' and 'generalities' can provide considerable insight into the concerns and anxieties of the letter-writer in a way that few other sources of this period can.

There are a number of well-known letter collections from the 'long twelfth century' (*c*.1050-*c*.1215). From England and Northern France from the very end of the eleventh century there is the letter-collection of Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury (d.1089). There are also the collections of Anselm, Lanfranc's successor as archbishop of Canterbury (d.1109); Herbert Losinga, bishop of Norwich (d.1119); Osbert of Clare, prior of Westminster Abbey (d. *c*.1158); John of Salisbury's (Becket's ally and later bishop of Chartres, d.1180), author of two distinct letter-collections; the two collections of Gilbert Foliot; Arnulf of Liseux's collection (d.1184); Herbert of Bosham's (Becket's advisor, d. *c*.1194); Alan of Tewkesbury (compiler of a Becket collection, d.1202), and the many collections of Peter of Blois. There are also the various Becket collections, compiled from the letters of a great

[9] W. Ysebaert, 'Medieval Letters and Letter Collections as Historical Sources: Methodological Questions, Reflections, and Research Perspectives (Sixth-Fifteenth Centuries)', *Medieval Letters- Between Fiction and Document*, ed. C. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout 2015), 34.
[10] Some chroniclers did use whole or parts of letters in their works but these were often shortened to preserve only the information necessary to the narrative.
[11] W. Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects* vi (Oxford 1887), 146.

number of individuals that were produced during and after the Becket dispute, the tumultuous falling out between Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury (d.1170), and King Henry II of England (d.1189). There are also the *Epistolae Cantuarienses*, compiled in a single manuscript by the monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, detailing their disputes with successive archbishops of Canterbury. To these, we can add, merely to cite the better known, the continental collections of Ivo bishop of Chartres (d.1115); Hildebert of Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans and archbishop of Tours (d.1133); Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux (d.1153); Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny (d.1156); Nicholas of Clairvaux, Bernard's secretary (d. *c*.1160); Peter, abbot of Celle and Saint-Rémy (d.1183); Stephen of Tournai, canonist and bishop of Tournai (d.1203); and Transmundus, papal notary and monk of Clairvaux (d. *post* 1216). There are also a number of collections from imperial lands, such as those of Wibald, abbot of Stavelot (d.1158); Abbess Hildegard of Bingen (d.1179); and Peter de Vinea (d.1249), secretary to the Emperor Frederick II. To these larger collections can be added an unknown but certainly vast number of other collections that are less studied. In many instances, the anonymous nature of these collections has meant they are rarely consulted. Some are very small, consisting of just a few letters which are not conducive to a larger study. Yet others are compiled from model letters, with identifying details omitted, the letters preserved as formulae for letter-writers.

Some of the collections listed above have received proper attention from historians. We are particularly indebted to early modern scholars. Were it not for one seventeenth-century editor, for example, the letter collection of Peter of Celle would not be extant today,[12] and the letters of Herbert Losinga survive only in a copy made by the Bollandists at around the same time.[13] Fortunately the nineteenth century witnessed a revived interest in these collections. In England, scholars such as William Stubbs (d.1901) or particularly John Allen Giles (d.1884) produced editions of numerous collections, including the Becket letters and the letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, John of Salisbury, Peter of Blois, and Gilbert Foliot.[14] In response to the desires of the state and institutions of governance to

[12] See *The Letters of Peter of Celle*, ed. J. Haseldine (Oxford 2001), xxxxiv.
[13] Brussels, Royal Library, MS 3723 (7965-73).
[14] Giles edited a huge number of medieval sources, a list of some of which can be found at [http://onlinebooks.library.upenn.edu/webbin/book/lookupname?key=Giles%2C%20J%2E%20A%2E%20%28John%20Allen%29%2C%201808%2D1884, accessed 06/03/2020]. See also N. Vincent, 'John Allen Giles and

explore the history of the nation, the period witnessed a search 'for accessible modern editions of medieval letters and chronicles', and as a result Giles' editions, amongst others, were produced in haste with manifold transcription errors.[15] Scholars of the nineteenth century viewed letters as depositories of historical information, which provided 'raw material' and 'unmediated information' from which they could construct their ideas about the past.[16] As a result, these collections were not studied as a genre and the original order and design of the letters was usually disturbed.[17]

Letters and collections began to be studied as a genre of source in the latter half of the twentieth century. The key scholarship on collections of this period remains Giles Constable's *Letters and Letter-Collections* (1976). Constable began his work by stating that 'The serious study of letters and letter-collections as a type of historical source is one of the least developed branches of medieval historiography'.[18] Whilst the field has advanced significantly since 1976, in some respects Constable is still correct and letter collections are still studied primarily for the historical worth, with their nature and genre merely secondary considerations.

More recently, many of the collections listed above have been re-edited with an aim to correcting transcription mistakes and earlier editorial practices which disturbed the original order. Such 'new' editions of twelfth-century collections include the letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, Ivo of Chartres, John of Salisbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter of Celle, Nicholas of Clairvaux, Anselm, Lanfranc, Hildegard of Bingen, and the Becket correspondence.[19] Editors here have taken great care to trace the

---

Herbert of Bosham: The Criminous Clerk as Editor', *Herbert of Bosham: A Medieval Polymath*, ed. M. Staunton (Woodbridge 2019), 133-135.

[15] Vincent, 'Giles', 135.

[16] 'Introduction' to *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, ed. C. Sogno, B. K. Storin, and E. J. Watts (Oakland, California 2006), 1.

[17] For example, James Craigie Robertson criticised Giles for arranging the Becket letters by author, yet Robertson arranged them chronologically, thus not itself reflecting the order of the letters in the manuscripts. See Vincent, 'Giles', 150. For a discussion of the issues of rearranging collections in such a way see R. Gibson, 'Letters into Auto-Biography: The Generic Mobility of the Ancient Letter Collection', *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature*, ed. T. Papanghelis, S. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (Berlin 2012).

[18] G. Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 17)* (Turnhout 1976), 7.

[19] *Letters Arnulf* and *LCA*; *Yves de Chartres: Correspondence*, ed. J. Leclercq (Paris 1949); *LJS*, i and ii*; The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson (Oxford 1979); *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen* i, trans. J. L. Baird and R. K. Erhman (Oxford 1994); *CTB*, i and ii; *Letters of Peter of Celle*, ed. Haseldine; *The Letter Collections of Nicholas of Clairvaux*, ed. L. Walhgren-Smith (Oxford 2018), *Letters of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury* i, ed. S. Niskanen (Oxford 2019).

manuscript traditions of these collections and to determine their archetypes where possible. Where collections survive in multiple manuscripts this problem has sometimes been tackled through scholarly works focussed solely on the manuscript traditions, such as Anne Duggan's work on the manuscripts of the Becket correspondence or Samu Niskanen's work on the manuscripts containing the letter collections of Anselm of Canterbury.[20]

The publication of these editions has enabled the production of a new body of scholarship which has more closely examined these letters as literary sources and has considered the letter collection genre from a range of new angles. There is now a wealth of existing scholarship, spearheaded by Martin Camargo, on the *ars dictaminis*: the theoretical framework taught in the schools which underpinned letter writing in the Middle Ages. There is also scholarship on the rhetorical tradition of the classical world which directly fed into the *ars*. This field has included studies focussed on the model letter collections produced by *dictatores* at various schools around Europe as well as the *dictaminal* treatises that accompanied them and laid out the rules for letter writing.[21]

There has also been new scholarship, such as that by the Byzantinist Margaret Mullet, which examines the networks of letter-writers and how these were built and strengthened through their correspondence.[22] Network scholars have also considered the place of *amicitia* (friendship) or *caritas* (Christian love) in letters. Scholars such as Julian Haseldine have analysed how letter-writers chose to conform to the expected rules of friendship or distort them to fit their needs.[23] There are also studies

[20] A. Duggan, *Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters* (Oxford 1980); S. Niskanen, *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury* (Turnhout 2011).
[21] See for instance various works by M. Camargo including 'The *Libellus de arte dictandi rhetorice* Attributed to Peter of Blois', *Speculum* 59 (January 1984); idem, *Ars Dictaminis, Ars Dictandi (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 60)* (Turnhout 1991); idem, 'A Twelfth-Century Treatise on '*Dictamen*' and Metaphor', *Traditio* 47 (1992); idem, *Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition: Five English* Artes Dictandi *and Their Tradition*. See also various essays in *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: Essays in Honour of John O. Ward*, ed. C. J. Mews, C. J. Nederman, and R. M. Thomson (Turnhout 2003); J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley and LA 1974).
[22] See for instance: M. Mullet, 'The Detection of Relationship in Middle Byzantine Literary Texts: The Case of Letters and Letter-Networks', *L'epistolographie et la poésie épigrammatique: projects actuels et questions de méthodologie*, (Paris 2003); M. Grünbert,' "Tis love that has warm'd us." Reconstructing Networks in 12th Century Byzantium', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 83 (2005); M. Richardson, 'The *Ars dictaminis*, the Formularly, and Medieval Epistolary Practice', *Letter-Writing Manuals and Instruction from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. C. Poster and L. C. Mitchell (Columbia 2007).
[23] See for instance: J. Haseldine, 'Understanding the Language of *amicitia*. The Friendship Circle of Peter of Celle (c.1115-1183)', *Journal of Medieval History*, 20 (1994); idem, 'Friendship, Intimacy and Corporate

based on how the social hierarchy of the period is displayed and respected through letter-writing.[24] Aside from these studies we also have works discussing the practicalities of letters and letter collections, though this field is somewhat held back by the lack of a large corpus of extant individual letters. Scholars have considered the writing of letters and their transmission and reception and their role in the literature and culture of the period.[25]

We now have access to many more editions and translations of twelfth-century letter collections than was the case fifty years ago, but the collections that have been re-edited are predominantly the larger collections of influential churchmen. This thesis seeks to provide a new edition of a collection from outside this group: a collection that has previously frustrated scholars due to its overly flowery and anonymised letters. The accompanying study will provide the first in-depth and extended study of this collection, seeking to look beyond the historical information it supplies, to probe the motivations behind its compilation.

Previous Editions

In 1772, the earliest printed edition of letters drawn from David's collection was published by Sarti and Fattorini in their work on the University of Bologna. David's letters were printed in a section

Networking in the Twelfth Century: The Politics of Friendship in the Letters of Peter the Venerable', *EHR* 126 (2011); J. McLoughlin, '*Amicitia* in practice: John of Salisbury (*circa* 1120-1180) and his Circle', *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge 1990). For further studies concerning *amicitia* in letters, see also J. Haseldine, 'Friendship and Rivalry: The Role of Amicitia in Twelfth-Century Monastic Relations', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 20 (1994); idem, 'Love, Separation and Male Friendship: Words and Actions in Saint Anselm's Letters to his Friends', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe*, ed. D. M. Hadley (Harlow 1999); idem 'Thomas Becket: Martyr, Saint- and Friend?', *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting*, ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford 2001); idem 'Friends, Friendship and Networks in the Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses*, 57 (2006); idem, 'Friends or *amici*? *Amicitia* and monastic letter-writing in the twelfth century', *Varieties of Friendship: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Social Relationships*, ed. B. Descharmes, E. Heuser, C. Krüger, T. Loy (Göttingen 2011); Y. Hirata, 'John of Salisbury, Gerard Pucelle and *Amicitia*', *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Haseldine (Stroud 1999); W. Ysebaert, 'Ami, client et intermédiare: Étienne de Tournai et ses réseaux de relations (1167-1192)', *Sacris Erudiri*, 40 (2001); idem, 'Medieval Letter-Collections as a Mirror of Circles of Friendship? The Example of Stephen of Tournai, 1128-1203', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 83 (2005); B. P. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (New edn, Ithaca 2010).

[24] For instance see G. Constable, 'The Structure of Medieval Society According to the *Dictatores* of the Twelfth Century', *Law, Church, and Society: Essays in Honour of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. K. Pennington and R. Somerville (University of Pennysylvania 1977).

[25] See for instance. M. T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (3rd edn. Chichester 2013); Constable, *Letters*.

dedicated to teachers of canon law.[26] The letters printed there were those written by the Pope concerning provision for David in England (Letters 71-4, 82, 87), and the editors refer to him as a canon of Lincoln, evidently in response to Pope Alexander III's (d.1181) attempt to secure a canonry for him there. In 1784, Ludovici-Vittorio Savioli reprinted two of these letters (71 and 87) in his *Annali Bolognesi*. He called David 'magister scholaris Bononie' and printed the letters for this link to Bologna.[27] He also called David a canon of Lincoln, and dated both letters to 1163. This dating, alongside shared mistakes in transcription, shows that Savioli took his text from Sarti and Fattorini's edition, although neither of these editions were noticed by Brooke.[28] In 1853, in his (heavily plagiarized) edition of the letters of Pope Alexander III for the *Patrologia Latina*, J. P. Migne republished one of the papal letters from David's collection, taking his text from Savioli.[29] Other early editions of various of the letters were derived not from David's manuscript, now in the Vatican, but from copies elsewhere of letters for which David's copies remained as yet unknown.[30]

All of this changed when, in 1863, Francesco Liverani published 105 items from the Vatican manuscript, including 78 of the 90 letters directly from David's collection.[31] His *Spicilegium Liberianum* contains the letters of an array of different authors, along with numerous treatises taken from the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Born in Castelbolognese on 22 February 1823, Liverani entered the local seminary in 1834 and was enrolled in the *Accademia dei nobili ecclesiastici* in Rome, before gaining a degree in jurisprudence in 1846. Hard work in Rome recommended him to various cardinals and his future must have looked bright when in 1846 his then friend and ally, Cardinal Mastai-Feretti, was elected Pope Pius IX. In reality, Liverani's career took a down-turn as envy from his peers blocked any great promotion, although he became a priest in 1851, receiving a

[26] *De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus, A saeculo XI usque ad saeculum XIV* i, ed. M. Sarti and M. Fattorini (Bologna 1772), 113-5: the section is entitled 'Monumenta spectantia ad professores iuris canonici'.
[27] *Annali Bolognesi* i, ed. L. Savioli (Bassano 1784), the letters are printed at 268-9 and this label for David is in the index at 306.
[28] Brooke, 'Register', 227, who believed 'Liverani was the first to make use of it [the collection]'.
[29] *LDL*, no.71, printed *PL* cc, no.800 col.737-8.
[30] For instance J. A. Giles, who printed the letters also found in the manuscripts of Gilbert Foliot's collection in his *Gilberti ex Abbate Glocestriae Episcopi Primum Herefordiensis Deinde Londoniensis Epistolae* 2 vols, (London 1845).
[31] *Spicilegium Liberianum*, ed. F. Liverani (Florence 1863), who printed nos. 1-28, 31-32, 34-39, 41-43, 46-50, 52-59, 61-68, 70, 72-82, 84-90.

canonry of S. Maria Maggiore in 1853 and promotion as protonotary.[32] His troubles were exacerbated by his 'undiplomatic' nature.[33] Liverani was accused of plagiarism by his colleagues, and even his former ally, Pius IX, became critical of his work. He was also criticized for his dealings with Conte Aurelio Saffi, a crystal dealer. In January 1861 Liverani left Rome and moved to Florence, where, two years later, he published the *Spicilegium.*[34] The intention seems to have been to reingratiate himself with the Holy College, even though by this time his dallying with the allies of Italian reunifacation had rendered him entirely *persona non grata* in Rome. His other works include *Il Papato, l'Impero e il Regno d'Italia* (1861). *Il Papato* was received badly, treated as a 'libello scandalistico', and as a result Liverani lost his canonry and was both banned from wearing the habit and denied communion.[35] Despite stating that he was not an enemy of the papacy, Liverani had used *Il Papato* to attack Cardinal Giacomo Antonelli.[36] Antonelli, Cardinal Secretary of State from 1848 until his death, and finance minister before that, was an avid proponent of papal authority and an opponent of Italian nationalism. Antonelli held great sway over Pius IX, whom he encouraged to disavow the cause of reunification and instead to ally with France and Austria. Whilst Antonelli had his own enemies amongst the cardinals and in Rome who accused him of nepotism, the Pope did not listen to these critics and Antonelli stayed in place until 1870.[37]

In 1882, Liverani published *La dottrina cattolica e la rivoluzione italica,* which defended Carlo Passaglia, whose *Epistola Catholicos pro causa Italia* had embraced the nationalist cause of Italian unification and attacked the temporal power of the Pope. Passaglia's work was, of course, ill-received in Rome, and the Pope had ordered Passaglia's arrest. Passaglia escaped Rome in October 1861, and moved to Turin where he devoted himself to the nationalist cause, producing a number of writings including an appeal supported by thousands of priests which asked to the Pope to renounce his

[32] I. Pizzinat, 'Monsignor Francesco Liverani (1823-1894) E Le Sue *Reminiscenze*', *Studi Romagnoli* XXVI, (1975), 249-51.
[33] Ibid., 251: 'Il suo carattere niente affatto diplomatico accrebbe l'ostilità nei suoi confronti, redendogli sempre più insopportabile quell'ambiente.'
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid., 252.
[36] F. Liverani, *Il Papato, l'Impere e il Regno d'Italia* (Florence 1861), 28.
[37] R. Aubert, 'ANTONELLI, Giacomo', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 2 (1961) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giacomo-antonelli_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, accessed 13/04/2021].

temporal power. He was suspended from the priesthood and the celebration of divine service as a result.[38]

As a result, in 1863, at the time of publication of the *Spicilegium*, Liverani found himself defrocked, disinherited, and chased from Rome. It is little wonder, therefore, that he dedicated his *Spicilegium*, with its collection of David's letters, to King Victorio Emmanueli II, who 'with laws and arms restored Rome from decay with the permission and agreement of the people' (*legibus armis libertate populorum foedere Romanam ab interitu restituit*).[39] Liverani did, however, still advertise his ecclesiastical titles in the volume, as 'protonotarius apostolicae Sedis- Canonicus SS. Partiarchalis Basilicae s. Mariae Majoris de Urbe'.[40] His *Spicilegium* is divided into three parts. The first contains various treatises by authors such as Augustine, whilst the second contains the homilies of Hamo, bishop of Halberstadt, and the third various letters. By his own testimony Liverani completed the volume alone, save for what are described as a few 'suggestions' made to him by Cardinal Angelo Mai.[41] Mai himself was a scholar who published editions of various classical texts found in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana in Milan. In 1819 he had become first custodian of the Vatican library (the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) where he remained until 1833. Thereafter, Mai's work on manuscripts continued, and he published hitherto unknown classical texts until his death on 8 September 1854.[42] Crucially, with some assistance, Mai had published ten volumes of edited texts in a work entitled *Spicilegium Romanum*.[43] Liverani's own *Spicilegium* then, was a tribute to the far greater scholar who had inspired and encouraged him.

It is unsurprising that Liverani made numerous transcription mistakes in V. He finished the *Spicilegium* in Florence, 'kept away from the Curia and from that bountiful town [Rome]', and was therefore unable to check his transcriptions against the manuscript.[44] These mistakes range from

[38] L. Malusa, 'PASSAGLIA, Carlo', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 81 (2014) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-passaglia_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, accessed 13/04/2021].
[39] Dedication at the front of *Spicilegium*, ed. Liverani.
[40] See the inner title page of ibid.
[41] Ibid., xiv.
[42] For Mai see A. Carrannante, 'MAI, Angelo', *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 67 (2006) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/angelo-mai_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, accessed 14/04/2021].
[43] Published in Rome 1839-44.
[44] *Spicilegium*, ed. Liverani, xiv.

minor errors ('sepe' in place of 'semper') to the inclusion of incorrect personal and topographical references (such as naming the bishop of Exeter 'Arthurus' rather than 'Bartholomeus'). The sheer volume of these mistakes has been demonstrated in Appendix One, which supplies a new edition of the collection. It is no exaggeration to describe Liverani's mistakes as egregious, super-abundant, and rendering any attempt at translation or syntactical analysis previously difficult or even impossible. What is more, and in ways that by the 1860s were already becoming unfashionable, Liverani deliberately disturbed the original order of the letters, arranging them according to sender, and thus obscuring the collection's codicological coherence.

A small number of the letters have been re-edited since Liverani, though his edition remains the chief authority.[45] In the sixth and seventh volumes of his *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket* (1882 and 1885) James Craigie Robertson published twenty-three of the letters in David's collection, possibly consulting V himself, since he corrected various of Liverani's mistakes, though he repeated others and added some of his own.[46] Two letters were printed by Pflugk-Hartting in the second volume of his *Acta Pontificum Romanorum Inedita* (1884),[47] and another letter was printed in the third (1886).[48] This latter, which declared the canonization of Edward the Confessor, was also printed in Armitage Robinson's edition of John Flete's *History of Westminster Abbey* (1909), though taken from another manuscript copy.[49] Zachary Brooke printed a portion of Letter 26 in 1927, aiming to correct Liverani's transcription mistakes.[50] In 1939, Frank Barlow published his edition of Arnulf of Lisieux's letters, in which he included the three letters in David's collection that were written by Arnulf, though he took the text of one of these from an alternative manuscript copy. All have subsequently been translated into English by Carolyn Poling Schriber.[51] Letters 56-69 were also printed by Barlow in his *Edward the Confessor*, where he corrected the majority of Liverani's

[45] For full references to what follows, see the notes to the letters in Appendix One.
[46] Printed in *MTB*, vols 6-7 are nos. 23-4, part of 26, 29-33, 35-41, also 42 but from another manuscript copy, 43-5, 60, 70, 83, and 87. In its edition of no.23, for example, *MTB*, corrects various minor transcription mistakes but repeats the incorrect *salutatio* added by Liverani, explaining 'This is the heading in the MS., and it is copied without suspicion by Mgr. Liverani.' This is not the heading in the MS and there in fact is not one.
[47] *LDL*, nos.50-1.
[48] Ibid., no.69.
[49] John Flete, *The History of Westminster Abbey*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge 1909), 93.
[50] Brooke, 'Register', 240.
[51] *LDL*, nos.17, 19, 43.

mistakes. In their edition of Gilbert Foliot's letters, Adrian Morey and Christopher Brooke printed ten letters which can be attributed to Gilbert or for which they regarded him as a likely candidate as author or recipient.[52] Letter 63 has been printed in the *English Episcopal Acta* volume for Ely, and Letter 88 was printed in the early volume for Worcester. Anne Duggan, in her volumes of *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket*, published Latin editions with English translations of three letters, though one of these from a different manuscript copy.[53] One letter has been published online as part of the *Aposcripta* database of papal letters.[54]

Overall, 33 of the 90 letters in David's collection have been reprinted since 1927, along with part of another letter, and of these only six have previously been translated into English. In two cases, the modern texts were taken from alternative manuscript copies, with variations from that in David's manuscript. We are therefore left with 59 letters for which we no modern edition exists, most of them with full transcriptions by Liverani but rendered virtually unusable by their transcription errors. For no less than 84 of the 90 letters no English translation has previously been made available. In my new edition, printed below as Appendix One, I have corrected Liverani's transcription mistakes. I have also returned the letters to their original order, to recreate the collection as it was intended to be, and in the majority of cases (so far more than 80 of the 90 letters) I have supplied full modern English translations.

Structure and Arguments

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter One will focus on the manuscript (V) in which David's collection survives. This chapter will consider previous scholarship, but where this has mostly focussed on each individual section of the manuscript, I shall instead consider the manuscript in its entirety, noting any similarities or differences between sections and arguing that the separate sections were first joined at an early date, likely at London and very possibly by David himself. This chapter will then discuss David's collection in more detail, including a palaeographical and

[52] Ibid., nos 31-32, 34-36, 39-40, 46-47, 70.
[53] Ibid., nos.37-38, 44 (though from a different MS version).
[54] Ibid., no.50.

codicological analysis. It will describe the groupings of the letters which appear to run along thematic lines. It will be argued that this shows the collection was purposefully compiled and designed to provide a narrative of David's life and career, suggesting that it was indeed compiled by David himself. This chapter also considers the dating of the collection, authorship of the letters, and other manuscript copies of letters where they exist.

Chapter Two will use the letters alongside other evidence to provide a narrative of David's life and career. This includes David's efforts on Gilbert Foliot's behalf throughout the Becket dispute and his turbulent relations with his colleagues at St Paul's. This latter has previously been obscured by Liverani's poor transcriptions and the lack of translations for all but six of the 90 letters. The chapter will also discuss the later stages of David's career, including his falling out with Foliot, who accused him of an unspecified betrayal. Based on evidence from the letters, this chapter will contend that David regretted his role during the Becket dispute. It will also be argued that he possibly died at a later date than previously supposed, based on evidence found within the collection as well as the existence of another manuscript, unknown to Brooke, but containing a pertinent inscription. Throughout this chapter, suggestions will be advanced as to how some of the letters came into David's hands.

Chapter Three will consider two groups of letters in the collection with no clear link to David. The first of these is the dossier of letters relating to the canonization of Edward the Confessor. This dossier, I shall suggest, was preserved as a formulary, intended to showcase a new aspect of the canonization process. I argue that David's interest in this process came about because of his position amongst the canons of St Paul's, the traditional rivals to the Westminster monks. This chapter then discusses a group of three letters which relate to legal disputes. It describes the disputes and suggests that at least two of these letters came into David's hands as a result of Gilbert Foliot's involvement in the cases.

Chapter Four moves away from historical events and instead considers the collection as a source, placing it in its context amongst other twelfth-century collections. This chapter also considers the 'authenticity' of the letters and discusses whether the categorisations of medieval letters and letter

collections that have been previously suggested are useful or pertinent in this case. This chapter also seeks to ascertain the purpose or intent behind the compilation of the collection, ultimately arguing that though there is one overarching narrative to the collection, each individual group of letters within it seems to have been preserved for different purposes.

Chapter Five examines different aspects of the individual letters. First, it discusses David's use, or failure to use, the language of *amicitia* (friendship) and the other language used to address his correspondents. From the small corpus of David's letters available to us this chapter is able to conclude that David followed the same rules of friendship as his peers, and was careful to respect social hierarchy in his letter-writing. Next it will consider David's adherence to the *ars dictaminis*. It will argue that David often dwelled on the *exordium*, the part of a letter designed to secure a reader's good-will, and that this was likely a reflection of his social status. The third part of this chapter will focus on David's emulation of the style of Bernard of Clairvaux. It will show that David regularly quoted or alluded to Bernard of Clairvaux in his letters, suggesting that he aimed to emulate the relationships that Bernard had with his recipients.

Overall, this thesis will argue that David's collection was likely compiled by David himself. David designed it to provide a narrative of his career, intended to counter various unspecified accusations levelled against him by Foliot in the 1170s. It did so through his own letters which disputed the charges, but also through the inclusion of Foliot's letters praising David, alongside letters of recommendation written on his behalf by the Pope and cardinals. The collection ends with three letters written to or about David which praised him and, taken together with the rest of the collection, implied that he had been unfairly wronged by those at London. Overall, this thesis seeks to demonstrate that David was a talented letter-writer, able to follow the rules of the *ars dictaminis* when it suited him and to express himself in complex and flowery Latin. He was knowledgeable in canon law and a talented advocate at the Curia. The collection ultimately highlights the anxieties of a twelfth-century cleric who found himself the subject of accusations that left him without a patron, and in fear of losing his income.

Chapter One: The Letter Collection

David's collection survives in just one manuscript copy which seems to be contemporaneous with his life and career. It is the archetype of the collection, allowing an insight into the practices and motivations behind its compilation. This chapter aims to analyse the collection as a physical object, including a wider analysis of the manuscript as a whole.

The Manuscript

V is a small codex (234 x 158 mm), the contents of which can be divided into eight sections as follows:[55]

1. The Letters of Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans (ff. 1r-29v): 82 items.
2. The Letters of Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux (ff. 30r-71v): 106 items.
3. Correspondence relating to the Becket Dispute (ff. 72r-129v): 210 items.
4. Correspondence relating to Pope Alexander III and London (ff.130r-139v): 68 items.
5. The Letter Collection of Master David of London (ff. 140r-154v): 90 items.
6. Two treatises (*De quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus* and *Contra matrimonium clericorum*) and a letter of Pope Paschal II (d.1118) to King Henry I of England (d.1135), *Legationis tue*, J-L 5868, (ff. 155r-157v): 3 items.
7. The Early Letters of John of Salisbury (ff. 158r-178v): 134 items.
8. The Letters of Ivo, bishop of Chartres (ff. 179r-211v): 84 items.

Folio 1r bears the *ex libris* inscription of Bishop Lelius Ruini of the Italian see of Bagnoregio (province of Viterbo). Ruini was the son of a Bolognese senator, doctor of Law at Bologna, and presbyter of Bologna. In September 1612, he was appointed papal nuncio to the kingdom of Poland, and in October named bishop of Bagnoregio in Lazio. He set out for Krakow in January 1613 and remained there until the expiration of his nunciature in December 1614.[56] He died at Bagnoregio in 1622.[57] Ruini was a 'passionate bibliophile', and in 1622-3 the BAV acquired 23 manuscripts from his collection, including materials in Greek, Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin. V was not listed among

[55] For the sake of brevity I will refer to each section by its number, alongside the first name of the author of the works within, for instance. Section Two (Arnulf).
[56] *Le Istruzioni Generali di Paolo V: Ai Diplomatica Pontifici 1605-1621* i, ed. S. Giordano (Tübingen 2003), 217-8.
[57] *CTB*, i, lxxiv. Though Lohrmann believed he died in 1621, D. Lohrmann, 'Ein Ingenieurtraktat des frühen 15. Jahrhunderts aus der Bibliothek des Lelio Ruini, Bischof von Bagnoregio (1613-21)', *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 80 (2000), 649.

these.[58] It is unclear when the Vatican acquired the manuscript, though it was there by 1636 when it appeared in an inventory completed that year.[59] It may be that the plain format and obscure contents of the manuscript prevented its entry to the BAV from being individually recorded. Whilst it is unclear how these manuscripts came into Ruini's possession, his great-grandfather owned at least one of those that later passed into the BAV, and it is possible that others came to him in the same way.[60]

The manuscript is bound in an early seventeenth-century binding, that bears the arms of Pope Urban VIII.[61] The codex is foliated in Arabic numerals in a later hand, running to 211 folios, though there are three mistakes in the foliation and the codex actually has 212 folios.[62] Each leaf is ruled in lead and laid out in double columns, except for four instances where the leaves are half leaves so the text is written over one column.[63] A number of hands - as many as eighteen - can be detected throughout the manuscript, but the number in each section varies greatly. Sections one (Hildebert) and eight (Ivo) feature one hand each, section two (Arnulf) has at least eight different hands, sections three and four (Becket and Alexander) have together at least five different hands.[64] Sections five (David) and six (Anselm) are written in the same hand, except for fos.153v-154r, and section seven (John) is written in two hands. The script throughout is mainly pre-gothic but features some characteristics of full gothic script.[65] The manuscript is written in book-hand throughout, though there are two separate instances of a documentary (or 'charter') hand.[66] The first is in section two (Arnulf) fos. 67r-68v, and the second is in section five (David) fos. 153v-154r; both of these entries possibly in the same hand.[67]

---

[58] F. D'Aiuto and P. Vian, *Guida Ai Fondi Manoscritti Numismatica A Stampa Della Biblioteca Vaticana (Studi e Testi 466) I: Dipartimento Manoscritti* (Vatican City 2011), 626.
[59] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS sala.cons.Mss.Rosso.36 (1), 309.
[60] Lohrmann, 'Ein Ingenieurtraktat', 649.
[61] R. Poupardin, 'Dix-huit lettres inédites d'Arnoul de Lisieux', *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartres* 63 (1902), 352.
[62] The mistakes are as follows: there is one unnumbered folio between fos.71 and 72, another between fos.177 and 178, and the foliation skips number 174, passing straight from 173 to 175 on consecutive pages.
[63] fos. 71, 154, 157, 178.
[64] Anne Duggan noted 7 changes of hand on ff. 85v, 86r, 116r, 120v, 130r, 139r. Duggan, *Textual History*, 50 fn.3.
[65] For example there are curves to the right on the feet of minims.
[66] Though, Professor Teresa Webber has argued that although by the late-twelfth century it was usual for scribes to write differently in books and documents, both styles of writing shared features and as such it is 'unhelpful' to apply any single term. See T. Webber, '*L'Ecriture des documents en Angleterre au XIIe* siècle', *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 165 (2007), especially 165. I will continue to use 'documentary' here mainly for ease to differentiate from the hand of the rest of the text.
[67] For this and other statements that follow I am grateful to Professor Teresa Webber for offering her thoughts.

In both cases space has been left for a larger initial at the beginning of each item, but these initials were not added. This documentary script is not necessarily later than the book-hand found elsewhere. There is a single instance where two letters were added in an obviously later hand, in section three (Becket) on fo.85v. These two letters were added at the end of the first group of letters in this particular section. The second letter extends below the bottom ruling, and these items were not part of the original grouping here but were clearly inserted later into an available space.[68] The potential significance of the additions in these three sections will be discussed below.

All hands found in the manuscript are English, showing various Anglicana letter forms throughout.[69] The ink is the characteristic English brown ink throughout much of the manuscript. A more specific localisation has not been possible to determine from the script, though it must be noted that there is evidence of some Italian influenced spelling throughout, with double 'c' taking the place of 't'.[70] The hands can all be dated s.xii$^{2/}$s.xiii^{1} (i.e. *c*.1200) but not more precisely. Anne Duggan prefers s.xii^{2}, but Zachary Brooke, Roger Mynors, Julius von Pflugk-Harttung, and René Poupardin favoured s.xiii^{1}.[71] It is possible that the items in the documentary hand found in sections two (Arnulf) and five (David) described above were added slightly later to these sections, but within a short time of the original transcription, as the hand can be dated to the same basic period.[72] Only the two extra items added to section three (Becket), mentioned above, look to be in a firmly thirteenth-century hand. The manuscript can be certainly dated to before *c*.1240 for all sections feature text above the first ruled line. Section five (David) was written at the very latest by *c*.1220, to judge by the hand, though as will be discussed below it is likely that David's collection, and probably the manuscript as a whole, was both composed and compiled towards the end of the twelfth century.

[68] For a breakdown of the different groups of letters in Section Three (Becket), according to the palaeographical evidence, see Duggan, *Textual History*, 50-1.
[69] For instance the distinctive Anglicana **w.**
[70] Caroline Poling Schriber believed the scribes of the first several quires used 'an early charter hand employed only by the papal chancery in Rome in the mid-twelfth century', but this is incorrect. See *LCA*, 10. Brooke believed the hands were probably English, Brooke, 'Register', 228, as did Duggan, *Textual History*, 49.
[71] Brooke, 'Register', 228; R. A. B. Mynors, introduction to *LJS*, i, lix; Poupardin, 'Lettres inédites', 352; Duggan, *Textual History*, 49 and *CTB*, i, lxxiii-lxxiv; *AIP*, ii, 366.
[72] As, for example, the 't' in these sections still does not have a bite above the cross bar.

It is clear that each section was compiled separately. Each ends a quire, and in some cases leaves or parts of leaves have been removed to ensure this arrangement.[73] There are also opposing quire marks throughout: section two (Arnulf) features a quire mark (*primus*) at the end of its first quire on fo.37v, suggesting that this was to be the first quire of a volume. Section seven (John) features two quire marks in Roman numerals (*I* and *II*) at the end of its first and second quires, suggesting that these were expected to be the first and second quires in a longer work. The ruling throughout is of variable dimensions and in some cases varies within each section itself.[74] The quality of the parchment varies and various leaves have been trimmed to fit within the codex.

The Works

All the works contained in the manuscript are in some way linked to the Anglo-Norman or Angevin worlds, with the exception of the letters of Ivo of Chartres, which were widely copied and circulated throughout the Middle Ages.

Section One (Hildebert)

Section One (Hildebert) contains 84 items, compared to the 93 found in Adolphe Dieudonné's family 'A' group of Hildebert manuscripts.[75] Hildebert's collection circulated widely in the Middle Ages and survives in a large number of manuscripts. Hildebert probably composed a small collection of his letters himself, numbering 56-7, with the remainder added after his death.[76] It is interesting to note that three of the manuscripts of his letters, now in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, also contain the letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, as is the case here.[77] V was not examined by Dieudonné in his study of Hildebert's letters, but it can be said that it represents a version of the collection that is well

[73] Instance. there are three stubs at the end of section one, two at the end of section three, and only half a leaf at the end of section six.
[74] For double column rulings: section 1. 172-190 X 122-128mm intercol. 10mm; section 2. 180-210 X 120-130mm, intercol. 10mm; section 3. 190-200 X 115-120mm, intercol. 10mm; section 4. 200 X 120mm, intercol. 6mm; section 5. 200 X 130mm, intercol. 6mm; section 6. 200 X 125mm, intercol. 10mm; section 7. 170 X 125mm, intercol. 10mm.
[75] A. Dieudonné, *Hildebert de Lavardin, évêque du Mans, archevêque de Tours (1056-1133): Sa vie. Ses lettres* (Paris 1898), 118-20.
[76] Cotts, *Clerical Dilemma*, 75.
[77] Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MSS nos. 17468, 2595 and 15166, see Dieudonné, *Hildebert*, 115.

represented in the manuscript tradition, rather than a unique collection, and was likely copied from another manuscript source.[78]

It should also be noted that the decorated initial 'D', which commences Hildebert's collection on f.1, is the most ostentatiously decorated initial throughout the manuscript, therefore suggesting that this section was always intended to appear at the start of its volume.

Section Two (Arnulf)

Frank Barlow argued there were two different medieval editions of Arnulf's letters. In Barlow's view V contains the first edition, compiled in 1166 before emendation and expansion.[79] This edition seems to have been compiled originally for Giles de la Perche, archdeacon of Rouen, for it begins with an introductory letter sent from Arnulf to Giles, in which he writes that Giles had requested Arnulf's letters 'be collected into a little book and provided to you.'[80] Barlow believed V transmitted the original form of the letters as copied from a special draft.[81] In a more recent assessment, Caroline Poling Schriber suggests that at least a part of section two was possibly the prototype of Arnulf's collection, but agrees that Arnulf was behind its compilation.[82] She believes that there were four separate editions of Arnulf's letters in the Middle Ages, with V containing the first along with a number of letters from the second.[83]

The parchment in this section is generally poor quality, with many holes. The leaves are not uniform in size and at least eight different hands can be detected. Poling Schriber suggests that the change of scribe on fo.54r might indicate a lapse of time before the copying of the next 30 letters. This group of 30 letters is unique as a group amongst the extant manuscripts of Arnulf's collection, and eleven of them appear in no other manuscript. Neither do four of the next group of letters copied from fo.65r

[78] All credit for this observation goes to John Hampson of King's College, London, who is currently writing a thesis on the manuscript tradition of Hildebert's letters.
[79] *Letters Arnulf*, lxxi.
[80] Trans. *LCA*, no.101.
[81] *Letters Arnulf*, lxxvi-lxxvii.
[82] *LCA*, 8-10.
[83] Ibid., 5, 9-10.

onwards, lending weight to the argument that this is at the very least an early version of Arnulf's collection.[84]

In 1171-2 Arnulf compiled a small collection of letters for Peter of Pavia, at that time bishop of Meaux.[85] Arnulf sent it apparently at Peter's request.[86] Poling Schriber has suggested that the collection of Arnulf's letters in V could be this collection, as it contains 15 letters found only in this version, including an epistolary preface addressed to Peter. Some of these letters may have been considered 'embarrassing' to Arnulf: for example a 'sycophantic' letter written to the Pope on behalf of King Henry II, after Becket's murder.[87] Arnulf asked Peter to ensure that he keep the letters 'in the public places of your conscience; if they should fall into public hands, they would not be assured official approval.'[88] These letters appear in no other version of Arnulf's correspondence, suggesting that if V is not the collection sent to Peter, its scribes at least had access to a more 'private' collection.[89] It is evident that Arnulf's letters were copied into V in different stages, with some items possibly added later. Despite Poling Schriber believing it to be the case, it does not follow that Arnulf oversaw these additions himself. This could suggest that whoever compiled it received the letters in stages.

Overall this section of V does not look like a presentation copy. Even so, some of the letters preserve full *salutationes* (the greeting part of the letter), suggesting they were either copied from originals or early full transcripts, and therefore that the compiler had access to Arnulf's own archive. Certainly, Poling Schriber believed this to be the case, even though I disagree with the identification of Arnulf as the compiler.[90]

Sections Three and Four (Becket and Alexander)

[84] Ibid., 9-10.
[85] Also known as Peter Ithier, later cardinal of S. Crisogono, see *CTB*, ii, 1380-1.
[86] See *LCA*, no.3.01.
[87] Ibid., 187-8.
[88] Ibid., no.3.01.
[89] Ibid., 187-8.
[90] Ibid., 10, and see below.

Sections three and four were examined in great detail by Anne Duggan.[91] Though I shall argue below that the two sections are distinct, Duggan treated them as one, so I shall analyse them together here. They are written in a number of hands, with large coloured initials and rubrics throughout, except for the final three items in section four which omit these and are possibly in a slightly later hand. Duggan believed the collection was compiled from multiple sources, from both the Becket camp and the Foliot camp, though overall favouring the Foliot versions of the letters whenever there are pronounced differences between the two traditions.[92] Duggan dated the original compilation of this section or its archetype to after 1173, for there is a reference in one rubric to '*Sanctus Thomas*'. But the canonization bulls for Becket were not copied here, suggesting that the archetype was compiled before February 1173.[93] Christopher Brooke and Adrian Morey believed that various papal letters in section four came from Alexander III's now lost register, but they made no detailed examination of the manuscript and cite only the vaguest of supporting evidence.[94] This particular section of the manuscript is clearly divided in two, for the 'Becket' letters (section three) end on fo.129r. The last letter fills only the first ten lines of the leaf and the rest of this folio has been cut away. The *verso* of fo.129 is blank and the next group of letters, the papal dossier, begins at the top of fo.130r, with the rubric:

> 'These are the letters of the lord Pope, which he sent to the bishop of London, and because he [Foliot] was found disobedient after many threats and admonitions which he scorned for a whole year, in the following year he [the Pope] declared him excommunicated by the archbishop.'[95]

This suggests that, far from coming from Alexander III's register, this collection was in fact made by someone with access to letters sent from the Pope to Foliot, though this section does also include a number of letters sent to recipients besides Foliot which were presumably circulated and found their

[91] Duggan, *Textual History*, 48-53 and *CTB*, i, lxxiii-lxxv.
[92] Duggan, *Textual History*, 51.
[93] *CTB*, i, lxxiv.
[94] A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and His Letters*, (Cambridge 1965), 23 and fn.1.
[95] V fo.130r: 'Hic sunt litterae domini papa, quas episcopo Londoniensis misit, et quia inobediens inuentus est post multas comminationes et commonitiones quas anno integro spreuit, sequenti anno denuntiauit enim archiepiscopo excommunicatum.'

way to London. Such preservation of a dossier of papal letters of local significance was not unique to London. Peter, abbot of Celle, retained a collection of letters from Alexander III written to or about him and these may have been added to the original manuscript of Peter's own collection.[96]

The letters in section four are copied in a hand also found in section three, and feature the same initials, so there is a clear link between the two sections. However, it is obvious that the compiler or scribe of these sections wished section four to be clearly distinguished from the preceding section, or that there was a gap in time before its copying, so we have the empty space (now excised) on fo.129 and the rubric at the top of fo.130r. This possibly reflects the exemplars the letters were copied from. Section four was either stored separately from the other Becket letters or came from another, smaller collection, and so was copied here as a distinct group. Meanwhile, the inclusion of section four, linked firmly to Foliot, supports Duggan's suggestion that the Becket letters in section three came from Foliot's archives.

Section Six (treatises + papal letter)

Section six contains two treatises, both of which Liverani attributed to St Anselm. These are followed by a letter from Pope Paschal II (d.1118) to King Henry I of England (d.1135).[97] The letter from Paschal II, *Legationis tue*, concerns the investiture of bishops and abbots.[98] The second of the treatises, *Contra matrimonium sacerdotum*, retains its *salutatio*: 'Vita peccator, habitu clericus G. sacerdoti, carnis affinitate michi propinquo, per pietatis studium promereri felicitatem supernorum ciuium.'[99] In his edition of the treatise, Liverani added 'Anselmus' to the beginning of this *salutatio*, though it is not present in the manuscript. There is, however, a modest rubric at the very top of the page in what seems to be a contemporary hand: 'Epistola Anselmi Archiepiscopi contra matrimonium sacerdotum.'[100] Liverani, then, had good reason to attribute the treatise to Anselm. However, the first

[96] J. Haseldine, 'The Creation of a Literary Memorial: The Letter Collection of Peter of Celle', *Sacris Erudiri* 37 (1997), 347.
[97] The two treatises are printed in *Spicilegium*, ed. Liverani, 559-569.
[98] It is printed in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia* iv, ed. F. Schmitt (Boston 1938), no.216.
[99] V fo.156r.
[100] Ibid.

treatise, *De quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus*, offers no such attribution, with its rubric simply providing the name of the text.[101] There is, furthermore, no *salutatio* or epistolary dedication.

It is in fact a section of Martin of Braga's (d.580) *Formula Honestae Vitae*, or 'Rules For an Honest Life', written in the epistolary form to Miro, king of the Sueves. The *Formula* survives in an enormous number of copies from the Middle Ages.[102] It is a *speculum principis*, or 'mirror of princes', instructing a ruler on the virtues associated with ruling. The twelfth century saw a revival of such texts, leading to the composition of works such as John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* (composed in 1159 for Thomas Becket), Gerald of Wales' *De principis instructione* (composed 1190-1216), and Giles of Paris' *Karolinus* (composed in 1200 for Prince Louis of France).[103] The text of the treatise in V differs slightly both from Migne's edition in the *Patrologia Latina* and from Claude Barlow's 1950 edition of Martin's works.[104] Most notably there are a few additions in V: a short passage found at the end of Chapter II (*De magnanimitate*), two extra passages found in Chapter III (*De continentia)*, another found at the end of it, and an extra passage at the start of Chapter IV (*De iusticia*). These additions are taken from Cicero's *De Officiis* ('On Duties' or 'On Obligations') which also discusses the four virtues, but the text has been amended slightly with some sections rearranged in a different order.[105] Of the more than twenty medieval manuscripts of *De Officiis* extant in the UK, only two are earlier than the thirteenth century.[106] However extracts from books one and three of the work did circulate in twelfth-century florilegia.[107] It was known and used by twelfth-century writers, including both William of Newburgh and John of Salisbury.[108] Barlow did not notice that the additions to the

[101] In the twelfth century it was common for the work to appear under the title 'De quattor virtutibus' though 'cardinalibus' was not always provided, and the work was often attributed to Seneca, *Martini Episcopi Bracarensis Opera Omnia*, ed. C. W. Barlow (New Haven 1950), 204.
[102] For a selection of surviving manuscript copies from before the twelfth century, see *Martini Opera*, ed. Barlow, 210-7. Barlow counted 635 manuscript copies and early translations of the work, 231-2.
[103] See C. Billot-Vilandrau, 'Charlemagne and the Young Prince: A Didactic Poem on the Cardinal Virtues by Giles of Paris (C.1200)', *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century*, ed. I. P. Bejczy and R. G. Newhauser (Leiden 2005), 341-2.
[104] For Migne's edition, see *PL* 72, cols.21-8 and for Barlow's, see *Martini Opera*, ed. Barlow, 236-50.
[105] Liverani prints the treatise in *Spicilegium*, 564-9. For Cicero's treatise, see Cicero, *De officiis*, ed. W. Miller (London 1928).
[106] Both of these are German in origin. See R. H. Martin, 'A Twelfth-Century Manuscript of Cicero's De Officiis', *The Classical Quarterly* New Series 1 (1951), 38. They are London, British Library, MS Harley 2682 from the second half of the eleventh century and Harley 2716 from the last quarter of the tenth century.
[107] J. Ward, 'What the Middle Ages Missed of Cicero', *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero*, ed. W. Altman (Leiden 2015), 317.
[108] Ibid., 318-22.

treatise in V came from Cicero, and though he claims that Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plutei MS 14.18 shares the same additions as V, the main text of the *Formula* found in each of these manuscripts differs.[109]

One of the many copies of Martin's *Formula* that survives from the same period must be mentioned here. It is British Library MS Royal 8.A.xxi, thought to be thirteenth century and from St Peter's Abbey, Gloucester, though in some parts the hand possibly dates from the late-twelfth century. What is remarkable about this manuscript is that although the main text of the *Formula* follows the traditional version, a marginal annotation next to Chapter II (*De magnanimitate*), in what appears to be an almost contemporaneous hand, adds much of the extra passage also found in V at around the same point.[110] Though this hand seems to be different to the main hand, some similarities in script suggest shared features, perhaps of the same scriptorium.[111] Royal 8.A.xxi does not add the other extra passages found in V, but the manuscript does contain a small collection of Foliot's letters from his time as Abbot of St Peter's and bishop of Hereford, copied onto one gathering which appears then to have been bound into the manuscript.[112] This must be remarked upon, as it provides another link to V.

I have chosen to follow previous scholars in referring to these three works (the two treatises, and the papal letter) as one section of the manuscript. However, given the lack of attribution of the first treatise to Anselm, and the fact that it appears on f.155, which is bound into the manuscript alone,[113] and also bearing in mind the difference in style in the copying of the two treatises (where the first has large initials and the second none at all) it is possible that section six may originally have offered the first treatise, *De quatuor,* entirely distinct both from the second, *Contra matrimonium,* and from the papal letter, *Legationis tue*.

Section Seven (John)

[109] *Martini Opera*, ed. Barlow, 231. The *Formula* can be found in this manuscript on fos.210r-v.
[110] Royal MS 8 A XXI, fo.168v.
[111] For example, the **s** in both cases has a very similar style.
[112] These are on fos.206r-212v.
[113] Though Brooke thought section six was contained in one quire he was incorrect, see Brooke, 'Register', 229.

This section contains the first and earlier of the two collections of the letters of John of Salisbury, running from approximately 1153 until the death of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury in 1161.[114] It seems that John compiled this collection for his friend Peter, abbot of Celle.[115] The most recent editors of the collection supposed V's version to be a copy of Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 8625, which they dated to the late-twelfth or early-thirteenth century, though they note that V is of poorer quality, with transcription errors, omitted proper names, and some small changes in word order.[116] If the editors are correct in their dating of BN Latin 8625, V must be a very early copy of it, for the hand in V is no later than early-thirteenth century. Either this, or both manuscripts are copied from another exemplar that is now lost.

Section Eight (Ivo)

This section contains the letters of Ivo of Chartres (d. 1115). These all date to the last 25 years of his life as bishop of Chartres, as do his sermons and canon law collections. The main collection was probably compiled at Chartres, after Ivo's death.[117] Jean Leclercq divided the extant collections of Ivo's letters into two types ('primaire' or type I and 'secondaire' or type II), and presumed that all the collections were dependant on type I.[118] Christof Rolker has since noted that various collections not dependant upon Leclercq's type I seem to have circulated even during Ivo's lifetime.[119] The full collection of Ivo's letters runs to almost 300 items, but only 84 are preserved in V, which is one of at least 127 known extant copies of the letters.[120] The collection circulated widely in the twelfth century, and it is not possible to locate V within an already overcrowded stemma.[121] V was not examined by Leclercq, [122] and nor was it examined in any detail by Rolker, but it is much smaller than the full

[114] *LJS*, i, liii.
[115] Ibid., x-xi.
[116] The letters in V appear in the same order as they originally were in Latin 8625, whose order is now disturbed, see Ibid., lvii-lxi.
[117] C. Rolker, [https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/letters/webmanuscripts.pdf, accessed 03/02/2022], 9.
[118] J. Leclercq, 'La collection des lettres D'Yves de Chartres', *Revue Benedictine* 56 (1945-6), 108 ; *Yves Correspondence*, ed. Leclercq, xxvii-xxviii.
[119] Rolker, [https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/letters/webmanuscripts.pdf], 10.
[120] C. Rolker, *Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres* (Cambridge 2010), 4, *Yves Correspondence*, ed. Leclercq, xvii.
[121] Rolker, *Letters*, 128.
[122] He was, after all, working around the time of World War Two and rather constrained as a result. For a list of the manuscripts Leclercq examined see *Yves Correspondence*, xxvi fn.1.

versions of Leclercq's types I and II, which contain around 270/283 letters each. It may be an incomplete version of one of these.[123] Ivo's works and letters were of great interest to readers in the twelfth-century because of his role in the Investiture Contest and his dispute with Archbishop Hugh of Lyon, zealous enforcer of papal rights. Rolker has suggested that medieval readers found Ivo's correspondence with Hugh of interest for its discussions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, supported by references to legal authorities, a key point of contention during the Investiture Contest but also during the Becket dispute.[124] In general, Ivo's letters were widely popular due to their legal, canonical, and theological concerns.

Composition and Localisation

Though all sections of V are separate works that were later joined, there are signs that some were bound together at an early date. Sections five (David) and six (Anselm) are without doubt written in the same hand.[125] The only differences in presentation between these sections are the plain initials found in the first treatise in section six, where section five has no initials, although the final three items added to section five in a documentary hand did leave space for the later addition of initials. These sections were certainly written as separate *libelli*, for section five was written on one double quire: a 'book' in itself. If it had been intended to be joined to section six we might expect it to have been broken down further, or for section six to have been added into the empty spaces in section five. If, then, we consider stage one in the composition of V to have been the copying of the eight sections as distinct *libelli*, then stage two saw sections five and six joined.

The documentary hands found in sections two (Arnulf) and five (David) may represent the next stage in composition. It is very possible they are in the same hand and represent a decision to add extra items in the available space.[126] In both instances space was left for large initials that were never

[123] Rolker, [https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/letters/webmanuscripts.pdf], 5.
[124] Rolker, *Letters*, 3.
[125] Excluding the three items in documentary script at the end of section five.
[126] Here I wish once again to thank Teresa Webber, who here offered her opinion. She theorised it could be the same scribe writing in two different levels of formality. In Webber's view, the hand in section five writes in a more set manner and employs a more formal treatment of certain letters (e.g. the tall **s** and the **f** finishing on the base line). In her view it is impossible to say with certainty that they were the same scribe at work for this type of handwriting is abundant at this date, but there is an absence of obvious differences in those elements of the handwriting unaffected by a difference in formality that would tend to suggest two scribes at work.

actually added.[127] It is striking that the two letters added in this hand to section two (Arnulf) are also present in section five (David) in the main hand of this section as Letters 42-3. Their order is reversed in section two (Arnulf), but the text is almost identical with only slight variations. Some of these variations were probably due to scribal error: 'exsequenda' for 'exequendo', and 'tantorum' for 'multorum'. A heavily abbreviated biblical verse is abbreviated differently in each copy, suggesting that both scribes had access to the originals or to another copy of these letters.[128] Letter 42 of David's collection preserves the *salutatio* showing it was sent by Giles, bishop of Evreux. The version copied into section two lacks this *salutatio*, as well as the *valedictio*. There is no *salutatio* at all in section two, and the scribe presumably mistook the letter for one sent by Arnulf. This suggests that it was not Arnulf himself who oversaw the addition of these two letters to section two, but more likely someone unfamiliar with his career, for the letter refers to Becket's actions in 1170 as well as the recent beginning (*initia*) of the author's career as bishop.[129] Arnulf became bishop of Lisieux in 1141 and therefore no individual with knowledge of his career could have attributed this letter to him. At the same time, had the section two copy been copied directly from section five, it seems unlikely the scribe could have overlooked the *salutatio* attributing it to Giles rather than Arnulf. Nonetheless, it is probable that the two versions were copied from the same exemplar. This may have been a draft copy of David's collection, or perhaps his own original archive of letters, given that the three items added at the end of section five, possibly in the same hand as these letters added to section two, were all sent to or refer to David himself.[130] The scribe was evidently not Arnulf or David and nor was he paying full attention to what he was copying. Had he done so, he would have been aware of the discrepancies between letters copied in duplicate.

Letter 43 of David's collection was sent by Arnulf to the Pope, and this *salutatio* is preserved in both copies of the letter in V. The evidence again suggests that both copies may have been made from the same exemplar, rather than from one another. Each adds one word that is not found in the other, and

[127] See V fos.67r-68v and 153r-154v.
[128] In section two: 'sic. serpe'tes .et. s. s. col' and in section five: 'sic' serp' .et sim. s. c.'.
[129] *LDL*, no.42: 'Circa mee vocationis initia'.
[130] See Ibid., nos.88-90.

there are some minor differences in readings, e.g. 'discretis' for 'directis' and 'deducta' for 'reducta'.[131] There is a suggestion that the section five version was corrected from the version of the text in section two. Where section two has 'percepimus', section five originally had 'suscepimus' but this has been corrected to 'percepimus', though this correction might equally have been based on the exemplar.[132] The section two version also includes one final sentence that does not appear in David's section: 'Omnipotens dominus personam vestram ecclesie sue per multa tempora conseruet incolumem'.[133] So there is one letter in section two with additions (43), and another (42) with its *salutatio* and *valedictio* clauses omitted. Letter 42 must have been copied into section two from a different version to that in section five. Arnulf himself suggested that in order to compile his letter collection he requested copies of his letters be returned to him from his correspondents.[134] It is possible that Letter 42 was sent back by mistake with its *salutatio* omitted, thereafter added by the scribe of section two as if sent by Arnulf. It is surely unlikely, however, given such a gross error, that this can be the prototype of Arnulf's collection as Poling Schriber believes was possible. These two letters must, then, have been added at a later date to the collection in section two, and given that the same hand probably added these as well as the three final letters of David's collection, all of these letters were probably added at around the same time, suggesting that the individual *libelli* into which they were copied already resided in the same library, if they were not already bound together at the time these additions were made.

One the letters found in David's collection, letter 44, can also be found in section three (Becket). This letter was sent from Becket to Bishop Henry of Winchester (d.1171) and appears in Section three on fos.102v-103r. This version is not referenced in Duggan's edition. The letter is effectively anonymised in David's collection, where a *salutatio* found elsewhere is replaced by 'Salutem et perseuerantem in iusticia et in matris ecclesie defensione constantiam.'[135] The section three version

[131] For these see *Letters Arnulf*, no.59 and 104-6 fns.
[132] See V fo.147r, 4 lines from the end of the letter.
[133] See *Letters Arnulf*, no.59.
[134] *LCA*, no.1.01: Arnulf wrote to Giles, archdeacon of Rouen, 'I have gathered those letters that I could recover, since none of the letters in my possession seemed to be good examples. I have received the letters without emendation from those who had saved them for some reason', though it is possible this was a trope to emphasise the merit of his letters (i.e. they must be worth adding to the collection as others had saved them).
[135] *LDL*, no.44.

does not preserve the *salutatio* either, which can only be found in one manuscript copy of the letter. But there is a rubric in section three noting that it was sent to the same recipient as the previous letter, which does preserve the *salutatio*, addressing that letter to Bishop Henry. Besides this, there are further textual differences between the two copies with one or two extra words in the section three version that do not appear in David's collection, and *vice versa*. David's version also adds a final *valedictio* clause not found in section three.[136] The textual differences in David's version do not appear in the other copies examined by Duggan. This could suggest that they were made as the letter was copied into David's collection, as they are generally minor and do not change the sense overall. The swapping of a specific *salutatio* for a more general and anonymous one, along with the addition of a *valedictio* clause suggests that versions of this letter were sent to bishops besides Henry, and that it was one of these copies that made its way into David's collection.[137] Either that, or a more generalised copy was circulated by the Becket camp which came into David's hands.

Three letters found in section four (Alexander) can also be found in David's collection. The first of these is Letter 29, from Alexander III to Henry II, which appears in section four on fos.131v-132r. There are numerous minor textual differences, with the section four version omitting various words and adding others, suggesting neither is a copy of the other. It is notable, however, that both copies are followed by the same letter, Letter 30, which was sent from the Pope to the bishops of England. Again, differences suggest that one is not a copy of the other, though it is noteworthy that the differences in the section four version are almost all shared by the version of this letter preserved in London, British Library MS Cotton Claudius B ii, the earliest extant version of Alan of Tewkesbury's collection of Becket letters, suggesting some link between these copies. Duggan believed the basis of Alan's collection was compiled 1174-6, and Alan himself stated that he had found copies of his letters in various places.[138] Duggan does, however, state that Alan's collection was 'evidently a Canterbury composition, directly dependent on materials available at Canterbury in the years following Becket's

[136] Ibid.
[137] Perhaps a version sent to Foliot.
[138] Duggan, *Textual History*, 12-3.

canonization'. She also believes it is likely that at least some of the letters from V are from Foliot sources.[139]

The third and final letter found in both sections appears in David's collection as Letters 33 and 82. More will be said below on why this letter was split in two, but here it suffices to note that the textual differences are very minor: 'nostrum' for 'vestrum', and 'amplexemur' as 'amplexamur'. The key difference is the lack of *salutatio* in section four, where it is preserved in section five. The section four copy has been added in a later hand, so perhaps this was copied from David's version. What is most remarkable about these three letters that appear twice in V is that all can also be found in the key manuscript of Gilbert Foliot's letters, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS B Cave e Museo 249 (henceforth C). This firmly suggests that the compilers or scribes of all three, sections three, four, and C, had access to the bishop's archive. In fact, the final three letters added to section four are only found in Foliot sources.[140]

There is one other section where two letters have been added in a documentary script instead of the book hand found elsewhere. This does not appear to be the same hand as the documentary script found in sections two and five discussed above, but is of a later date. These letters on fo.85v in section three (Becket) were both sent by Becket. The first went to Gilbert Foliot (*Excessus vestros*) and the second to the dean and chapter of London (*Vestram latere*).[141] These two letters are those that were read out in St Paul's during mass in 1169, dramatically announcing Becket's excommunication of Foliot.[142]

Given the presence of the dossier of papal letters relating to London, the additional letters with a London link, and David's letter collection, it is clear that at least parts of the works contained in V were taken from London archives, the bishop's in particular, therefore placing the manuscript firmly within a London milieu.

[139] Ibid., 12, 15 and fn.3
[140] Ibid., 53.
[141] *CTB*, ii, nos.195 and 196b.
[142] See Ibid., no.207.

Master David's Letter Collection

All 90 of the letters in David's collection are copied onto one double quire. There are no rubrics, although there are three marginal notes in the same hand as the main body of text. These appear next to letters 1-2 and 13 and highlight David's emulation of Bernard of Clairvaux in these letters. One refers to 'the blessed Abbot Bernard'.[143] Bernard was canonized in 1174, which could suggest a *terminus post quem* for the copying of this section of the collection, though the description of Bernard as *beatus* does not necessarily signify an official canonization.[144]

Zachary Brooke believed that the letters in this section were copied into the manuscript in groups, an assumption with which I agree. He saw the first group as letters 1-23, running from fos.140r-143v. I would extend this grouping to cover letter 24, which is on fo.143v immediately after 23. After this the remaining space is not filled, though the content of letter 24 does differ from that of the other letters in this group and it may simply have been inserted into the blank space.[145] The majority of the letters in this group were written by David. They develop similar themes: David's debts, hopes for career advancement, and his affairs at St Paul's. By contrast, letter 24 is an anonymous letter written after Becket's murder, and cannot be attributed to David's authorship.

Contrary to Brooke, letters 25-27 appear to form the next grouping. This begins and ends on fo.144r, and the text of letter 27 extending below the bottom ruling in order that it could all be fitted onto this page, rather than run on to the *verso*. Letters 25-6 refer to David's attempts to secure his pension, and 27 provides an unknown recipient with details of events occurring *c*.1175. Letter 28 is then copied onto fo.144v with some space at the end of this letter and is clearly not a part of the preceding group. The hand differs from that which copied the main body of the collection.[146] The differences are insufficient to prove it was written by a different scribe, but it is possible that there was a lapse in time

[143] 'Stilus beati B(ernardi) abbatis et verba' *LDL*, no.13.
[144] For instance, Bernard was called 'beatus' in 1166 in the catalogue of Nonantola, see J. Leclerq, 'Etudes sur S. Bernard et le texte de ses éscrits', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 9 (1953), 15.
[145] Though this space does only run to 3 lines.
[146] For instance: the round-backed **d** form used features an ascender which slopes off to the left at a 45 degree angle; straight **s** is taller and more likely to feature a loop; **a** tends to be larger; and **m** in some cases appears more curved with a leftward pointing final stroke.

before its copying, suggesting that this letter was simply inserted into blank space. The difference in hand may itself be a reflection of the fact that the scribe had a whole page onto which to copy this letter. The letter is addressed from David so certainly belongs to his collection.

Letters 29-32 are another group, all on fo.145r, with space left blank after letter 32. This grouping includes two papal letters and two sent from Foliot to David. All relate to and were written during the Becket dispute. Letter 33, sent from the Pope to Foliot, stands alone on fo.145v, but fills less than one column, with the remaining space left blank.

The next group begins with letter 34 on fo.146r.[147] This group relates to David's career and to the Becket dispute. It begins with a letter from Foliot to Roger of Worcester attacking David,[148] followed by letters 35-6 detailing David's efforts on Foliot's behalf throughout the Becket dispute. Letters 37-8 were carried to Becket by David on behalf of Foliot and Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury (d.1184). Letters 39-40 both relate to the bishops' appeals against their excommunication by Becket. Letters 41-3 were all sent from bishops to the Pope after the coronation of the Young King. Brooke ended this grouping with letter 43, although letter 44 is copied immediately after, running over onto fo.147v where letter 45 is copied directly afterwards in more cramped handwriting, spilling over into the margin at the bottom of the folio. Both of these letters also relate to the Becket dispute, the first (44) written by Becket to the bishop of Winchester, and the second (45) an anonymous letter probably sent from John of Salisbury to Bishop John of Poitiers. Both probably belong to the same grouping as letters 34-43.

The next group includes letters 46-9, running fo.147(b)r-148r, where the writing only fills one column. The other empty half of the folio has been cut away and fo.148v is blank. These letters were all written to the Pope and refer to three different legal disputes. They may have been cases in which David was involved or at least acted as messenger, though it is clear that they have been grouped due to their general subject matter, rather than because of any more precise connection.

[147] The manuscript is foliated incorrectly and there are two folios labelled fo.147, I have called the first fo.147 and the second 147(b).
[148] *LDL*, no.34.

The next group begins with Letter 50, sent by the Anti-Pope Victor informing all the faithful of the schism. It runs from fos.149r-v, followed by a letter of Alexander III (51) supplying his own version of these same events. These two letters are clearly linked by theme, but are followed by four letters (52-5) with no such clear link. These are followed by a dossier, also a part of this group, consisting of letters relating to the canonization of Edward the Confessor. This dossier begins after letter 55 on fo.150v and runs until fo.151v, where it is followed immediately by a short anonymous letter (70) on behalf of a Master N.: possibly Nicholas, archdeacon of London, possibly just anonymous 'nomen'. There is a small quantity of parchment left blank after letter 70. Given that the majority of this grouping relates in some way to papal letters or communications to the Pope, it seems likely that letter 70 was simply added into available space.

Brooke's fourth group, my seventh, comprises letters 71-87, running from fos.152r-153r, after which empty space has been left. These are all letters of recommendation for David, written by bishops, cardinals, and the Pope. The final three letters in the collection (88-90) form their own group because they are written in a different script, and unlike the rest of the collection space has been left for large initials. Two of these are letters addressed to David praising him, and the other was sent from Roger of Worcester to the Pope, defending David against Foliot's accusations. These three letters seem to fit thematically with the letters of recommendation, offering further praise for David. Therefore, the difference in their script may indicate only that they were added at a slightly later date, not randomly but intended to fit this particular grouping.

To summarise, according to the palaeography and codicology the grouping of the letters is as follows:

- Group 1: letters 1-24
- Group 2: letters 25-27
- Letter 28
- Group 3: letters 29-32
- Letter 33
- Group 4: letters 34-45
- Group 5: letters 46-49
- Group 6: letters 50-70
- Group 7: letters 71-87
- Group 8: letters 88-90

This is not to suggest that all these groups were necessarily intended to be thematically ordered collections, for as shown there are some instances where letters were simply added into empty space. Rather, the ordering reflects the way the letters were copied into the manuscript. This suggests that the letters as they survive in V were either copied from pre-existing groups of letters, or were here sorted into the groups from drafts or exemplars.[149] If V was a copy of another complete version of David's collection we would surely expect to see the letters copied in a continuous series, rather than as distinct groupings with clear demarcation. These smaller groups of letters are likely to have been originally copied onto separate folia or gatherings.[150] The groups themselves may have been copied into the manuscript in stages which would account for the blank spaces and various breaks. Copied by two scribes, this is possibly not David's own holograph, as least in its entirety. Even so, the circumstances outlined above indicate a collection compiled very close to David himself, both in time and physical space.

The groupings of the letters correspond to theme rather than chronology, and within the groupings there is no chronological order. Other letter collections of the time were also compiled from smaller collections, including Gilbert Foliot's.[151] Alan of Tewkesbury compiled his collection of Becket letters from various 'schedulae', i.e. smaller collections or letters copied onto separate sheets.[152] The collection as it survives in V is the first (and possibly only) recension of the full collection. It represents a consciously constructed collection or group of smaller collections which have been joined, and is not a random assemblage of correspondence. The decision to preserve original groupings within the letters may be evidence for the suggestion - previously made by Brooke and confirmed above - that the collection was made by or under the direction of David.[153] Though Brooke suggested that the palaeographical evidence suggests otherwise, this argument assumes that the hand is s.xiii[1]. As discussed above, however, it is possible that the hand is instead s.xii[2], and this, along with

[149] We know David had his own personal archive at least for his charters, as he refers to it in *LDL*, no.26.
[150] This was probably the case with John of Salisbury's earlier collection as well as the letter collection of Fulbert of Chartres, see *LJS*, i, 297-8 and R. W. Southern, review of: Millor, S. and H. Butler, and Brookes', *The Letters of John of Salisbury vol.i: The Early Letters (1133-1151)*, *EHR* 72 (1957), 495 for John of Salisbury; *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. F. Behrends (Oxford 1976), li for Fulbert.
[151] See *GFL*, 2-3, 8-9.
[152] *CTB*, ii, 300.
[153] Brooke, 'Register', 234.

my argument, forthcoming in chapter two, that David may have lived into the 1190s, does support the theory that David had some hand in the compilation of the collection.

Dating

Aside from the palaeographical evidence, internal features suggest that the collection was compiled in the late 1170s or early 1180s. Many of the events described in the letters are undateable or can be narrowed down only to a period of some years. However, there is no firm evidence that any refer to events that occurred later than *c*.1181, and that date is dependent on David's involvement in a contest to become dean of St Paul's around that time: an assumption that will be disputed in chapter two. Aside from this, the only Pope referred to in any letters is Alexander III (d. August 1181), and the only king is Henry II (d. July 1189). If the twelfth century was the 'golden age' of letter writing then the 1170s and 1180s were at the very epicentre of it in England, at least if we consider the number of collections then and there compiled.[154] This is especially true for those involved in the Becket dispute. One of the earliest 'Becket' collections was composed in Becket's household, very shortly before or after his murder in 1170, and Herbert of Bosham, Becket's closest advisor, probably compiled his own collection towards the end of his life in 1189.[155] This drive for the compilation of collections was also evident amongst Becket's enemies: the main manuscript (C) of Foliot's letter collection was possibly written in his household *c*.1177-*c*.1180.[156] Another manuscript contains a smaller collection of Foliot's letters (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 287), taken from the bishop's archive probably between April 1172 and April 1173.[157] The manuscript also contains William FitzStephen's *Description of London* (though incomplete); his and John of Salisbury's lives of St Thomas, and a *Summa cause inter regem et archiepiscopum*. Whoever compiled the manuscript, possibly FitzStephen himself, had access to the bishop of London's archive, and FitzStephen was able to use

[154] For this suggestion, see Constable, *Letters*, 31.
[155] J. Barrau, 'Scholarship as a Weapon: Herbert of Bosham's Letter Collection', *Herbert of Bosham*, ed. Staunton, 90 and fn.25.
[156] *GFL*, 3, 7-8.
[157] M. Cheney, 'William FitzStephen and his Life of Archbishop Thomas', *Church and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to C. R. Cheney on his 70th Birthday*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke, D. E. Luscombe, G. H. Martin, and D. Owen (Cambridge 1976), 148-9.

the material found there to construct a less than friendly narrative of Foliot's role in the dispute.[158] It can be no coincidence that David's collection was compiled around the late 1170s, at almost the same time that these other collections were compiled, and particularly around the same time as the compilation of Foliot's letters by the bishop's household of which David was a part for at least a decade.

Authorship

A number of the letters in David's collection do not retain their *salutatio* and are anonymous. Furthermore, no personal names appear in various letters and thus provide no further clues as to author or recipient. In the instances where individuals are mentioned, they are often referred to simply by an initial (e.g. Magister H.), and so one must attempt to deduce to whom the initial refers. Sometimes the person named is so obscure as to be impossible to identify. In other cases, author and recipient can be identified according to events described, but elsewhere the letters are so vague on detail as to make this impossible. In other cases, the author can be identified by his style, including the use of certain favoured phrases and themes, although it must be taken into account that medieval letter-writers could and did adapt their styles of writing to their audience and purpose. Here, David's authorship of a number of the letters will be demonstrated, and some of his possible recipients will be identified. For further notes on these, see the edition in Appendix One.

Letters 1-3 are anonymous. Letter 4 was sent by 'D'; David. Letters 5-20 are again anonymous, excluding 17 and 19 which were sent to David by Arnulf of Lisieux. David puts his name to letters 21-2, though 23 is once again anonymous. Brooke, following Liverani, attributed all of these anonymous letters to David's authorship on account of the 'subject-matter and style'.[159] Letter 24 is anonymous, though Liverani attributed it to an English bishop,[160] as are 25-7 which Brooke believed

[158] FitzStephen included 'sharp comments' on (amongst other things) Foliot's desire for the archbishopric; his plotting against Becket; his role in rousing the king's anger after Becket's return to England. See Cheney, 'FitzStephen', 152.
[159] Brooke, 'Register', 234.
[160] *Spicilegium*, ed. Liverani, 551, where he added the heading 'Anonymi cujusdam Angliae Episcopi de caede Sancti Thomae Cantuariensis ad Alexandrum p.'.

were written by David.[161] Letters 36 and 53 are anonymous, though the contents of the former make it clear that it was written by Gilbert Foliot but anonymised due to his excommunication. Letter 45 is anonymous though it has been attributed to John of Salisbury.[162] Letters 29 and 44 do not retain their *salutationes* here, but can be found in other manuscript copies. Letter 46 was written by an unnamed bishop to Alexander III. Liverani attributed it to Arnulf of Lisieux, but Morey and Brooke though it more likely to have been Gilbert Foliot, Roger of Worcester, or Bartholomew of Exeter.[163] Letter 70 is anonymous, but Morey and Brooke suggested it may have been written by Foliot.[164] Letters 28, 30-5, 47-52, 54-69, and 71-90 all preserve their *salutationes* so the author and recipients are known.

It is clear that a number of the letters share a similar style, featuring the same flowery and complex Latin which generally follows a similar sentence structure and features recurring phrases. I will quote here in the Latin, so as to highlight the similarities in prose and demonstrate David's authorship. Letter 21 preserves its *salutatio*: 'Venerabili domino suo H(ugoni) Dei gratia London(iensis) ecclesie decano et toti eiusdem ecclesie capitulo suorum minimus magister D(avid)'.[165] Two other letters feature contracted *salutationes* with personal names missing, Letter 16: 'Suorum minimus salutem et se i(psum) licet mun(us) modicum.'[166], and Letter 14: 'Unico suo et domino suorum minimus se ipsum licet hodie munus modicum.'[167] Letter 27 has almost precisely the same *salutatio* as Letter 16: 'Salutem et se ipsum licet munus modicum.'[168] Caution must be exercised here, firstly because the letters were likely edited before they were added to the collection, and secondly because *salutationes* often followed a formula. However, the similarities do at the very least suggest that the compiler of the collection had a hand in editing the letters before they were copied in, and when combined with other similar elements in the letters point towards a shared authorship. The theme of smallness is echoed in another phrase which appears in Letter 1:

[161] Brooke, 'Register', 234.
[162] *LJS*, ii, no.230.
[163] *Spicilegium*, ed. Liverani, 582 and *GFL*, app.7 no.2.
[164] *GFL*, app.8 no.3.
[165] *LDL*, no.21.
[166] Ibid., no.16.
[167] Ibid., no.14.
[168] Ibid., no.27.

> ‘Paruitatis mee non est quod pari quam rependere vice. Ago quod nunc possum, si quandoque tempus accepero, quod nunc desiderans et affectibus recolo, factis libentius compensabo.’[169]

Letter 10 features a strikingly similar statement:

> ‘Nunc autem quoniam paruitatis mee non est quod pari queam rependere vice, quod solum possum in gratiarum actione gratus existo an quibus non desistam dum vixero.’[170]

As does Letter 14:

> ‘Paruitatis mee non est quod p(ari) q(ueam) re(pendere) vice. Quod possum ago, in sola gratiarum actione gratus existo.’[171]

Clearly the vocabulary employed here is very similar and these phrases seem to have been penned by the same author who adjusted the wording slightly to add variety. The idea of waiting for an opportunity to arise, as shown above in letter 1, is similarly phrased in letters 3,[172] 10,[173] 11 and 14 where the wording is identical to letters 10 and 27, where it is identical to letter 3. Letter 22 features the same phrasing as 3 and 27, which is fortuitous as David has put his name to the letter: ‘O(doni) Dei gratia priori Cant(uariensi) dictus mag(ister) D(auid)’.[174] This, then, was clearly one of David’s favoured phrases and its appearances in other letters suggests that he penned all or most of them himself.

Three of the letters mention rewards from God in very similar language: ‘vicem vobis rependat qui potest et qui fuit in cura Deus.’,[175] ‘gratam vobis vicem rependat qui potest...Deum’[176], and ‘illam inquam gratiam condigna vice rependat vobis Dominus’.[177] The last of these, letter 18, was sent to Arnulf of Lisieux. The author conceals his name but the contents of the letter show that it was a reply

[169] Ibid., no.1.
[170] Ibid., no.10.
[171] Ibid., no.14.
[172] Ibid., no.3: ‘si quandoque tempus accepero’.
[173] Ibid., no.10: ‘Nouit Dominus quia si quandoque tempus accepero’.
[174] Ibid., no.22.
[175] Ibid., no.1.
[176] Ibid., no.27.
[177] Ibid., no.18,

to Letter 17, sent from Arnulf to David, which preserves its full *salutatio*.[178] In Letter 17, Arnulf refers to David's title 'of London', which:

> 'did not fall to you from battle, as Africa did to Scipio, or from domination as Rome did to Caesar. We know that this title has been attributed to you solely by birth (*natiuitas*).'[179]

In Letter 18 the author refers to the titles of birth (*natiuitas*) on which he is silent, but he does go on to recall other men from the same place:

> 'They were glad to be marked themselves: a certain one of them by the learning of the place, another by teaching alone, another by his dwelling, though it is not continuous, and a certain one of them with the title of our town.'[180]

He continues, discussing other places in which he has lived (Clermont, Paris, and Italy) but, quoting Ulpian, a Roman jurist, he asserts that a man's birthplace cannot be forgotten, either by mistake or by that man claiming to have been born elsewhere. One cannot change the truth by rejecting where one is born.[181] Given the placing of this letter it must be a reply from David to letter 17 from Arnulf.

Letter 18 also contains a phrase that reappears in three of the letters and expresses the high regard in which the letter-writer held his recipient: 'Et certe de vobis innata bonitate confido quamplurimum'.[182] Similar phrasing appears in letters 13 ('Confido enim et adhuc quamplurimum de bonitate ipsius)'[183], and 20 ('confido de vobis quamplurimum').[184] Letter 18 also features another common phrase, where the writer expresses his concern 'Sed ne vos et tempora vestra...morer orationis dispendio'.[185] Similar phrases occur in letters 7 ('Sed ne vos vestraque tempora morer')[186], 15 ('sed ne vos et vestra tempora morer'),[187] and 16 ('sed ne prolixe vos morer orationis

[178] Ibid., no.18: 'Si etiam et nomen meum supprimo, ne miremini', see and no.17, trans. *LCA*, no.3.07.
[179] *LDL* no.17: 'quamvis ad vos ciuitas illa nec expugnatione pertineat, sicut Affrica Scipioni, nec dominatione, sicut sua Cesari Rome concessit. Titulum hunc vobis de sola minus utili natiuitate nouimus attributum, sed utinam quandoque natiuitati et cognomini', trans. *LCA*, no.3.07.
[180] *LDL*, no.18: 'quorum quidam a loci doctrina, quidam a sola disciplina, quidam ab inhabitione licet non perpetua, illius quondam urbis nostre titulo se gauisi sunt insigniri'.
[181] Ibid.
[182] Ibid.
[183] Ibid., no.13.
[184] Ibid., no.20.
[185] Ibid., no.18.
[186] Ibid., no.7.
[187] Ibid., no.15.

dispendio')[188]. Letter 18 can be attributed to David's authorship on account of its contents, and the shared phrases between the letters listed here point towards a shared authorship. In Letters 12 and 14 the letter-writer also expresses in a different phrase the high esteem in which he holds his recipient: 'Scitis enim quoniam, statim post Dominum, unicam et singularem pre omni anima que viuit in carne, in vobis habuerim fidutiam.'[189]

Another phrase that is reused in the letters appears in letters 1: 'precibus meis si que sunt, vos exoratum cupio',[190] and 2, 3, and 13 in the same way ('precibus meis vos exoratum cupio')[191], and in 15 ('qua possum precum instantia vos exoratum cupio')[192]. In each case the letter-writer is hoping for something different from his recipient: favour for the letter-bearer[193], that the recipient have faith in him[194], that they remember him fondly[195], or that they send him money[196]. The phrase also appears in letter 21 ('omni qua possum precum instantia vos dominos meos exoratos cupio')[197], to which David puts his name. I suggest, therefore, that he found it useful to repeat this phrase when he needed to make a request, and therefore Letters 1-3, 13, and 15 can all be attributed to his authorship.

The most recurrent phrase throughout the letters in slightly varying form remains 'a memoria vestra me non ventilauit obliuio'.[198] In one letter it is 'those days' which the author hopes his recipient has not forgotten, rather than himself[199], in another it is a conversation[200], and in another it is the favour his recipient had shown towards him[201]. In other letters, it is the author's memory which has either

[188] Ibid., no.16.
[189] Ibid., no.12. No.14 reads as follows: 'Scitis, mi domine, quoniam pre omni anima que viuit in carne singularem in vobis habeo fidutiam et a diebus illis semper habui'.
[190] Ibid., no.1.
[191] Ibid., nos.2, 3 and 13.
[192] Ibid., no.15.
[193] Ibid.
[194] Ibid., no.1.
[195] Ibid., no.13.
[196] Ibid., no.2.
[197] Ibid., no.21.
[198] Ibid., nos.3, 11, see also nos.9, 18.
[199] Ibid., no.9: 'dies illos'.
[200] Ibid., no.11: 'Verbum tamen illud gratie quod in discessu meo mecum ultimum habuistis...si tamen illud a memoria vestra non ventilauit obl(ivio)'.
[201] Ibid., no.20: 'Si gratiam illam antiquam quam in oculis vestris inueni a me(moria) v(estra) nondum ventil(auit) obl(iuio)'.

failed[202], or not[203]. We are fortunate that the phrase appears in Letter 18, for which David can be identified as the author, where David hopes that those 'urbes preclaras' which he goes on to discuss have not disappeared from Arnulf's memory.[204]

As well as these recurring phrases, there are various overlapping themes in the letters that suggest they were written by the same author. In letter 1, the author is concerned that his recipient has been turned against him by the lies of others, so that the author has been 'expelled', so that he hopes to convince him that he has done nothing wrong.[205] On this basis we can suggest that the author is David and the recipient is Foliot, for there are two letters which can be firmly attributed to Foliot which refer to troubles between him and David.[206] In letter 82 the Pope writes to Foliot, recommending David and asking the bishop not to 'believe the wicked intimations of any others, nor in any way withdraw your faith from him', likely referring to the same troubles David wrote about.[207] Letter 1 then, was sent by David and it is likely he is referring to his personal disputes. Letters 5, 6, and 13 refer to the same events. In Letter 5 the writer addresses another unknown recipient requesting help with his 'lord'; surely a reference to Foliot.[208] The anonymous recipient is possibly Robert de Broi, for he is referred to in another letter as prepared to assist David.[209] Letter 6 contains a reference to Foliot, to whom the author has 'shown [themselves] a son in the flesh and a faithful servant beyond faith', but despite this the author expects to be exiled from his city, as well as 'a certain other world, which I inhabited, albeit for a short time'.[210] The city in question must be London, which means that the letter was describing David's troubles with the chapter of St Paul's, though this letter does assume a different tone to David's usual style and contains more Biblical and patristic allusions that was his

[202] Ibid., no.13: 'Recolo et vix a memoria mea ventilabit obliuio quid michi...conuenerit'.
[203] Ibid., no.15: 'A pectore meo non excidit nec unquam a mem(oria) m(ea) v(entilauit) o(blivio) id plurimum honoris et gratie quod michi fecistis'.
[204] Ibid., no.18.
[205] Ibid., no.1: 'a domo vestra et laribus expulerunt me...profugum'.
[206] *GFL*, no.190 and *LDL*, no.34.
[207] *LDL*, no.82: 'nec aduersus eum prauis aliquorum suggestionibus credas vel de ipsius in aliquo fidelitate diffidas'.
[208] Ibid., no.5: 'sic enim audio quod adhuc in oculis domini mei pro me bene loquimini'.
[209] Ibid., no.1.
[210] Ibid., no.6: 'cui me filium carnalem supra fidem fidele mancipium exhibui´ and 'quam ab alio quodam quem etsi tempore modico, incolui orbe.'

usual practice. This letter can be linked to Foliot's letter to Roger of Worcester (Letter 34).[211] Letter 13 refers to its author as an exile, '[from] the house of my lord, and afterwards...from the land in which I was born' - another reference to David's troubles in London.[212] What, the writer asks, 'is more ugly than to wage war with those you lived with as a household'?[213] This must be a reference to the chapter at St Paul's, and the writer's 'lord', whom he has displeased, is once again Foliot. Reference is certainly made throughout the letter to a dispute over an appointment.[214] This may be a reference to the events described in letter 34, to be explored further in Chapter Two.[215] Letter 25 also seems to refer to these troubles, for its author 'lost the grace of many, and I collected the displeasure of many'.[216] Therefore, letters 1, 5, 6, and 13 can all be attributed to David and linked to his disputes at London.

Letters 1-2 and 12 all refer to financial difficulties the author suffered as a result of his time in Bologna. I have already shown that letter 1 was written by David, and we know that David spent time in Italy,[217] specifically at Bologna,[218] and Foliot had sent David to Bologna along with his nephews.[219] Letters 3 and 5 also refer to this time spent at Bologna.[220] In letter 1, the author had hoped to receive money from 'Lord N.'[221] yet in Letter 2 he complains of the 'total negligence' of 'Lord N.' who has not helped him.[222] Letter 3 begins with musings on the friendship possible between rich and poor

[211] Ibid., no.34. See also Chapter Two, 94-101.
[212] Ibid., no.13: 'ipsi viderint qui me prius a domo domini mei turpiter elimitarunt et postmodum terre in qua homo natus sum fecerunt extorrere.'
[213] Ibid.: 'At quid turpius quam bellum gerere cum quibus familiariter vixeris?'.
[214] Ibid.: 'quod quisquis fuerit qui ab hoc aliud ei suadere nititur, non quid honoris sui celsitudinem deceat intelligit, aut certe tamen que sua sunt querit, vel profecto non diligit.'
[215] Above ft.211.
[216] Ibid., no.25: 'Multorum gratiam amisi, multorum offensam contraxi.'
[217] See Ibid., no.18 and *GFL*, no.190.
[218] See *LDL*, no.71.
[219] *GFL*, nos.188, 189, 191, 192.
[220] *LDL*, no.3: 'Proculdubio scitote quoniam pre ceteris quos diebus istis de partibus nostris vidi Bolonie' ['Know without doubt and before all else that having seen those from our parts who have come to Bologna'], and no.5: 'Aduentantibus Boloniam dominis meis archid(iaconis), nepotibus domini mei, letus factus sum' ['I rejoice at the arrival in Bologna of my lord, the archdeacons, my lord's kinsmen'].
[221] Ibid., no.1: 'Pro his .xii. marcis, quas mutuo accepi, dimisi prebendam meam totam intus et extra domino N. Presumebam enim quam plurimum de fide ipsius.' ['For these 12 marks, that I received as a loan, I handed over my entire prebend, both inside and out, to the Lord N. For I trusted entirely to his good faith.'].
[222] Ibid., no.2: 'Sed ne vel meos redditus, vel meos incusare videar excessus, lesit me supramodum et inhumane nimis incuria domini N., ne cetera querar, et in huius cuiusdam extreme condicionis precipitauit periculum.' ['You may think I am blaming my income or my own excesses, but I was inhumanely injured beyond measure by the total negligence of Lord N.'].

men, concerning which its author has already written to the recipient - possibly a reference to Letter 1 or 2.[223] Though little detail is provided in letter 8, it refers to much the same business as does letter 7: Foliot's request to David for aid during the Becket dispute, though it is clearly addressed to a different recipient. Letter 23 must have been written by David while he was at the Curia on Foliot's behalf, and letter 26 clearly shows David discussing his pensions which can be tracked in the Pipe Rolls.[224]

As demonstrated, there are many phrases that reappear throughout several of the letters. On the basis of the Latin alone it can be shown that letters 1-3, 7, 9-16, 18, 20, and 27 can be attributed to David's authorship. Once the contents of the letters are considered, we can also add letters 5, 6, 8, 12, 23, 25-6. This leaves only letters 24, 53, and 70 still unaccounted for and potentially anonymous.

Other Manuscript Copies

This is the only extant manuscript copy of David's collection in its entirety. However, a small number of the letters do survive separately in other manuscripts. One such is Letter 51 (*Eterna et incommutabilis*) in which Alexander III describes the circumstances of his election and the schism. This letter was sent in different versions to a variety of recipients, of which David's collection preserves the version sent to the bishop and clergy of Paris. There is one other twelfth-century manuscript copy of this version, in Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 9. 17, the decretal collection known as the *Collectio Cantabrigiensis*. There are textual differences between the two copies which can be attributed to scribal error. Even so, both copies seem to be taken from the same exemplar, though Trinity's is a fuller version of the letter with, for example, a passage that is missing in V, and the correct first person plural version of the verb *dicere* where V has the first person singular, most unlikely to have been used by the Pope.[225] The section of Trinity R. 9. 17 in which this letter appears is a collection of decretals, and the two hands which appear in this section have been dated to around

[223] Ibid., no.3: 'Unde rari diuites pauperum reperiuntur amici, dum vel diues a paupere non se sed sua queri coniectat, vel dum pauper quia suspitiosus diuitem ad gratiam incurare formidat. Hac de causa factum est quod salutationis mee litteras, velut nunc tardius susceperitis.' ['Whence the rich are rarely accounted friends of the poor, either because in the pauper the rich man perceives one who covets not himself but his possessions, or because the pauper, being suspect, is reluctant to request the favour of the right. It is for this reason that you will have only now, and lately, have received these letters with my greeting.'].
[224] See Chapter Two, 79-80.
[225] The letter is on fo.72.

1200, so roughly contemporaneous with David's collection. But it has been suggested that the collection is of French origin or is an English copy of a French collection.[226] It is therefore all the more interesting that David's English collection contains this letter. It is possible, although unproved, that he received a copy of this letter whilst in France at the schools.[227]

Some of the letters can also be found in C, the main (Oxford) manuscript of Foliot's letter collection. One of these is letter 29 (*Excellentie tue nuntios*) sent from the Pope to Henry II in 1168 regarding a royal embassy to the Curia. The letter survives in three copies besides V and C.[228] The two manuscripts, V and C, share textual differences from the other manuscript copies, such as 'negotia' for 'negotium', 'dilectionis' for 'caritatis', the omission of the *salutatio* and the name of Clarembald, the abbot-elect of St Augustine's. There are a few differences between C and V, for example the omission of a word in C which appears in V and *vice versa*, which suggests that rather than one being a copy of the other, they have been copied from the same exemplar. This is also the case for at least two of the other letters from David's collection. Letter 38 also shares textual differences with C, and letter 40 retains its *salutatio* only in V and C. This suggests that the compilers both of C and of David's collection had access to the same version of certain letters.[229] It cannot be the case that David carried these letters to Foliot himself, and so made copies of them in this way, for all three of these letters were sent in 1168 or 1169 when he was at Bologna. Therefore, he must have had access to Foliot's archives after his return to London in the 1170s, deciding that these letters were worthy of inclusion in his own collection.

The remaining letters from David's collection that can be found in other copies generally display too few textual differences to determine V's relationship to them.[230] However of these, letter 30 was written from the Pope to all the bishops of England, so Foliot may well have had a copy in his archive, and letters 33 and 82, originally one single epistle, were sent from the Pope to Foliot and

[226] W. Holtzmann, *Studies in the Collection of Twelfth-Century Decretals: From the Papers of the Late Walther Holtzmann*, ed. C. R. Cheney and M. G. Cheney (Vatican City 1979), 28-30.
[227] See Chapter Two, 60-2.
[228] The others are: London, Lambeth Palace, MS Lambeth 136; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 937; and London, British Library, MS Claudius B II.
[229] See *LDL*, nos.38, 40 for details of these textual differences.
[230] This includes Ibid., nos.30, 33, 44 and 82.

David likely carried this missive back to London in person, with ample chance to make a copy for himself. Letter 60 can also be found in both V and C, but the version in V appears to have been shortened so that it could be used as a formulary model. Letter 83, one of the letters of recommendation for David, also appears in C, as does another recommendation, letter 85.[231] Why these particular recommendations were added to C when others were not, remains unclear. The two versions of letter 83 have various minor differences, barring one significant divergence: the exclusion from C of a short final phrase: 'nec illius qualitatis homo videtur qui a vestra velit deuotione recedere.'[232] As it is only David's version that preserves this phrase, and C adds nothing not found in V but only makes minor changes, it is possible that C takes its text from V. For letter 85, the version in C omits the *salutatio* found in V, and omits a passage towards the end. Other textual differences suggest that both copies come from an exemplar, and not from one another.[233]

Letter 39, from Foliot to Henry II, survives in two versions, and David's collection contains the only copy of this particular version. Morey and Brooke suggested that David's version was probably sent to him by Foliot for reference, and the second version is either the one actually sent or a later revision.[234] Either way, David was in Italy at the time it was written and sent. Although I have shown that David took some letters from Foliot's archive, it is the second version of the letter that survives in Foliot's own collections, so David could not have taken the text of his letter from there unless he amended it before including it in his collection. Therefore, Morey and Brooke's suggestion seems plausible.

Letter 45 appears in David's collection without a *salutatio* but seems to have been sent by John of Salisbury to John of Poitiers, and survives in multiple copies. The letter provides an account of the meeting between Becket and the papal legates, between Gisors and Trie. The version found in David's collection follows a revised version of an earlier letter that exists in two earlier recensions.[235] Three

[231] 83 can be found in C on fo.198v and 85 on fo.144r.
[232] *LDL*, no.83: 'no man of that quality shall be seen who should wish to retire from your devotion.'
[233] For instance, the version in C has 'Lund(oniensis)' where V has 'Romana'.
[234] *GFL*, no.203(a) and (b), and 275n.
[235] For details see *LJS*, no.230 fn.1. The other manuscripts are: Cotton Claudius B II; Bodley 937 (3088); and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 295.

other manuscripts contain this revised version, though V does have minor differences which in some instances, though not all, agree with Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Rawlinson Q.f. 8 (henceforth R), a twelfth-century manuscript from Ely. The materials within this manuscript were compiled in stages from the 1160s and the letters within can be divided into five sections:

1. A widely circulated selection of letters relating to English and papal history
2. A small collection of Becket materials
3. A unique collection of Becket letters with 'a marked royal and episcopal bias'
4. Another Becket collection
5. John of Salisbury's *Ex insperato*, describing Becket's murder and Alexander III's announcement of the Peace of Venice in 1177.[236]

As V contains a version somewhere between R and the revised version of letter 45, it seems it is not a copy of R but rather must come from another copy of a letter that seems to have circulated widely.

Letter 44 appears in numerous manuscript copies. However, the version preserved in David's collection differs from those found elsewhere.[237] The differences here suggest that, rather than its being a copy of the original letter sent from Becket to Henry of Blois, David's version may have been sent to another recipient, with the name of the addressee suppressed in V.

The Afterlife of the Collection

Aside from a single hint that the compilers of Foliot's collection may have had access to David's, it is extremely difficult to determine any kind of use for David's collection after its compilation. As it was compiled from London records we might expect to see some use of it there, though it may have left with David, its maker, some time in the 1170s.[238] One obvious place to look for its use is Ralph de Diceto's *Ymagines Historiarum*, for which he used a number of letters as his sources, particularly for the years 1163-73. Diceto was dean of St Paul's by 1181, and wrote his *Ymagines* whilst at London. Some letters were directly quoted in the *Ymagines*.[239] However, Diceto only quotes from part of one

[236] See Duggan, *Textual History*, 38-46, 169, 233-5; *CTB*, ii, lxxii-lxxiii.
[237] For instance the *salutatio* has been changed in David's collection and there is an additional valete clause not found elsewhere, see *LDL*, no.44.
[238] See Chapter Two.
[239] Anne and Charles Duggan write that 'Diceto was very much dependent on epistolary records for his reconstruction of the story, and his selection from the very large number of letters available was limited and fragmentary, but without partisan emphasis', A. Duggan and C. Duggan, 'Ralph de Diceto, Henry II and Becket', *Authority and Power: Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. B. Tierney and P. Linehan (Cambridge 1980), 69.

letter from David's collection, letter 33 (*Quod tibi*), and in a text with distinct differences from David's version.[240] A selection of letters used by Diceto do appear in section 3 (Becket) of V. One of these is *Desiderio desideraui*.[241] But yet again, there are significant textual differences between Diceto's version and that found in V. These vary, but in some instances Diceto adds a word that is omitted in V, and in others it is the other way around.[242] These differences suggest that Diceto did not take his copy of this letter from V. Comparison of another letter sent from Foliot to the Pope (*Mandatum vestrum*) suggests the same.[243] This is not the place for a full analysis of Diceto's epistolary sources, but even this initial comparison suggests Diceto did not use V as a source for his chronicle.

Conclusion

It has been shown that parts of V were compiled from London sources, most likely from Foliot's archive. As demonstrated, David himself appears to have taken the text of some of his letters from Foliot's archive. There is no evidence to suggest that V had an afterlife at London or was used by the great London historian, Ralph Diceto. Quite who made it remains conjectural. Almost certainly someone working in a London milieu. Most likely, perhaps David himself. Though our lack of direct evidence here does not necessarily indicate that the manuscript left London, as shall be shown David's career did carry him away from London in the 1170s and so potentially the manuscript also.

The arrangement of the letters in groups suggests there may have been practical uses for the original smaller collections of letters, or at least a thematic ordering that was inherent to their preservation within David's archive. For example, despite the letters of recommendation (Letters 71-87) being addressed to different recipients and written over a period of around a year, they were kept as one group of letters. Was this group kept together so that David could use them as references when

[240] See *LDL*, no.33.
[241] Found on fos.73r-v, printed *CTB*, ii, no.74, and found in Ralph Diceto, 'Ymagines Historiarum', *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London* ii, ed. W. Stubbs (New edn. Cambridge 2012), 320-1.
[242] For instance, in line 2 of the letter in 'Ymagines' Diceto adds 'quidem', and has 'me' where V has 'mei'.
[243] This letter is fos.74r-v, *GFL*, no.155, Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 331-2. For instance, line 3 of the letter in 'Ymagines': V has '...et si in ipsis iam Gualie finibus exercitum agentem adivimus. Et adiuncto nobis venerabili fratre nostro R. Herefordensi episcopo iuxta vestri formam...' where Diceto has 'adivimus et juxta vestri formam...'.

needed? If so, these letters worked to David's benefit, and after his first period at the Curia in 1169-70 perhaps helped him secure a pension he is known to have enjoyed. Clearly these groups were designed to be read as such, for we see in group one heavy abbreviation of phrases in successive letters whose readers were clearly supposed to remember that precisely these same phrases had appeared in letters earlier within the group.[244]

These groupings and the use of London sources strongly suggests that it was David himself who compiled the collection, One further notable piece of evidence to support this suggestion is the use of various Italianate spellings throughout, where the scribe has opted for 'cc' or over a 't'.[245] This despite the fact that the script is clearly English. This would suggest that the scribe had extensive experience in Italy, as we know David did.

David seems to have compiled the collection using a combination of drafts, originals, and copies of letters, perhaps already arranged into smaller dossiers of such materials. Some of these were likely preserved in his archive along with his charters, though others may have been more peripatetic and had a practical purpose. The question that remains unanswered is whether or not David ever intended the collection to be shared and read. There is no epistolary prologue as there is to the collections of Arnulf of Lisieux, Nicholas of Clairvaux, and others, suggesting that the most likely answer here is 'no'. Yet, the preservation of David's own collection within V, alongside the letters of his contemporaries, certainly promotes David's letters amidst extremely exalted company.

[244] For an example of this see *LDL*, no.8.
[245] For instance, see letter 6 where we have 'dileccionis' rather than 'dilectionis'.

Chapter Two: Master David's Career

Early Life

In his 1927 article, Brooke provided an overview of David's career and began to explore the content of the letters. However, he was limited by space and word count, and could supply only an overview. A more detailed narrative of David's life will be provided here, including an exploration of his relationships at St Paul's and beyond.

It is clear from two letters in the collection that David was from London, though, as Arnulf of Lisieux wrote to him:

> 'That city did not fall to you from battle as Africa did to Scipio, or from domination as Rome did to Caesar. We know that this title has been attributed to you solely by birth.'[246]

We know nothing of David's family, and nowhere in the letters does he make reference to any relatives. It seems he could not call upon them when he needed financial support, and in 1170 the Pope described David merely as a native of the English realm, with no suggestion here of anything save humble birth.[247] In his reply to Arnulf, David recalled other men from London who he deemed to be greater than himself. One of these had acquired the title 'of London' through learning, one by teaching, and one by where he lived. But there was one who in recent memory was 'found pleasing and decorated with glory before all his other comrades in the eyes of his prince.'[248] This was surely Thomas (Becket) of London, former *familiaris* and chancellor of Henry II, elected archbishop of Canterbury in 1162.[249] If a relatively humble Londoner like Becket could receive the praise and rewards of his prince, then might there not yet be hope for others, David himself included?

---

[246] *LDL*, no.17, trans. *LCA*, no.3.07.
[247] *LDL*, no.71: 'quoniam in regno tuo de quo extitit oriundus natalis soli dulcedine captus'.
[248] Ibid., no.18: 'Sed forte fuit hoc non nubilis temporibus, sed cum ei sui dies arriserent et tempora, cum armis et ornatu decora pre ceteris participibus suis in oculis sui principis inuesta est gratiosa.'
[249] William FitzStephen, later wrote that 'St Thomas glorified both these cities- London by his rise and Canterbury by the setting of his sun- by that same token the one might claim his merit with greater justice than the other.' Latin in *MTB,* iii, 2; trans. Morey and Brooke, *Foliot,* 161.

On the basis of letter 18 it has been assumed that David studied at 'Clermont' (precise identification uncertain), and there received the title *magister*.[250] However, another reading suggests that David was in fact a teacher at Clermont. He claimed to have been previously known as 'Claremontensis' ('of *Clarus Mons*'), after that 'famous place' where he was master *emeritus* before removing to Paris.[251] The two possibilities for the Clermont he is referring to are Clermont-Ferrand, in the Auvergne, and Clermont-en-Beauvaisis, in the modern département of the Oise. The most 'famous' Clermont, though, was Clermont-Ferrand, location of the preaching of the first Crusade.[252] Clermont-Ferrand had been the location of a cathedral school since at least the late-tenth century and from the turn of the eleventh century the church and canons there were known solely as the 'ecclesia Claromontensis' and the 'canonici Claromontenses' or 'Claromontis'.[253]

As Richard Southern noted in his work on the schools of Paris and Chartres, pupils from the schools were wont to refer to themselves according to the individual masters under whom they studied. Hence, pupils of Robert of Melun were known as the 'Meludinenses'.[254] Their masters and teachers, on the other hand, might derive their own nicknames from the school at which they taught: Robert of Melun was known as such because he taught at the royal palace of Melun.[255] David was not suggesting that he completed his studies at Clermont. Indeed, he writes to Arnulf that when he was at Clermont he was a master 'emeritus', a title commonly used alongside 'provectus', 'doctor', and 'peritus', to denote a

[250] For this assertion see Brooke, 'Register', 236, whence for instance Cheney, 'Roger', 208.
[251] Ibid., no.18: 'Per annos enim aliquot dictus fui Claremontensis, a loco celebri in Galliarum partibus, ubi priusquam Parisius habitans fui magister emeritus.'
[252] Mentioned in accounts of the preaching of the first crusade, for example that by William of Tyre, who wrote how Pope Urban convened a synod 'in God's name, at Clermont, a city of Auvergne', William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* i, trans. E. Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York 1943), 88. However, the addition of the province in which Clermont is located does suggest that he believed his audience may not be precisely sure of where the city is. Either that or he felt the exact location of the preaching was very important, and wanted to ensure his readers had exactly the right information, given that there was another Clermont in France. Thanks to Dr Andrew Buck for pointing me towards this reference.
[253] *Chartes et Documents de L'Église de Clermont Antérieurs Au Xiie Siècle*, ed. E. Grélouis and M. Saudan (Paris 2015), 44.
[254] R. Southern, 'The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres', *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. R. L. Benson and G. Constable (Oxford 1982), 114. Incidentally, I briefly wondered if 'Claremontensis' might refer to the Mont Ste Geneviève just outside Paris, a place of study for many at the time David was at the schools. However, David is clear that he was 'Claremontensis' **before** he was in Paris and though the Mont was just outside the city it was often equated with it. Further, Southern notes in idem that students of the masters of the Mont called themselves 'Montani'.
[255] C. J. Mews, 'The Schools and Intellectual Renewal in the Twelfth Century: A Social Approach', *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools*, ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019), 24.

student who had completed an advanced course of study, used in opposition to 'rusticus', to denote those who had completed only a basic degree.[256] David's nickname 'of Clermont' signified his role as teacher there, rather than student. Where he studied before is uncertain, although one plausible suggestion given his later career and place of birth is St Paul's London, which had a cathedral school from at least the late-eleventh century.[257] Another option might be the Augustinian priory of St Mary at Merton in Surrey, with which David had some connection, for he later gifted the priory a part of a manuscript, rebound in the thirteenth century.[258] Merton, of course, had previously been Becket's school.

In letter 18 David provided further information on his time at Clermont: there he held his 'first magisterial chair' (*prima cathedra magistralis*).[259] It is not clear at precisely what kind of school he taught, whether urban, cathedral, courtly, private, or monastic (the latter the least likely, as there is no

[256] C. Frova, 'Le scuole municipali all'epoca delle università', *Vocabulaire des écoles et des méthodes d'enseignement au moyen âge: Actes du colloque Rome 21-22 octobre 1989*, ed. O. Weijers (Turnhout 1992), 189 and fn.31. 'Emeritus' is from 'emerere' meaning 'to finish (a task or course)' or 'to earn, merit' and was often used in a military context to refer to a veteran, see for instance John of Salisbury, *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury* trans. D. D. McGarry (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1955), 143 fn.10. My thanks to Dr Ian Wei for providing his thoughts on this matter and referring me to the Metalogicon.

[257] There had been a schoolmaster at St Paul's since before 1100. The schoolmasters of St Paul's were responsible for the granting of teaching licenses throughout London, and no one was permitted to teach without his approval, except at the schools of St Mary le Bow and St Martin le Grand. See K. Deane, 'From Conquest to Capital: St Paul's *c*.1100-1300', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004), 23; and *St Paul*, no.275.

[258] Now British Library, Royal MS 9 E XII, with the inscription 'Hunc librum dedit Magister Dauid Londoniensis Ecclesie Beate Marie de Meritona. Quem diu abstulerit, vel quocumque modo alienauerit, vel pignori subposuerit, vel extra septa ecclesie commodauerit, vel titulum istum deleuerit vel mutauerit anathema sit'. ['Master David of London gave this book to the church of the Blessed Mary of Merton, and he who shall long remove it or lose it in any way whatsoever or subject it to a pledge or lend it outside the wall of the church or eras or changes this title, shall be excommunicated.'] The inscription is on fos.1r and 10v. The MS is described in N. Ker's *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain*, online version no.3964, [http://mlgb3.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/e/mlgb/book/3964/, accessed 11/02/2022] and in the British Library catalogue at [https://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?tabs=detailsTab&ct=display&doc=IAMS040-002106469&displayMode=full&vid=IAMS_VU2&_ga=2.151394751.743217569.1638013735-1930674178.1631527267, accessed 23/02/2021].

[259] *LDL*, no.18. It is worth noting the relationship between the diocese of Clermont and Cluny, where Gilbert Foliot was a monk in the 1130s until he became abbot of Gloucester. For instance the canons of Clermont and the monks of Cluny witness together a charter of Aimeric (d.1150), bishop of Clermont, declaring that any serious and grave conflict between him and Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, and the canons of Clermont and monks of Cluny, is to be extinguished with God's help. Printed in *Cartulaire de Sauxillanges*, ed. H. Doniol (Clermont-Ferrand and Paris 1864), 630. Pope Celestine II wrote to Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, informing him that he was only tolerating Aimeric's behaviour- who had not appeared before the Pope in accordance with the instructions of Pope Innocent II, and had not presented an excuse- for Peter's sake, see *Letters of Peter the Venerable* ii, ed. G. Constable (Cambridge, MA 1967), 175. For Aimeric see B. Gonod, *Chronologie des évêques de Clermont et des principaux événemens de l'histoire ecclésiastique de l'Auvergne* (Clermont-Ferrand 1833), 29-32.

evidence that David ever took monastic vows). His self-professed title suggests he did not teach as a private tutor for a noble, or at a courtly school where it was less likely there would be an official seat of learning. Clermont-Ferrand's 'magistri schole' had held chapter land since at least 976.[260] In the first half of the eleventh century a charter of the bishop was witnessed by Autbertus 'caput schole' (head of the school), and half a century later another charter was witnessed by Bernard 'cabiscolus'.[261] Pope Gregory VII (d.1085) ordered all bishops to make provision for the teaching of the liberal arts in their churches: evidently the bishops of Clermont had complied.[262] Wherever David taught we can presume he taught one or all of the liberal arts: most likely grammar, rhetoric, dialetics (the *trivium*), rather than arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy (the *quadrivium*).

After Clermont, as David explained to Arnulf, he moved to Paris, presumably to undertake further study or teaching. By the middle of the twelfth century Paris had asserted its pre-eminence amongst the schools of France, and a large number of students converged upon the city.[263] Within a few years of David's arrival in Paris other English students such as John of Salisbury and Peter of Blois also moved there, men comparable to David in their backgrounds, who each went on to serve the archbishops of Canterbury.[264] Students would be taught there by renowned masters such as Peter Lombard, Peter Abelard, and Gilbert of La Porrée, with each 'school' centred around one of the masters.[265] William of Tyre recalled his days at the schools of Paris from *c.*1146 where he studied letters with 'excellent teachers, venerable men, worthy of cherished memory, vessels of learning'.[266] David was not unusual

[260] *Histoire généalogique de la maison d'Auvergne* ii, ed. E. Baluze (Paris 1708), 38-9.
[261] E. Lesne, *Les Écoles de la fin du VIIe siècle a la fin du XIIe* (Lille 1940), 64.
[262] For discussion on this, see T. Kouamé, 'The Institutional Organisation of the Schools', *Companion to Schools*, ed. Giraud, 30-1.
[263] Southern, 'Paris and Chartres', 123-4 and 128, where he suggested it would not be surprising were there two or three thousand students there in around 1140. For the subjects taught at Paris see: A. Sapir Abulafia, 'Intellectual and Cultural Creativity', *The Central Middle Ages: Europe 950-1350*, ed. D. Power (Oxford 2006), 153 and Mews, 'Intellectual Renewal', 11. For the importance of the schools there, see for instance A. L. Gabriel, *Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Mediaeval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1969), 2-4.
[264] Peter of Blois studied Roman Law in Bologna *c.*1150-55, R. Southern, 'Towards an Edition of Peter of Blois's Letter-Collection', *EHR* 110 (1995), 929; John of Salisbury studied and taught at Paris in the 1130s-40s, S. Jaeger, 'Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century "Renaissance"', *Speculum* 78 (2003), 1169.
[265] For noted masters at Paris in the first half of the twelfth century see John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, 97; and see also the list of masters from the *c.*1150 *Metamorphosis Goliae Episcopi*, ed. R. L. Poole, 'The Masters of the Schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time', *EHR* 35 (July 1920), 336-337 which includes Bartholomew, later bishop of Exeter.
[266] William of Tyre, *Chronique*, ed. R. B. C. Huygens (Turnhout 1986), 800-1, this passage translated in Jaeger, 'Pessimism', 1166.

in his decision to study and teach abroad: 'English' men made up the largest 'non-French' group of masters at the Paris and other French schools.[267] David may even have begun his legal studies in Paris. Not only this, but Paris was renowned as a place of study, but it offered the chance of upward mobility for those who taught there.[268] Many students went to Paris to study theology in the hope of securing employment with a bishop or other churchman.[269] It is unclear precisely when David was there, but the preservation in the collection of letter 51, the cyclical letter of Alexander III to the bishop and clergy of Paris, written in October 1159 to inform them of events surrounding the schism, suggests that David was in Paris when the letter arrived, or at least shortly after. Other copies of this same letter were sent to European clerics and notables, including the bishop of Bologna, the archbishop of Canterbury, King Henry II of England, and the archbishop of Salzburg.[270] However, as discussed, the only other manuscript copy of this letter is almost certainly of French origin.[271] The letter would likely have circulated around Paris, so we can presume that it came into David's hands this way. There is no record of him being in Paris aside from his own autobiographical remarks, and if he was there as a teacher he was evidently not considered significant amongst his peers, for he was not named in any of the accounts of masters there. He may have been there merely as a student, perhaps working part-time as a private tutor, as John of Salisbury did.[272] If David was in Paris in *c.*1159 he was probably younger than John of Salisbury, who was born between 1115 and 1120, crossed to France for his studies in 1136, and spent twelve years learning there.[273]

There is no sign of David in England in the early 1160s, though he may have been there for some of the time between Foliot's translation from Hereford, on 6 March 1163, and 1167, by which time he was

[267] R. M. Thomson, 'England and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Past & Present* 101 (1983), 7; Gabriel, *Garlandia*, 1-2.
[268] J. W. Baldwin, 'Masters at Paris from 1179 to 1215', *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. R. L. Benson and G. Constable (Oxford 1982), 146.
[269] Baldwin, 'Masters', 151-2; Mews, 'Intellectual Renewal', 15.
[270] For an example of a version of the letter addressed to a different bishop, see *Cafari Annales et Continuatorum Annales Ianuae a.1099-1294*, ed. G. H. Pertz (Hannover 1863) 18, 28-9, which preserves the copy of the letter sent to the bishop of Genoa. For a list of the different letters sent see J-L, nos.10584-92; the letter to the clergy of Paris is no.10589.
[271] See Chapter One, 52-3.
[272] R. Pepin, 'John of Salisbury as a Writer', *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014), 149.
[273] See John of Salisbury, *Metalogicon*, xvi.

definitely in possession of his prebend at London.[274] Though there was a canon named Master David at Hereford *c*.1148-*c*.1183, it is unlikely that this man can be identified as our David.[275] The Hereford David is commemorated in the Hereford obituary roll on 6 September as 'Master David the canon', whereas Master David of London is commemorated in the St Paul's obituary roll on 31 March.[276] Moreover, as we have seen, David is explicit that he was born in London and was regularly called 'of London', which the David who appeared at Hereford was not. Though there is no sign of David at Hereford under Foliot, his name itself might suggest marcher or even Welsh origins. David was certainly not a common name at St Paul's (or in general in this period) where he was the only canon so named 1066-1300.[277] At Hereford, in comparison, alongside the David mentioned above there were at least two other Davids and possibly more.[278] Perhaps a generous uncle helped his nephew and namesake to attain a position in Foliot's household.

It is possible that David was made canon of St Paul's by Foliot's predecessor at London, Richard de Belmeis II (d. 4 May 1162). Competition for prebends was fierce in the English cathedrals, and at St Paul's Richard II's uncle, Richard de Belmeis I (d. Jan 1127), had founded 'the most prolific of all the clerical families of twelfth-century England', promoting at least two of his sons and four of his nephews.[279] The Belmeis connection at London continued with Gilbert Foliot, who was related to the family. By contrast, there is no evidence that David was related to either the Belmeis or the Foliots. Gilbert Foliot makes explicit reference to his various nephews, so the absence of any such reference in his dealings with David is surely definitive proof here. At St Paul's in the twelfth century there was a tradition of nicolaitism in which prebends remained within a particular family, passing to sons or nephews.[280] There is little evidence of David's immediate predecessor in his prebend (William de

[274] *Fasti*, i, 1-4 and 29-30.
[275] Ibid., viii, 65. See also *Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral*, ed. W. Capes (Hereford 1908), 16-7, 19.
[276] For the Hereford David, see *Fasti*, viii, 140 and for the London David, see idem, i, 29-30.
[277] See ibid., i, 103-15.
[278] Most notably David de Aqua, alongside some Davids which may or may not also be him, and David son of Bernard, see ibid., viii, 161-84.
[279] C. Brooke, 'Gregorian Reform in Action: Clerical Marriage in England, 1050-1200', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 12 (1956), 17 and 16-18 for the Belmeis family. See *Fasti*, i, 1-4 for the bishops.
[280] C. N. L. Brooke, 'The Composition of St Paul's, 1086-1163', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 8 (1944), 124-5.

Costentin, probably from Coutances), but the practice of hereditary prebends was already dying out by *c*.1150,[281] and if David were William's son we might expect to see this reflected in his given name. 'William' was a Norman name, but 'David' most decidedly was not.[282]

Several prebends at St Paul's were held by royal clerks but there is no evidence David was in royal service in the 1160s.[283] Instead, he may have received his prebend as reward for work, or more likely for the promise of future work, in the bishop's household. Certainly, various letters suggest that David was counted amongst Foliot's episcopal *familia*.[284] The household of the bishop of London and the chapter of St Paul's were closely linked throughout the twelfth century, and especially so under Foliot.[285] If David studied at the cathedral school of St Paul's and returned after further study in Paris, he might have encountered the new bishop only on returning to England. David himself reminds one of his correspondents (letter 4) that 'As is known … I am a man who does not dream high dreams, nor hunger for the favour of the court, patiently munching my greens however paltry'. But this is polite convention. In reality, his potential as a trained and ambitious cleric led to his employment in Foliot's service, probably in the early 1160s, following Foliot's translation there. At St Paul's there was a tradition whereby promising young men from the diocese would be sent to the schools, then trained in the bishop's household. Probably David was one such young man.[286] If this is accepted as the base chronology, the implication must be that he was in England in or shortly after 1163, had been in Paris in 1159 (presumably for at least a year), had taught at Clermont before this 'for several years' (perhaps around five),[287] had completed his studies and gained the title of master before this (taking perhaps six

[281] Though it did continue to some extent: for instance Nicholas, archdeacon of London, first occ. as canon 1150/1 was promoted to the prebend of Oxgate, which was held before him by his father, see *Fasti*, i, 68.
[282] For William de Constentin, see *Fasti*, i, 29-30 and Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 277.
[283] For instance, Thomas Becket, see *Fasti*, i, 73.
[284] J. Barrow, 'Cathedrals, Provosts and Prebends: A Comparison of Twelfth-Century German and English Practice', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986), 563: 'Ambitious young clerks often had to spend a long time studying or working in lay or ecclesiastical households before they were granted a vicarage or a more valuable benefice'. For references to David as a part of Foliot's household, see *LDL*, nos.1, 34, 21.
[285] For a list of officials of the chapter and those who held prebends at London under Foliot along with a list of his clerks and chaplains, see Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 271-91.
[286] Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 43.
[287] It is rather difficult to determine how long David may have spent studying at Clermont and at Paris. When he was praised and asked how long he had studied at Paris and Bologna, Gerald of Wales boasted that he had studied only at Paris for only three years, so evidently most scholars stayed for longer, Gerald of Wales, *The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis*, trans. H. E. Butler (London 1937), 37. John of Salisbury, on the other hand, spent twelve years at the schools in Paris, see K. S. B. Keats-Rohan, 'John of Salisbury and Education in Twelfth Century Paris from the Account of his *Metalogicon*', *Histories of Universities* 6 (1987), 12. William of

years) and was somewhere between 14 and 20 when he first began his studies.[288] If each of these surmises is correct, then David must have been born between 1127 and *c*.1135.

In *c*.1166-7 David went to Bologna to study law. At the Bolognese schools, canon and Roman law were taught together, with Gratian's *Concordia discordantium canonum* (commonly known as the *Decretum*) used as the main textbook, from the mid-twelfth century onwards.[289] David was probably sent there by Foliot, for in one letter he writes of his having been in Bologna 'before the others who you advanced from our regions'.[290] The 'others' that Foliot sent were two of his nephews (and archdeacons), Richard Foliot and Robert Banastre, who arrived in Bologna shortly after David.[291] It was common for bishops to send their protégés to the schools for further training.[292] Foliot wrote twice to the dean and chapter of Hereford to ask them to allow these nephews, canons there, to receive their portions from the church whilst they were absent in the schools.[293] At least one of them, according to Foliot, was crossing to Italy to study 'as he proposes to do and with our counsel' (*de proposito suo et consilio nostro*).[294] Both nephews first appear as archdeacons *c*.1167/8, at around the same time they were sent to the schools, and these appointments must have been made in order to assure them of an income throughout their

Tyre spent ten years studying the liberal arts and six years studying theology, P. Edbury, and J. G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge 1988), 25, and in 1215 a statute was enacted which declared that no one under the age of twenty-one should lecture in the Arts at Paris, and that he should have heard lectures himself for at least six years before he begins to lecture. This was of course some time after David's time there but may give an indication of the average age of those expected to teach the Arts, though it was enacted in response to long held complaints that scholars were teaching when they were too young. See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* i, ed. H. Denigle and E. Chatelain (Paris 1889), no.20; Baldwin, 'Masters', 144; and I. P. Wei, 'From Twelfth-Century Schools to Thirteenth-Century Universities: The Disappearance of Biographical and Autobiographical Representations of Scholars', *Speculum* 86 (2011), 66-7.

[288] For these were the ages at which students commonly went to the schools, see S. C. Ferruolo, 'The City, Its Schools, and the Origins of the University of Paris', *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, ed. T. Bender (Oxford 1988), 30. See for instance W. Stubbs, ed. *Radulfo de Diceto Decani Lundoniensis opera historica: The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London* i (London 1876), xxxi for a discussion on the age at which Diceto went to the schools.

[289] K. Pennington, 'The Beginnings of Law Schools in the Twelfth Century', *Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools*, ed. Giraud, 243.

[290] *LDL*, no.3: 'Proculdubio scitote quoniam pre ceteris quos diebus istis de partibus nostris vidi Bolonie'.

[291] According to Ibid., no.5.

[292] S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century: An Introductory Study', *Traditio* 7 (1949-51), 280-1; J. W. Baldwin, '*Studium et* regnum: The Penetration of University Personnel into French and English Administration at the Turn of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Revue des études islamiques* 44 (1976). For Bologna see P. Delhaye, 'L'Organisation Scolaire au XIIe Siècle', *Traditio* 5 (1947), 213.

[293] *GFL*, nos.188-9, see also 191-2.

[294] Ibid., no.189.

absence, besides that which they would receive from Hereford.[295] The duties of an archdeacon were heavy, so it is surprising to find Foliot send two of his (surely most trusted) kinsmen abroad in the midst of his troubles with Becket.[296] Foliot had trained in both Roman and canon law when he was at the schools in the 1120s-early 1130s, and would have recognised the value of such training.[297]

Herbert of Bosham's list of Becket's *eruditi* highlighted the great number of learned and capable men with whom the archbishop had surrounded himself during his dispute with Henry II.[298] At least seven of these had legal training, and five went with him into exile.[299] Becket also sent one of his own nephews to Bologna to study.[300] By 1167 Foliot would have known of the legal team Becket had assembled. After his suspension by Becket on Whit-Sunday 1166, and the failure of all attempts to bring about a reconciliation between king and archbishop, Foliot was evidently determined to acquire his own team of experts.[301] It does not seem that this was a long held plan; in one letter sent from Bologna, David wrote of his 'unexpected absence' at the schools.[302] Foliot wrote to a nephew in Bologna ordering him to 'learn what afterwards you shall teach'.[303] The phrase was taken from Jerome, but points to the bishop's intention in sending his nephews there: to ensure they were well-trained in the law so that they might pass this knowledge on to others at St Paul's.[304] Morey and Brooke were sure David was

[295] *Fasti*, i, 13, 19.
[296] Richard Southern aptly described the duties of an archdeacon as 'onerous', in 'Paris and Chartres', 125.
[297] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 52-3.
[298] For Herbert's list written in the 1180s, see *MTB*, iii, 523-31.
[299] Lombard of Piacenza, a 'legal eagle' was probably recruited by Becket straight from Bologna in 1163, A. Duggan, 'The Price of Loyalty: The Fate of Thomas Becket's Learned Household', *Thomas Becket: Friends, Networks, Texts and Cult* (Aldershot 2007), 15; Gerard Pucelle lectured in canon law, and possibly also civil law, at Paris, though he had left Becket's service by the first months of 1166 he wrote to Becket in 1167 reaffirming his loyalty to the exiled archbishop, C. Donahue, 'Pucelle, Gerard (*d*. 1184)', *ODNB*; Gilbert de Glanville, described by Herbert of Bosham as a master of both canon and civil law, M. N. Blount, 'Glanville, Gilbert de (*d*. 1214)', *ODNB;* Ralph of Sarre later oversaw the production of a canon law collection (*Collectio Brugensis c*.1187) suggesting he had legal training, C. Duggan, 'Decretal Collections from Gratian's *Decretum* to the *Compilationes antiquae:* The Making of the New Case Law', *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington DC 2008), 285; Philip of Calne had taught law at Tours (though he not active in Becket's service and made peace with the king in 1166) and Roland of Lombardy and Humbert Crivelli of Milan were two of the Italian lawyers who entered Becket's service, Duggan, 'Price of Loyalty', 15.
[300] *MTB*, vi, no.449.
[301] For the events of 1165-6, see A. Duggan, *Thomas Becket* (London 2004), 101-23.
[302] *LDL*, no.3: 'rogo si quid forsitan inopinatum in me absentem fumum et flamam eructuans cuiusquam'.
[303] *GFL*, no.192: 'disce quod postmodum doceas'.
[304] See Jerome ep.125 to Rustics, a young monk of Toulouse whom Jerome advises not to become an anchorite but to continue in a community. For the English translation and details, see 'The Letters of St Jerome' [http://www.tertullian.org/fathers2/NPNF2-06/Npnf2-06-03.htm#P4761_1305404, accessed 21/08/2020]. This was unnoticed by Morey and Brooke.

'Gilbert's protégé', and evidently he was chosen as another potential *eruditus* for Foliot, to be trained in the law so that he might match the skills of Becket's own *familia*.[305] By 1167 the Pope was in Italy and it must have benefitted Foliot to have three of his most trusted men in close proximity to the Curia. Pursuing a case at the Curia required not only legal skill but an awareness of the customs that governed that most peculiar of forums. Thomas of Marlborough found this out to his peril in the early thirteenth century, when he travelled to Rome to pursue a case against the bishop of Worcester. For his questioning of former actions by Pope Innocent III he stirred up papal anger, and was told to be silent and withdraw from Innocent's presence. As a result of his lack of success at the Curia, and upon the advice of a cardinal, Marlborough spent six months in Bologna studying the law and becoming better acquainted with curial procedure, so that he might later return and again press his case.[306]

David complained regularly of his financial situation whilst in Bologna: a common theme amongst the letters of students of the time.[307] Expenses were many, including books, lodgings, clothing, food, and tuition.[308] David informed his correspondents he was living under heavy usury on account of the loans he had taken out to support himself.[309] The level of interest charged on loans in the twelfth century was often exorbitanly high.[310] Before leaving London for Bologna, David had received a loan of twelve marks, but only seven of these made it to the schools to cover his expenses: he had been forced to use the other five to pay off debts incurred in England before his departure.[311] Though he had received the prebend of Brownswood before he left,[312] according to Alexander III this prebend was 'insignificant and modest' (*tenuis et modicus*) and not fit for David's needs.[313] Some of the

[305] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 211.
[306] *Chronicon Abbatiae de Evesham*, ed. W. Dunn Macray (London: Rolls Series, 1863), 141-47.
[307] See for instance, *LDL*, nos.1-2, and C. H. Haskins, 'The Life of Medieval Students as Illustrated by their Letters', *The American Historical Review*, 3 (1898), 208-9.
[308] For student costs at Bologna in the thirteenth century, see S. Stelling-Michaud, *L'université de Bologne et la pénétration des droits Romain et canonique en Suisse aux XIIe et XIVe siècles* (Geneva 1955), 88-9.
[309] *LDL*, nos.1, 2, 12; a term used before the late twelfth century to apply only to loans between Christians, see D. Nicholas, 'Economy', *The Central Middle Ages: Europe 950-1320*, ed. D. Power (Oxford 2006), 82.
[310] Nicholas, 'Economy', 83.
[311] *LDL*, no.1.
[312] *Fasti*, i, 29-30; *GFL*, no.188; *LDL*, no.72 where the Pope states that David has been at the schools for three years or more. Brownswood's income came from the parish of Willesden in Middlesex, see R. Newcourt, *Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense: Comprising An Ecclesiastical History of the Diocese of London* (London 1708), 760, and *Registrum Statutorum et Consuetudinum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Sancti Pauli Londoniensis*, ed. W. Sparrow Simpson (London 1873), iv.
[313] *LDL*, no.72.

prebends at St Paul's were meagre, and their income was often supplemented by other payments from the common fund. It was agreed by Alexander III that nothing need be paid to absentee canons besides the rents from their lands and their weekly allowance of bread, ale, and ten-pence.[314] David's prebend of Brownswood was not the most meagre at St Paul's, but it was certainly not the wealthiest, ranking twelfth in terms of income amongst the thirty prebends assessed under Dean Baldock before 1305, valued at five marks per annum.[315] In 1221 five marks was established as the minimum sum required to support a parish priest, excluding parts of Wales.[316] And parish priests might be expected to have rather lower expenses than canons travelling abroad for their studies.

When he set out for Bologna, David effectively gaged his prebend to the dean and chapter of St Paul's as credit for a loan. In return, he expected to receive further income from 'Lord N', probably Master Nicholas, archdeacon of London. In the event, the funds from Nicholas were not forthcoming, and this may have been the beginnings of David's troubles at St Paul's.[317] David admitted to living in some luxury whilst at Bologna, and this compounded his financial woes.[318] By 1169, after two and a half years at the schools, David was in heavy debt to the sum of 22 marks, excluding the interest he owed, amounting to 21 shillings of Lucca per month.[319]

'The Part He Played During the Becket Dispute'

When David had been at the schools for two or three years, Foliot wrote to him, asking for help in his appeal against Becket. On Palm Sunday (13 April) 1169, at Clairvaux, Becket had pronounced a sentence of excommunication against Foliot and others.[320] Learning of the archbishop's intentions here, some weeks earlier, around the beginning of Lent (Ash Wednesday, 5 March) Foliot had made a precautionary appeal (an appeal *ad cautelam*), with 9 February 1170 set as the date by which his appeal

[314] *St Paul*, xx-xxi; Barrow, 'Provosts and Prebends', 560.
[315] See *Registrum*, ed. Sparrow Simpson, 24-5.
[316] *Councils and Synods: With Other Documents Relating to the English Church* i pt.ii, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford 1981), 112.
[317] *LDL*, nos.1-2, 72.
[318] Ibid., no.12, see also no.2.
[319] Ibid., no.2: 'Si bene recolo, ad exhonerandam solam sortem qua teneor, exceptis usuris duorum annorum et dimidii, vix michi .xxi. solid(os) Lucensium non tenear'.
[320] *CTB*, ii, nos. 194-5, and 196a/b.

was to be heard.[321] In March, Foliot also wrote to Becket informing him of the appeal, and to Jocelin de Bohun, bishop of Salisbury, informing him of their excommunication and appeal.[322] In April, Foliot wrote to Alexander III begging him to consider Becket's sentence null and void, as he had already appealed against it.[323]

Foliot must have hoped that Becket's sentence of excommunication as pronounced in France would prove a mere annoyance, but after its dramatic delivery to him in person on Ascension Day (29 May), at the high altar of St Paul's in front of all those assembled, he could ignore it no longer.[324] Two days later he arranged a meeting of the London clergy, and a wider ecclesiastical assembly was set for 7 June.[325] Before the end of the month, he wrote to David asking that he represent him in his appeal at the Curia.[326] It seems the bishop also sent David a copy of his April letter to the Pope, for it appears in David's collection with only minor differences to other manuscript copies and no great alteration to the text.[327] In June, Foliot wrote to Henry II to inform him that he was sending him Master Henry of Northampton, canon of London and occasional royal envoy.[328] Foliot asked for the King's help in prosecuting his appeal, requesting letters to certain cardinals, the King's 'friends', who Foliot believed could influence the Pope on his behalf.[329] The version of Foliot's letter to the King preserved in David's collection is slightly shorter than another which survives. Morey and Brooke believed David's version was sent to him by Foliot to keep him up to date on the bishop's activities. The second, slightly longer version which appears in other manuscripts represents either a fuller version of the letter actually sent or a later revision. In it, Foliot asks the King for permission to cross overseas and allow him to await there the messengers he was sending to the Pope.[330] The second version of the letter employs a more

[321] *LDL*, no.31
[322] *GFL*, nos.198-9.
[323] Ibid., no.200.
[324] Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 31-2.
[325] *GFL*, nos.203-4, see also no.198n.
[326] *LDL*, no.31.
[327] See Ibid., no.40. The variances are mostly confined to word order, for instance 'paratus sum' for 'sum paratus'.
[328] Ibid., no.39.
[329] Ibid.
[330] *GFL*, no.203 version 2 and n.

obsequious tone to the King. Both include the same quote attributed to Pope Sixtus, but where the version in David's collection adds:

> 'Therefore since what we see is consonant with law, do not fail, lord, to seek from your friends and well-wishers that which you can easily obtain from the Pope should he know your desire.'[331]

Version two adds:

> 'Of the rest, because it is utterly necessary to have your repeated comfort and counsel, we are supplicating to your most devoted excellence so that you shall grant us a licence for crossing the sea, and in regions across the sea you should allow us to await our messengers who we are sending to the lord Pope.[332]

David's version then ends: 'As Gregory the Great [said]: "He who abuses any power granted to him, deserves to lose his privilege."[333] Version two ends: 'May the omnipotent Lord preserve you safely for a long time'.[334] This suggests either that Foliot toned down his original request, or that David made his own amendments to the draft sent to him, and preserved this in his collection.

In David's response to Foliot's request he wrote that he was prepared 'with prompt spirit and with all effort I have instantly prepared both faithfully to carry out your business and voluntarily to take it up, according to your words to me', acknowledging 'the hand of your mercy which you once opened to poor me through Ralph my servant'.[335] Evidently Foliot's request for help came with a financial incentive. This would have been particularly welcome to David given his precarious financial situation at Bologna.

It might have been at the meeting he had arranged for 7 June that Foliot gathered a dossier of letters of support, written by various churchmen on his behalf and addressed to the Pope.[336] Anne Duggan

---

[331] *LDL*, no.39: 'Cumque itaque concordet iuri quod petimus, amicis vestris et beneuolis id, domine, non negetis, quod a summo pontifice facile, si vestrum in hoc affectum senserit, impetrabitis.'
[332] *GFL*, no.203 version 2: 'De cetero quia crebra allocutione frui vestra summopere nobis necesse est et consilio, excellentie vestre deuotissime supplicamus, ut nobis transfretandi licentiam concedatis, et in partibus transmarinis nuntios quos nuntios quos ad dominum papam mittimus nos expectare permittatis.'
[333] *LDL*, no.39: 'Gregorius magnus: "Privilegium meretur amittere qui concessa sibi abutitur potestate".'
[334] *GFL*, no.203 version 2: 'Conseruet incolumitatem vestram in longa tempora omnipotens Dominus.'
[335] *LDL*, no.7: 'negotium vestrum tam fideliter gerere quam sponte subire.' and 'Misericordie vestre manum quam...inopi michi'.
[336] *MTB*, vi, nos.518-29.

believed that these letters were gathered for David to take with him to the Curia.[337] If so, they must have been carried to David, probably still in Bologna, by another trusted canon of St Paul's along with those written by the bishop to King and Pope.[338] At Michaelmas (29 September) Foliot himself set out for Rome, crossing to Normandy in October.[339] He was accompanied by Nicholas, archdeacon of London.[340] Foliot was delayed at Montmartre by a meeting on 18 November between Becket, Henry II, King Louis VII of France, Count Theobald of Blois, and others, which ended in frustration when the King refused to give Becket the kiss of peace.[341] Possibly Nicholas carried on to David, carrying with him the letters of support.[342] After the failure of the meeting at Montmarte, 13 January 1170 was set for the date of another meeting between Henry and Louis at Tours. Probably in December, Foliot wrote to David explaining what had happened and asking him to inform the Pope of his intention to travel to the Curia in order to prosecute his appeal. He told David to explain that he would be delayed in arriving on account of his presence at these meetings, as he had hoped to secure peace. He informed David that if he did not arrive by the allotted date of the appeal (9 February 1170), David should work to prove his innocence and ensure that the Pope did not confirm the excommunication.[343]

After the meeting at Tours, Foliot continued on to the Pope at Benevento, taking a longer route in order to avoid Burgundy and the threat of violence there, crossing the Alps towards Milan.[344] This, at a time of year when the Alpine passes were barely passable and certainly no place to linger. Meanwhile, David must have arrived at the Curia some time in the second half of 1169 or very early 1170. His efforts there were successful, and on 12 February 1170 he secured a letter from the Pope to Foliot, informing the bishop that he was to be absolved by the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Exeter, as well as a letter to these two bishops from the Pope ordering them to proceed.[345] In his letter

[337] Duggan, *Becket*, 161-2.
[338] For in *LDL*, nos.7 and 8 David writes that he was delayed in carrying out Foliot's requests.
[339] *CTB*, i, lx and Ibid., no.35.
[340] *Twelfth-Century English Archidiaconal and Vice-Archidiaconal Acta*, ed. B. R. Kemp, (Woodbridge 2001), no.203.
[341] *CTB*, i, no.35.
[342] *LDL*, no.70 is possibly a letter of credence for Nicholas, sent with him to David.
[343] *LDL*, no.31.
[344] Ibid., no.32; *GFL*, 271; Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 101, Diceto, 'Ymagines', 337. Burgundy was Imperial territory at this time. For Foliot's itinerary in 1160/70, see *EEA*, xv, 161.
[345] David secured *LDL*, no.33. Some MS versions of the letter had it that it was the bishop of Nevers rather than the bishop of Exeter who was designated by the pope to absolve Foliot. Morey and Brooke supposed that the

to the two bishops Alexander informed them that he was absolving Foliot specifically as a result of David's petitions.[346]

It was also at this time that Alexander III wrote two letters which will be explored below but deserve brief mention here. One was sent to the dean and chapter of St Paul's, praising David and ordering the chapter to make repayments to him of what he was owed from his prebend, and the other was sent to Foliot. It was full of praise for David and asked the bishop to disbelieve anyone doubting David's loyalty.[347] The Pope also wrote three letters which aimed to provide David with a prebend in the vacant cathedral of Lincoln; to the King, to the dean and chapter of Lincoln, and to David himself.[348] In Letter 71 to the King, the Pope praised David's efforts on Henry's behalf at the Curia. He had proved himself to be 'faithful and devoted', and as it was fitting for the papal office to reward talented men, so the Pope was commending David to the King and granting him the first prebend which should fall vacant at Lincoln.[349] Letter 73 follows much the same lines; the Pope was establishing David (who was worthy not only of a canonry but even a bishopric) as a canon of Lincoln and ordered the dean and chapter to accept him as such without delay or appeal. They were to assign him a place in the choir and chapter and to provide him with the first prebend to become vacant. Letter 74 was written to David himself outlining the provision, presumably designed as proof for David to use if he encountered opposition. The see of Lincoln was itself vacant, so Alexander had been 'called by the Lord' to make provision for David there.[350] David was benefitting from the upsurge in expectative provisions which occurred under Alexander III. The first example of such a letter from a pope is that of Hadrian IV (d.1159) to the bishop of Paris, and there are several examples from Alexander III's

confusion arose firstly because both bishops had the initial 'B' and secondly because the bishop of Nevers was around this time commissioned to visit England with the archbishop of Rouen. See Morey and Brooke, *Foliot,* 101 fn.1. *LDL*, no.33 has the correct attribution to the bishop of Exeter. The letter sent to the bishops is *MTB,* vii, no.656.

[346] *MTB,* vii, no.656: 'dilecti filii nostri magistri David Londoniensis ecclesie canonici postulatione inducti, fraternitati vestrae per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus si memoratus episcopus ad vos pro absolutionis receptione accesserit' ['having been influenced by the petition of our beloved son David, canon of the church of London, we mandate to your fraternity through apostolic script, until the aforesaid bishop should approach you for the receiving of absolution'].

[347] *LDL*, no.72 to the dean and chapter of St Paul's, and no.82 to Gilbert Foliot.

[348] Ibid., no.71 to the king, no.73 to the dean and chapter of Lincoln, and no.74 to David.

[349] See Ibid., no.71.

[350] Ibid., no.74: 'Unde quoniam Lincoln(iensis) ecclesia nullum ad presens episcopum habet, nosque non in partem sollicitudinis sed in plenitudinem potestatis licet inmeriti a Domino sumus vocati'.

reign. Between 1175 and 1181, for example, Alexander secured a canonry at Lincoln for his nephew Gentile.[351] This, despite the ruling of the Third Lateran Council in 1179 that benefices should not be promised before they were vacant.[352]

There is no sign that David ever received a prebend at Lincoln, and the amount accounted for from the prebends there in the Pipe Roll for 1170-1 did not differ from that in previous years.[353] A David canon of Lincoln witnesses a charter of the bishop of Lincoln in 1184, but unlike 'Master Hugh of London', who appears earlier in the witness list, he is afforded no title as *magister* and no toponym, so it is unlikely to be our David.[354] Instead, in the Pipe Roll for 1169-70, by writ of the King, David received a payment for half the year (Easter to Michaelmas) of £10 from the archdeaconry of Oxford, at that time held by Gilbert Foliot's relative Robert Foliot.[355] Was it unusual for the Pope's mandate in this case to go un-fulfilled? Zachary Brooke pointed out that Henry II was unlikely to have obeyed such an order during a vacancy at Lincoln.[356] This is especially pertinent in the context of the King's 1169 decrees, which aimed to prevent papal mandates from entering England. The decrees may have had little effect: certainly, the King faced a revolt against them from the English bishops. But they reflected his desire to limit the authority of both the Pope and Becket in England.[357] In light of these decrees an expectative provision by the Pope to a canonry in a vacant see, and one therefore under the King's control, would not have been warmly received. Regardless, David carried his letters back from the Curia in expectation of a reward and was not entirely disappointed to instead receive a pension from the archdeaconry of Oxford, administered by the Lincoln chapter. The precise dating here is impossible to establish, but perhaps it was the case that no Lincoln prebends were vacant for David's use.[358] As we shall see below, by the end of 1170 David had requested that his £10 pension be

[351] C. R. Cheney, *From Becket to Langton: English Church Government 1170-1213* (Manchester 1956), 76-82 for a discussion of expectatives. For the provision, see *Papal Decretals Relating to the Diocese of Lincoln in the Twelfth Century*, ed. W. Holtzmann and E. Kemp (Hereford 1954), 50-1.
[352] Gervase of Canterbury, 'Opera Historica', *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury* i, ed. W. Stubbs, 282-3.
[353] *PR*s *15 Henry II*, 45; *16 Henry II*, 152; *17 Henry II*, 111.
[354] *Facsimiles of Royal and Other Charters in the British Museum*, ed. G. F. Warner and H. J. Ellis (London 1903), no.66.
[355] *PR 16 Henry II*, 153. For the archdeaconry of Oxford, see *Fasti*, iii, 35-9.
[356] Brooke, 'Register', 238.
[357] Duggan, *Becket*, 174-6.
[358] See *Fasti*, iii for Lincoln, where there is little evidence available for many of the prebends.

reassigned, at the same time apparently deciding against pursuing a canonry or prebend at Lincoln. This explains why there is no further record of him there. One curious papal letter does remain which may be linked to this case: in a letter which has been dated to *c*.1174-5, Alexander III wrote to Roger bishop of Worcester, informing him that the Geoffrey (Plantagenet, the King's illegitimate son), bishop elect of Lincoln, did not have the power of granting honours or prebends as he had not as yet been ordained bishop. If Geoffrey had granted away the archdeaconry of Northampton, or the prebend held by the former archdeacon, Roger should command him to revoke this grant. Importantly, the Pope added a further stipulation:

> 'But since the dean and chapter of that church have received our mandate concerning that archdeaconry and the conferring of the prebend you shall intervene effectively with them and by our authority see that they allow no hindrance to prevent the execution of the mandate.'[359]

What mandate the Pope is referring to is unclear, and though it is tempting to think he might be referring to his orders regarding David, as this letter does not refer to a specific prebend or beneficiary this cannot be confirmed.

David seems to have carried the letter from the Pope absolving Foliot to the bishops himself, for when Foliot arrived at Milan in around February and was informed of the Pope's decision (through a letter from the Pope) he wrote again to David asking him to await his arrival at Rouen for his absolution.[360] David was there, then, for Foliot's absolution on Easter Sunday, 5 April 1170, and came away with one further letter of recommendation addressed to Henry II, this time from Rotrou, archbishop of Rouen.[361] After this, David seems to have accompanied Foliot back to England and was probably present at the Young King's coronation in June 1170. In the early 1170s Henry II confirmed a settlement made between the monks of Lewes and the canons of Saint-Léonard-de-Noblat.[362] Foliot,

[359] *Decretals Lincoln*, ed. Holtzmann and Kemp, 18-9: 'Cum autem decanus et capitulum eiusdem ecclesie de ipso archidiaconatu et prebenda conferenda mandatum nostrum receperint, apud eos ita partes tuas efficaciter interponas et auctoritate nostra taliter ipsos inducas, quod mandatum nostrum sine repulsa qualibet sortiatur effectum.'
[360] *LDL*, no.32.
[361] For Foliot's absolution, see *GFL*, no.198n. Rotrou's letter is *LDL*, no.75.
[362] *LCH*, no.1490.

meanwhile, issued his own charter recording this settlement which was made in the presence of the King, Roger archbishop of York, and other bishops. David was amongst the witnesses.[363] Although Morey and Brooke supposed Foliot's charter to have been issued in England on account of the witness list, they believed it likely to have been issued in 1171-2 on the basis that Henry II visited England only twice between 1170 and 1173: once in June 1170 for his son's coronation, and again in 1171-2.[364] They assumed that David was probably still in Italy at the time of the first visit, so the settlement should be dated to the time of the second.[365] The King's notification, however, and therefore Gilbert's charter (for their witnesses lists are very similar)[366] was issued at Westminster and Nicholas Vincent has established there is no other evidence that the King visited London between June 1170 and July 1174. On account of this and the witness list, Vincent considers it more likely that the King's notification was issued around the period of the Young King's coronation.[367] On the basis of a spurious or reworked royal confirmation for Swineshead Abbey, R. W Eyton supposed that, after his absolution, Foliot hastened back to England, reaching Windsor before the King left it *c*.10 April 1170.[368] Foliot would have been hasty indeed to make the journey in five days, but there would have been enough time for the bishop to make it back to London for the coronation on 14 June, for which he was present.[369] The King was in England until *c*.24 June. David's presence in the witness list to Foliot's charter suggests that the two met in Rouen as Foliot had planned, with David then accompanying Foliot to England, and the coronation.

[363] *GFL*, no.391.
[364] The witness list is as follows: Henry II, Archbishop Roger of York, Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury, Count William of Arundel, Count Hamelin of Warenne, Count William of Essex, Richard de Lucy, Abbot Laurence of Westminster, Abbot William of Reading, Archdeacon Geoffrey of Canterbury, Archdeacon Richard of Poitou, Nicholas, Ralph, Richard, and Robert, archdeacons of London, Master David, Master Henry, Master Gilbert, Master Hugh, and Robert de Clifford, canons of St Paul's, Ralph Fitz Brian, and others, *GFL*, no.391.
[365] Ibid., n.
[366] The king's notification was witnessed by: Geoffrey, archdeacon of Canterbury; Richard (of Ilchester), archdeacon of Poitou; Hugh, earl of Norfolk; and Richard de Lucy, *LCH*, no.1490.
[367] *LCH*, no.1490n.
[368] R. W. Eyton, *Court, Household and Itinerary of Henry II* (London 1878), 136. For the notification of the confirmation see *LCH*, no.2574.
[369] Julia Barrow has shown that a messenger may be able to travel up to 50 miles a day but a bishop, with their retinue and using their own horses, would achieve somewhere between 10 and 20, J. Barrow, 'Way-Stations on English Episcopal Itineraries, 700-1300', *EHR* 127 (2012), 554. For Foliot's presence at the coronation see F. Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (2nd edn. London 2000), 206, and Roger of Howden, *The Annals of Roger de Hovedon* i, trans. H. T. Riley (London 1853), 326.

After the coronation, Becket was incensed that the traditional right of the archbishops of Canterbury to crown English kings had been usurped by the archbishop of York.[370] He asked Alexander III to issue letters of censure against the bishops who had taken part in the ceremony. The King, hearing of William of Sens' proposed interdict on France, came to terms. He crossed to France to meet Louis VII, and the archbishop of Rouen and the bishop of Nevers arranged for Becket to be there and receive the King's peace on 22 July. Peace was made between Henry II and Becket, but it was not sealed with the kiss of peace.[371] To prepare the way for his return, Becket sent Herbert of Bosham to England to secure the restoration of his Canterbury estates.

Herbert encountered opposition in England. The bishops, wrote John of Salisbury to Peter of Celle (referring to the triumvirate of London, York, and Salisbury), had sent messengers to the King asking him not to allow Becket to return to England before he had resigned his role as legate, and arrangements had been made to begin elections to the vacant English sees.[372] Becket received a report of these events and sent it on to the Pope, also asking for further letters of censure to use against the bishops involved in the coronation. He complained to Henry II of the delayed return of his Canterbury properties, but travelled to Rouen some weeks later to meet the King. There he instead met Rotrou of Rouen and John of Oxford, dean of Salisbury. Under pressure from the King to return to England, amidst the criticism of the English bishops, but in the knowledge that his enemies were waiting on the English shoreline, Becket return from Wissant to Sandwich. He sent letters ahead suspending the archbishop of York and the bishop of Durham, and excommunicating the bishops of London and Salisbury. It was these letters that were presented to the bishops of York, London, and Salisbury as they waited at Dover.[373] When a favourable wind arose, Becket crossed to England, arriving at Sandwich on 1 December. On 2 December he returned to Canterbury, and there the bishops' messengers reached him, informing him of their appeals to the Pope.[374] They asked that he absolve the bishops, for their excommunication was injurious to the King. Becket informed them that he would

[370] See *CTB*, ii, no.300.
[371] For these events see Duggan, *Becket*, 182-6.
[372] *LJS*, ii, no.304.
[373] Duggan, *Becket*, 192-6.
[374] *LJS*, ii, no.304; Diceto, 'Ymagines', 341-2.

absolve the bishops of London and Salisbury if they agreed to swear before him that they would obey his mandates. However, when York was informed of this, he claimed the bishops could only swear such an oath by the King's will. London and Salisbury apparently determined to go to the Pope to receive absolution, but Roger of York persuaded them instead to go to Henry II and convince him that Becket planned to depose him.[375]

One of the bishops' messengers sent to Becket was David.[376] Becket reprimanded David for receiving a benefice from the King. He must have been referring to David's pension in the archdeaconry of Oxford, presumably on the basis that the see was still vacant and that, therefore, nothing should be done there under royal command or until a new bishop was elected. In a letter that has been many times cited as a demonstration of the sheer volume of writs required to ensure that payments be properly accounted at the Exchequer, David wrote to an unknown correspondent with details of the changes to his pension. At David's request, the King agreed to alter arrangements, with £15 henceforth to be paid from the king's demense and £5 from the diocese of London. The King had confirmed this in a charter and granted another charter of confirmation, given to Gilbert Foliot to carry to David. He had also ordered through letters close sent to the Young King that he confirm the same payments. In further letters close he ordered Ranulf de Broc to pay £15 to David each year, and Foliot to pay £5. The King also ordered the sheriffs of Middlesex to cease demanding the £5 from the bishop of London, and sent a writ to the Exchequer ordering the barons there to compute £15 to Ranulf de Broc and £5 to Foliot. David received copies (*transcriptum*) of the writ to the Exchequer and the writ to Ranulf, which he had sealed and had stored with his charters.[377] The recipient of letter 26 was charged with the safe-keeping of David's charters, both new and old. Perhaps the same individual preserved copies of David's letters. The Pipe Roll for 1170-1 shows these new payments being made to David, so the changes were made some time before Michaelmas and probably before Easter 1171.[378] The £15 from the King came from a grant of land in Artington in the royal manor of

[375] *CTB*, ii, no.326.
[376] *LDL*, no.26.
[377] Ibid.
[378] *PR 17 Henry II*, 144, 147.

Godalming, which had originally been made to Ranulf de Broc.[379] Ranulf was now to hold Artington from David in fee-farm for £15 per annum. The payment was recorded in King John's 1212 inquest into fees, where it was noted as having been made to David as a result of his efforts as a *nuncius* in Rome.[380] The £5 payment (accounted as 100 shillings) from the bishop of London was made from the customary lands of the bishop in Fulham and Stepney.[381] Both payments were accounted continuously thereafter through to the King's death in 1189.[382]

Meanwhile Foliot, acting together with Roger of York and Jocelin of Salisbury, 'made haste in an angry mood to wait on the King', at least according to John of Salisbury.[383] They crossed to the King in Normandy to express their anger over the rebukes they had received from Becket. David must have accompanied Foliot, for the decision was made to appeal to the Pope, and at some point before 29 December (the date of Becket's murder), David was sent back to the Curia, carrying several letters to the Pope.[384] One was written by the King, who complained of Becket's actions and told the Pope he would hear more from David, the bearer of the letter.[385] David also carried letters from Rotrou of Rouen, Giles of Evreux, and Arnulf of Lisieux, all preserved in his own collection as letters 41-3. This may be when David first met Arnulf, with whom he later exchanged several letters. All three bishops complained of Becket's actions and particularly of their suspension and excommunication. They defended the King, who 'had granted peace to [Becket]... and had expected peace' in return.[386] They assured the Pope that at his coronation the Young King had made the required oaths according to

[379] *PR 17 Henry II*, 144. For Godalming, see J. H. Round, *The King's Serjeants & Officers of State* (London 1911), 100-2.
[380] *The Book of Fees: Commonly Called Testa De Nevill* i, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London 1920), 67: 'Henricus Rex... dedit Ertedun...cuidam magistro David qui ivit in nuncium apud Romam'.
[381] For the payment, see *PR 17 Henry II*, 147.
[382] See *PR*s *18 Henry II*, 141 and 144; *19 Henry II*, 91 and 183; *20 Henry II*, 3 and 7; *21 Henry II*, 15 and 202; *22 Henry II*, 12 and 212; *23 Henry II*, 192 and 197; *24 Henry II*, 127 and 131; *25 Henry II*, 121 and 124; *26 Henry II*, 42-3 and 150; *27 Henry II*, 152 and 156; *28 Henry II*, 155 and 158; *29 Henry II*, 83 and 161; *30 Henry II*, 137 and 152; *31 Henry II*, 217 and 235; *32 Henry II*, 49 and 194; *33 Henry II*, 40 and 211; *34 Henry II*, 18 and 23. Note that in *PR*s *20*, *22*, and *33* the payment from the lands of the bishop of London is recorded for only part of the year but is divided accordingly: i.e. 50 shillings for half the year.
[383] *LJS*, ii, no.304.
[384] *LDL*, no.87; Barlow, *Becket*, 234.
[385] *MTB*, vii, no.729.
[386] *LDL*, no.41: '...ab ipso cui pacem concesserat, et a quo pacem exspectabat'.

canon law,[387] and asked that the Pope defend the King against Becket.[388] Arnulf also wrote letters on behalf of bishops Jocelin of Salisbury and Foliot, these letters presumably also carried by David. Here Arnulf noted Jocelin's poor health, which prevented him from visiting the Pope. Jocelin, so he claimed, had 'endured many injuries for the sake of the freedom of the church' and did not believe he had erred in taking part in the coronation, for Alexander had previously given permission for such a ceremony.[389] For Foliot, Arnulf largely reused a letter he had written on the bishop's behalf in 1169, praising Foliot's virtues and accusing Becket of pursuing a personal grudge against him.[390] Was this, in the circumstances, a rather half-hearted defense of Foliot's cause?

Alongside these letters, David carried at least one other from Foliot himself, addressed to an un-named ally at the Curia, asking that he help David in two tasks: to secure Foliot's absolution from excommunication, and his freedom from Becket's authority.[391] Foliot's second aim - freedom from Becket - was presumably a reference to his claim that London, as first noted by Bede, had been intended to enjoy metropolitan status as, in effect, a third archbishopric either alongside Canterbury and York or in place of Canterbury. In 1169, Foliot was said to have suggested that the primatial see be transferred from Canterbury to London. Although there is no evidence that Foliot pursued these claims himself before 1169, he was following in a long tradition beginning with Paulinus, as reported by Bede. Fifty years before Foliot's translation to London, his predecessor Richard de Belmeis I had claimed the right of London to be an archiepiscopal see.[392] It seems that Foliot's second excommunication by Becket was the final straw, pushing him into pursuing these claims at the Curia. Though Morey and Brooke suggest that Foliot 'never himself openly referred to [the desire to secure London as a metropolitan see] in any extant letter', it is difficult to see what else Foliot could have been referring to here.[393] The only means for Foliot to 'be freed (*emancipari*) from the power of the

[387] Ibid., no.43, trans. *LCA*, no.3.20: 'Everything that is accustomed to being performed or required in the consecrations of kings was carried out...in the consecration. For the son took his oath....Everything was in keeping with the freedom and dignity of the Church in canon law'.
[388] *LDL*, no.42.
[389] *LCA*, no.2.02.
[390] The two letters are translated as one in Ibid., no.2.03.
[391] *LDL*, no.36.
[392] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 148-53, 156-60.
[393] Ibid., 160.

lord of Canterbury' - as he himself put it - was to secure London's metropolitan status.[394] This would appear to answer a question posed by Morey and Brooke, as to whether London's claim to metropolitan status in Foliot's eyes was 'a cause to be fought for' or, rather, 'just an expedient in the agonising conflict with Thomas Becket'.[395]

David arrived at the Curia around fifteen days after royal agent John Cumin, who had also been sent there to secure the absolution of the three bishops. Also present were clerks of the archbishop of York and a messenger from the bishop of Durham. They were in the midst of negotiations when news arrived of Becket's murder, throwing everything into chaos. The Pope refused to speak to the envoys for eight days, cutting off all communication.[396] A messenger from Canterbury had carried news of the murder to Herbert of Bosham and two other members of Becket's *familia*, reaching them probably at Sens in January 1171. Louis VII and others wrote scathing letters to the Curia, denouncing King Henry. These reached the Curia at Frascati some time in February, putting an end to David's attempts to gain absolution for Foliot and Jocelin of Salisbury.[397] Richard Barre, the first of the envoys sent by the King to the Curia after the murder, arrived there around 3 March, but was not even allowed to enter the Pope's presence. Nor were the other envoys who followed him shortly afterwards.[398]

Some time after Easter 1171 (28 March), but probably before the end of April, David wrote to Foliot concealing his name but detailing his difficulties at the Curia. He was fearful because he had heard that the Pope was going to treat the 'trinity' (Foliot, York, and Salisbury) harshly in order to make an example of them, and to strike 'terror' into the hearts of those who presumed to assist their princes against the Church. Foliot was accused of complicity in Becket's death and of ignoring the Pope's prohibition against the Young King's coronation.[399] After protracted negotiations, and in fear of greater repercussions from the Pope, around 3pm (the hour of Nones) on 25 March (the feast of the Annunciation) the King's envoys, as well as those of the bishops (including David and Master Hugh

[394] *LDL*, no.36: 'a potestate domini Cant(uariensis)...emancipari'.
[395] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 163.
[396] For David and John as the first messengers sent to the Curia, see *MTB*, vii, no.751. For John Cumin, royal agent and later archbishop of Dublin, see M. Murphy, 'Cumin [Comyn], John (*d*.1212)', *ODNB*.
[397] The French letters are *MTB*, vii, nos. 734-6, 743.
[398] Ibid., no.751.
[399] *LDL*, no.23.

of London, also at the Curia on Foliot's behalf) swore an oath before the Pope and cardinals.[400] David and Hugh swore on Foliot's behalf, promising that he would be obedient to the orders of the Pope. David had done so, he informed his bishop, not only to secure Foliot's absolution, but from fear that graver consequences would otherwise follow.[401] The King's envoys had also sworn an oath on Henry's behalf, as had the envoys of York and Salisbury for their respective masters.[402]

The murderers were excommunicated, as were those who had aided or counselled them, and the interdict placed on the King's French lands by the archbishop of Sens was confirmed.[403] As for Foliot, who was possibly at this time in France, he was in person to swear the oath that David had made on his behalf, following which he would be absolved by the archbishop of Bourges and the bishop of Nevers.[404] David had accomplished at least part of his mission. Foliot was to be absolved of his excommunication, as was the bishop of Salisbury, but both were to remain suspended.[405] It has been suggested that in May, David may have written a further letter to Foliot, detailing the movements of various of the cardinals, two of the royal envoys, and the abbot of Clairvaux, as well as other events.[406] The letter survives only in the second manuscript of Foliot's letters, Douce 287, leading to this suggestion that it was written by David.[407] There is no evidence for this attribution. Though David would have been well-placed to write it, the fact that it was not included in his own letter collection rules it out of further consideration here.

David left the Curia once again armed with recommendations, including one sent from Alexander III to the King. In the letter Alexander praised David along with Reginald, archdeacon of Salisbury and Richard Barre, two of the royal envoys. The Pope wrote that all three men had worked diligently on his behalf and deserved equal praise and reward to the other envoys.[408] In the midst of what could

[400] For the report of the king's envoys, see *MTB,* vii, no.750.
[401] *LDL*, no.23.
[402] See *MTB,* vii, no.750.
[403] Ibid., nos.750-1.
[404] See Ibid., no.753 where the Pope wrote to the archbishop and bishop informing them of such. For Foliot's itinerary, see *EEA,* xv, 161.
[405] *MTB,* vii, no.753
[406] Such as the death of the archbishop of Bourges. The letter is ibid., no.756.
[407] Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 287 fo.97v.
[408] *LDL*, no.87.

have been total breakdown of royal-papal relations, this letter implies a desire to signal ultimate reconciliation. The 'other' group of envoys consisted of Bishops Roger of Worcester and Giles of Évreux, Richard de Blosseville, abbot of Le Valasse in Normandy, R, probably Robert Arden, archdeacon of Lisieux, Dean Robert of Évreux, an unnamed Templar, and Master Henry of Northampton. Interestingly, although Richard Barre had been the first of these envoys to arrive after the murder, Reginald had arrived along with the abbot of Le Valasse, Robert of Arden and Henry of Northampton.[409] It seems that either there had been disagreements between the envoys or David, Richard, and Reginald feared they would be overlooked when it came to rewards for their efforts, even though both Richard and Reginald had been amongst the authors of the report of events sent to the King by his envoys.[410]

This must have been a matter of great concern because David also left the Curia armed with a batch of further letters of recommendation on his behalf written by various cardinals. Peter de Mizo, cardinal priest of S. Lorenzo in Damaso; Hyacinth, cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin; John of Naples, cardinal priest of S. Anastasia; William, cardinal priest of St Peter-ad-Vincula; John of Anagni, cardinal priest of S. Marco; and Vivian, archdeacon of Orvieto, all wrote letters of recommendation addressed to the King.[411] In addition, the Pope, William of S. Pietro-ad-Vincula, John of Naples, Hyacinth, and John of Anagni wrote to Foliot.[412] David was praised for his 'learning, discretion, and honesty'[413]; his fidelity to Gilbert Foliot and the zeal with which he had pursued Foliot's absolution[414], and his efforts to further the King's interests at the Curia.[415] It would only be right for the King to retain such a skilful man in his service, wrote William of S. Pietro-ad-Vincula, and so the King should reward David financially that in the future he would prove to be more useful still in royal service.[416] The importance of these letters lies not in their contents, which are mundane and repetitive, but in

[409] Barlow, *Becket*, 255.
[410] *MTB*, vii, no.750 sent by the abbot of Le Valasse, Reginald, Robert Arden, Richard Barre and Henry of Northampton.
[411] *LDL*, nos.76-81.
[412] Ibid., nos.82-86.
[413] Ibid., no.79: 'litterature sue, discretionis et honestatis'.
[414] See ibid., no.82.
[415] See for instance ibid., no.81.
[416] Ibid., no.79.

their rarity. For there are just twenty-seven extant letters sent from Alexander III to Henry II. These mostly concern the Becket dispute, or the dispute between the monks of Canterbury and their archbishop.[417] Two of these survive only in David's collection.[418] For the cardinals the evidence is even more sparse: for Henry's entire reign only five letters from cardinals to the King are extant besides those found in David's collection.[419] What these letters alongside the Pope's earlier letter of recommendation prove is that the volume of letters between the Pope and King was much higher than whatever fraction of this correspondence has survived, and that Alexander III regularly wrote to the King on such mundane matters as the preferment of clerks.

David had probably arrived back in Normandy, where both the King and Foliot were established, by June 1171, as other of the King's envoys to the Curia were possibly with Henry and witnessing his charters in this month.[420] It was around this time that David conversed with Arnulf of Lisieux. The first extant letter between them was written by Arnulf in *c*.July 1171. Arnulf informed David that he had spoken to the King on his behalf in the presence of Richard of Ilchester, archdeacon of Poitiers. The King's envoys had written a report of events to Richard alongside their report to the King, and unlike the report to Henry II, this made a brief mention of David. Perhaps Arnulf and David had hoped Richard would act as a character witness for David before the King.[421] Richard certainly had the King's ear. He was also charged with custody of the see of Lincoln during the vacancy there.[422] Both Arnulf and Richard petitioned the King on David's behalf, and as a result the King agreed to transform the secular pension that David held from the King into an ecclesiastical benefice.[423] According to Arnulf, rumours were circulating that the King was on his way to England. So, he

[417] For a discussion on the surviving letters sent between the two, see N. Vincent, 'Beyond Becket: King Henry II and the Papacy (1154-1189)', *Pope Alexander III (1159-81): The Art of Survival*, ed. P. Clarke and A. J. Duggan (Farnham 2012), 258-60. For details of these letters, see idem, 297-8 and *LCH*, nos. 4248-4274 where 27 letters are listed but one is spurious.
[418] *LDL*, nos.71 and 87, listed in *LCH* as nos. 4268-9.
[419] *LCH*, nos.4283-7.
[420] For instance, see *LCH*, no.291 for a notification of the king's grant to Boxley Abbey, witnessed by Giles, bishop of Évreux who had been amongst the second group of envoys. Eyton dated this to June or July 1171 though Vincent widened these dates to 1170 x 1173, see *Itinerary Henry II*, 158 and *LCH*, no.291n.
[421] *MTB*, vii, no.751.
[422] For Richard's career, see J. Hudson, 'Ilchester, Richard of (*d*.1188)', *ODNB*.
[423] *LDL*, no.17: 'bonum seculare', trans. *LCA*, n.3.07, though Poling-Schriber translates this as 'secular property' and I prefer 'secular pension'.

advised, if David was able to remain in Normandy until the King crossed, Arnulf would ensure his comfort. But, if David had to leave to accompany Foliot to his second absolution, Arnulf would remain his steady friend.[424] In the event David did leave Normandy, but with his reply to Arnulf's letter he sent a small gift as a token of his affection.[425] Whether he accompanied Foliot to his absolution at Gisors on 1 August is unclear. In his reply to Arnulf, David referred to his 'departure from Normandy'.[426] Gisors was at this time a part of the Norman Vexin, on the frontier between the lands of the dukes of Normandy and the kings of France, and often a meeting place for the two. It is unlikely David would have seen a trip to Gisors as leaving Normandy.[427] It seems more likely either that David was despatched immediately to England, or that he wrote his reply to Arnulf after he had accompanied Foliot to Gisors and then left for England.

In letter 19 Arnulf continues in a friendly vein, informing David that, although he knew the King to be committed to him, he also knew from experience that it was best to appear before Henry as often as possible to ensure his favour. There was a danger otherwise, Arnulf explained, that those in the King's presence would take advantage over those absent.[428] Arnulf believed that 'many things are going to be coming into [the King's] hand soon'.[429] It has been suggested that these 'things' were ecclesiastical benefices and this seems likely given the looming elections to vacant English sees.[430] It is unclear precisely when this letter was written, but the King left Normandy in August 1171, arriving in England on 6 August, and spent a month there before moving to Wales for September and to Ireland in mid-October. There he stayed until April 1172, when he began the return journey to Normandy to meet the papal legates sent by the Pope to impose penance for his role in Becket's murder.[431] The most likely explanation then, given that letter 17 must have been written in July 1171 when all envoys

[424] *LDL*, no.17.
[425] Ibid., no.18.
[426] Ibid.
[427] For a brief discussion of Gisors as a meeting place, see D. Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge 2004), 16.
[428] *LDL*, no.19.
[429] Ibid.: 'Sane, sicut credimus, in manus eius ad presens multa ventura sunt'.
[430] Poling Schriber added this suggestion to her translation of Ibid., in *LCA*, n.3.08.
[431] For Henry's movements at this time, see A. Duggan, 'Diplomacy, Status, and Conscience: Henry II's Penance for Becket's murder', *Forschungen zur Reichs-, Papst- und Landesgeschichte. Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht* i, ed. K. Borchardt and E. Bünz (Stuttgart 1998), 272-3.

were back in Normandy and before Foliot had been absolved, is that some time passed between Arnulf's two letters to David. Earlier discussions on David's behalf must have been put on hold when the King left Normandy, and may well have been picked up again in May 1172, when the King returned.

Arnulf was in and around Normandy for most of the years 1171-3.[432] He had been tasked with negotiating with the two legates sent by the Pope, and had arranged a day on which the King would meet them at Avranches after initially failed negotiations at Savigny.[433] He acted in company with the archdeacons of Salisbury and Poitiers. David must have been in England at least until Arnulf wrote letter 19 to him, for the bishop instructs him to 'Put in order...what you see needs to be put in order in your house'.[434] David's house at this time was still St Paul's. Early in 1173 Foliot was called to Normandy by the King. There, after discussion, the King and legates agreed that elections to the vacant sees in England should be held and Foliot was sent home with a letter from the cardinals to the clergy of England instructing that elections proceed.[435] The names of those subsequently elected leave no doubt that the King was heavily involved, and it may even be the case that Foliot was sent back with a list of recommended candidates, or at least a firm idea of who might be deemed acceptable. The leading candidates here were John of Greenford, promoted to Chichester,[436] Richard of Ilchester, promoted to Winchester,[437] Robert Foliot, promoted to Hereford,[438] Geoffrey Ridel, promoted to Ely,[439] Reginald FitzJocelin, promoted to Bath,[440] John of Oxford, subsequently promoted to Salisbury, and the King's own illegitimate son, Geoffrey, promoted to Lincoln also in 1173, though here at last the Pope put up a show of resistance and Geoffrey was forced to visit the Curia in order to receive confirmation of his status as bishop-elect.[441] We must remember that two of the letters of

[432] The only exceptions seem to be brief sojourns to Sens in February 1171 and to Paris in January 1173. For his itinerary, see C. Poling Schriber, *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas versus Old Ideals* (Bloomington and Indianapolis 1990), 125-38.
[433] *MTB*, vii, no.771.
[434] *LDL*, no.19, trans. *LCA*, no.3.08.
[435] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 366-7.
[436] *Fasti*, v, 3.
[437] Ibid. ii, 85.
[438] Ibid., viii, 4.
[439] Ibid., ii, 45.
[440] Ibid., vii, 2.
[441] Ibid., iii, 2.

recommendation on David's behalf preserved in his collection, sent by the Pope to the King and to the dean and chapter of Lincoln, describe David as deserving 'not only a canonry but a bishopric'.[442] Hyperbole perhaps, but this may reflect David's ambitions for advancement in the church, if not to a bishopric then to another high office: a charge later levelled against him at St Paul's.

The men elected to the vacant bishoprics in 1173 had been in royal service throughout the Becket dispute. Richard of Ilchester had represented the King at the Council of Wurzburg in 1165 and later at the Curia, and was excommunicated twice by Becket for his work for the King;[443] John of Oxford had attended Wurzburg with Richard, had also been sent to the Curia, and was also excommunicated;[444] and Reginald FitzJocelin had been sent to the Curia on a royal embassy along with David and there had received the praise of the Pope alongside him.[445] John Cumin, elected as archbishop of Dublin in 1181, was also sent to the Curia and was excommunicated by Becket.[446] Of course there were not enough bishoprics to satisfy all of the King's supporters, but other royal envoys received lesser but nonetheless substantial rewards. Richard Barre was the third man praised alongside David and Reginald FitzJocelin for his work at the Curia on Henry's behalf.[447] He became archdeacon of Lisieux some time after 1171 and archdeacon of Ely in 1190, representing the King as envoy once again in 1188 at the court of the King of Hungary and before the German and Byzantine emperors.[448] Jocelin, archdeacon of Chichester, was another of Henry's envoys during the Becket dispute. He was promoted archdeacon of Lewes in 1173-4, and was later active as a royal justice. He acted again as envoy for the King at the Curia in 1178.[449] Of the 55 justices whose names are recorded between 1179 and 1189, Jocelin was amongst the thirteen who appeared most regularly.[450] David's subsequent career seems thoroughly lacklustre in comparison. But he was first and foremost an envoy for Gilbert Foliot, and not the King. Henry may well have considered the £20 pension he arranged for David an

[442] *LDL*, nos.71, 73.
[443] Hudson, 'Ilchester, Richard of', *ODNB*.
[444] C. Harper-Bill, 'Oxford, John of (*d.* 1200)', *ODNB*.
[445] *LDL*, no.87.
[446] M. Murphy 'Cumin [Comyn], John (*d.* 1212)', *ODNB*.
[447] *LDL*, no.87.
[448] J. M. Rigg (Revised R. V. Turner) 'Barre, Richard (*b*. *c*. 1130, *d.* in or after 1202)', *ODNB*.
[449] H. Mayr-Harting, 'Hilary, Bishop of Chichester (1147-1169) and Henry II', *EHR* 78 (1963), 219.
[450] R. V. Turner, *The English Judiciary in the Age of Glanvill and Bracton c.1176-1239* (Cambridge 1985), 19, 29, 44.

adequate reward and that no further preferment was deserved. At any rate, David received nothing further so far as we can tell.

David and St Paul's

For David, the 1160s and 70s were characterised not by his role during the Becket dispute, which was confined to a mere three-year period, but by disputes with his fellow canons of St Paul's. Trouble began here during his time at Bologna. Initially, having received no correspondence from Gilbert Foliot since he had arrived there, David wrote to the bishop anxiously querying this silence:

> 'you will have only now, and lately, have received these letters with my greeting. I speak saving your reverence, but not even today would you have received them, had it not been for the token and favour of your regard, delivered in your own letters'.[451]

David suspected trouble back at St Paul's and asked the bishop not to believe any rumours:

> 'I ask that should there be any envy plotted against me in my absence, or perhaps some unexpected eruption of one belching fume and flame, I ask, I say, that when this comes to your hearing, you shelter me under the shield of your protection.'[452]

Evidently David had little trust in his fellow canons and was concerned that they might have turned the bishop against him. His worries were not unfounded. In *c.*1168-9 he wrote further letters to St Paul's. In one, addressed to an anonymous recipient, he wrote of the treachery he had experienced from a man who had accompanied him on the journey to Bologna.[453] This man had sworn an oath on a Gospel book but had deceived David: instead of acting as a 'help-mate' or 'fellow labourer', he had been a 'spy'. Yet, at the time of their departure (we can assume from London), the man had persuaded David of his trustworthiness through petitions, both his own and those of members of the household,

[451] *LDL,* no.3: 'velut nunc tardius susceperitis. Salua vestra reuerentia loquor, sed nec adhuc hodie suscepissetis, nisi q(uonia)m insigne vestre non indicium me litteris vestria et gratia preueniendo, hanc de medio suspitionem tulerisset et formidinem.'
[452] Ibid.: 'De cetero si michi gratie vestre perseuerantiam sperare liceat, rogo si quid forsitan inopinatum in me absentem fumum et flamam eructuans cuiusquam, machinetur inuidia, rogo inquam cum ad aures vestras peruenerit, michi vestre protectionis scutum obumbret.'
[453] The letter was not written to Foliot for he is referred to in the letter, but David refers to his prebend suggesting the recipient was someone at St Paul's who was in the know, see Ibid., no.12.

surely the household of the bishop of London.[454] It is unclear if this man was himself a member of the household, or if the household was merely complicit in his treachery. But, in light of David's suspicion that rumours were being spread against him, any connection between his enemy and Foliot's household would have been alarming. What we also observe here, of course, is the depth of connection between the immediate circle of Gilbert Foliot in London and the schools of northern Italy, specifically the schools of Bologna: the leading centre in Europe for the study of Roman and canon law.

Foliot eventually deigned to reply to David, denying suggestions that he was angry. But problems arose from a third, unnamed person, who had spread rumours of Foliot's anger. Whoever this anonymous person was, he was 'worthy' and evidently someone David had trusted: surely someone at St Paul's.[455] Foliot assured David he harboured only warm feelings towards him and always had done, and suggested that David return to England for he had been in Italy for a long time.[456] David was reassured and wrote back to Foliot:

> 'My soul gives thanks that I should have received letters of your favour and affectionate blessing, so that the devoted love I once had in serving you is now repaid to me with yet greater devotion.'[457]

As a result, he proceeded with Foliot's business, securing the bishop's absolution from excommunication. Clothed in the wordy flummery of *dictamen* (the medieval art of letter-writing and rhetorical figuration), there are nonetheless firm hints here of the jealousies that could beset any great household, not least that of a bishop whose familiars were divided from one another not only by personal ambition but by considerable geographical distance.

---

[454] Ibid.: 'Subdolus ille non ruffus sed subruffus, qui suis precibus et quorundam familiarium meorum in discessu meo me vicit et iureiur(ando) super textum corporaliter prestito me decep(it), ut meum comes iter prosequeretur, et mea mecum comitaretur vestigia, non michi minister nec laboris socius factus est, sed itineris mei explorator et insidiator vite mee'.

[455] *GFL*, no.190: 'Amicorum namque sepe confundit animos lingua tertia digna confundi, quam ire et odiorum incentiua portantem a nobis obsecro non admitti.'

[456] Ibid.: 'Nil enim de te sinistrum concipio, nil intus adversum te corde foveo, sed admissum semel in gratiam michi et gratie et benevolentie vicissitudine observare deposco. De cetero quia sales vestros habunde iamdiu lambit Italia, bonum est ut eosdem amodo- cum tamen libuerit- experiatur et Anglia.'

[457] *LDL*, no.7: 'Quod gratie vestre litteras et affectuose benediccionis accepi, gratum super omnia factum est anime mee, et affectum quem ad obsequia vestra deuotum habui, michi reddidit deuotiorem.'

In another letter to an anonymous recipient, probably Foliot, David complained of financial difficulties. He was prevented from continuing his work for he was in heavy debt at the schools, and the income he believed was due from his prebend had not been forthcoming. As we have seen, he had lived in a degree of luxury in Bologna, and had stayed there for some time in expectation of his revenues. Instead, a 'Lord N.' (possibly Nicholas, archdeacon of London, possibly an acronymic 'nomen' as a means of anonymising the real culprit) had injured David through 'excessive negligence'.[458] N. was withholding payments owed, which David believed he would not receive without an order from Foliot. As a result, David asked for an advance payment of a year's revenues from his prebend.[459] As we have seen, David had received a loan in expectation of the payments he was due from his prebend, and as an advance against payments expected from N. Whoever the 'N.' of these letters may have been, Archdeacon Nicholas appears in another letter in the collection, where David refers to him as a messenger, sent from Foliot and bringing good news.[460] He may be the Master N. discussed in letter 70, which asks the recipient to receive N. kindly and to help him in his poverty.[461] Later, in 1171, Arnulf of Lisieux refers to Nicholas when writing to David: 'your Nicholas greets you'.[462] Perhaps, all had been forgiven between the two men, and Nicholas had been sent not only to bring messages from Foliot but also to repay the money he owed.[463]

David's issues, though, extended beyond a disagreement with just one fellow prebendary. Another letter, with *salutatio* intact, was sent by David to Dean Hugh de Mareni (d.1179/80) and the whole chapter of London, some time in the late 1160s.[464] This particular letter reveals that the chapter had

[458] *LDL*, no.2: 'Sperabam uberius de redditibus meis, quoniam michi responderint, et earum contemplatione, ut moris est et fieri opportuit, sumptus in quamplurimis maiores feci, et longiora tempora Bolonie continuaui. Sed ne vel meos redditus, vel meos incusare videar excessus, lesit me supramodum et inhumane nimis incuria domini N., ne cetera querar, et in huius cuiusdam extreme condicionis precipitauit periculum.' A 'Lord N. of London' was mentioned in the first letter in the collection, *LDL*, no.1. Nicholas was archdeacon of London, first occ. before 4 May 1162, last occ. 29 Sept 1189, see *Fasti,* i, 9.
[459] *LDL*, no.2.
[460] Ibid., no.1: 'Verbum quod michi misistis per Magistrum N. London' de cura et sollicitudine rerum, quas in me gratie vestre contulit habundantia, letum sonuit in auribus meis, et gratum factum est anime mee. Fecundavit gratiam vestra offerentis affectio, qua tanta tantulum pietatis officio preuenire curastis.'
[461] Ibid., no.70.
[462] Ibid., no.19, trans. *LCA*, n.3.08.
[463] Note that in one surviving copy, David witnesses a charter of Nicholas, dated to 1169, in which Nicholas gifts his houses and land in London to his nephew Nicholas after the death of his brother Richard. David's witnessing to this suggests the witness list may have been added at a later date as he was certainly in Bologna or at the Curia at the time the charter was made. See, *Archidiaconal Acta*, ed. Kemp, no.203.
[464] For Hugh, see *Fasti*, i, 5.

been complaining of David's absence. Evidently his return to London was demanded, but David was unable or unwilling to comply: he was, he claimed, seriously unwell. Not only that, but he was still occupied with the business of the bishop's household, on which account he had left London in the first place, business that was not as yet settled.[465] David was prepared to justify his absence in the hope that the dean, in company with the whole body of canons, would excuse him.[466] David was clearly still working for Foliot, yet his absence on the bishop's behalf was not sufficient to resolve his difficulties within the chapter. Evidently relations between bishop, episcopal household, and chapter, were not always harmonious. Unfortunately for David, not only did the dean and chapter reject his excuses, but they decided to withhold payments from his prebend. The Pope wrote to them in February 1170 ordering them to repay what was owed, without delay. The money, according to the Pope, had been withheld specifically because David had 'lingered' at the schools for more than three years.[467] David was punished as an absentee canon: this at a time when licences for absentees, and specifically those attending centres of learning, were a hot topic not just in England but across Christendom.[468]

Issues over the status of resident *versus* non-resident canons came to a head in every English chapter between 1066 and 1300.[469] At St Paul's, efforts had already been made to establish the rights of canons to payments from the common fund. Under Bishop Robert de Sigillo (before 1142-1150) a statute was passed denying any payments from the common fund to non-residents.[470] In the 1160s, this would have still been within living memory for various of the canons, perhaps even for Dean

[465] *LDL*, no.21: 'infirma mei corporis valitudo retardat...Excusationem istam novam non adinuenio, sed eam in corpore meo iamdiu grauem pertuli et adhuc hodie longe solito grauiorem perfero, et adeo quod ut nouit Dominus, licet me plura rei familiaris ut humane necessitatis est angant negotia, ex quo tamen discessi London(iensi), nec pro eorum uno expediendo, semel in equum ascendere potui'.
[466] Ibid.: 'Potero super his multum nimis et magnum producere testimonium...Ea igitur omni qua possum precum instantia vos dominos meos exoratos cupio, quatenus communi vestro et alterno fraterne caritatis officio, in eis ad que me vocastis negotia, meam suppleatis absentiam.'
[467] Ibid., no.72: 'vos ei in scol(is) iam per triennium et eo amplius commoranti, partem de communia que parua dicitur, duas scilicet marcas et dim(idium) adminus annis singulis subtraxistis.'
[468] For general discussion here, see G. Post, *The Papacy and the Rise of the Universities*, ed. with a preface by William J. Courtenay (Leiden 2017), 27 fn.72, noting that it was for the English *magister*, Gerard Pucelle, that the earliest evidences survive (from 1178) of papal intervention to secure rents, both in England and Germany, to ensure residence in the Paris schools.
[469] Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 38.
[470] Ibid., 27.

Hugh who had served as archdeacon of London from before *c.*1154, prior to his election as dean. At some point during his pontificate Alexander III commanded the dean and chapter that nothing be paid to absentee canons besides the stipends from their lands and their weekly allowances of bread, ale, and ten-pence from the common fund of the canons.[471] This was reaffirmed by Pope Lucius III (1181-5).[472] Both bulls appear in one of the surviving registers of the chapter, and Lucius' states that it had been issued following a petition from the canons and the example of his predecessor, Alexander.[473] Unfortunately, as Alexander's bull appears after that of Lucius, its text has been abbreviated, but according to the scribe the bull appears 'in all just as in the nearest preceding privilege' i.e., as in that of Lucius.[474] We can assume, then, that both bulls were issued in response to petitions from the canons, who were keen to ensure that no non-resident canon could claim more than what the chapter believed was their customary allowance. The canons must have been sufficiently concerned by the situation for them to petition Rome on the issue. Could the payments that David complained were not forthcoming have been from the common fund? As a non-resident canon he would have been entitled only to bread and ale (or a cash equivalent) and the paltry sum of ten pence per week. If he was pushing for more and believed he was entitled to it, this could very well have frustrated the resident canons back in London sufficiently for the dean and chapter to withhold payments from his prebend.

The desire to define the rules of residency for canons and their entitlement to the common fund remained a priority under Dean Diceto (1180/81-1201).[475] This culminated in a statute of residence, completed in or shortly after 1192.[476] Christopher Brooke regarded this statute as 'representing in some ways a revolutionary departure from previous custom'.[477] The consent of the whole chapter was now required and obtained: in many ways an extraordinary feat, since St Paul's had a long history of

[471] *St Paul*, no.225.
[472] Ibid., no.224.
[473] *St Paul*, no.224: 'Volentes igitur iuxta petitionem vestram grauamini canonicorum residentium prouidere, ad exempla [sic] felicis recordationis Alexandri pape predecessoris nostri presenti scripto duximus vobis indulgendum.'
[474] Ibid., no.225: 'In omnibus sicut in proximo precedenti priuilegio.'
[475] The income of the chapter was split into two, with one part going to fund individual prebends and the other being used as a communal fund for the chapter, Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 27.
[476] Printed in Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. Stubbs, ii, lxix-lxxiii. For questions over the dating of the statute, see Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 271 fn.2.
[477] Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 51.

absentee canons who likely would have objected. Brooke estimated that they made up around a quarter to a third of the cathedral establishment in the latter half of the twelfth century.[478] The statute had been composed, as the text itself states, 'for the purpose of abolishing the scandal which long endures between the canons in the church of the blessed St Paul over unequal distribution of common funds'.[479] Diceto himself was continuously resident throughout his career, and evidently felt passionately about the issue.[480]

According to the text of the statute, then, the question of payments to absentee canons had troubled the chapter for some time before 1192. David's absence at the schools, and his subsequent issues with the dean and chapter may well have been symptomatic of this longer-term dispute. Diceto's statute defined the length of time a canon had to be present in the cathedral in order to receive income from the common fund, with the precise amounts that would be deducted for each week of absence for a quarter of the year, up to a maximum absence before the absentee would forfeit all entitlement. There were certain exceptions for which absence was permitted, including for study abroad, when a canon would be entitled to 40 shillings a year, though he might only leave with the permission of the dean and chapter.[481] This 40 shilling annual limit was much less than the more than 22 marks that David admitted as his debts after two and a half years at the schools.[482]

I would suggest that given these attempts to formalise the rules over payments to absentee canons, the telling off David received from the dean and chapter, and his insistence that it was the bishop's business that kept him overseas, together build a picture of a chapter with a less than harmonious relationship between bishop (i.e. the bishop's household) and chapter. This is in contradiction to the previous picture, most vividly drawn by Brooke and Morey, of a chapter that in many respects was

[478] Ibid., 29-30. Thomas Becket himself was an absentee: had held the prebend of Reculversland before and during his time as chancellor, *Fasti*, i, 73.
[479] Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. Stubbs, ii, lxix: 'Ad rescindendum scandalum quod diu in ecclesia beati Pauli inter canonicos super inequali distributione communae perdurauit.'
[480] Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 29.
[481] Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. Stubbs, ii, lxxi: 'Si quis vero residentium qui non minus anno integro ecclesiae deseruierit, de licentia domini decani et capituli, studiorum gratia peregre degat per annum forte vel biennium vel triennium, singulis annis xl solidos de communa percipiet.'
[482] *LDL*, no.2: 'If I remember right, twenty-two marks (full weight) would scarce suffice to pay the principal, let alone the accumulated usury of two and a half years'. ['Si bene recolo, ad exhonerandam solam sortem qua teneor, exceptis usuris duorum annorum et dimidii, vix michi .xxii. m(arce) ponderate sufficerent.'].

synonymous with the household, indeed with the extended kinship network of Bishop Foliot.[483] Another of Brooke and Morey's insights may also be relevant here: their demonstration that the chapter itself, its prebendal residences around the Cathedral, and the Cathedral's other semi-public spaces functioned by the 1160s to all intents and purposes as one of the city of London's principal seats of higher learning.[484] If St Paul's was itself by this stage in effect a school for theologians and canon lawyers, what need, it may have been argued, had the canons of pursuing studies in so distant and potentially expensive a location as Bologna? Meanwhile, David's time abroad, first in his studies and then in the work of the bishop's household, caused grave tensions at home amongst his fellow canons.

Trouble with The Bishop

If David thought his troubles would be resolved after Alexander III instructed the dean and chapter to resume payments from his prebend, he was sorely mistaken. In fact, they spread further, into dispute with Foliot. By the time of their falling out, David had left Foliot's service and entered the household of Bishop Roger of Worcester (1163-1179), a cousin of Henry II, yet, in the Becket dispute one of the few bishops to have sided openly with Becket.[485] In a letter preserved in David's collection, Foliot wrote to Roger asking him to withdraw any support he had previously given to David, who Foliot believed was on his way to visit Roger and the 'lord' (presumably the bishop) of Hereford. David was accused by Foliot of 'with greedy mind casting his eyes on the principal dignity of our church'.[486] In order that he might obtain such dignity, David was on his way to the two bishops to secure commendatory letters from them, with which he was then prepared to travel to the Pope. Foliot asked Roger that he refuse to provide such letters, or, if this request arrived too late and the letters had already been given, that Roger have them returned.[487] Foliot was indeed too late. Roger had already written a letter of support for David to the Pope, explaining to Alexander III that he was writing on David's behalf and requesting the Pope's assistance. Foliot had previously assigned David an annual

[483] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, esp. 211-16.
[484] Ibid., 52-73.
[485] See Cheney, *Roger*, 17-55 for Roger's role during the dispute.
[486] *LDL*, no.34: 'iniecit oculus in precipuam ecclesie nostre dignitatem'.
[487] Ibid.

payment of £10 from the archdeaconry of Middlesex, to be paid until David was provided with an ecclesiastical benefice of equal or greater value. Foliot had confirmed this in a charter, that Roger had seen, and Foliot had ordered Ralph Diceto, then archdeacon of Middlesex, to pay the £10 to David. A quarrel had then arisen between Foliot, Diceto, and David, and as a result the bishop and archdeacon amended the agreement so that the £10 was paid to Foliot instead of to David. Roger now asked the Pope that he order Foliot to provide David with the first benefice to fall vacant, and order the archdeacon to pay the £10 to David that was owed.[488] It has been suggested that the two letters were written some years apart: Roger's in 1173 and Foliot's later in 1179. This on the basis that Roger informed the Pope that David's pension from the archdeaconry of Middlesex had been paid for two years until 1172, when it had been stopped, suggesting that David then complained to Roger in the following year.[489] However, it would be strange indeed if David became embroiled in two distinct conflicts with Foliot, both of which inspired him to contact Roger for help: one resulting in Foliot's letter, and the other in Roger's. Furthermore, in his letter to the Pope, Roger refers to David as his *familiaris*, that is to say as a member of his household. Yet throughout the 1170s, and certainly beyond 1173, David continued to witness charters for Foliot in the company of other members of the bishop's household and his kin.[490] Perhaps the most significant of these for us is a settlement made by Foliot and Roger, concluding a case between the canons of Oseney and St Frideswide's at Oxford. David is here found amongst the witnesses, all of whom appear to have been canons of London or members of Foliot's household, rather than Roger's.[491] Furthermore, there was no bishop of Hereford between the death of Robert of Melun in February 1167 and the election of Robert Foliot after Easter 1173, with the latter not consecrated until 6 October 1174.[492] Robert Foliot was a relative of Gilbert Foliot, and when in 1173 the Young King opposed the elections of various bishops (including that of

[488] Ibid., no.88.
[489] Brooke, 'Register', 243 and fn.1; Morey and Brooke, *Foliot,* 205. Cheney suggested 1171, as Roger's letter does not mention David's desire for the deanery or some other position, *Roger*, 251 fn. Yet, as I shall discuss below, David denied such accusations anyway and would possibly not have mentioned them to Roger. Further, in 1171 he was only just returning from Rome and Foliot was dealing with his own absolution until at least August.
[490] See *EEA*, xv, nos.98, 130-1, 182, 213, 239-40, 244.
[491] Ibid., no.182.
[492] *Fasti*, viii, 4.

Robert to Hereford), Gilbert had written on his kinsman's behalf to the Pope.[493] It seems hardly plausible that in this same year Robert would be petitioned by David for a letter contradicting the wishes of his kinsman and chief supporter, Gilbert Foliot. Roger's letter to the Pope, then, was written in the 1170s, but likely later than 1173 and shortly after Foliot wrote to him attempting to prevent this letter's dispatch.

William Stubbs believed that the 'highest dignity' that Foliot accused David of coveting was the deanery of St Paul's, which fell vacant in June 1179 or 1180 when Dean Hugh de Mareni died.[494] Morey and Brooke followed Stubbs, suggesting that Foliot's letter against David must have been written in July or August 1179, after the death of Dean Hugh and before the installation of Diceto, who succeeded as dean between January 1180 and January 1181.[495] Roger's letter to the Pope must have been written before 9 August 1179, when Roger himself died.[496] I am sceptical, however, that Foliot's letter refers to the deanery. Another letter in the collection, written by David himself, offers a lengthy and eloquent rebuttal of all charges against him. He supplies a hint that he may have been hoping for higher preferment, for he writes that his recipient (possibly Henry Banastre, canon of London, kinsman of Bishop Foliot, and treasurer of St Paul's from *c*.1174)[497] should remind Foliot that:

> 'whosoever pressed him [Foliot] to recommend another, did not understand what is fitting for the lofty dignity of his honour, or at least they sought their own man, or surely one he (i.e. the bishop) does not love.'[498]

All of this suggests manoeuvring over promotion to a prebend or perhaps an archdeaconry. But whether David's ambition reached as high as the deanery is another matter altogether. Foliot accused him of trying to obtain 'what is ours by right'.[499] This might have referred to the deanery. Although

[493] *GFL*, no.244.
[494] Stubbs, *Historical Introductions*, ii, 64-6. See *Fasti*, i, 4-8 for the dates of the deans of St Paul's.
[495] *GFL*, no.240 n.; Brooke 'Earliest Times', 37; Brooke, 'Register', 243-4.
[496] *Fasti*, ii, 99-100.
[497] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 288; *Fasti*, i, 21, 88.
[498] *LDL*, no.13: 'Licet enim sero de me sibi mentientes aduertat, erit ei familiare tamen et promptum intelligere, quod quisquis fuerit qui ab hoc aliud ei suadere nititur, non quid honoris sui celsitudinem deceat intelligit, aut certe tamen que sua sunt querit, vel profecto non diligit.'
[499] Ibid., no.34: 'et ipsum circumueniendo quod nostri iuris est'.

the canons may have considered it was they who had the power to elect their deans, in reality the election was more often decided by the bishop. It was not until the thirteenth century that statutes were enacted whereby the dean would be elected by the chapter, though appointments to prebends and offices would be made by the bishop, or the King in the case of a vacancy.[500] Morey and Brooke believed that in his attempt to gain the deanery, David was acting as the representative or head of a group of canons who wished to pursue the right of the chapter to elect their own dean. As Dean Hugh may have died on his way back from the Third Lateran Council of 1179, there was some basis for the legal argument that the appointment of his successor lay with the Pope (since offices that fell vacant as a result of deaths at or travelling to and from the Papal Curia were considered the Pope's to fill) and therefore, argued Morey and Brooke, David hoped to win the Pope's nomination.[501] This would explain Foliot's accusation that David was on his way to Roger of Worcester in order to gain letters of support which he would then take to the Pope 'to injure us by the Pope's authority'.[502]

Yet, it is clear from these letters that, though David had some allies at St Paul's, he also had powerful enemies there. We must account for Ralph Diceto's strong presence at St Paul's, as he was continuously resident there from 1153 to 1202. He may have been related to a predecessor as dean, Ralph of Langford (d. *c*.1154), and by 1179 had been a member of the chapter for almost thirty years. David would surely have been foolish to suppose that he stood a chance of winning an election against such a man.[503] Hereditary succession to prebends at St Paul's was not entirely eradicated by the 1170s, and a familial element to appointments to high office remained there. Such a connection to a previous dean would have stood Diceto in good stead. Diceto also had a long history of dealings with Foliot. He was involved in the negotiations to translate Foliot to London from Hereford in 1163, and had acted on Foliot's behalf in the Becket dispute.[504] To secure the deanery David would have needed the support of either the chapter or the bishop. In the event it seems he had neither, though this

[500] E. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the* Mensa Episcopalis (Cambridge 1994), 331-2; *Regestrum*, ed. Sparrow Simpson, 14 for the statute of Dean Baldock (dean until 1304 when elected bishop), 181-3 for the statute of Dean Henry of Cornhill (d.1254).
[501] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 205-6.
[502] *LDL*, no.34: 'ut eius auctoritate nos ledat'.
[503] Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. Stubbs, ii, xxix, lii; Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 29.
[504] A. Gransden, *Historical Writing in England: c.550 to c.1307* (London 1974), 196.

does not preclude the possibility that he canvassed unsuccessfully for both. Had Diceto expected to inherit the deanery without a struggle after his predecessor's death, even a hint that David coveted the position might have been enough to set Diceto against David and spread rumours about him to the bishop of London.

Christopher Brooke believed it possible that Diceto only gained the deanery after a 'wrangle at the papal curia', with David presenting himself as a rival candidate. The timeline, however, makes this unlikely. Dean Hugh died in June 1179 or 1180, but Diceto was likely made dean at some point in 1180, and certainly by January 1181.[505] Unless this 'wrangle' was begun before Hugh's death - possible but unlikely - there was little time for letters and messengers to travel back and forth to the Curia. David would also have had to set out on the very day of Hugh's death to arrive in time to beg support from Roger of Worcester, since Roger was dead by 9 August 1179. Roger's letter of support would have to be dated almost immediately afterwards, as would Foliot's attempts to block it. Yet Foliot himself admitted that he might be late in writing to Roger, for David had 'utterly concealed his journey to you from us'.[506] The journey to the Curia, when in Rome or south of it, usually took at least seven weeks (though in urgent matters a messenger could take a month), so a decision on the election would have been needed reasonably swiftly for Diceto to be in place by 1180-1.[507]

The nature of papal bureaucracy makes this dating even less likely: when Diceto was first appointed archdeacon of Middlesex in *c*.September 1152 the Pope had already chosen another candidate for the office. Presumably appeals to the Pope were made by bishop and chapter, and Diceto's appointment was confirmed by *c*.June 1153.[508] The difference here was that the Pope's candidate - John aux Bellesmains - was at the time working at the Curia, so any such negotiations would have been resolved much more quickly. For a decanal election disputed between David and Diceto both parties would have needed to gather up letters of support for their cause, as David evidently sought from

[505] *Fasti*, i, 5-6; C. N. L. Brooke, 'The Deans of St Paul's, *c*.1090-1499', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* xxix (1956), 233.
[506] *LDL*, no.34: 'Nam si vobis sero scripsimus, h(ec) causa est quod iter suum ad vos, nobis penitus occultauit.'
[507] Cheney, *Becket to Langton*, 62.
[508] *Fasti*, i, 15-16 and, see Brooke, 'Earliest Times', 28-9.

Roger of Worcester. Yet if Roger's letter was designed to help David obtain the deanery, it made a complete hash of things, for Roger makes no mention in his letter of David's hopes for high office.

Instead, Roger's letter centres around the payment due to David from the archdeaconry of Middlesex. There is no mention in the letter of either candidate becoming dean. Surely if Diceto were soon to give up the archdeaconry of Middlesex, we would expect Roger to have asked the Pope to order that the payment be made 'by Diceto *or his successors*'. This he did not do, suggesting that any election to the deanery was not yet on the horizon and supporting the hypothesis that whatever David and Foliot clashed over it was not the deanery, but something else linked to Roger's letter of support. None of this, of course, rules out the possibility that it was Diceto, 'the leading figure in the chapter' who was very possibly the enemy at St Paul's who David had long worried was spreading rumours against him.[509]

In his letter rebutting the charges against him David places the blame not on Foliot but on others who had deceived the bishop whilst David was away. These anonymous foes - evidently the same canons who had troubled him previously - had cast David 'out of doors from the house of my lord', making him an 'exile from the land in which I was born'.[510] David was from London, so the 'land' from which he found himself exiled must be London and St Paul's. David explains why he left London and sought refuge with Roger: he left when he sensed he was to be betrayed and the bishop of London was about to turn against him.[511] He still regarded Foliot as his 'first and last' Lord, and promised that 'I will adore and love him, and accordingly he will use me as he will wish and he will consider me ruined when he will wish, and when he will wish, he will recall me in my wanderings'.[512] Whoever he was writing to, David evidently believed that they would be able to intervene with Foliot on his behalf. He sent accompanying letters to be shown to the bishop if it seemed he was willing to listen,

[509] For this description of Diceto, see *GFL*, 206.
[510] *LDL*, no.13: 'Si autem vel modicum dominum meum mea turbauit vel prima vel h(ec) secunda discessio, ipsi viderint qui me prius a domo domini mei turpiter elimitarunt, et postmodum terre in qua homo natus sum fecerunt extorrere.'
[511] Ibid.: 'in quanta amaritudine anime mee semel et iterum ab eo discessi, cum presenserim quod preualentibus insidiis, faciem suam auertisset a me.'
[512] Ibid.: 'hunc dominum meum primum agnoscam et ultimum. Hunc venerabor et diligam. Hic me prout volet utetur, contempnet pereuntem cum volet, et cum volet reuocabit errantem.'

but to be destroyed if not.[513] It is likely that the letter was sent to an ally at St Paul's, for David refers to an arrangement he had made with the recipient over the church of Southminster. This had been perpetually assigned to the treasurer of St Paul's except when the treasurership was vacant, in which case it would revert to the bishop.[514] The letter, then, was possibly written to the treasurer, either Godfrey or his successor Henry Banastre.[515] Henry was himself a kinsman of Gilbert Foliot, so David would have had good reason to suppose that he might act as mediator.[516]

Seemingly David had returned to St Paul's by the 1180s when he witnessed three charters pertaining to the chapter alongside various canons and, in every case, Dean Diceto.[517] Meanwhile, he witnessed no charter of Gilbert Foliot's later than 11 June 1180.[518] This is not conclusive evidence that he was permanently excluded from the bishop's service, and Foliot's own letter and charter collection was possibly compiled *c.*1180, reducing the surviving evidence for the bishop's final years.[519] It does seem, however, that the rift between David and the bishop was not repaired, and there is no evidence to suggest David acted ever again as the bishop's mouthpiece. Despite this, he retained his income from the canon's demesne until at least the time of Diceto's survey of the estates of the chapter in 1181, and he probably retained his prebend until the end of his life.

Beyond Becket and St Paul's

Aside from this episode with Diceto and Foliot we have only the briefest glimpses of David's activities after the resolution of the Becket Dispute and it is difficult to assign certain dates even to to

[513] Ibid.: 'Si forsitan his dominus meus aurem benignam accomodauerit, tunc litteras in his inclusas ex parte mea ei porrigetis. Sin vero vos non audierit, supprimetis eas.'
[514] Bishop Richard de Belmeis I had given land in Southminster and the church of Southminster to the canons of St Osyth's, to be held of the bishop of London, *EEA,* xv, no.27, and see no.28 where he informs the dean and chapter of St Paul's of this grant, but under Richard Belmeis II the churches were taken away from St Osyth and became part of the endowment of the office of treasurer of St Paul's, see idem no.28 n. In a charter of July 1160 x 4 May 1162 the church of Southminster was perpetually assigned to the treasurer of St Paul's, idem no.69 and this was confirmed by the king in *LCH,* no.1629, by the dean and chapter of St Pauls, *St Paul*, no.193 and by the Pope, *St Paul*, no.231. Gilbert Foliot confirmed an agreement between Godfrey, treasurer of St Paul's and the convent of St Osyth over the church of Southminster 1163 x 1174, *GFL,* no.450, though when the treasurership was vacant it would revert to the bishop, see Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter,* 331.
[515] *Fasti,* i, 21.
[516] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot,* 44.
[517] *St Paul*, nos. 164, 220, 243.
[518] Above fn.491.
[519] For a final word on the dating of the collection, see Christopher Brooke's discussion of his views with a rebuttal to those of Sir Richard Southern in *EEA,* xv, 146-8.

events for which we have evidence. Perhaps his earliest such dateable activities are discussed in Letter 22. This, from David to Prior Odo of Canterbury, reveals that in 1173 David was involved in the election to the archbishopric of Canterbury. David wrote between June 1173 and September 1174 to inform Odo that he had been unable to pass on to him the greeting (*salutatio*, possibly referring to a letter), or the signs (*intersigna*) to Richard, the newly elected archbishop, by which Odo had recommended him. If he could, David wrote, he would visit Odo as soon as opportunity arose. The rest of the letter is as ever cloaked in mystery; David wished for something from Odo, but it was not safe to commit it to writing, and so on.[520] David was, however, grateful for the hospitality Odo had provided him.[521] In April 1173, the bishops and the Canterbury monks met at London to discuss the election to Canterbury, following months of stalemate and the failed election of Roger, abbot of Bec, who was promoted in February 1173 but refused the position. His candidature was withdrawn in early April.[522] After this, according to Gervase of Canterbury, the King had to console Odo with promises of free elections to the bishoprics of England, farms and income for Canterbury, and the institution of Becket's sister Mary as abbess of Barking; this latter apparently carried out at the instigation of Odo himself.[523] In April, discussions over the election were continued between the bishops (including those newly elected) and Odo, with the bishops claiming the election result should be announced first by both the bishop of London and Odo. Odo rejected this, claiming the monks had the right of first announcement. The abbot of Cerisy was suggested as a candidate but rejected as being unknown.[524] After further disagreements, two monks were sent to Henry II in Normandy to ascertain his will. He had already put forward three Norman candidates, but none was deemed suitable. The monks, one of whom was Richard of Dover, later archbishop, found the King agreeable, but according to Gervase Henry did not express his will on the matter of the election. Instead, through messengers he communicated his wishes to Richard de Lucy, the justiciar, and the King's uncle Reginald, earl of Cornwall. Another meeting was held in May, where Diceto says two candidates were selected by the

[520] See *LDL*, no.22.
[521] Ibid.: 'For the hospitality and serenity of countenance that you have shown me, may the Lord repay you in kind' ['De hospitalitatis gratia et vultus serenitate quam michi pretendistis, vicem vobis Dominus rependat']
[522] Gervase, *Opera* i, 241-2.
[523] Ibid., 242.
[524] Ibid., 244.

monks and presented to the bishops: Odo himself, and Richard of Dover. Diceto tells us that Gilbert Foliot, as spokesman for the bishops, first praised Odo, before announcing that his fellow bishops had chosen Richard.[525]

The same month, before Richard was elected, Foliot wrote to Henry II in Normandy. He informed the King that the monks of Canterbury had accused him of coveting the archbishopric, a claim he denied. The letter is scathing in its descriptions of the monks throughout the election. The King, Foliot advised, should consider whether it was wise to leave the choice entirely to the monks who were not bound to the King in fidelity, and not to the bishops who were, and who were dedicated to preserving his honour before God. Foliot advised that the King should elect an ecclesiastic from or in England, and that the election should be announced simultaneously by the prior of Canterbury and one of the bishops, or in another way in which God might advise the King.[526] This would have been quite transparently against the king's promise to free and fair elections.[527] Following this, another meeting was called at London in July and there Richard was elected as archbishop. Henry Mayr-Harting, and Morey and Brooke, have all suggested that when he wrote to the King, Foliot had come to some arrangement with Odo regarding a suitable candidate.[528] David's letter to Odo certainly suggests negotiations between bishop and prior, with David acting as go-between. Any negotiations must have involved discussions over candidates, but they may also have focussed on a compromise over who would announce the result of the election. This was clearly a point of contention that concerned both parties. As Gervase reported it, in April Odo refused the suggestion that he and Foliot announce the result together, but in May the bishop was still forging ahead with the idea and hoping for the King's support. Neither Diceto nor Gervase's account is clear on who won this argument and was first to make the announcement, though after his declaration of Richard as the bishop's choice, Foliot began

[525] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 369: 'Et quia regis patris intererat plurimum diebus illis electionem concorditer celebrari, semotis duobus a multitudine monachorum, Odone scilicet priore Cantuariensi, Ricardo priore Dovorensi, cum eos monachi praesentassent episcopis, ad sui prioris electionem unanimiter aspirantes, Gilbertus Lundoniensis episcopus consurgens in medium, cum prius ad laudem Odonis prioris plurima congessisset, de communi consilio coepiscoporum aliam declinavit in partem, dicens, "Nos Ricardum priorem eligimus".'
[526] *GFL*, no. 220.
[527] See A. Duggan, 'Law and Practice in Episcopal and Abbatial Election before 1215: with special reference to England', *Élections et pouvoirs politiques du VIIe au XVIIe siècle* (Paris 2008), 53-6.
[528] See *GFL*, no.220n.for Morey and Brooke's views, and H. Mayr-Harting, 'Henry II and the Papacy, 1170-1189', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965), 50-1.

reciting the *Te Deum Laudamus* and so inspired the gathered clerics to join him.[529] Whatever the focus of the negotiations between the bishop of London and the prior of Canterbury, it is clear that David was involved on Foliot's behalf, acting as negotiator and perhaps playing a pivotal role in securing the rights that the bishop claimed.

Letter 15 presents the next dateable sighting of David. The letter shows that David planned to attend the Council of Westminster, called in May of 1175 by Archbishop Richard of Canterbury. At this stage he was still in the bishop of London's household, for he informed the recipient of letter 15 that he would come to them for counsel, with the approval of the bishop of London.[530] He hoped his anonymous recipient would make generally known the agreement regarding the church of Doddington that he had made with David.[531] Doddington was a dependent chapel of Teynham, an archiepiscopal manor which had been annexed to the archdeaconry of Canterbury, and was presumably given to David either during Becket's exile or during the Canterbury vacancy.[532] It may have been given to him at the King's insistence by Geoffrey Ridel, archdeacon of Canterbury from early 1163, until his election to the bishopric of Ely in 1173. Geoffrey was roundly detested by Becket, who called him 'our archdevil', and for his part Geoffrey deliberately impeded the restoration of the archiepiscopal properties after October 1170.[533] Letter 15 was likely written to Geoffrey, now bishop of Ely, with David hoping he would clarify and publicise the agreement they had made regarding Doddington. In the event Geoffrey attended the Council but it does not seem that he clarified things for David, who we see in further letters was engaged in various difficulties over Doddington.[534]

In Letter 16 David discusses this further, noting that he had entered into dispute with a Lord Herbert regarding Doddington. It has been suggested that the Herbert referred to was Herbert of Bosham,

[529] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 369.
[530] *LDL*, no.15: 'Tunc enim annuente domino London(iensi) vobis occurram, et ad vestrum consilium et voluntatem exinde in verbo illo cedam vel contendam'.
[531] Ibid.: 'Verbum illud de ecclesia vel capella de Dudincon' super quo iam eum conuenistis, in adventum vestrum London' ad generalem illam quam iam fecit dominus Cant(uariensis) vocationem, differatis.'
[532] For its annexation to the archdeaconry, see *EEA*, ii, no.65.
[533] A. Duggan, 'Ridel, Geoffrey', *ODNB*.
[534] For attendees of the council, see Roger of Howden, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis* i, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1867), 84 and Gervase, *Opera* i, 251.

Becket's closest advisor.[535] The argument would be then, that whilst he was either archdeacon or archbishop Becket had gifted Doddington to Herbert, and that after Becket's death Herbert attempted to regain it from David. However, there is no evidence that Herbert of Bosham ever held the church. There is an alternative Herbert that is more likely to be the one discussed: Herbert le Poer, royal clerk and son of Richard of Ilchester, appointed archdeacon of Canterbury in 1175. As archdeacon is it natural he would have attempted to regain a property belonging to the archdeaconry. It is not clear in which month Herbert was appointed. Diceto writes only that Archbishop Richard appointed three archdeacons within three months: Savaric, Nicholas, and Herbert, though he was perhaps mistaken for neither Savaric nor Nicholas is known to have held any archdeaconry under the see of Canterbury.[536] It seems that upon becoming archdeacon, Herbert endeavoured either to regain Doddington or to secure a greater income from it at David's expense. Evidently someone disputed Herbert's claim to the church though David denied that it was him, insisting that someone 'greater' than him 'or attached to one greater than [him]' had 'pursued this cause as my agent in name'.[537] This person was perhaps Bishop Geoffrey Ridel, for in a letter written to David by the convent of St Pancras at Lewes the monks informed David that they had 'heard that Ely (*Eliensis*) in anger has turned his face and spirit from you'.[538] The letter from St Pancras cannot be precisely dated but based on the general dating of the collection we can presume it comes from the 1170s, and 'Eliensis' could well refer to Geoffrey, by then bishop of Ely.[539]

Eventually Herbert agreed to pay David half a mark annually but he was insistent the payment was to be made 'not in the name of the church of Doddington but in the name of the transaction' so as to avoid any heavy annual burdens on the chapel itself after Herbert's death.[540] It is not clear when precisely the matter was settled, but we might presume it to be a short while after the Council in May

[535] M. Staunton, 'An Introduction to Herbert of Bosham', *Herbert of Bosham,* ed. Staunton, 11.
[536] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 403; *Fasti,* ii, 13-14.
[537] *LDL,* no.16: 'ut quidam quiuis alius me maior vel me maiori adherens, meo et procuratorio nomine causam istam qualemqualem agitasset'.
[538] Ibid., no.90: 'Audiuimus quidem, quod auerterit a vobis Eliensis pre ira vultum suum et animum, quia melius iudicastis tutum non esse pugnare cum illo contra Dominum.'
[539] *Fasti,* ii, 45.
[540] *LDL,* no.16: 'non nomine ecclesie de Dudinton', sed nomine transactionis michi soluere voluit'; see also Staunton 'Introduction', 11.

1175. In his letter explaining the settlement, David reminds his anonymous recipient that 'a grave and unceasing grievance does not cease to wound me' so perhaps this occurred around the same time as his falling out with Foliot and Diceto.[541]

Sometime after September 1175, David wrote letter 27, possibly addressed to Richard of Ilchester, then bishop of Winchester. David would have met Richard when they were both acting as envoys at the Curia during the Becket dispute and as we have seen, Richard was prepared to speak to the King on David's behalf. It is clear that the recipient of letter 27 had done David some favour for which David himself was deeply grateful. In the letter, David recounts a conversation with a Master N. - as ever more likely to be 'nomen' rather a true initial - who had recently visited the abbeys of Ramsey and Peterborough, where he had met the archbishop and archdeacon of Canterbury. N. informed David that at Peterborough he discovered a certain Hospitaller had received a papal mandate, ordering the recipient of the letter and the King to restore a certain house to the Hospitallers, or risk excommunication. However, David considered this to be nonsense and rebuked N. For his part, David states, he preferred to earn his friends' anger by informing them of the truth, than to seek their favour through lies. It was on this account that he was writing to his correspondent.[542]

It may have been whilst he was still Foliot's *familiaris* that David received letter 90 from the priory of St Pancras, Lewes.[543] In the letter the monks of Lewes reminded him of the Biblical David who stood against the Philistines alone:

> 'Who...will stand for the tribe of Israel and fight for the camp of the eternal king?
> Only David, who has no second. Our David... shall be one for a thousand, better than
> the ten thousand against him...Only our David shall stand glorious, triumphant over so
> numerous a foe.'[544]

[541] *LDL*, no.16: ;grauis et assidua querela me lacerare non desinat'.
[542] See *LDL*, no.27.
[543] Lewes (Sussex), St Pancras (Cluny), f.1077, Knowles, *Heads*, 119.
[544] *LDL*, no.90; 'Quis ergo stabit pro agminibus Israel et pugnabit pro castris regis eterni? Solus D(avid), qui secundum non habet. Sit igitur alter iste noster D(avid) unus pro mille contra x. millia melior ill(is). Solum D(avid) manet gloriosus de tam multiplici hoste triumphus.' For the story of David and Goliath, see 1 Samuel 17.

Evidently the priory required his aid: 'We know...that we deserve nothing from you...Thus it shall be for grace alone to supply protection to the petitioners'.[545] So, they wrote, ' "Seize arms and shield" therefore... and rise up to aid the poor of Christ'.[546] What service was required of David here is not clear as there is no direct request in the letter: most likely this was conveyed by the messenger and remains frustratingly beyond our reach. Even so, David was witness to three settlements made by Gilbert Foliot in cases involving the priory. The first of these, noted above, can probably be dated to June 1170 around the time of the Young King's coronation.[547] Perhaps this was when David first encountered representatives from the priory, for he was certainly still engaged in the Becket dispute at this point and had probably not yet fully proved himself through his efforts at the Curia. The two remaining cases are harder to date. One belongs probably to the 1170s, and is a settlement between the priory and a clerk, over the church of Reed (Hertfordshire). The church had been granted to the priory and Richard was instituted as perpetual vicar, in exchange for an annual pension paid to the priory.[548] The other case is a settlement by Foliot as papal judge delegate of a case between Lewes priory and Master Osbert of Bray over the church of High Bray (Devon). The priory's right was recognised and Master Ralph de Alta Ripa (or 'Hauterive', one of Foliot's many nephews) was instituted as rector in exchange for a pension.[549] It has been dated 19 March 1163 X January 1181, and David appears amongst the witnesses. As we have seen he appears in no other of Foliot's charters in the 1160s, was absent at the schools from *c*.1166 until 1170, and only returned to England for a few months in 1170. Therefore, the settlement can probably be dated after 1171. In both witness lists, however, David appears amongst the canons of St Paul's and members of the bishop's household, rather than with the adherents of the priory. This does not suggest he played a long-term role for the priory, unless they were in fact asking him to petition Foliot on their behalf during one of these cases. The priory's cartulary also records a settlement of 1174/5 between the monks and William fitz

[545] *LDL*, no.90: 'Scimus quod et non sine dolore fatemur quod a vobis nichil meruimus nec pendet precium nostrarum optentus de precedentium gratia meritorum. Erit igitur solius gratie presidium parare poscentibus, et Cristi pauperibus patrocinari'.
[546] Ibid.: ' "arma et scutum, et exurge in adiutorium" pauperum Cristi'. Cf. Psalms 34:2.
[547] *EEA*, xv, no.129.
[548] Ibid., no.130 where it is dated 17 May 1170 x 1180, probably 1171 x 1176l *The Chartulary of the Priory of St Pancras of Lewes* ii, ed. L. F. Salzman (Lewes 1934), 126 where it is dated *c*.1170.
[549] *EEA*, xv, no.131.

Randulf, concerning the estates of Heselcroft and Tillbury. The Pope had delegated this to Roger of Worcester and Robert, archdeacon of Winchester, who judged that William was to put land to the value of £20 into the hands of a responsible person, and the monks would give the same man the estates of Heselcroft and Tillbury, and that they should pay rent on these until the monks had received 100 marks.[550] David could have been involved in any one of these cases, but the evidence does not prove which. If it seems bizarre that the monks should write to a relatively obscure canon of London for help, there is a potential explanation in the relationship of the priory to Gilbert Foliot. At some time between *c*.1148 and 1153 Foliot had written to Pope Eugenius III, extolling the virtues of the priory. St Pancras was the leading Cluniac priory in England, and Foliot had begun his career as a Cluniac monk.[551] This connection alone would have been enough for the priory to hope for a favourable reception by the bishop of London, and before their dramatic falling out, Foliot would surely not have hesitated to recommend David for the priory's legal battles, not least after his role in Foliot's two absolutions.

By the 1170s, when David entered Roger of Worcester's household, Roger was most occupied with his work as a papal judge-delegate: work in which David was well suited to assist as a result of his legal training and experience. Roger was well-regarded for this work, for which he was praised by so sharp a critic as Gerald of Wales. Gerald described Roger, along with Bishop Bartholomew of Exeter, as 'twin candelabra illuminating all Britain', and noted Alexander III's high opinion of Roger.[552] It has been estimated that Roger acted as papal judge-delegate at least 130 times and three of the earliest English collections of decretals had a connection with his see of Worcester.[553] Roger's legal reputation alone might not have been enough to tempt David away from London, for Foliot also had a considerable reputation as a lawyer and was also often called upon by the Pope to act as papal judge-delegate.[554] Roger, however, was not only renowned for his legal skills but had retained a good

[550] *Chartulary St Pancras* ii, 140-1.
[551] *GFL*, no.84.
[552] Gerald of Wales, 'Vita St Remigii', *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* viii, ed. J. F. Dimock (London 1877), 57, trans. R. H. Hemlholz, *The Profession of Ecclesiastical Lawyers: An Historical Introduction* (Cambridge 2019), 96. See Gerald of Wales, 'Vita St Remigii', 345 for Alexander's view on Roger.
[553] Cheney, *Roger*, 317-73; C. Duggan, *Twelfth-Century Decretals Collections and their Importance in English History* (London 1963), 152-62.
[554] See Helmholz, *Ecclesiastical Lawyers*, 102-7.

reputation throughout the Becket dispute, helped by his absence in France for most of the period 1167-72. Though he was cousin to Henry II, and in the early days of the dispute had acted as messenger to the Pope on his cousin's behalf, Roger complied (or at least attempted to comply) with many of Becket's orders to the bishops.[555] Roger's absence from England for much of the later 1160s was therefore in all likelihood a calculated attempt to remove himself from the dispute, for in the aftermath of the archbishop's murder he was happy to be sent to the Curia on the King's behalf. Regardless, he was well regarded by his contemporaries and a position in Roger's household would not only have enabled David to display his legal skills, but would also have helped to rebuild his reputation after the murder. His work for Foliot, who together with Roger of York was the most hated of the bishops amongst Becket's circle, can hardly have endeared him to those who had supported the archbishop. Indeed, Becket as martyr was celebrated even at St Paul's.[556] David himself hinted at regretting his involvement in the affair. Writing perhaps to Foliot, David referred to his time at the Curia where he had 'eagerly' taken care of matters until their 'accomplishment': that is, when he secured Foliot's second absolution.[557] But, he wrote

> 'Behold... the reward of labours...Behold the recompense of faith, while I was faithful beyond faith to a man, until I almost went astray from God and from the Church in infidelity.'[558]

David was not alone in his regret; of course even the King eventually performed penance for his role in Becket's murder.[559] The desire for penance was prevalent amongst the royal envoys. In 1174, the bishops-elect of Bath and Ely purged themselves of any guilt for their roles in the murder.[560] This came after the journey of the archbishop-elect of Canterbury to Rome, and before their consecration

[555] See Cheney, *Roger,* 17-55 for Roger's role throughout the dispute. For Roger as messenger in the early days, see Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 314-5.
[556] J. Jenkins, 'St Thomas Becket and Medieval London', *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* (2020), 655-8.
[557] *LDL*, no.14: 'cum ultimo in curia fuerim, studiose procurauerim quominus negotia pro quibus venimus manciparentur effectui.'
[558] Ibid.: 'Ecce, mi domine, que merces laborum...Ecce que fidei retributio, qua dum supra fidem homini fidelis fui, fere a Deo et ab ecclesia infidelitate aberraui.'
[559] For Henry's penance of 1174, see A. Duggan, 'Becket is Dead! Long Live St Thomas', *The Cult of St Thomas Becket in the Plantagenet World, c.1170-c.1220* (Woodbridge 2017), 36-9.
[560] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 391-2.

as bishops, so it may well have been a prerequisite of the Pope's approval of their elections, or at least designed to gain Alexander's support. Richard of Ilchester, elected bishop of Winchester in 1173, assented to and permitted the construction of a chapel at Portsea in honour of St Thomas.[561] Richard de Lucy spent his career in royal service and had helped draw up the Constitutions of Clarendon. He was excommunicated by Becket in 1166 and 1169, yet in 1178 he founded a house of Augustinian canons at Lesnes in Kent, which was dedicated to the Virgin and to St Thomas of Canterbury, and it was there that Richard himself was subsequently buried.[562] The seal of Lesnes showed Becket flanked on either side by two pike fish, symbols of the Lucy family.[563] There is no evidence that David made a similarly grand gesture, but he must have felt a degree of pressure to atone for his association with Becket's greatest enemy amongst the bishops, and a degree of Christian guilt for the part he had played in the dispute. Master Henry of Northampton was another of the canons of London to have acted as royal emissary to the Curia.[564] After Becket's murder he joined the bishop's *familia* at Canterbury and served archbishops Richard and Baldwin. The earliest charter he witnessed at Canterbury can be dated no more precisely than 28 April 1174 X 1176, but he was in the archbishops' service by the late 1170s.[565] Henry was rewarded for his services by Baldwin with churches and benefices. Henry himself founded a hospital dedicated to St Paul, evidently not forgetting his time spent in the saint's cathedral in London.[566] It seems that David shared both in the desire to make amends to the martyr, now a saint, and the need to restore his reputation: a new start with Roger of Worcester must have seemed very tempting indeed.

In letter 89 Bartholomew of Exeter thanks David for his advocacy on behalf of the canons of Guisborough (Yorkshire, North Riding) in their dispute with the archbishop of York.[567] The dispute began over the advowson of the church of Kirk Levington. This had been granted to the canons at

[561] See Hudson, 'Ilchester, Richard of', *ODNB.*
[562] A. Emt, 'Lucy, Richard de (*d.*1179)', *ODNB.*
[563] J. McEwan, *Seals in Medieval London 1050-1300: A Catalogue* (Woodbridge 2016), nos.110-11.
[564] See above.
[565] *EEA,* ii, no.220 where a 'Henry of Northampton' witnesses without the magister title, but must surely be this Henry who witnesses 23 more of the archbishops' charters from the mid-1170s on. Note in idem that Master Ralph of Sancto Martino also witnesses without the title of magister that he is afforded elsewhere.
[566] *Epistolae Cantuariensis* in *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I* ii, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1865), nos.366-8.
[567] Founded 1119, a house of Augustinian canons, see *Heads,* 164.

their foundation by Robert de Brus, or so they claimed, though it is possible there is a hint of forgery to the original charter.[568] It seems though that Robert's grandson, Adam, later caused difficulties as he gifted the church both to the canons of Guisborough and to the Augustinian canons of Thornton, Lincolnshire.[569] The canons' right to the advowson of the church had been confirmed by Roger of York - though this charter too is suspect - who instituted Geoffrey de Crammaville at the instigation of Prior Cuthbert, agreeing that upon Geoffrey's death the canons should have the right of appointment. The canons were not impressed with Crammaville, insisting that his successor should live from his own income or rely on the archbishop's support, and appealing to the Pope to secure their rights.[570] The Pope duly confirmed Kirk Levington to the canons.

In anger at this, archbishop Roger instituted his clerk, William of Ryedale, to Eston, a chapel of Kirk Levington, without the canons' knowledge. When the canons found out and opposed him, Roger excommunicated two of them, deposed the prior, placed an interdict upon the convent, and threatened to excommunicate any chaplains who celebrated services for the canons in their churches, and their parishioners if they should pay tithes or offerings. The canons appealed again to the Pope and he delegated John, bishop of Chichester[571], Baldwin, abbot of Ford[572], and Adam abbot of Evesham[573], as papal judges delegate.[574] These judges met at Oxford, where they heard testimony from eminent lawyers, ('tandem plurimorum qui aderant honestorum, sapientium et iurisperitorum consilio').[575] There they brought about peace between the two parties. The canons were pardoned by Roger who secured the right to institute any candidate to Eston except William of Ryedale. In return the canons were to receive an annual pension. However, disputes over Kirk Levington persisted. After Geoffrey de Crammaville's death, the prior and canons chose a rector for Kirk Levington, but archbishop Roger

[568] For this suggestion, see *EEA*, xx, no.41n.
[569] *Cartularium prioratus de Gyseburne, Ebor. Dioceseos, Ordinis S. Augustini, Fundati A. D. MCXIX* i, ed. W. Brown (Durham 1889), xiv-xv; 1-3 for the foundation charter; 11-12 for Adam de Brus's grant.
[570] *EEA*, xx, no.41n.
[571] See above fn.436.
[572] Occurred 1169 x 75 until 1180, when he resigned to be bishop of Worcester before being elected archbishop of Canterbury 1184. He died 1190, *Heads*, 132.
[573] Prior 1161-89, Ibid., 46.
[574] Alexander's letter is in *Cartularium Gyseburne, Ebor. Dioceseos, Ordinis S. Augustini, Fundati A.D. MCXIX* ii, ed. W. Brown (Durham 1894), no.718, or *PUE* i, no.173.
[575] Ibid., no.718.

appealed to Rome against this, prompting the prior and canons to issue a counter-appeal and institute their candidate regardless. The archdeacon of Cleveland excommunicated the canons in Roger's name, but they ignored him. The dispute between canons and archbishop was then heard by the papal legate to Scotland, Alexis, who brought about a settlement *c*.1180: the archbishop was to hold the church for life under fixed conditions, but the canons would retain its two chapels of Yarm and Worsall. After the archbishop's death, Kirk Levington would revert to the canons and they would have the power of advowson.[576] The canons also had trouble with Roger concerning the advowson of the church of Skelton, given to the canons by Robert de Brus, though as with Kirk Levington the charter confirming it is suspect.[577] Roger of York's nephew, Ralph, held the church, where dispute arose between Ralph and Guisborough, leading to the intervention of Simon abbot of St Albans[578] , Adam of Evesham, and Baldwin of Forde. Their settlement of *c*.1173 determined that Roger should hold Skelton for life; the canons should receive an annual pension, and the church should revert to the canons on Roger's death, much as in the settlement for Kirk Levington.[579] The details of this dispute are less clear, but between *c*.1171 and *c*.1177 Roger authorised the appropriation of Skelton to Guisborough, following Ralph's death.[580]

One piece of evidence provides a rough gauge as to when David may have become involved in the dispute over Kirk Levington. After Roger suspended the prior and placed an interdict over his churches, but seemingly before delegating the three papal judges-delegate to hear the case, Alexander III wrote to Bartholomew of Exeter. The Pope informed Bartholomew of the canons' accusations against Roger, but stated that he found these hard to believe. Therefore, he was ordering Bartholomew to summon both parties to him within thirty days to hear the truth of the matter. If it proved true, he was to declare the canons and churches free from suspension and interdict and order Roger to cease from his actions.[581] Evidently Bartholomew did not do so or was unable to settle the case, and the new

[576] Ibid., no.686 and *EEA,* xx, no.41n.
[577] *EEA,* xx, no.43n.
[578] Abbot 1167-83, *Heads*, 67.
[579] *Cartularium Gyseburne* ii, no.819.
[580] For a brief discussion of the issues relating to both churches, see J. Burton, *The Origins and Development of the Religious Orders in Yorkshire c1069 to c1200* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 1977), 371.
[581] *Decretals Lincoln*, ed. Holtzmann and Kemp, 30-3.

delegation was the result. We might suppose that by the time Bartholomew came to consider the case, David was already involved, and so encountered the bishop of Exeter. Otherwise, perhaps Bartholomew recommended David to the canons as their case proceeded.

Bartholomew asked David to persist in his advocacy for the canons, 'through to its final reckoning' (*usque ad calculum diffinitionis*).[582] Given his history of successful advocacy at the Curia it is likely that David's role involved negotiations with the Pope: either petitioning the Pope to confirm Kirk Levington to the canons, or tasked with pressing their counter-appeal regarding a rector for Kirk Levington. He may also (or instead) have been one of those lawyers representing the canons in Oxford before the papal judges delegate. The evidence is too thin to reach any firm conclusion. We can nonetheless see from the bishop of Exeter's letter that the canons' opponents, Roger of York's party, had offered David bribes to come over to their side, but Bartholomew had assured David that should he stay true to the canons, reward would accrue to him a hundredfold.[583]

Though we have only scant glimpses of David's activities in the mid to late 1170s, this evidence is bountiful when compared to the woeful absence of any evidence for his activities thereafter. It has been suggested that David may have been responsible for various glosses in legal manuscripts that may be Bolognese, and that may (note the congeries of conjectures here) date from the 1180s onwards.[584] He may likewise have been the author of material used in a later *summa*.[585] The evidence for these assertions rests solely on David's presence in Bologna in the 1160s, and the fact that there are virtually no other known possible candidates for the 'd.' or 'magister d.' who glosses these manuscripts. This does not make these attributions certain; there is no evidence that David returned to

[582] *LDL*, no.89.
[583] Ibid.
[584] For these suggestions, see S. Kuttner, *Repertorium der Kanonistik: (1140-1234)* (Vatican City 1937), 18-9, 51, 53, and 192-4; idem, 'Bernardus Compostellanus Antiquus: A Study in the Glossators of the Law', *Traditio* 1 (1943), 281; Kuttner and Rathbone, 'Canonists', 286; R. Weigand, 'The Development of the *Glossa ordinaria* to Gratian's *Decretum*', *Canon Law in the Classical Period*, ed. Hartmann and Pennington, 78. The manuscripts that have been glossed by a 'd' and either firmly or tentatively attributed to David are: Cambridge, Sidney Sussex College 101; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library 446; Madrid, Fundacio Lázaro Galdiano 440l Munich, Staatsbibliothek 10244; Innsbruck, Universitätsbibliothek 90; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 1367 (though Kuttner disputes this in *Repertorium*, 53); Treves, Diocesan Seminary 8; Vercelli, Cathedral Chapter XXV; Lilienfeld, Cistercian Monastery 222.
[585] For this, see J. F. Schulte, *Zur Geschichte der Literatur über das Dekret Gratians* iii (Vienna 1870), 44-5, and 52 where Schulte is certain that David is the author; Kuttner, *Repertorium*, 192-3. The Summa can be found in Bamberg, Staatsbibl. MS Can. 17; Halle, Universitätsbibl. Ye. 52; and London, BL Additional MS 24659.

Bologna in the 1180s and one other candidate has been suggested.[586] The section of the *summa* attributed to David by Schulte is entitled 'Si peccaverit', beginning:

> 'Magister d. concordans cum auctoritate intelligit de occulto hoc ponendum dicens: Si pecc(auerit) in te f(rater) t(uus) c(orripe) e(um) int(er) te et ip(sum) s(olum).'[587]

The reference here is to Matthew 18, a chapter not referred to in David's letters. However the sense of the passage attributed to this Master D. is striking, given David's issues within his chapter and *familia*: if your brother should trangress against you, tell him his fault and keep it between yourself and him alone. If he will not hear you, bring two or three witnesses to share this with him, but these men ought not to publicise his crime but to keep it secret, and they ought not to speak of the crime but only offer reproof and correction.[588] Perhaps a vague reference to the actions of the canons and bishop of London against David himself? Despite this intriguing subject matter, we cannot say for certain that this passage should be attributed to David.

David's last appearance in the Pipe Rolls occurs in the year 1188-9, the first Michaelmas term of Richard I's reign.[589] The Roll shows that it was in this Exchequer year that David received his last payment from the hundred of Godalming. However, he received just £7 and 10 shillings for half the year, and not the full year's payment. There is also no record that he received his usual payment from the lands of the bishop of London. In the same year we have a second sighting of 'I.', servant (*serviens*) of Master David, surely our David, since in an the entry for Wiltshire in the 1187-8 Pipe Roll it was recorded that 'I.' owed half a mark.[590] The entry for the next year records that he owed half a mark, but in the same year he paid it to the treasury and was quit of the debt.[591] There are no other clear sightings of 'I.' in the records unfortunately, so we do not know what became of him.

---

[586] A Master Daifer, see Weigand, '*Glossa ordinaria*', 78.
[587] Printed in Schulte, *Literatur* iii, 44-5.
[588] As above, and the passage continues: 'Si vero te non audierit adhube duos vel tres testium et facias eum moneri a duobus vel tribus, qui crimen non debent publicare, sed tecum occultare, et hi tales non dicitur testes commissi criminis, sed testes castigationis et correptionis', Schulte, *Literatur* iii, 44.
[589] *PR 1 Richard I*, 217. The roll was incorrectly labelled 1189-90 when it was published in 1844.
[590] *PR 34 Henry II*, 140, in the edition for this year he is called John, but in the next Jordan. It is unclear which is correct.
[591] *PR 1 Richard*, 175.

This absence of David from the Pipe Rolls after Michaelmas 1189 led Zachary Brooke to suggest that in 1189 either David died, or his fortunes fell with the accession of the new King and a new bishop of London, Richard FitzNeal, elected 25 September 1189 and consecrated on 31 December that year.[592] The successor to David's prebend at London, Brand, first occurs as canon there *c*.1192, named in Diceto's Statute of Residence.[593] As there is no other record of David beyond 1189, Brooke's suggestion that David died that year seems plausible. Certainly, he was commemorated in the St Paul's obituary roll on 31 March. If he died on that date in 1189 it would account for the payment of just half a year.[594] If he had been born some time between 1127 and 1135, as I have suggested above, he would have been in his mid 50s or 60s by 1189.

Yet, there is a curious piece of evidence to suggest that David survived beyond 1189, but may have left St Paul's. I have already mentioned an inscription in a theological collection now in the British Library, recording that it was given to Merton Priory by Master David of London. This inscription occurs at the beginning and end of the first gathering. The works in this collection, principally Simon of Tournai and various others posing questions on Peter Lombard's Sentences, date from the mid twelfth-century and potentially as late as *c*.1200.[595] The same hand (dated *c*.1200) which records that the manuscript was gifted by David includes a list of the works in the manuscript including those beyond the first gathering, so we know that these must have been given by David. The list includes the *Institutiones* of Simon of Tournai's (*fl. c*.1165-1201, composed between 1160 and 1165), and his *Questiones*, further *Questiones Theologice*, a *summa* attributed to Alan de la Porrée but probably the work of Alan de Lille, along with 'certain other' works. It is a relatively large manuscript with coloured initials throughout: not the type of gift one could make if one were living in poverty.[596] The manuscript has been dated to the thirteenth century, but in my opinion by error.

[592] Brooke, 'Register', 239; for Richard FitzNeal, see *Fasti*, i, 2.
[593] Diceto, *Historical Works*, ed. Stubbs, ii, lxxii; *Fasti*, i, 29-31.
[594] *Fasti*, i, 29-30.
[595] The manuscript is now London, British Library, Royal MS 9 E XII. For catalogue details, see [http://searcharchives.bl.uk/primo_library/libweb/action/display.do?dscnt=1&doc=IAMS040-002106469&displayMode=full&dstmp=1614075883201&_ga=2.250206790.1759504975.1614075606-751882596.1508165699&vid=IAMS_VU2&ct=display&tabs=detailsTab&fromLogin=true, accessed 23/02/21].
[596] The MS measures 121/4 in. x 81/4, ibid.

If David lived past 1189, why then did he lose his prebend and his pension from the King? The explanation may lie in one of his letters, in an obscure reference already mentioned. In the final letter of the collection the monks of St Pancras informed David that they 'heard that Ely (*Eliensis*) in anger has turned his face and spirit from you'.[597] The obvious 'Eliensis' here is bishop of Ely, Geoffrey Ridel. However, an alternative suggestion is Richard FitzNeal, elected bishop of London on 15 September 1189, and before this prebendary of Chiswick at London from *c*.1181.[598] Richard was the son of Bishop Nigel of Ely (d.1169), had been archdeacon of Ely from *c*.1158 until 1189, and before he became bishop was often referred to by contemporaries as Richard of Ely.[599] If David had done something to anger Richard, either before or after Richard's election to London, he may have lost his prebend in 1189 as a result of it.

David's pension from Fulham and Stepney does not appear in the Pipe Roll for 1188-9. Foliot had died on 18 Feb 1187, and although David received the full payment for the year 1187-8, it could simply be that it took the wheels of administration some months to stop the payment after the bishop of London's death.[600] The payment makes no appearance in the Pipe Roll for 1188-9, but the next year it is recorded that the county sheriff is quit of having to collect the payment from Fulham and Stepney in the lands of the bishop of London.[601]

In 1189, when Richard I took the throne, the new King granted £15 worth of land in the Hundred of Godalming to Stephen of Thurnham (near Detling, Kent), Ranulf de Broc's son-in-law.[602] That year, David received only half his usual payment from Godalming.[603] Ranulf had died *c*.1177, and we can see from the Fine Roll for John's reign that after Ranulf's death, Stephen of Thurnham received £15 of land in Artington from Henry II, which the 1212 survey of fees recorded as a portion of Godalming.[604] Henry II died on 6 July 1189, so Stephen may well have taken the King's death as an

[597] *LDL*, no.90: 'Audiuimus quidem quod auertit a vobis Eliensis pre ira vultum suum et animum'.
[598] See *Fasti*, i, 2 and 41.
[599] See J. Hudson, 'Richard *fitz* Nigel', *ODNB* and *Fasti*, ii, 50.
[600] *Fasti*, i, 2.
[601] *PR 2 Richard I*, 156.
[602] For Stephen, see H. Summerson, 'Thornham [Turnham], Stephen of', *ODNB*
[603] *PR 1 Richard I*, 216-7.
[604] *Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus in Turri Londinensi Asservati Tempore Regis Johannis*, ed. T. D. Hardy (London 1835), 339 and *Book of Fees*, 67.

opportunity to regain the full income from Godalming. In letter 26 discussing his pensions David wrote that Ranulf de Broc had been ordered by the King to pay him £15 'each year at the agreed terms' (*ut singulis annis statutis terminis xv. libras michi soluat*), suggesting that the £15 would be split into smaller payments, either paid at the four terms of the year, or at Easter and Michaelmas.[605] If Stephen of Thurnham viewed David's pension as coming from Henry II, and through him from Ranulf de Broc, it was in 1189 deemed null and void now that both men were dead. Stephen, then, decided to contest it and this would explain why in 1188-9 David received just half of his usual payment from Godalming. In the first Pipe Roll of Richard's reign, Stephen's land was recorded as being at Godalming but this was later corrected in the roll, and afterwards when the payment appears it is recorded as a payment of £15 from Artington, which the inquest of 1212 records as a vill of Godalming.[606] The same inquest and the Fine Roll for John's reign report the payment as a gift from Richard I in exchange for service of half a knight's fee.[607] Stephen was on crusade from 1190 until at least 1192, for in that year he visited Jerusalem, and if David contested the loss of his pension this would explain why no payment was recorded from Godalming or Artington in the Pipe Roll for the second year of Richard's reign as the matter could not be easily settled while Stephen was overseas. Dispute with David would also explain why the payment to Stephen was corrected in the Pipe Roll for the first year of the new King's reign. If so, the situation had been settled by Michaelmas 1191 when the £15 from Artington was once again recorded for Stephen and he was paid in arrears for the previous year's lost income.[608] Importantly, Richard FitzNeal was also treasurer until 1198. If David had angered him, he chose the one man with perhaps most control over his pensions at London and beyond.

Therefore, 1189 does not necessarily mark David's death, whilst the existence of the Royal manuscript, apparently gifted to Merton Priory by David, instead suggests that he lived for some years beyond but that his fortunes declined drastically with the arrival of a new King and bishop. Whatever

[605] *LDL*, no.26.
[606] See for instance *PR 1 Richard I*, 216
[607] *Book of Fees*, 67 and *Rotuli*, 339.
[608] *PR 3 Richard I*, 132.

the truth, as there is no further record of David beyond 1189, it is here that our biographical survey must end.

Conclusion

This new edition and translation of David's collection has enabled a more detailed study than has previously been possible, leading to this lengthy chapter. The clearest image we have of David's activities comes directly from the letters, and we know most for the time-frame covered by the collection. It is clear he was a skilled and adept advocate and negotiator, aware of the conventions of the papal Curia and able successfully to navigate them.

We might suppose that David hoped to be one of the 'new men' of the twelfth-century, those supposed to have been 'raised from the dust' to greater heights in royal or clerical administration. In reality, of course, as has been many times pointed out, these men were often far from new.[609] Most often they were nephews or kinsmen of important men, and as ever the wheels of nepotism aided their rise in one way or another. David had no such network of kinsmen to rely upon. Instead he had to cultivate his relationships with bishops, priors, and his fellow canons, and when these relationships failed he found himself in a precarious position.

[609] See for instance N. Vincent, 'Jocelin of Wells: The Making of a Bishop in the Reign of King John', *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier*, ed. R. Dunning (Woodbridge 2010).

Chapter Three: Miscellaneous Letters

Aside from the letters in David's collection that relate to his career, there are several with no obvious connection to him, which cannot be attributed to his authorship. It is virtually impossible to say how the majority of these letters ended up in the collection but some speculation is called for. These 'extra' letters sometimes appear in gaps at the end of the various groupings, suggesting that they were simply copied into empty space. However, there are two dossiers of letters that were clearly grouped together before they were copied into the manuscript, and therefore deserve consideration as distinct units.

Westminster and Canonization

Contained in David's collection are two stray letters written by Laurence, abbot of Westminster (d.1173). Laurence had been a student of Saint-Victor at Paris and monk of St Alban's. He reputedly had Henry II's favour and returned from Saint-Victor with a recommendation from Bernard of Clairvaux. He was elected abbot of Westminster *c*.1158.[610] In letter 54 Laurence wrote to Stephen, abbot of Cluny, of his distress that they had been unable to meet whilst Stephen was in England, as Laurence was detained at London by unspecified business. If any business should take him to Normandy, Laurence promised, he would visit Stephen at Cluny.[611]

Stephen was elected abbot of Cluny in 1161 but was not established until 1163. He died 12 August 1173 so letter 54 must have been written between 1163 and 10/11 April 1173, when Laurence died. The Annals of St Pancras priory, Lewes, not entirely reliable on dates, claim that Stephen's first visit to England occurred in 1163.[612] Lewes was a Cluniac house, the first in England, though with complicated relations with the continental order.[613] We can expect the Lewes monks to have taken an interest in any visit of the abbot of Cluny, though the Lewes annals' dating of the visit can be queried. Based on other dating mistakes, we can assume an approximate date three years either side of 1163.[614]

---

[610] E. Mason, 'Lawrence (*d*.1173), abbot of Westminster', *ODNB*.
[611] *LDL*, no.54.
[612] For instance, the Annals have Alexander III's election as 1158 (in reality, 1159), and Becket's martyrdom is listed under 1171 rather than 1170, F. Liebermann, 'The Annals of Lewes Priory', *EHR* 17 (1902), 87-8.
[613] B. M. Crook, 'General History of Lewes Priory in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 81 (1940), 68-96.
[614] See above fn.612.

If the annals are correct and Stephen did visit in 1163, it is unsurprising that Laurence claimed he was busy in London for he must have been preoccupied with preparations for the translation of Edward the Confessor.[615]

Letter 55, written from Laurence to Alexander III, concerns a dispute in the diocese of Norwich between the bishop and prior of Norwich and two Norwich monks, A. and R., described by Laurence as 'sons of iniquity' and 'persecutors of peace'.[616] The monks had obtained papal letters through 'false suggestions' that must have been damaging to the bishop. The two had turned against the bishop, who had appealed to the Pope, who had delegated the bishops of Worcester and Hereford to hear the case.[617] This they must have done at some time between 1164, when Roger was elected bishop of Worcester, and 27 Feb 1167, when the bishop of Hereford, Robert of Melun, died. His successor was not elected until Easter 1173, and Laurence died in that year.[618] Through the efforts of the judges-delegate the two men were reconciled to their bishop, William de Turbe, by this point elderly. The two monks promised peace and were welcomed back to the cathedral priory, but Laurence outlined in letter 55 that they had not remained there peacefully. Instead, they began to turn their fellow monks against the bishop. Events had taken an even worse turn when the brothers used violence in the chapter house against their prior, John.[619] John had only escaped when dependents of the Church, hearing his shouts for help, came to his aid. Laurence wrote to the Pope, therefore, to ask that should either monk approach the Curia, the Pope should know they had been excommunicated by Bishop William and not afford them a friendly welcome. The Pope should consider, wrote Laurence, how it would damage the Benedictine order (indeed all monastic life in England) should the troublesome monks find favour at the Curia. 'God forbid', concluded Laurence, 'that my pious Lord should so

[615] See below.
[616] *LDL*, no.55: 'filii neq(uitatis)', 'persecutores pacis'.
[617] Ibid.
[618] *Fasti*, ii, 70 and viii, 4. See Cheney, *Roger*, 377 for Roger's itinerary and 367 for Cheney's dating of the papal commission to September 1164 x late 1166. Christopher Harper-Bill dated Laurence's letter to the late 1160s, see 'Bishop William Turbe and the Diocese of Norwich, 1146-74', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 7 (Woodbridge 1984), 142.
[619] John first occ. 1153 x 68 and last occ. *c*.1168, *Fasti*, ii, 59.

disappoint a bishop .... whose life from boyhood to old age has shone bright with virtues'.[620] Christopher Harper-Bill has argued that this dispute arose as a result of reforms Bishop William had attempted to impose at Norwich through Prior John, which met with opposition from a faction of the monks, possibly referring to the attempts to prevent sons of priests from inheriting their fathers' churches on which topic Alexander III wrote two letters to Bishop William.[621]

Laurence's letter highlights the anxieties of the bishop of Norwich and his supporters, who were concerned that the monks might receive a favourable welcome at the Curia. It also hinted at another issue faced by ecclesiastics in England. With the growth in appeals to Rome and the many months - often years - it could take for a dispute to be settled, a bishop or abbot might be powerless to act against a troublesome monk or canon for a lengthy period.[622] In fact, by the time of the Third Lateran Council in 1179, Alexander III had taken pains to curb the number of appeals made to the Curia. A year or two before the Council he approved a method devised by the prior and convent of Augustinian Bridlington: those living under monastic discipline and hoping to appeal against any superior must first have their case discussed in chapter. If it could not be settled there, they should bring in two or three others of their order to arbitrate. If this did not settle things, the case should be heard by the diocesan bishop. If the bishop could not settle it, only then should appeal be made to the Pope.[623] Evidently, in the case of the monks of Norwich, the procedure was not yet worked out and the monks believed they could appeal directly to the Pope.

It is not entirely clear why William turned to Laurence for aid. William had spent his youth at Norwich, with which Laurence had no obvious link.[624] The pair may have met in 1162, when Henry II ordered his justiciar, Richard de Lucy, bishops William of Norwich and Hilary of Chichester, the bishop of Lichfield, and Laurence, to report on the rights of the abbey of St Alban's. William and

[620] *LDL*, no.55: 'Absit, absit, ut pius dominus meus, episcopi iam centenarii cuius vita a pueritia insenium virtutibus clara refulsit, presertim in tali et talium personarum causa confundat faciem, quod quidem absque communi regis et regni confusione facile fieri non potest'.
[621] C. Harper-Bill 'William [*called* William Turbe]' *ODNB*, Harper-Bill, 'William Turbe', 152, and see *Gilberti Epistolae* ii, ed. Giles, nos.366-7.
[622] For more on this, see Cheney, *Becket to Langton*, 42-86.
[623] Ibid., 70, see *PUE*, iii, no.242 for the papal ruling over the case at Bridlington.
[624] William probably entered Norwich Cathedral priory as an oblate and was educated at the cathedral school there, Harper-Bill 'William Turbe', *ODNB*.

Hilary had been delegated by the Pope to hear the claims of the abbey to exemption from the authority of the bishop of Lincoln.[625] It was perhaps the Benedictine link that caused William to turn to Laurence, for both Westminster and Norwich were black monk houses. As will be shown, the monks of Westminster made more than one visit to the Curia during this period, and Laurence's letter was likely given to Westminster monks to carry to the Curia. Further, as one of the petitioners to the Pope for the canonization of Edward the Confessor, William may have felt that Laurence owed him a favour. Unfortunately, this letter is the only evidence for this case so no more detail can be provided.

The significance of Laurence's letters lies not in their content, but in what they reveal of Laurence's attempts to build a network within the Benedictine order and beyond. The lack of a surviving letter collection for Laurence means there is no clear picture of his friends and allies, so we risk falling into the trap of reading individual letters as proof of personal relations between Laurence and the two men in question: Stephen of Cluny and William of Norwich.[626] We cannot truly know if Laurence's flattering letter to Stephen indicated personal affection, or was motivated by political consideration. Certainly Laurence appeared to suggest that he had not previously met Stephen; one of his regrets in not meeting him was that 'I failed to set eyes on your beloved and much desired face'.[627] At one stage Laurence wrote to the Pope on behalf of Gilbert Foliot, yet the relationship between the two was not without difficulty.[628] It is not clear how Laurence's letters found their way into David's possession, though perhaps the explanation lies in David's links with the priory of St Pancras at Lewes. As shown above in in Chapter Two, the priory wrote to David, 'their most beloved friend', requesting his aid in an unknown matter. Perhaps Laurence's letters found their way to the priory due to the Benedictine link, and from there to David.

Laurence's letters likely found their way to David around the same time as a dossier pertaining to the canonization of King Edward the Confessor. These mostly represent unique copies forming a part of the wider petitioning by Laurence for Edward's papally sanctioned canonization. This was the second

[625] Harper-Bill, 'William Turbe', 148.
[626] For this as a common occurrence in studies of medieval letters, see J. Haseldine, 'Friendship, Intimacy', 251.
[627] *LDL*, no.54: 'desideratam michi faciem vestram peccatis meis impedientibus videre non merui.'
[628] See below.

such petition to go to the Pope, an earlier attempt having been made by Osbert of Clare. Osbert was a monk of Westminster, and had quarrelled with his abbot Herbert, elected in 1121. As a result, he had been banished from Westminster.[629] Frank Barlow believed that Osbert's push for Edward's canonization:

> 'was part of a general restatement of Westminster's rights and claims ... It is likely that Osbert believed that he was acting in defence of the true privileges of the abbey against all oppressive authorities'.

These, no doubt, included Abbot Herbert, himself appointed by King Henry I.[630] As part of this burnishing of Edward's memory and as a way of supplying a written record of the abbey's rights, Osbert was also involved in the forging of a series of documents supposedly issued by Edward the Confessor as King. These purported to 'prove' the rights of the abbey and were accompanied by a revision of the earlier *Vita Edwardi Regis* (*VER*).[631] In 1134, Osbert returned to Westminster, became prior, and continued his campaign for the promotion of Edward's cult: founding a house of canonesses tasked with praying for Edward's soul; preaching on Edward's anniversary; and composing his *Vita beati Edwardi regis Anglorum* (*VBE)*, based on the earlier *VER*. These efforts culminated in 1138/9 in the decision to petition the Pope for Edward's canonization.[632]

When Cardinal Alberic of Ostia held a legatine council at Westminster Abbey in December 1138, he was presented with a copy of Osbert's *VBE*, along with a letter requesting that Edward be canonized.[633] Osbert also wrote to Bishop Henry of Winchester who had charge of the diocese of London during the episcopal vacancy, requesting his support for the canonization.[634] Between 1139 and 1142, most likely closer to 1139, Osbert obtained letters of support from King Stephen (father of the new abbot of Westminster), Bishop Henry (Stephen's brother), and from the chapter of St Paul's.[635] Despite this, Osbert's petition failed. Pope Innocent II informed him that he would not grant

[629] For Herbert's dates, see *Heads*, 77.
[630] Barlow, *Edward*, 272.
[631] Ibid., 273.
[632] Ibid., 274.
[633] *The Letters of Osbert of Clare Prior of Westminster*, ed. E. W. Williamson (London 1929), no.14.
[634] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 304; ibid., no.15.
[635] *Letters Osbert*, nos. 16-8. For the dating of these letters, see Barlow, *Edward*, 274-6.

approval for canonization, citing a lack of widespread support from the bishops and abbots of England.[636]

This decision has traditionally been attributed to the Pope's less than friendly feelings towards King Stephen, following Stephen's arrest of the three English bishops of Salisbury, Lincoln, and Ely.[637] In January 1139, Theobald of Bec was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury. Not himself a great supporter of Stephen, Theobald set off to visit the Pope and collect his pallium. Some months later at the Second Lateran Council, Innocent II gave audience to the Angevin view of Stephen as a usurper. The Pope avoided pronouncing sentence and in June 1139, after a scuffle between Bishop Roger of Salisbury's men and those of the count of Brittany, the king arrested Bishop Roger, his son, and his nephew Bishop Alexander of Lincoln. Roger died shortly afterwards in December 1139: an event that can hardly have endeared Stephen to the Pope.[638] Added to this, Empress Matilda and Robert of Gloucester invaded England in October 1139, putting the Pope in a difficult position: if he canonized Edward at the request of Stephen and his son, he might appear to be favouring the losing side in the civil war? In a more recent examination of Osbert's petition, Kyly Walker has highlighted the papal context: the petition was presented to a Pope less reliant upon English support for his own position, following the death of his schismatic rival in 1138.[639] This, argues Walker, combined with Stephen's weakness and the lack of widespread support for the petition led to Innocent's decision to postpone any canonization until Osbert could collect further testimonials.[640] No such effort seems to have been made and Osbert once again fell out with an abbot of Westminster, this time Stephen's son Gervase, losing his position as prior, and once again fleeing into exile.[641]

---

[636] *Letters Osbert*, no.19: 'si sufficientia prae manibus habuissemus testimonia episcoporum et abbatum, iam canonizatum in catalogo sanctorum a Romana secum curia reportasset regum vestrum.'
[637] See M. Bloch, 'La Vie de S. Édouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare', *Analecta Bollandiana* 41 (1923), 14; Barlow, *Edward*, 276; and R. Foreville, 'Canterbury et la canonisation des saints au XIIe siècle', *Tradition and Change: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Chibnall*, ed. D. Greenway, C. Holdsworth, and J. Sayers (Cambridge 1985), 66.
[638] Barlow, *Edward*, 276.
[639] See K. Walker, 'Westminster Abbey, King Stephen, and the Failure to Canonize King Edward in 1139', *Royal Studies Journal*, 5 (2018), 27-48, especially 44-8.
[640] *Letters Osbert*, no.19.
[641] Barlow, *Edward*, 277, though Richardson and Sayles are less certain that Osbert fell out with Abbot Gervase or that he was replaced as prior, see H. G. Richardson and G. O. Sayles, *The Governance of Medieval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh 1963), 418-9.

When Laurence became abbot in 1158, apparently hearing of monastic discontent at Edward's lack of saintly status, he determined to resubmit the canonization petition. He inspected the *VER* and *VBE* and secured agreement from the monks that another attempt be made.[642] He awaited favourable political conditions which came in 1160 after Henry II had formally recognised Alexander III as Pope over his schismatic rival.[643] Edina Bozoky has characterised this new attempt as the 'convergence' of the interests of three parties: Westminster Abbey, Henry II, and Alexander III, through Henry's desire for a royal saint, Westminster's desire to strengthen its privileges and royal links, and Alexander's desire to solidify the role of the papacy in canonization processes.[644] Laurence determined not to make the same mistake as Osbert, and secured widespread support. David's collection contains letters from seven bishops, two abbots, and two priors, all written to Alexander III probably *c*.autumn 1160 in support of Edward's canonization. These letters detail Edward's piety, his marital virginity, his miracles, and the miraculously preserved state of his body.[645] Besides these displays of Edward's sanctity, the letter-writers advance a variety of reasons as to why the petition should be granted. Some referred to the schism, rejoicing that it was now over.[646]

In autumn 1160 Laurence travelled to Normandy to secure Henry II's support for the petition, then to Paris to obtain assistance from Cardinals Henry and Otto.[647] Henry II wrote his own letter to Alexander III, reminding him that he was himself of Edward's bloodline. Though the King did not explicitly state this, it cannot have escaped Alexander's attention that as Pope he was deeply in Henry's debt as a result of the King's support for him over his schismatic rival.[648] The cardinals wrote a separate letter, declaring that Laurence had visited them, recounted Edward's miracles, and showed them his shroud which had not perished with age. They asked the Pope to answer Henry II and

[642] Barlow, *Edward*, 278.
[643] See *LDL*, nos.50-1 for the schism.
[644] E. Bozoky, 'The Sanctity and Canonisation of Edward the Confessor', *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*, ed. R. Mortimer (Woodbridge 2009), 173, 176-82, 184-5.
[645] *LDL*, nos.56-68.
[646] See *LDL*, nos.59 (Roger of York), 60 (Gilbert Foliot of Hereford), 65 (Abbot Roger and the Convent of Reading), 66 (H. minister of St N.).
[647] See *LDL*, no.57 and Richard of Cirencester, *Speculum Historiale De Gestis Regum Angliae* ii, ed. J. E. B. Mayor (London 1869), 321.
[648] *LDL*, no.56: 'De cuius sanguine propagatum me'.

Laurence's prayers, though Laurence was unable to attend the Pope in person.[649] A party from Westminster then proceeded to Rome, taking with them Innocent II's letter relating to the original attempt, a book of miracles, and the testimonials. Alexander III authorized the canonization, issuing two bulls on 7 February 1161: one directed to the abbot and church of Westminster, the other to the whole English church.[650] Here he proclaimed that, following consultation with the cardinals and having inspected the book of miracles and read Innocent's letter, as well as the new testimonials, he was granting the petition even though usually this would only happen in solemn council. Edward was to be added to the list of confessors and those in England who had petitioned for the canonization were to honour him with due rites.[651] In the letter to Laurence and Westminster, Alexander informed them that he viewed the petition as having been advanced by 'our beloved son in Christ, Henry, illustrious king of the English, as much as by you.'[652] No doubt the Pope felt he had sufficiently repaid Henry for his support and wished to make this clear.

Following this success, Laurence requested the composition of a new *Vita* by his relative, Ailred, abbot of Rievaulx. On 13 October 1163 Edward's body was translated to a new shrine in Westminster Abbey; an event presided over by the new archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Becket, and attended by ten English, one Welsh, and three Norman bishops, four abbots, and eight earls. The king was also present.[653] The Westminster monks must have revelled in such glory. The new Pope had formally canonized their own saint, a royal saint no less and related to the current king, widely supported by the prelates of England, with the King and archbishop of Canterbury and other important figures present at the translation. This also marked the first papal recognition of a pre-Conquest English saint, occurring at a time when papal control of sainthood was being consolidated.[654]

[649] Ibid., no.57.
[650] See ibid., no.69 for the letter to Laurence and Westminster.
[651] Ibid.
[652] Ibid.: 'Inde utique fuit quod super petitione quam de Eduardo glorioso quondam rege Anglorum canonizando et in sanctorum cathologo ascribendo tam karissimus in Cristo filius noster H(enricus) illustris Anglorum rex quam vos ipsi nobis instantius porrexistis'.
[653] Barlow, *Edward*, 283, 325.
[654] Bozoky, 'Canonisation', 173.

The dossier in David's collection is unlikely to represent the entirety of the assembly of testimonials, for there is no letter from Laurence himself, nor is there anything from Archbishop Theobald whose support we would expect Westminster to have courted. Theobald was ill from 1159 until his death in 1161 which may have prevented his involvement.[655] However, Nigel of Ely refers specifically to Theobald's support for the matter in his own letter.[656] Henry of Winchester's letter is heavily abbreviated, though it is possible that he only provided a short letter as he had already written in support of the earlier petition.[657] In the canonization bull Alexander acknowledged that he had examined Innocent II's letters on the case, suggesting he may also have seen the letters received for the first petition.[658] Elsewhere a fuller version of Gilbert Foliot's letter is preserved, suggesting either that Gilbert later wrote an expanded version of what was sent, or that the version in David's collection has been shortened.[659] Barlow believed the dossier was preserved in David's collection as a formulary.[660] But this in turn begs the question of a 'formulary' for what? Did David preserve the letters purely for interest's sake, because of their Latin language (itself not especially useful, one might suppose, save in the very specific circumstances of the Confessor's cult), or because he in fact intended to use them as models for a future canonization project?

The twelfth century witnessed the development and consolidation of a more formal canonization procedure. Whereas previously bishops and archbishops, sometimes in church councils, would determine whether an individual could be venerated as a saint, papal recognition became increasingly important as the century advanced.[661] By the time of Alexander III's accession, although bishops still had a degree of control over canonizations in their dioceses, the Pope was regularly consulted in such processes.[662] By 1171, and the sensational reaction to Becket's murder, despite widespread and immediate declarations of Becket's sanctity, John of Salisbury was determined to gain papal approval

[655] Barlow, 'Theobald (*c*.1090-1161)', *ODNB*.
[656] *LDL*, no.63.
[657] Ibid., no.59.
[658] *Letters Osbert*, no.16 and ibid., no.69.
[659] *LDL*, no.60, for the longer version, see *PL* 190, cols.852-4.
[660] Barlow, *Edward*, 309.
[661] *The Saint of London: The Life and Miracles of St. Erkenwald*, ed. E. G. Whatley (Binghamton 1989), 41-2; E. W. Kemp, 'Pope Alexander III and the Canonization of Saints: The Alexander Prize Essay', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 27 (1945), 14-16.
[662] Kemp, 'Canonization', 16.

before calling Becket a saint.[663] In the case of St Wulfstan of Worcester, the results of a report commissioned by Hubert Walter in 1200 were submitted to the Curia for consideration alongside letters of support, but the Pope still insisted on a second inquiry to obtain written statements from eyewitnesses and the personal attendance at the Curia of various of these.[664] In 1206, when a bid was made for the canonization of Abbot Waltheof of Melrose, eyewitness accounts of the powers of the saint were obligatory as well as the usual miracle collection.[665]

If the Edward dossier was intended to serve as a formulary, did David put it to use? Between the canonizations of Edward and Waltheof, England produced at least three other such processes: those of Thomas Becket, Gilbert of Sempringham, and Wulfstan of Worcester. In 1163 Becket also petitioned the Pope for the canonization of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury.[666] Gilbert of Sempringham and Wulfstan of Worcester were canonized in 1202 and 1203 respectively, likely after David's lifetime, ruling out his involvement. Furthermore, the petition for Gilbert's canonization came from within the order of Sempringham. A dossier of letters pertaining to this petition does survive. Though the letters do not clearly use the Edward dossier as their model, this may be due to differences in subject matter: the letters regarding Gilbert focus upon his role as founder of Sempringham, stressing this as a key reason for the canonization, a situation clearly distinct from the case of Edward.[667]

Wulfstan's canonization in 1202 followed an earlier failed attempt by Bernard, bishop of St David's, presented during the pontificate of Eugenius III (d.1153).[668] Wulfstan's cause was revived by Bishop

[663] John was referring to him as 'gloriosus martir Thoma Cantuariensis' by early 1171, but he also wrote to his friend William, archbishop of Sens, noting that though he wondered why the Pope had not yet canonized Becket, he also approved of Alexander's insistence on the proof and testimony of his legates, for only through a clear process and with the authority of the pope could Becket as a saint be immune from the criticisms of those who could not see him as such. See *LJS*, ii, nos.305, 308.
[664] H. Birkett, 'The Struggle for Sanctity: St Waltheof of Melrose, Cistercian in-house Cults and Canonisation Procedure at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland*, ed. S. Boardman and E. Williamson (Woodbridge 2010), 53.
[665] Ibid., 45.
[666] See L. Grigoli, 'A Cistercian Copy of Eadmer's "Life of Anselm" (BHL 0526) from Northern England and the Canonization of Anselm of Canterbury by Thomas Becket', *St Anselm Journal*, 10 (2015).
[667] For the canonization and the supporting documents gathered together to support the petition, see *The Book of St Gilbert*, ed. R. Foreville and G. Keir (Oxford 1987).
[668] Bernard was chancellor of Queen Matilda, elected and ordained before 18 Sept 1115, died 1148. See *Fasti*, ix, 46.

John of Worcester (d.1198), who in his final illness proceeded to open Wulfstan's tomb.[669] Papal letters concerning the canonization were addressed to the bishop and chapter of Worcester, who were evidently concerned to secure Wulfstan's canonization.[670] There is no evidence David that was involved with the bishops of Worcester beyond Bishop Roger, but might it be plausible to suggest that Roger instructed David to consider reviving the cause? If so, the evidence is entirely lacking.

Remaining as potential opportunities for the re-use of the Edward dossier are Becket's canonization and the failed petition for Anselm, which both took place during David's lifetime. The petition for Anselm was initiated in 1163 at the Council of Tours by Becket, acting as newly installed archbishop of Canterbury. The evidence is preserved in a letter from Alexander III to Becket describing the attempt, dated at Tours on 9 June 1163.[671] Here, Alexander informed Becket that though he had not decided to canonize Anselm at the council in Tours, Becket should summon a council of his fellow bishops, abbots, and other religious persons, to whom a *Life* of the prospective saint should be read aloud and Anselm's miracles declared. If those gathered agreed with Becket that Anselm should be canonized, Alexander would ratify this decision.[672] By insisting that Becket gain the support of his fellow prelates, Alexander was following Innocent II's actions for Edward's canonization. By his own testimony, Alexander postponed his decision regarding Anselm's canonization as a result of the volume of requests for canonizations that he received at Tours, including one for Bernard of Clairvaux. This was not revisited for ten years, being granted more or less simultaneously with the almost indecently hasty canonization of Becket himself.[673] Alexander's letter shows that in 1163 he was prepared to delegate the power of canonization to Becket, though he reserved the right of

[669] John was possibly elected as bishop Jan 1196, consecrated 20 Oct that year and died 24 Sept 1198. *Fasti,* ii, 100. For the canonization, see Foreville, 'Canterbury', 71.
[670] Printed *The Vita Wulfstani of William of Malmesbury*, ed. R. Darlington (London 1928), 148-50.
[671] *CTB,* i, no.10.
[672] Ibid.
[673] In his letter eventually declaring Bernard's canonization, Alexander wrote that despite many people calling for Bernard's canonization, and his intention to declare it, he had received many similar petitions from around Western Christendom. He realised it was not possible to satisfy all petitioners so to avoid scandal he realised he should reject all petitions for the time being- including the one for Bernard: 'Cumque nos eidem negotio favorabili satis intenderemus affectu, superuenit multitudo et frequentia petitorum, qui in diuersis prouinciis rem similem postulabant. Unde, cum videremus non posse congruenter omnibus satisfieri, statutum fuit, pro scandalo deuitando, etiam in hoc differri quod oportebat pro tempore caeteris denegari.' *PL* 185, col.622. The petition for Bernard's canonization was spearheaded by the monks of Clairvaux, thus ruling out David's involvement as he has no connection to them, Kemp, 'Canonization', 17, 22.

confirmation to himself.[674] Becket could not be blamed, however, for doubting that Alexander would ratify any such decision, given the delay in Edward's canonization after more than two decades of waiting. Even had the recommended council been called, and the prelates unanimously agreed that Anselm be canonized, Alexander's papal ratification was still required. Becket had clearly prepared for the canonization attempt for, at his behest, John of Salisbury, then a member of his *familia*, had composed a new *Vita Sancti Anselmi*, duly presented to Alexander at the Council.[675] Though Eric Kemp suggests there is no evidence that Becket carried out Alexander's instructions, Leland Grigoli has more recently argued to the contrary.[676] Here, new evidence is supplied by a codex containing Eadmer's *Life of Anselm of Canterbury* along with lives of four abbots of Cluny, compiled at the Cistercian abbey of Holm Cultram. Through a codicological and palaeographical analysis of the Anselm section, Grigoli has concluded that unusually this *Life* was written in haste on poor quality parchment. This suggests, according to Grigoli, that it was completed around 1163, in order to raise awareness and support for Becket's petition.[677] If this *Life* was indeed copied after the Council of Tours, it is possible that Becket considered what further evidence might be needed, including letters of support from English prelates which could be drummed up through the circulation of a new *Life*. Potentially, the Edward dossier could have proved useful here as a formulary. However, there is no evidence that David was ever involved with Becket's *familia*, and the date of the petitioning for Anselm's canonization, 1163, lies outside the general confines not only of David's career but also of his letter collection more generally.

Becket's own canonization in 1173 fits better with the time range of David's career and collection. However, no official dossier of letters concerning Becket's canonization has survived. Given the huge volume of letters preserved relating to the dispute, were such a dossier ever gathered in support of Becket's canonization we should expect to see its contents preserved in at least one manuscript. That

[674] Kemp, 'Canonization', 18: 'The important point of this letter, however, is that it shows the Pope explicitly delegating the power of canonization, reserving to himself only the right of confirmation which, however, he seems to promise shall not be withheld.'
[675] R. Pepin, 'John of Salisbury as a Writer', *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014), 165.
[676] For Kemp's argument, see 'Canonization', 18.
[677] Grigoli, 'Canonization', 3-10.

there is no such dossier suggests that none ever existed, or perhaps that what was gathered was not so much a dossier equivalent to that for Edward, but an embryonic version of the saint's own letters: the start of what later, under the direction of Alan of Tewkesbury, developed into the 'Becket correspondence'. Even if the Edward dossier was considered as a potential formulary in this instance it was not put to use. There are some few letters that exist detailing Becket's sanctity and describing his murder and posthumous miracles. The best-known was written by Becket's former friend and ally, John of Salisbury. John's letter *Ex insperato*, addressed to John bishop of Poitiers, was clearly written to promote Becket as a saint. Even here John was wary of pre-emptively proclaiming Becket's sanctity without papal approval. Two letters written by French bishops to the Pope survive which are similar to John's, describing the murder of the 'martyr' and calling for vengeance.[678] But we can hardly expect David to have been involved in the push for Becket's canonization. The *Thomas Saga* describes how, at least in the immediate aftermath of the murder, Becket's enemies tried to stifle his popularity as martyr and apparently forbade anyone from referring to him as such.[679] Even if David did regret his role in the Becket dispute, the monks of Canterbury and Becket's other supporters were hardly likely to accept his involvement in any formal petition given his association with Gilbert Foliot. David's only clear link with Canterbury came via Prior Odo, who we cannot prove he knew before June 1173 (after the canonization). Even Odo cannot be considered an ally of Becket, as Becket had planned to depose him as prior, and Odo perhaps even opposed the cult.[680]

Hence we arrive at a potentially more likely reason for the preservation of the dossier in David's collection, derived from David's connections to St Paul's and hence to the shrine of St Erkenwald. Erkenwald was bishop of London, reputedly of royal blood, and founder of the monasteries of Chertsey and Barking. He died at Barking, supposedly on 30 April 693, whereafter his relics were claimed by the nuns there as well as by the monks of Chertsey and the clergy of London. The latter proved more successful than their rivals, so that it was generally agreed that the relics of Erkenwald

[678] John's letter is *LJS*, ii, no.305. For the French bishops, see for instance *MTB*, vii, nos.740, 743.
[679] *Thomas saga erkibyskups* ii, ed. E. Magnùsson (RS, London 1883), 91: 'Hence it cometh, that the highest lords of the land forbid, under peril of life and limbs, any one to call archbishop Thomas a holy man or even a martyr.'
[680] M. F. Hearn, 'Canterbury Cathedral and the Cult of Becket', *The Art Bulletin* 76 (March 1994), 48, 52, building upon earlier, important work by Richard Southern.

lay buried at St Paul's.[681] Five centuries later, around the time Osbert was reviving the cult of Edward the Confessor at Westminster, various canons of St Paul's began attempts to revive Erkenwald's cult. An anonymous author, probably a canon of St Paul's, composed a *Vita sancti Erkenwaldi* (*VSE*) by the early 1100s.[682] Arcoid, canon of London and nephew of Bishop Gilbert the Universal (d.1134), probably wrote the *Miracula S. Erkwenwaldi* (*MSE*), composed in the latter half of 1140 or early 1141.[683] Erkenwald's body was translated in 1140 and again in 1148: this double translation, as with the double or even triple translations of the relics of 'St' William (d.1143) at Norwich, perhaps suggesting that, whatever the canons of St Paul's might have claimed, popular enthusiasm for the cult remained in need of regular and theatrical boosting. E. Gordon Whatley has discussed how Erkenwald's cult was 'long-established' at St Paul's by the time Arcoid wrote his *MSE*.[684] William of Malmesbury, writing in the first quarter of the eleventh century, described Erkenwald as 'London's greatest saint... by no means undeserving of the favour of the canons because of the speed with which he answers prayers'.[685]

Westminster and St Paul's had a troubled relationship throughout the twelfth century. In 1133, Gilbert the Universal appropriated the offerings made during his mass in the church of Westminster, and in response, the monks sent one of their number to the Curia to complain.[686] In the same year, the monks claimed to have received a bull from Innocent II, exempting their abbey from the jurisdiction of the bishops of London.[687] Between 1100 and 1140 the monks forged a series of charters including a bull of Pope Pascal II, claiming to inform Henry I that the abbey was exempt from the jurisdiction of the

[681] D. Farmer, 'Erkenwald (Earconwald)', *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (5 rev. ed. Oxford 2011) [https://www-oxfordreference-com.uea.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acref/9780199596607.001.0001/acref-9780199596607-e-570?rskey=jfIY3N&result=576, accessed 23/09/2021].
[682] *Saint*, ed. Whatley, 16.
[683] Printed as 'Vita S. Erkenwaldi, Lundoniae Episcopi' in W. Dugdale, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral*, ed. H. Ellis (London 1818). Arcoid first occ. as canon 1132/3 and last occ. *c*.1140, *Fasti*, i, 27, for the dates of Arcoid's work, see *Saint*, ed. Whatley, 37 and 37-8 for a discussion of the authorship of the *MSE*.
[684] *Saint*, ed. Whatley, 50.
[685] William of Malmesbury, *The Deeds of the Bishops of England (Gesta Pontificum Anglorum)*, trans. D. Priest (Woodbridge 2002), 94.
[686] B. Scholz, 'The Canonization of Edward the Confessor', *Speculum* 36 (January 1961), 40 and for Bishop Gilbert, see *Fasti*, i, 1.
[687] *WA Charters*, no.155.

bishop of London and confirming its status as the coronation church of English kings.[688] Another forged charter exempted those living within the precincts of the abbey from paying Peter's Pence, traditionally collected by the bishop of London.[689] Scholz has shown how the monks modelled various of their forgeries on the charters of Saint Denis, thus implicitly portraying themselves as a 'royal' abbey, just as Saint Denis was for the French kings. This was a status further emphasised by Westminster's role as the resting place not only of Edward the Confessor, but of his wife Edith, and of Henry I's first Queen Maud.[690] The abbey's exemption from episcopal authority, acknowledged by numerous Popes, was also supposedly confirmed in a likely spurious royal charter of Henry II, purportedly dated 1155 x 1158.[691] The monks secured confirmations of their rights, lands, and privileges from Popes Eugenius III (1146) and Adrian IV (1157).[692] Though the chapter of St Paul's had written in favour of the canonization petition spearheaded by Osbert, their letter was brief, focussing on Osbert himself rather than the glory of the saint. Furthermore, it was written at a time of episcopal vacancy in London.[693] In 1163, under Abbot Laurence, the abbey secured an authentic papal bull from Alexander III confirming its privileges and possessions.[694] In 1171 Westminster received a further bull confirming the privileges and possessions of the abbey, and particularly its exemption from the jurisdiction of the bishop of London.[695] The question must be posed, why was there a need to secure a further bull in 1171, given that neither the abbot nor the Pope, nor indeed the bishop of London, had been replaced since the abbey secured its 1163 bull?[696] We must suppose here that the monks felt the need to reaffirm their independence from London.

[688] Dated [1101 X 1114], *WA Charters*, no.154. For a discussion of this and other forgeries, see B. Scholz, 'Two Forged Charters from the Abbey of Westminster and Their Relationship with St. Denis', *EHR*, 76 (1961), 466-478 and 471 for the dating.
[689] Scholz, 'Forged Charters', 470.
[690] Ibid., 470.
[691] *LCH*, no.2807.
[692] *WA Charters*, nos.162, 165.
[693] Bishop Gilbert the Universal died in August 1134, Anselm, Abbot of Bury, was elected on 22 March 1136 but this was rejected by the Pope and he returned to Bury in 1138, thereupon Bishop Robert de Sigillo was not consecrated until July 1141 x April 1142. See *Fasti*, i, 1-2.
[694] *WA Charters*, no.171.
[695] Ibid., no.172.
[696] Foliot was translated from Hereford 6 March 1163, but the bull was issued 6 Oct. 1163. *Fasti*, i, 2; *WA Charters* no.171.

Laurence and Gilbert Foliot seem to have enjoyed mostly good personal relations: in 1169 Laurence wrote to the Pope in support of Foliot in his dispute with Becket.[697] Despite this, an underlying tension between the abbey and their diocesan seems to have prevailed throughout the 1160s and 70s. Westminster features heavily in Aelred's *Vita Sancti Edwardi*, commissioned by Laurence in 1163. Westminster, according to Aelred, had been blessed by St Peter himself. In the tale Aelred tells of this blessing, Westminster was portrayed as independent of the bishop of London, who was stopped from dedicating the church by the words of the saint in person.[698] In a papal letter previously dated no more precisely than 1160 x 1173, Alexander granted Laurence and his successors the right to wear a mitre and ring on Sundays, during other solemn festivals, during mass, in processions within the abbey, and during papal and episcopal synods.[699] This would have publicly and physically signalled the independence of Westminster from the bishop of London. Foliot would not have been pleased, regardless of his personal relationship with Laurence. The dating of the bull is not immediately evident, as it is merely dated 18 April, at Anagni.[700] Alexander was at Anagni on this date in 1160, 1161, and again in 1173.[701] Emma Mason believed it was most likely obtained in 1161, presuming that members of the delegation sent that year to petition for the canonization of Edward the Confessor remained in Anagni or returned there to obtain this second bull.[702] However, Mason did not notice that Diceto dated the privilege to 1173, for when writing of the election of Laurence's successor Walter, Diceto writes that Walter exercised the privilege of wearing the mitre (and sandals) 'which his predecessor Laurence had obtained but prevented by death had never received'.[703] Laurence died on 10 or 11 April 1173, but Alexander could not have known this when he issued his bull on 18 April in a year that we can now confirm as 1173.

---

[697] *MTB*, vi, no.519.
[698] Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor, by Blessed Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx*, trans. J. Bertram (Guildford 1990), 51-3.
[699] *WA Charters*, no.173.
[700] 'Dat. Anagn. XIIII kal. Maii'.
[701] For Alexander's itinerary, see J-L 679-754.
[702] Mason concluded that the letter could be from 1161, 1163, or 1173, though 1161 was most likely, E. Mason, *Westminster Abbey and its People c.1050-c.1216* (Woodbridge 1996), 54; *WA Charters*, no.173.
[703] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 404: 'Walterus prior Wintoniensis, electus in abbatem Westmonasterii, benedictionem accepit ab episcopo Lundoniensi, professionem fecit, mitram et cyrothecas, quas praedecessor suus Laurentius emeruerat sed morte praeuentus nunquam receperat, de manu episcopi Lundoniensis suscepit, et post in conuentibus episcoporum mitratus incessit'.

A letter from Foliot to Laurence, datable 1163 x 1173, describes a dispute between Westminster and the cathedral.[704] The abbey claimed that the church of St Margaret's at Westminster was exempt from synodal dues.[705] Foliot denied this and ordered the abbot to pay all dues to 'R.' the archdeacon- presumably Diceto. In a notification probably issued by Foliot, the bishop declared that, following a dispute between himself and the abbot of Westminster concerning the jurisdiction of the cell of Kilburn, he confirmed to the abbot and his successors jurisdiction over that cell in spiritualities, declaring it permanently exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop of London.[706] Evidently Foliot was not prepared to allow Westminster its independence without a tussle.

Laurence's successor Walter was probably elected in 1175.[707] As we have seen, Walter obtained two bulls from Alexander III authorising him to wear a dalmatic tunicle and sandals on solemn days and to wear gloves during solemn mass on festivals.[708] According to Diceto, Walter received these from the hand of the bishop of London, and afterwards arrived at a council of the bishops mitred (*mitratus*). Cardinal Hugh Pierlioni, who was present, saw this and forbade it, which suggests that there may have been local opposition to Walter's claims.[709] In 1178 Walter obtained a further bull confirming Westminster's possessions and its exemption from the jurisdiction of the bishop of London.[710] Westminster's push for independence continued into the 1180s, and in 1189 Pope Clement III issued a bull to Walter and the convent prohibiting any bishop or archbishop from saying mass or holding a synod in St Margaret's Westminster, and apparently exempting the abbey from the diocesan authority of the bishops of London.[711] Mason argued that this final charter was a response to a plan at St Paul's

[704] *GFL*, no.229.
[705] A bull of Clement II, 20 July 1989, to Abbot Walter of Westminster and the abbey, confirmed the abbeys possessions, and prohibiting any bishop or archbishop from saying mass or holding a synod in the church of St Margaret's, Westminster, *WA Charters*, no.179.
[706] Morey and Brooke have dated it 1163 x 1187 but they think it is more likely from an earlier date, and the possibility it was issued by Bishop Gilbert the Universal (1108-1127) cannot be entirely ruled out. *GFL*, no.463. Falko Neininger agreed this was possible but unlikely, *EEA*, xv, no.238.
[707] *Heads*, 77.
[708] *WA Charters*, nos.174 [1175 x 1180] and 175 [1177].
[709] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 404-5: 'Caeterum Hugo Petrileonis, Romanae sedis legatus, apud Westmustier minus reuerenter receptus, ut ei visum est, abbatem ab usu mitrae priorem ab introitu chori suspendit vi kalendas Martii.'
[710] *WA Charters*, no.176.
[711] Ibid., no.179.

to lodge a complaint at the Curia regarding Westminster's privileges.[712] As Mason has also pointed out, the cost, danger, and difficulty of sending a deputation to the Curia meant that the Westminster monks would only do so for matters of the greatest concern to them.[713] Given the number of bulls obtained in confirmation of the abbey's rights and independence from London, this must surely have qualified as a matter of greatest concern, justifying the regular appeals to Rome.

It is against this background that the canonization of Edward the Confessor must be set. The canonization and subsequent prestige it brought Westminster offered another opportunity for rivalry between Westminster, the bishops of London, and the chapter of St Paul's. For Edina Bozoky:

> 'The canonisation of the holy king was obviously intended to provide Westminster's independence from episcopal interference, and its recognition as the church of the coronation and the depository of the regalia'[714]

There are signs that St Paul's was not entirely opposed to Edward's cult: Bishop Richard de Belmeis II (1152-62) granted an indulgence of 40 days and all benefits and prayers of the cathedral church to those who visited Edward's tomb.[715] Here, Scholz's view commands notice: 'One is inclined to suspect that the ambitions of Westminster possibly stimulated the canons of St Paul's to intensify the cult of St Erconwald.'[716] This is certainly plausible. Westminster was home to the first, papally sanctioned, pre-Conquest saint; the king had presided over the translation of Edward's body; and Westminster's prestige was growing further still as it became home to the Exchequer, itself sited within the rapidly growing royal palace of Westminster.[717] With its papally approved independence from the bishops of London, its new royal saint, and its permission for the abbots to wear the mitre, Westminster's star was on the rise. Compare this to the bishop of London, whose reputation after

[712] Ibid., n.
[713] Mason, *Westminster Abbey*, 121-2.
[714] Bozoky, 'Canonisation', 178.
[715] *WA Charters*, no.204.
[716] Scholz, 'Canonization', 41.
[717] See P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven 1995), 4-5.

Becket's murder in 1170 was severely damaged, and whose standing with Henry II appears to have waned accordingly.[718]

As we have seen, Erkenwald's cult had been revived at St Paul's in the first half of the twelfth century. It was not forgotten thereafter. After Diceto's accession as dean *c*.1180, he conducted a visitation of the St Paul's estates. Only two pages of the record of the visitation now survive as Diceto's Domesday Register, in a codex known as *Liber B*.[719] Originally preserved alongside the record of the visitation, according to William Dugdale (d.1686), was a copy of the Life of Erkenwald (*VSE*). Whatley believed this *VSE* was included in *Liber B* because it supplied historical background to the early charters of St Paul's, some of which were preserved in the same codex.[720] If this copy of the *VSE* came from *c*.1180, this suggests a renewed interest Erkenwald around this time. Despite Whatley's suggestion, a *Vita* was also a necessary prerequisite for any canonization petition.[721] There are other signs that the canons were interested in Erkenwald. Master Henry of Northampton owned a maniple embroidered on one end with a portrait of Bishop Richard de Belmeis and on the other with Erkenwald.[722] An inventory of the cathedral from 1245 lists a manuscript of collects and missals, ending with an office for Erkenwald.[723] Yet, despite being the cathedral's 'foremost shrine', Erkenwald's was originally 'comparatively simple', described in 1245 as being made of wood, covered with silver plates depicting images and with precious stones.[724] It was thereafter enriched by members of the chapter, including one dean who fastened his own ring to the shrine, and another who in 1319 gifted all his gold and jewels to it.[725] For Christopher Wilson, in 'the last two centuries of the

[718] For this suggestion, see N. Vincent, 'Shall the First be Last? Order and Disorder amongst Henry II's Bishops', *Authority and Power in the Medieval Church, c.1000-c.1500*, ed. T. W. Smith (Turnhout 2020), 304.
[719] Printed in *The Domesday of St Paul's of the Year M.CC.XXII*, ed. W. Hale, 140-52 but Hale suggests the record comes from the Liber L. In Dean Lyseux's 1447 booklist of the cathedral he lists the Liber B '*Tabula contentorum in majori Registro de Diceto Decani signato cum litera B*'. The list is printed in idem, xvi and the fragmentary survival of Diceto's survey is discussed in G. Yeo, 'Record-Keeping at St Paul's', *Old St Paul's and Culture*, ed. S. Altman and J. Buckner (London 2021), 36-7.
[720] *Saint*, ed. Whatley, 2-3. Dugdale printed this MS copy in *A History of St Paul's Cathedral* (2nd edn. 1716), appendix 5-8 289-91.
[721] Kemp, 'Canonization', 25.
[722] W. Sparrow Simpson, 'Two Inventories of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London, dated respectively 1245 and 1402', *Archaeologia*, 50 (1887), 487.
[723] Ibid., 497.
[724] As described by Brooke in 'Earliest Times', 70.
[725] Sparrow Simpson, 'Inventories', 444.

Middle Ages the shrine of St Erkenwald will have appeared as the single most sumptuous element of a spectacular ensemble'.[726] A Middle English *Vita* of Erkenwald was composed *c*.1400, which has been linked to an attempt by the bishops of London to revive the cult, suggesting that Erkenwald retained his importance for London's cathedral clergy throughout the Middle Ages.[727]

David's position at St Paul's is clear. Considering his close links to Foliot and St Paul's, it is possible David was commissioned by one or the other to investigate the canonization process. In 1175 Foliot appealed for funds to finish the building of the cathedral, and it is not implausible to think that a translation or expansion of the shrine was being considered as part of this.[728] The shrine was later rebuilt, with the first stone laid in 1313 and the saint's remains translated in 1326.[729] After his work for Foliot and given his knowledge of the Curia, David would have remained the bishop's 'go-to' man for all papal petitions, so we should not be surprised to find him in possession of a formulary for canonization petitions. Alternatively, David may have pursued this venture himself in order to regain his position at St Paul's. The period from the late 1160s to *c*.1180 (i.e. the period of David's collection) could plausibly have seen revived interest at St Paul's in an official canonization of Erkenwald, coinciding with London's dip in prestige, the rise of Foliot's formal rival now as St Thomas of Canterbury, and the growing importance of Westminster. Any such suggestion must remain speculation, not least because there is very little contemporary evidence for a cultic rivalry between St Paul's and Westminster.[730] Even so it is a suggestion that, at least for the 1130s and 40s, scholars have previously explored.[731] There is no concrete evidence that such a petition was on the mind of the bishop of London or the canons of St Paul's. We might also question why the chapter would feel the need to gain papal recognition for Erkenwald, a saint with an already well-established cult. The answer to this likely lies in the changing process of canonization, which meant that papal recognition might add a layer of prestige to the cult, and it was becoming standard to expect papal

[726] C. Wilson, 'The Shrine of St Erkenwald on Paper and in Reality', *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. S. Powell (Donington 2017), 224.
[727] J. Scattergood, ' "Saint Erkenwald" and its Literary Relations', ibid., ed. Powell, 339.
[728] J. Schofield, *St Paul's Cathedral Before Wren* (English Heritage 2011, repr. 2012), 64.
[729] Ibid., 125.
[730] For this, see Whatley, *Saint*, 66.
[731] Scholz, 'Canonization', 40-1 where Scholz argues 'One is inclined to suspect that the ambitions of Westminster possibly stimulated the canons of St Paul's to intensify the cult of St Erconwald.'

recognition before a saint could be venerated as such. Added to this, the papal bull *Audivimus* was being copied into English decretal collections by *c*.1180. Here, in letters written in 1171/2 or 1181 to King Canute of Sweden concerning a man who was killed while drunk and had thereafter been venerated as a saint, Alexander III declared that 'even if many signs and miracles had been made through him, it is not permitted to you that he is venerated as a saint without the authority of the Roman Church.'[732] There has been discussion over whether this bull was regarded as establishing new canon law or simply as a response to a specifically Scandinavian situation, but it was at least known in England.[733]

Henry II took a keen interest in saints' cults and ceremony. Aside from the 1163 translation of Edward, he prevented the hand of St James leaving England in 1157, attended the 1164 consecration of the church of Reading Abbey, was present for the translation of St Brieuc in the church of Saint-Serge at Angers, visited Mont-St-Michel in 1158 and 1166, was present for the translation of his Norman ancestors Richards I and II at Fécamp in 1164, completed a pilgrimage to Rocamadour in 1170, was the instigator of the translation of the relics of St Frideswide in 1180, and supported Frederick Barbarossa's request for Charlemagne's canonization in 1165.[734] In 1174, he performed penance at Becket's shrine in Canterbury.[735] Edward's translation was delayed for two years after his canonization so Henry II could attend, and in the ceremony itself he helped carry Edward's *capsa* through the abbey.[736] The day itself may have been chosen to coincide more or less precisely with the anniversary of the Battle of Hastings, thus emphasising Henry's relationship to his ancestor and predecessor as King.[737] Nicholas Vincent has suggested that the relative lack of pilgrimages performed by the Angevin Kings in Europe and beyond may be a reflection not simply of logistical concerns but also a recognition that an English or Angevin saint could do more for the dynasty than

[732] *PL* 200, col.1259: 'cum etiamsi signa et miracula per eum plurima fierent, non liceret vobis pro sancto absque auctoritate Romanae ecclesiae eum publice venerari.'
[733] Kemp, 'Canonization', 26-8.
[734] See Bozoky, 'Canonization', 183; Scholz, 'Canonization', 59.
[735] Diceto, 'Ymagines' ii, 383.
[736] Richard of Cirencester, *Speculum historiale* ii, 325-6.
[737] N. Vincent, 'The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154-1272', *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan*, ed. C. Morris and P. Roberts (Cambridge 2002), 25.

those abroad.[738] A papally sanctioned canonization and further translation at London would have piqued the King's interest and gone some way to restoring the standing of the bishop of London in Henry's eyes.

Finally, it must be noted that the Edward dossier seems to have come to David from Westminster itself. There is surely no other reason why it would come accompanied by two personal letters of Laurence, and should close with the canonization bull addressed to Westminster rather than that addressed to the English church.[739] Perhaps this dossier was circulated by Westminster to enhance their prestige and show the widespread support they had received for the attempt. If so, it cannot have circulated widely for it survives in just four manuscript copies: the other three are all in cartularies of the abbey itself.[740] Given the generally friendly relations between Westminster and London, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that David was allowed personal access to the dossier.

A final possible reason for the survival of this dossier takes us to the second part of this chapter. It could simply be that David found these letters to be of interest for their link to the canon laws concerning canonization. In other words, they may simply have caught David's eye as an advocate and legal expert interested in the general procedures of papal law.

Four Legal Disputes

Another groups of letters in David's manuscript (letters 46-9) consists of just four letters detailing various legal disputes.[741] This is a self-contained group suggesting these letters were purposefully copied into the manuscript together, either because they already formed an existing small collection or because they were grouped together by David or his scribe.

Letter 46 was written to the Pope by an anonymous correspondent who may well have been a bishop, but who had certainly been appointed as a papal judge-delegate. Liverani believed the author was Arnulf of Lisieux, without offering any proof. Morey and Brooke believed the author to have been a

[738] Ibid., 18-9. For more examples of Henry II's piety and dedication to saints see 23-5, 28-9.
[739] See *LDL*, nos.54-5, 69.
[740] See *WA Charters*, 1-23, no.167.
[741] *LDL*, nos.46-9.

bishop with links to David, suggesting Gilbert Foliot, Roger of Worcester, or Bartholomew of Exeter.[742] The letter itself details a case between Master William, physician to the king, and Laurence, clerk of 'Hutton', concerning the church of 'Hutton'.[743] William claimed he had been ejected from the church by Laurence when he was abroad on the king's business. Upon his return to England William provided evidence and witnesses to his possession of the church, and was restored to it by papal judges-delegate. Laurence disputed this, showing letters of the bishop of Durham and the abbot of Vaudey in Lincolnshire in which they had adjudged possession to him, with Laurence himself appealing thereafter to the Pope. The letter-writer was unsure if Laurence's appeal was lawful, and so was sending a transcript to the Pope for his judgement. However, William was insistent that the church be restored to him, claiming Laurence's appeal was deceitful. The letter-writer had received missives from certain judges delegated in this case, but on account of Laurence's appeal they were unsure whether to proceed. In letter 46 they informed the Pope that they had thus not proceeded further, awaiting proper instruction from the Curia.[744] It is unclear precisely who the William referred to in this letter is. However, the reference in the letter to William's absence abroad on the king's business could well point to a William, king's clerk, who accompanied Herbert of Bosham as envoy to the Emperor in the 1150s.[745] Morey and Brooke suggested the cardinals referred to in the letter were Albert and Theoduin, envoys to Normandy and England 1171-3 in the aftermath of Becket's murder.[746] Though there is no proof of this, it would fit with the general timeframe of the collection and also with the other letters in this group.

Letter 47 was also sent to the Pope but this time the author's name, Gilbert bishop of London, is preserved. Foliot reports to the Pope on a case delegated to him between William de Lanvallay and John the clerk, concerning the church of Walkern.[747] William was ducal seneschal of Rennes 1162-*c*.1172, and in Henry II's service since 1154. After 1172 he served as constable of Winchester and as

[742] *GFL*, app.7 no.2.
[743] It has not been possible to determine precisely where this is.
[744] *LDL*, no.46.
[745] For some suggestions see *LDL*, no.46 fn.2.
[746] *GFL*, app.7 no.2.
[747] Hertfordshire, in the diocese of Lincoln and the archdeaconry of Huntingdon, the rural deanery of Baldock.

royal justice in England.[748] John, his adversary, claimed to have been presented to Walkern by Hamo of Saint-Clair, sheriff of Essex/Colchester under King Stephen,[749] who had presented him through the archdeacon of Huntingdon.[750] John claimed he had been violently expelled from the church by William de Lanvallay, and that at a hearing he had produced witnesses to attest this, along with Hamo's charter. Present were two former deans, presumably rural deans of the diocese of Lincoln, in which the archdeaconry of Huntingdon lay.[751] These men opposed the charter of the archdeacon presented by John, swearing on the Gospels they had never heard of this presentation and that though they were listed as witnesses to the archdeacon's charter, they had not been present. As a result, William de Lanvallay claimed John's deeds and witnesses were false, and that John's father had received Walkern from the bishop of Lincoln only for the term of his life. In other words, this was yet another case of attempted nicolaitism, in which a son attempted to succeed his father to a clerical benefice. William argued John had falsely obtained a papal rescript, a claim which John opposed. Foliot and the other judge/s arranged to examine John's witnesses but William opposed this, stating that John had sworn an oath on his body that he would not oppose William in his possession of the church. William claimed that many had witnessed this, but John countered that he had been caught and bound by William's men and had promised fidelity to William in fear of his life, claiming he could supply witnesses to prove this. When the judges determined to examine these witnesses John sought to evade their examination, and instead prepared to appeal to the Pope with the octave of the feast of John the Baptist set as the term for this appeal.[752] Evidently William de Lanvallay was successful, for a charter of William, bishop of Lincoln 1203-1206, refers to a later William de Lanvallay, son of William (I), patron (*patronus*) of the church of Walkern, where the abbot and monks of St John's, Colchester, were now confirmed in an annual pension of a mark. The church was to be held by Geoffrey of Bocland (Buckland), for the term of his life in exchange for this pension.[753]

[748] J. A. Everard, *Brittany and the Angevins: Province and Empire 1158-1203* (Cambridge 2000), 209.
[749] Hamo was firmly linked to Colchester, see for instance *Regesta Anglo-Normannorum* iii, ed. H. A. Cronne, and R. H. C. Davis (Oxford 1968), no.210.
[750] This must be Henry, the historian, who first occ. 1114 x 23 and last occ. 1156 x 7, *Fasti*, iii, 27.
[751] See *LDL*, no.47 fn.7.
[752] Ibid., no.47.
[753] *Cartularium monasterii sancti Johannis Baptiste de Colecestria* i, ed. S. A. Moore (London 1897), 124 and *EEA*, iv, no.230. Possibly this was the same Geoffrey of Bocland who occurs as archdeacon of Norwich from

By the time of the *Taxatio* of 1291, the abbies of St Albans and Colchester held pensions from Walkern, with Colchester claiming the advowson.[754] A bare outline of these two cases reveals their overall patterning, but fails to note the extraordinary professionalism of their pleading. In both cases considered so far, the letters preserved by David refer to a bewildering variety of legal arguments, some canonical, some civilian or derived from the Justinianic corpus, others customary and apparently derived from English royal law. What we have here, I would suggest, is some of our clearest and most telling proof that by the stage in the 1170s or 80s, it was still entirely legitimate for canon law cases to be argued using whatever legal weaponry lay closest or best to hand, be that evidence papal decretal, Roman imperial law, or indeed even the laws of England. A similar interest persists into the other letters in this section.

Letter 48 was written to the Pope by Thomas, prior of Dunstable, who declared that he had attended two hearings in his church at the request of judges-delegate, concerning a dispute between the nuns of Ickleton and William, clerk of Writtle, over the church of Fowlmere in the diocese of Ely. The case had been delegated to the abbot of St Alban's and the prior of Kenilworth, and Thomas was writing to the Pope at William's request to inform him of proceedings. The proctor of the nuns had demanded that a papal mandate be immediately implemented and the case be heard as he was fully prepared to prove his suit, claiming that William had only obtained a hearing through deception. The proctor, therefore, refused to be examined by the judges-delegate claiming that their jurisdiction was limited to the nuns and a certain clerk who had obtained possession of Fowlmere from the nuns. William claimed the church was already in his possession so the nuns had no right to bestow it on another. He declared he had been presented by the lord of the fee to the diocesan bishop, who had instituted him to the church. He had been granted permission by the bishop's official and received approval from the mother of the lord of the fee who consented to the presentation made by her son, superseding an earlier presentation by the nuns in the King's court, which had been quashed. The lordly family mentioned here must be the Montfitchets, the son being Gilbert of Montfichet and the mother

1197 x Sept. 1198 and was also dean of St. Martin le Grand in London and a canon of Salisbury, *Fasti*, ii, 65, 70.

[754] *Taxatio*, 37.

Margaret de Clare, at this time a widow.[755] The nuns had begun their action with Archbishop Becket's aid. Becket had declared that William was to pay the nuns an annual pension of 40 shillings. William claimed this was granted by Becket in ignorance as at the time Fowlmere was vacant following the death of its parson, and William of Lavington, archdeacon of Cambridge, held the church as farmer for William. Upon William of Lavington's death, William of Writtle had been brought before the late bishop of Hereford, Robert of Melun, by Richard of Ilchester, acting on papal orders, and there resigned all rights as parson of the church. He did so, he claimed, to make his own right to the church clear and to display the injury done by his opponents. After this William of Writtle had halted his actions but then renewed them to prevent the judges-delegate ruling against previous papal mandates, directing that his appeal should be allowed following a papal mandate to the bishop of Worcester. In this mandate, the Pope had explained that where an appeal was launched on an incidental question, this should take precedence over the hearing of the principal matter at stake. The lord of the manor, i.e. William, seems to have succeeded against the nuns, for the Montfichets and their successors remained patrons of the church for the next three centuries. Here, once again, we find highly technical legal arguments deployed, in this instance relating to the Roman law concepts of 'accessio' and 'possessio soli': perhaps the most extensive citation of such civilian doctrines in any English twelfth-century canon law dispute thus far discovered.

Letter 49 was sent by Prior Gilbert and the convent of Thurgarton to a brother Roger, R. the archdeacon and William fitz Fulk. It concerns a dispute between Thurgarton and Roger, archbishop of York, over the church of Granby in the diocese of York. Gilbert claimed Granby had been in Thurgarton's possession for a long time, as confirmed by episcopal and papal authority. Archbishop Thurstan of York had indeed issued a charter during his episcopate (1119-1140) confirming to Thurgarton all the churches given to them by Ralph de Eyncourt, including Granby.[756] Archbishop

[755] Fowlmere was granted to William Montfichet (d.after 1137) in the early twelfth century, and was held by William's wife Margaret de Clare until at least 1185, thereafter passing to William's son Gilbert (d.1186 x 7). It then passed to Gilbert's son Richard and so on through various branches of the family (excluding a break 1473-*c*.1484) until 1583 when it was sold. A. P. Baggs, S. M. Keeling, and C. A. F. Meekings, 'Parishes: Fowlmere', *A History of the County of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely: Volume 8*, ed. A. P. M. Wright (London 1982), 155-164. For Margaret's possession of Fowlmere, see *Rotuli de Dominabus et Pueris et Puellis de XII Comitatibus*, ed. J. H. Round (London 1913), 86.
[756] *EEA*, v, no.66; *The Thurgarton Cartulary*, ed. T. Foulds (Stamford 1994), no.988.

Roger himself seems to have confirmed the church to Thurgarton in a charter that possibly dated from between 1164 and 1167.[757] There is no sign of any papal privilege concerning Granby in the Thurgarton cartulary, though a fragment of what appears to be a purported papal privilege was copied into David's collection along with Gilbert's letter. The privilege does not include the name of any issuing authority, nor any dating. It does not name any specific church, but permits Thurgarton to retain any churches granted to the canons by episcopal authority and to prohibit anyone (including archbishops) from placing Thurgarton under interdict or expelling them from their possessions. Its terminology is superficially papal, but in reality so far from anything that a twelfth-century Pope would have issued that it must be considered either fraudulent or misattributed. Trevor Foulds believed this to be a papal privilege, and based on external evidence argued that it was most likely issued by Alexander III.[758] No such privilege survives in the canons' cartulary, and as noted it does not in any respect conform to what was by the 1170s the standard phraseology of the papal chancery. Perhaps this was a draft designed by the canons to represent what they hoped to achieve.

In letter 49 prior Gilbert of Thurgarton writes that Richard, clerk of Thurgarton, had received a pension from the church by permission of the priory. Before his death Richard was made canon of Thurgarton and resigned the keys of Granby to the convent. After his death the archbishop of York demanded the keys, claiming this as his prerogative. Thurgarton launched an appeal, but the archbishop of York shortened the period of this appeal and informed the Pope that Thurgarton had obtained the keys through violence. The abbots of Riveaulx and Leicester compelled Thurgarton to restore the keys to the archbishop. The canons refused, pending a response to their appeal, and because they believed the abbots to be tainted as judges due to their relationship to the archbishop. They sent two canons to the judges at York with letters explaining the reasons for the prior's absence and objecting to the time and place of the hearing. The judges declared the prior to be insolent and

[757] Foulds has it as this date in *Thurgarton Cartulary*, no.989 but *EEA*, xx, no.98 simply situates it within Roger's time as legate.
[758] Fould's argument is as follows: an indult of Innocent III to the canons of St Peter's 'Torgaton' was issued 'in accordance with that of Pope Alexander' and allowed them to appoint three of four canons, one of whom should be presented to the bishop (of York) to receive from him the cure of souls in void churches belonging to them, in *Calendar of Papal Register Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Volume 1, 1198-1304*, ed. W. H. Bliss (London 1893), 34.

placed Thurgarton under interdict. At this point, Thurgarton's messengers returned from the Curia with letters recalling the abbots as judges and instead deputing the cause to the bishop of London and the abbot of St Albans, declaring any previous letters void. The prior reached out to these new judges showing them letters he had from the Pope, and the judges set a date for another hearing. However, when the day approached, the archbishop's men arrived claiming that the matter of the keys had been settled by the previous judges, so that the archbishop would refuse to appear. He would only agree to discuss the issue of property rights. The prior disputed this, as the first judges had been recalled and their decisions declared void. Foliot wished to absolve the prior. However, the abbot of St Albans (according to Prior Gilbert) favoured the archbishop as he held churches from him. Another date was set for the hearing of the principal matter, i.e. possession of the church, but the prior wished this hearing to be delayed as he was awaiting news from the Curia regarding his appeal. Trusting that Thurgarton would be absolved, the prior had resumed services despite the interdict. However, hearing that Thurgarton had resumed services Archbishop Roger had communicated with the Pope: a development that worried Thurgarton as the archbishop had greater resources than them as well as more men at the Curia. The letter ends there, but immediately after in the manuscript is copied the episcopal privilege discussed above.

Ultimately, Thurgarton was successful. Possibly, Archbishop Roger's charter, mentioned above, was issued after Thurgarton's successful resistance against his actions. Roger's successor as archbishop, Geoffrey, issued his own charter confirming Ralph de Eyncourt's gifts, including Granby.[759] Henry II also confirmed Ralph's gifts, including Granby, in a charter issued between 1174 and 1185.[760] In 1252 Archbishop Walter of York instituted Walter Punch to the vicarage of the church of Granby, at the presentation of Thurgarton, though in the early fourteenth century Thurgarton once again ran into trouble with the archbishop of York concerning a number of churches, including Granby.[761]

[759] The charter is *Thurgarton Cartulary*, no.990 and *EEA*, xxvii, no.68. Geoffrey was elected as archbishop 1189 but the election was not confirmed by the Pope until 1190, *Fasti*, vi, 1-7.
[760] *Thurgarton Cartulary*, no.967, Vincent dates it as July 1174 x April 1185, ?July 1174 x October 1176, in *LCH*, no.2643.
[761]Ibid., nos.998, 1002.

These four letters provide interesting sidelights on twelfth-century canon law. They may have been carried to the Pope by litigants presenting appeals, for every appellant was expected to carry with him a letter detailing the history of the case from the judge whose court he had appealed.[762] None of the letters includes any decision on the cases, the three written to the Pope (46-8) all deferring to him as a result of appeals made. Letter 49 is the only one addressed to proctors and its purpose seems to be to instruct them rather than offer definitive response. Mary Cheney briefly discussed letters 47-8, noting that both refer to statements by the Pope regarding appeals *super incidenti questione* or arising *ex incidenti questione*. According to the appellant in letter 48, Alexander III had declared in a decretal letter to Roger of Worcester that, where an appeal was made on an incidental question, this would take precedence over the hearing of the principal matter. The decretal letter referred to here was undoubtedly *Meminimus*, issued to Roger of Worcester between September 1167 and 1169 when he was away from England.[763] *Meminimus* provided rulings by the Pope on a number of legal points.

Letter 47 also offers information on another point of canon law. William de Lanvallay claimed that John was portraying himself as the son of the former parson of Walkern, Ralph.[764] As a result, John's inheritance of the church directly contradicted another of Alexander's decretals, *Inter cetera sollicitudinis*, probably issued to Roger of Worcester in November 1164, which declared:

> 'We also command you...that you should not allow priests' sons to minister in their fathers' churches, and that you should remove them altogether, without right of appeal'[765]

William was aware of this, and used it as one of his arguments against John:

> 'William called John to account for serious transgression in the procuring of your rescript, since John had in fraudulent silence concealed the fact that he was the son of a priest, seeking to succeed his father in a church in which that father had ministered,

[762] Cheney, 'Roger', 222.
[763] Ibid., 217.
[764] *LDL*, no.47: 'William de Lanvallay...claiming that John's father Ralph had received the parsonage of the church of Walkern from Robert Bloet, late bishop of Lincoln, ministering thereafter as parson there until the day of his death, without, in William's understanding, in any way renouncing or resigning the church's cure or parsonage into the hand of the bishop or any of his officers.
[765] Trans. Cheney, 'Roger', 211-2.

and to insinuate himself there in contradiction of widely received holy canons and decretal letters'[766]

It is not surprising that *Inter cetera* was known by William, or more probably by his legal team, for it found great success in England.[767]

As Cheney notes, the presence of letters 47-8 in David's collection suggests David was involved in both cases as an advocate, and that in both instances he made use of the Pope's ruling on appeals *super incidenti questione* to argue for his clients.[768] She further argues that David either carried these letters to the Curia on his clients' behalf, or acquired them in draft form in his role as advocate.[769] If Cheney's argument is correct, and David was acting as advocate, this shows that he was aware of various of the most up-to-date papal statements of law. There is no evidence to show he was involved, though we know from letter 90 that he was called upon in other legal cases in this way.[770] Furthermore, Gilbert Foliot was involved in at least two of these cases as judge-delegate (letters 47 and 49). As a member of the bishop's household and as a result of his experience at the Curia, David might well have been employed here as advocate or agent. The lack of *salutatio* to letter 46, on the other hand, may show that this letter came into David's hand simply as a matter of interest. This is likely the case for another letter in the collection concerning papal judges-delegate: letter 52, written by the Pope to Bishops Bartholomew of Exeter and Roger of Worcester and Abbot Clarembald of Faversham, delegating to them a case concerning St Augustine's Canterbury. This letter can be dated between October 1170 and 26 January 1173, when David was still in Foliot's employ and had not yet joined the bishop of Worcester's. The letter, therefore, may have reached his collection some time after it was sent, and after David had entered Roger's service.

Both *Meminimus* and *Inter cetera* were copied into a number of English decretal collections. More importantly, however, they both appear in the *Collectio Belverensis*, in both instances accompanied

[766] *LDL*, no.47: 'Causabatur etiam Will(elmus) I(ohannem) in impetratione rescripti vestri in fraude tacendi deliquisse plurimum, cum se filium sacerdotis dissimulans, patri suo in ecclesia in qua ministrauerat succedere, et auctoritate vestra in ipsam irrepere contra sacros canones'.
[767] Cheney, 'Roger', 212.
[768] Ibid., 215-6.
[769] Ibid., 216 fn.32.
[770] *LDL*, no.90.

by marginal rubrics summarising their content.[771] Amongst these notes for *Inter cetera* we find 'De filiis sacerdotum' and amongst those for *Meminimus* 'De appellationibus que fiunt ex incidenti questione', directly highlighting the specific points of law discussed in the letters considered here.[772] *Belverensis* is made up of several elements later drawn together, including

1. The canons of the Council of Tours (1163)
2. A group of decretal letters
3. The canons of the Council of Westminster (1175)
4. A final group of decretal letters.[773]

Meminimus and *Inter cetera* appear in the first section, directly after the canons of Tours. Charles Duggan has described how the second and third of these sections in *Belverensis* link firmly to the bishop of London, Gilbert Foliot. The dating of the collection as a whole is unclear, but Duggan has suggested that nothing in section 2 can be dated with certainty to after 1174, and the conciliar decrees from Westminster were published in 1175, so he surmises that the collection as a whole was completed soon after 1175.[774] Aside from the link between this collection and Foliot, David's patron, the significance here lies in the manuscript in which this collection is preserved: Bodleian MS Cave e Musaeo 249 (C), the main manuscript of Foliot's letter collection.[775] As shown above in chapter one, David clearly had access to the same exemplars of a number of Foliot's letters as did C; presumably to examplars held in the bishop's archive. Therefore, we may surmise that he also had access to the decretals now preserved in C, or perhaps even the full *Collectio Belverensis*. David was after all still in Foliot's employ in 1175 and attended the Council of Westminster in person.[776] It is clear from C, from the legal training received by the bishop's *familia*, and from the involvement of Foliot in a number of legal cases, that canon law and its study was a high priority at London. David could even have acquired copies of rulings directly from Roger of Worcester. We know that David borrowed

[771] It must also be noted that *Meminimus* also appears in the Trinity MS R. 9. 17, discussed in Chapter One.
[772] *Inter cetera* appears on fo.122v and *Meminimus* appears on fo.123r.
[773] For a breakdown of the four sections see C. Duggan, *Twelfth-century Decretal Collections and their Importance in English History* (London 1963), 71 fn.2. For a breakdown of individual letters see app.2, 155-61.
[774] Duggan, '*Decretal Collections*', 72.
[775] *Belverensis* appears from fos.121r-135v.
[776] See Chapter Two.

legal books from Roger in the later 1160s.[777] The two decretals most directly relevant to the letters in David's collection appear in the same section of C as the canons from the Council of Tours, and this section also appears in an earlier collection, the *Collectio Wigorniensis* which possibly dates from *c*.1173-4 and can be linked to Roger of Worcester, the recipient of four of the collection's ten items (including the two under discussion here), itself held at Worcester Cathedral Priory in the Middle Ages.[778] It should be noted, however, that the relevant sections of *Meminimus* do not appear in the version in the *Collectio Wigorniensis*, which is here shorter than that in *Belverensis*. We can only speculate, but perhaps David was somehow involved in the reception of decretal letters at London and this is why he was familiar enough with these particular papal statements of law to be able to use them in the cases discussed in Letters 47 and 48.

Conclusion

Besides the letters discussed here, there are a few further letters in the collection that are not obviously linked to David or to any of the other letters in his manuscript. One of these, Letter 52, I have briefly mentioned above. This was sent from Alexander III, delegating a case to the bishops of Exeter and Worcester, and the abbot of Faversham. The case in question concerned Clarembald, abbot (elect) of St Augustine's Canterbury, who had been imposed upon the monks by the king and had refused to profess obedience to Archbishop Becket.[779] After Becket's murder the monks of St Augustine's complained to the Pope that Clarembald was 'polluted by crime'.[780] Alexander directed the judges to go to the monastery or to summon the monks to them to investigate. If they should find the allegations to be true and determine the monastery could not be set right save by Clarembald's removal, they should remove him and replace him with someone more suitable. Ultimately the judges

[777] *LDL*, no.6: 'I had formerly sent a man of mine to Tours for the purpose of carrying certain judgements of Master Robert to me, which the grace of the Lord of Worcester had lent me' ['Miseram quondam meorum Turonis pro deferendis michi quibusdam sententiis mag(istri) Rob(erti) quas gratia domini Wigorn(iensis) michi com(m)odauerat'], and for Roger's itinerary, see Cheney, *Roger*, app.4.
[778] Duggan, *Decretal Collections*, 69-70 and 152-4. The collection is now British Library, Royal MS 11 B II fos.97r-102r.
[779] Clarembald was abbot 1163-73, *Heads*, 36 and J. Greatrex, 'Clarembald (*fl*.1155-1173)', *ODNB*.
[780] Gervase, *Opera* i, 256: 'Accusaverunt enim eum in praesentia papae Alexandri de crimine incestus', and see *LDL*, no.52.

did just this.[781] Perhaps David gained access to Letter 52 during his time in Roger of Worcester's *familia*, or encountered the delegation at Canterbury when he was there for negotiations concerning the episcopal election. This is followed by Letter 53, another letter with no clear link, sent to an anonymous recipient to congratulate them on a recent promotion. The style is not David's. Instead, the letter is full of biblical and classical quotations. The use of 'frater' may suggest it is from one bishop (or possibly monk) to another, but nothing here is certain.[782] Letter 70 is a brief letter of recommendation for a Master N. The details are so vague as to make any identification impossible, once again with Master N. perhaps being Nicholas, archdeacon of London, or perhaps simply standing for 'nomen'.

Ultimately, unless further evidence comes to light we can only speculate as to how these letters found their way into David's collection. Even so, my codicological analysis of the manuscript suggests that their inclusion here was not merely random, but reveals, wider patterns to Master David's career. In particular, they reveal his ongoing and close relationship with the bishop and canons of London, and in the case of the judge delegate letters, with the latest developments in papal law, here informed by the civilian law that, in David's day, was best acquired by study at Bologna. Once again, there is a clear pattern of interests here that links more broadly across the arc of David's career, as scholar, canonist, and professional advocate.

[781] Their report to the Pope is *LJS*, ii, no.322.
[782] *LDL*, no.53: 'Porro frater unum tibi credo necessarium'.

Chapter Four: David's Collection in Context

This chapter is concerned with David's letter collection as a literary work and will seek to place it in its context by comparing it with other twelfth-century letter collections. In his *Letters and Letter Collections* Giles Constable laid out a series of categorisations for such compilations. Aside from those made for administrative purposes,[783] Constable asserted that collections can be broadly categorised into types: 'archival' (which represent the archive of an individual or institution); 'literary' (which contain a carefully selected group of letters usually in the name of one writer); and didactic (designed to teach their readers, including formularies and collections of model letters).[784] This assertion is one favoured by scholars of medieval letter collections. Wim Verbaal has since suggested a different categorisation, arguing that 'collections of letters' should be distinguished from 'letter collections'. The former may contain letters by the same or different senders which have been kept for 'archival, didactic, political, biographical, administrative reasons', and 'serve to transmit the image of the central writer as desired by the organiser'. The latter, 'letter collections', he suggests are distinct. They are 'not intended to solely collect letters as documents or models'. Instead, they are 'designed to tell something in [themselves], as a collection.'[785] The distinction between the two categories may not seem immediately clear, but the argument here is that a 'letter collection' has an overall message or theme, a 'macrotext' composed of individual micro-texts, whereas a 'collection of letters' remains a gathering of independent units, even if they are thematically similar (i.e. linked by common authorship). A letter collection is deliberately and often painstakingly edited, whereas there may be less thought behind a collection of letters which does not have an overarching theme or narrative. In these attempts to categorise or define collections, there is a danger of obscuring their true nature.[786] The reality of twelfth-century compilation practice is that there often do not appear to have

[783] For instance monastic letter-books and episcopal registers, see W. A. Pantin, 'English Monastic Letter-Books', *Historical Essays in Honour of James Tait,* ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith, and E. F. Jacob (Manchester 1933).
[784] See Constable, *Letters,* 56-7.
[785] W. Verbaal, 'Epistolary Voices and the Fiction of History', *Between Fiction and Document,* ed. Bartoli and Høgel, 12-14.
[786] For discussion of this, see for instance R. Gibson, 'Letters into Auto-Biography: The Generic Mobility of the Ancient Letter Collection', *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature,* ed. T. Papanghelis, S. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (Berlin 2012), and W. Verbaal, 'Voicing your Voice: The Fiction of a Life: Early Twelfth-Century Letter Collections and the Case of Bernard of Clairvaux', *Interfaces* 0.4 (2017).

been any guiding principles to compilation, and though a letter-writer may have been influenced by other collections, he might also compile according to his own motives which are no longer evident.

This chapter will not necessarily seek to categorise David's collection, but will instead pose a series of questions in order to consider the nature of the collection: should it be called a 'register'? Was it designed as a formulary or collection of exemplary letters? Are the letters within authentic or fictional letters? Were they edited before their inclusion in the collection? These last two questions are perhaps the most difficult to answer, as none of David's own letters and very few of the other letters in the collection survive elsewhere, making textual comparison difficult if not entirely impossible.

'Real', 'Authentic', or 'Fictional'?

John Van Egen identified four letter-writing activities of the twelfth century: the writing of letters that were (probably) sent; the writing of letters as school exercises; the collection of exemplary letters (as a result of the first two activities); and the spread of letter-writing manuals.[787] Constable preferred to categorise individual letters into three categories: 'real' letters (those actually sent), 'authentic' letters (any work in the form of the letter which followed epistolary rules to some extent), and 'fictional' letters (form letters, treatises in epistolary form, and any work not intended to be sent 'but …. considered letters by contemporaries').[788] For clarity and consistency, I will use the terms 'real', 'authentic', and 'fictional' in the same way as Constable, though with the caveat that these categories do not fully encompass the nature of medieval letters.

Categorising these letters is easier said than done. Some of the items in David's collection must have been real and sent in some form because they survive in another manuscript copy, can be linked to letters found elsewhere, or their contents were actioned. Letters 29, 30, 33, 38-40, 42-5, 51, 60, 69, 82-3 and 85 are found in other manuscript copies. Letters 42-3 can be found in the Arnulf section of V, and as shown above, textual differences suggest they were not copied from the David section (or

[787] See J. Van Egen, 'Letters, Schools, and Written Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Dialektik und Rhetorik im frühen und hohen Mittelalter*, ed. J. Fried (Munich 1997), 109.
[788] Constable, *Letters*, 12-13.

vice versa). Letters 29, 33, 44, and 82 also appear in the Becket section of V.[789] Letters 46-49 and 52 refer to a variety of legal disputes, suggesting they are not mere fictions. Letter 50 is the cyclical letter from the Anti-Pope Victor, the only copy of this letter, but from its contents apparently real. Letters 54-5 were sent by Laurence, abbot of Westminster and there is no obvious reason why they should have been falsified. Letter 53 offers little identifying information and is written in a different style to that which was usual with David. If it is real and was sent it was perhaps saved for its literary worth for it concerns the promotion of a prelate and contains numerous classical and biblical quotations.[790] As this letter does not appear to have been written by David and preserves no identifying features, I would suggest it should be considered 'authentic' rather than 'real'.

Besides these letters, there are two main groups of letters whose status as 'real' letters remains in doubt. The first is the group of letters written by David (Letters 1-16, 18, 20-3, 25-8). Many of these appear without *salutatio*, but as was demonstrated in chapter one, according to their content and/or style they can be attributed to David. They are full of flowery and complex Latin, and this, added to the lack of *salutatio* and *valedictio* clauses and the omission or abbreviation of personal names raises doubt over their status as 'real' letters. Were they actually sent in any form, or were they instead fictional letters, written in order to display David's mastery of the *ars dictaminis*?

These letters will be explored in chapter five, with respect to their adherence to the rules of the *ars dictaminis*, but here it must be noted that in some of these the *benevolentiae captatio* - the section designed to secure the recipient's good will - is very lengthy. Amongst other topics there is much rumination over David's poverty[791], reflection on friendship[792], or meditation on David's fidelity and gratitude to his recipients.[793] Of the twenty five letters written by David, four preserve a *salutatio* including personal names,[794] one preserves a *salutatio* noting David's initial but no recipient's

[789] For these, see Chapter One.
[790] See *LDL*, no.53.
[791] See for instance ibid., nos.2-3, 12.
[792] Ibid., no.4.
[793] Ibid., nos.9-10, 13-14.
[794] Ibid., nos.18, 21-2, 28.

name,[795] and twenty preserve no *salutatio* at all, or a *salutatio* containing no names.[796] Fourteen letters do not preserve a *valedictio* clause to finish the letter appropriately.[797]

When encountering problems similar to these in John of Salisbury's first letter collection, Richard Southern believed this indicated that the letters were drafts rather than 'real' letters.[798] However, the suggestion that a lack of *salutatio* and *valedictio* clauses necessarily indicates that a letter cannot be a 'real' letter is highly disputable. Responding to Southern, Walter Ysebaert argued that readers of collections compiled for their style were likely uninterested in the *salutatio*. Dictaminal treatises laid out the correct formulae for these with examples provided, so it was the main body of the letter that was of interest not this more formulaic part (with which a trained letter-writer would have been familiar and therefore in no need of further text).[799]

Here we may note that some of the letters in the collection sent from Gilbert Foliot to David do preserve their *salutatio*, including David's name.[800] This suggests that the smaller collections or bundles from which these letters were copied did preserve their *salutatio*. In this case then, the letters without *salutatio* or *valedictio* clause in the collection may lack such clauses because they were missing from the copies from which the collector was working. It is possible these letters were David's drafts and some may never have been sent. This could suggest that this smaller group of letters, which opens the collection, was David's personal record of his own correspondence.

In addition to the lengthy *exordiae* in these letters are the marginal notes that appear next to three letters in the collection: 1, 2, and 13.[801] These notes indicate that these letters were written in the style of Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, and are full of quotations and allusions from his correspondence and treatises. The letters as we have them are the only copies, so it is impossible to tell how much they

[795] Ibid., no.4.
[796] Ibid., nos.1-3, 5-16, 20, 23, 25-7.
[797] Ibid., nos.1, 4-6, 9, 12, 15-6, 20, 22-3, 25-7.
[798] R. Southern, review of: Millor, S. and H. Butler, and Brookes', *The Letters of John of Salisbury vol.i: The Early Letters (1133-1151) EHR* 72 (1957), 496. Julian Haseldine agreed with Southern and when considering the manuscripts of Peter of Celle's letters, considered that the greater omission of *salutationes* and *valedictio* clauses in one MS indicated that this collection was made up of rough drafts, see Haseldine, 'Literary Memorial', 368-9.
[799] See Ysebaert, 'Historical Sources', 54-5.
[800] See *LDL*, nos.31-2, 35.
[801] See these letters in the Appendix One. These letters are also discussed in Chapter Five.

were edited from their originals. However, the marginal annotations next to these letters (three of the lengthiest letters) suggest they may have been edited to include more allusions to Bernard's work than was the case in the original letters as sent. Through the *exordiae* of these letters, which reflect on David's debts or the betrayal of his fidelity and friendship, we are made to experience the depth of David's woes. Had the letters been sent in their present forms, their recipients might have felt less rather than more inclined to assist David. After all, who would want to be accused of being a betrayer?[802] In his treatise on letter writing, the Anonymous of Bologna wrote:

> 'As a matter of fact, opponents are led into hatred if their disgraceful deeds are cited with cruel pride; into jealousy if their bearing is said to be insolent and insupportable; and into contention if their cowardice or debauchery is exposed'[803]

These guidelines did not always reflect the reality of letter writing, yet as a subordinate, dependent on the goodwill and favour of his correspondents, this may have been a rule David was unwilling to break. Another possibility is that David's name was edited out to save his blushes for having written such scathing letters. This was the case with *Multiplicem,* the long and angry letter sent from Foliot to Becket at the height of the dispute. The letter was added to Foliot's collection, compiled after Becket's death when his reputation had suffered as a result of his animosity towards Becket, and when he had himself begun to accept Becket as a martyr.[804] It was added to the collection without its *salutatio*, thereby somewhat obscuring Foliot's role as letter-writer. As suggested by Christopher Brooke, amongst others, it is possible that Foliot was simply too proud of his literary efforts here to consign them entirely to oblivion, yet too ashamed of their specific details to attach his name to them.

If David's collection in its entirety was intended to provide a thorough overview of David's career, as will be argued, this group of letters would serve to arouse the reader's sympathy for David. It was common for letters to be edited before their inclusion in a collection and it seems likely that this was

[802] See especially *LDL*, no.1 here.
[803] The Anonymous of Bologna, 'The Principles of Letter-Writing', trans. *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts,* ed. J. J. Murphy (London 1971), 17.
[804] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot,* 167-8 and for Foliot's reputation after the martyrdom, see Vincent, 'Shall the First be Last?', 302-4.

the case with David's letters due to their length and flowery style.[805] However, this does not mean that the letters were never sent in some form. Other letters in the collection written by Foliot and the Pope indicate that David was in debt whilst he was at Bologna and that he did experience betrayal and struggles at St Paul's.[806] Further, David's letters do in some cases refer to named individuals who can be traced and fit the circumstances, suggesting that even if they have been heavily edited before inclusion they were indeed once sent, either as preserved or in a form not far dissimilar.[807]

In his edition of Henry II's letters and charters, Nicholas Vincent listed a number of the letters from David's collection under the heading 'Literary exercises, including mimetic fictions in the name of archbishops, bishops or other churchmen'.[808] The letters Vincent calendared here were the letters of recommendation written on David's behalf to Henry II by the cardinals and the archbishop of Rouen.[809] The very similar letters sent to Foliot should also be considered as a part of this group.[810] What Vincent was suggesting here was that David wrote these letters himself. This supposition must be based on the repetitive nature of these letters but also on the unusual survival of a relatively large group of letters sent by the cardinals at this time.[811] It was also unusual for a collection to preserve this number of letters of recommendation. In John of Salisbury's first collection, for instance, there is only one letter of recommendation for him, sent by Archbishop Theobald to Henry II.[812] We only know of another recommendation for John, sent by Bernard of Clairvaux, because it was preserved in Bernard's own collection.[813] There are no such letters in John's second collection. None appear in

[805] See for instance the letter collection of Bishop Robert Grosseteste (d.1259), where Robert probably had a hand in selecting and editing the letters to be included in the collection which were written in 'florid, exaggerated language, though no doubt conveying among medieval readers an appropriate sense of formality and even elegance', *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln* trans. F. A. C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto 2010), 5-6. For another example, see the collections of Hildegard of Bingen, where letters were emended between editions, discussed J. Van Egen, 'Letters and the Public *Persona* of Hildegard', *Hildegard von Bingen in ihren historischen Umfeld*, ed. A. Haverkamp (Mainz 2000), 378.
[806] For example, see *LDL*, nos.34 and 71.
[807] For example, Robert de Broi who is mentioned in *LDL*, nos.1 and 13, was at one time a member of Foliot's household.
[808] *LCH*, nos.4321-37.
[809] *LDL*, nos.75-81.
[810] Ibid., nos.83-6.
[811] Only one such example, besides that found in David's collection, addressed to Henry II survives and is discussed below.
[812] *LJS*, i, no.126.
[813] *Bernard Epistolae*, no.361.

either of Nicholas of Clairvaux's collections,[814] nor in Alan of Tewkesbury's collection.[815] As was the case with John and Bernard, it was in fact more common for the authors of these letters to preserve them than for the subject, though this is also a reflection of the types of people who compiled their own collections: a bishop was more likely to write such a letter than have one written on his behalf. It was perhaps a mark of status to have written such letters in the expectation that your word carried weight.[816] Yet, David's collection preserves sixteen letters of recommendation on his own behalf as well as one further letter sent on behalf of David in company with Reginald, archdeacon of Salisbury, and Richard Barre.[817] The sheer number of such letters in comparison to other collections renders them open to a suspicion that they were written not by the cardinals whose names are attached to them, but by David himself.

The letters from the cardinals are distinctly hyperbolic and certainly repetitive, but the recommendations from the Pope are equally exaggerated. Alexander III informed the King that if he did not reward learned men such as David, 'from poverty [they should be] encouraged to move to foreign realms'.[818] David was 'worthy not just of a canonry but of a bishopric'.[819] There is little doubt that Alexander's letters were sent, for David did receive a benefice at Lincoln in response, even if he did not receive the canonry suggested. Therefore, we need not presume that the cardinals' letters are inauthentic simply because they present similarly hyperbolic statements. The repetition between the letters could, however, suggest that David had a hand in composing the letters, with oversight from the cardinals themselves, or that the letters were subsequently edited before their inclusion in the collection.

There are some few extant examples of these types of letters sent from cardinals, and the list increases when considered along with papal letters. A textual comparison can serve to assess whether the letters

[814] Which is Nicholas of Clairvaux, *The Letter Collections of Nicholas of Clairvaux,* ed. L. Walhgren-Smith (Oxford 2018).
[815] Which is *Alan of Tewkesbury and his Letters*, ed. M. Harris (Montserrat 1976).
[816] For example, Nicholas of Clairvaux's collection contains four letters recommending third parties but none written for him, *Collections of Nicholas*, ed. Wahlgren-Smith, nos. 18, 23, 30, 41.
[817] *LDL*, nos.71-86 and 87.
[818] Ibid., no.71: 'ne paupertatis occasione se ad exterorum regna cogantur transferre.'
[819] Ibid.: 'presertim cum eum non solum canonicatu sed etiam episcopatu dignum esse credamus'.

in David's collection could pass as 'real' letters of this type. One of these few extant examples was sent to Henry II from Hyacinth, cardinal deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin, who also wrote two of the letters on David's behalf.[820] In the letter, Hyacinth recommended to the King Master Gilbert, precentor of Soissons, who was seeking refuge in England.[821] Hyacinth's letter begins by reminding the king that:

> 'Since there is no doubt that it will redound to the honour and utility of your kingdom, if ecclesiastical preferments or benefices should be conferred on learned, suitable, or honest persons, we therefore confidently and fearlessly solicit you on behalf of such people'[822]

This is a sentiment echoed in the letters found in David's collection. For example, Rotrou of Rouen wrote to the king that:

> 'Since royal affairs should be handled by prudent and discrete men, just so should your business, and especially that which pertains to ecclesiastical right, be conducted by such persons'[823]

John of Naples, cardinal priest of S. Anastasia, wrote to the king:

> 'You [should] allow no hinderance to his promotion in your realm but instead favour him with your protection...you ought to retain him in devotion and obedience to you by benefits and grace.'

John was writing because 'By virtue of our office...we have a duty to lend all possible support to those labouring amongst the clergy.'[824] In his letter on behalf of Master Gilbert, Hyacinth noted Gilbert's

---

[820] *LDL*, nos.77, 85.
[821] *Études sur quelques manuscrits de Rome et de Paris*, ed. A. Luchaire, (Paris 1899), no.46.
[822] Ibid.: 'Quoniam ad honorem et utilitatem regni vestri non est dubium redundare, si personis litteratis, idoneis et honestis, in ipso, honores ecclesiastici et beneficia conferantur, idcirco fiducialius et securius pro talibus vobis preces porrigimus.'
[823] *LDL*, no.75: 'Cum regia negotia per prudentes et discretos viros debeant tractari, vestra quidem et ea precipue que ad ecclesiastica pertinent'.
[824] Ibid., no.78: 'Quamuis de officii nostri debito uniuersis de clero laborantibus si fieri potest debeamus subuenire, viris tamen litteratis, honestis et discretis propensiore cura tenemur ubi possumus providere...ne suum in regno vestro permittatis impedire prouectum...longe magis cum vester sit ad deuotionem vestram et ad obsequium beneficiis et gratia debetis retinere.'

attributes: his prudence (*prudentia*) and knowledge (*scientia*), the same attributes for which, amongst others, David was also praised.[825] Hyacinth ended his letter with a direction for the king:

> 'So you should provide so that honour shall be yours and he shall feel our prayers to be advantageous for himself, he shall emerge from devotion more devoted and from faith more faithful to you'[826]

This sentiment, of rewarding the subject of the letter and thus receiving the reward of his fidelity, is echoed throughout the letters on David's behalf. Rotrou of Rouen wrote to the king:

> '[we are] humbly asking your excellency and faithfully counselling your prudence that you generously promote him who we now know to have served you devotedly...so that his desire to serve you shall increase and confidence and hope render him more prompt to your service'[827]

John of Anagni, cardinal priest of S. Marco wrote to the king requesting 'that you hold him dear and deign so to provide for him [David]...that he remain always prompt in your service'.[828] The letters preserved in David's collection follow the same form as the one written by Hyacinth on behalf of Master Gilbert, itself considered to be authentic. Either the letters for David were also, or he had extensive knowledge of what this type of letter should look like.

For a further suggestion that these letters are real we can turn to one of the other few extant letters sent to Henry II by a cardinal. In 1168, Cardinal John of Naples wrote to the king regarding a royal embassy to the Curia. He began with a typical *salutatio*, expressing his modesty in comparison to the many titles of the king:

---

[825] *Études*, ed. Luchaire, no.46. See for instance ibid., no.71.
[826] Ibid.: 'ita ei prouideatis ut honor vobis sit et preces nostras sibi sentiat fructuosas, et deuoto deuotior et de fideli fidelior vobis semper existat.'
[827] *LDL*, no.75: 'excellentiam vestram humiliter rogantes et prudentie vestre fideliter consulentes, quatenus erga eum quem iam cognouimus deuote vobis seruisse...ut seruiendi vobis eius augeatur desiderium, et confidentia et spes seruicio vestro eum faciant promptiorem.'
[828] Ibid., no.80: 'et ei taliter prouidere dignemini ut ad seruitium vestrum semper paratus existat'.

> 'Illustrissimo domino Henrico, Dei gratia regi Angliae, duci Normanniae et Aquitaniae, et comiti Andegauensi, Joannes Neapolitanus, indignus presbyter cardinalis, salutem, et votiuos semper obtinere successus'[829]

Excluding Henry's full titles this *salutatio* is repeated almost word for word in John's letter to the king on David's behalf:

> 'Serenissimo domino H(enrico) Dei gratia regi Angl(orum) Ioh(anne)s Neapol(itanus) indignus presbiter cardinalis salutem et votiuos semper optinere successus'.[830]

Salutationes were often formulaic but it was also common for letter-writers to reuse a favoured *salutatio*. In the case of a cardinal writing to a king, it should not be surprising if John reused a *salutatio* that he had previously found best fit the circumstances and social standing of sender and recipient. As this particular *salutatio* was not used by the other cardinals, this could signal that this was John putting a personal touch to the letters he sent to Henry II, including the one sent on David's behalf.

The key point though that suggests this group of letters does not contain fictions, is the survival of two of them in other manuscript copies. Letters 83 and 85, sent from Cardinals William and Hyacinth respectively, both survive in Folio's letter collection C. Both appear there without *salutatio*, though 83 is rubricated and the rubric names both sender and recipient.[831] As shown, the copy of letter 83 in C could possibly be a copy from V. The version of letter 85 found in C is clearly an addition to that particular folio, in a different hand. The *salutatio* has been removed and the letter appears amongst fragments of others. Textual differences suggest the version found in C is not a copy of V. Further, there is a missing clause in C towards the end of the letter and the final sentence is missing from C.[832] Therefore, Letter 85 in particular suggests not that the versions in C are simply copies of V, but rather

[829] *MTB*, vi, no.396: 'To his most illustrious lord Henry, by the grace of God king of England, duke of Normandy and Acquitaine, and count of Anjou, John of Naples, undeserving cardinal priest, a greeting, and vows always to maintain successes.'
[830] *LDL*, no.78: 'To his most serene lord Henry by the grace of God king of the English, John of Naples undeserving cardinal priest sends a greeting and in his endeavours always success.'
[831] fo.198v.
[832] For these, see *LDL*, no.85.

that they share a common exemplar. The letters of recommendation therefore were not fictions, but rather were actually written to Foliot on David's behalf.

Overall, although it is likely - and indeed was standard practice - that some of the letters were edited before their inclusion in the collection, it is probable that the majority were in fact sent in some form. It is unclear if the copies preserved in V are drafts, as although they are by Southern's criteria, this is by no means certain proof.[833] As pointed out by Julian Haseldine, it is futile to attempt to recover letters in the form they were actually sent from the versions preserved in letter collections. In discussing Peter of Celle's letters, Haseldine noted that with regard to individual letters:

> 'Even in the one case where a letter from a recipient's archive overlaps with these texts the letter we have from that archive... [it] has been collected for a purpose and presented as part of a coherent collection or group with...a clear polemical aim. Thus even if they were not subject to extensive editing or alteration, it exists in a specific and selective context.'[834]

The same is true of David's collection. Even if the letters preserved in his collection are copies of 'real' letters that were sent, these letters were preserved for one purpose but included within the collection for another.

The 'Register' of Master David?

Medieval letter collections survive in many different forms and there was no standardised format for the collections of the twelfth century. In his 1927 article on David's letters, Zachary Brooke called the collection 'The Register of Master David of London' and it is by this designation that it has since been consistently referenced.[835] Brooke does not explain why, for him, David's collection deserves to be called a 'register' rather than a 'letter-collection', but such a label comes with its own panoply of meanings. In the twelfth century the term 'registrum' was used predominantly to refer to the papal

[833] See above.
[834] Haseldine, 'Literary Memorial', 358.
[835] See Brooke, 'Register'.

registers, especially the earliest surviving papal register of Gregory VII (1073-1085).[836] Gregory's register is generally in chronological order.[837] The register contains letters addressed to the Pope as well as documents such as the text of oaths and the records of synods, but the contents are overwhelmingly outgoing correspondence.[838] Gregory's letters do not seem to have been copied in one by one as they were sent, but rather in batches.[839] Stephen of Tournai/Orléans (d.1203) noted that the documents copied into the papal registers were copies made from the drafts of outgoing correspondence.[840] All these copies (*exempla*), Stephen wrote, were copied into one book 'which is called a register (*registrum*)', so that the papacy could refer to these documents later if needed.[841] Gregory's register was written in one hand only, apart from two or three inserted pieces.[842] The presence of just one main hand, despite the letters having been added in batches and probably over a number of years, suggest a continuity to the project of preserving the pope's correspondence which seems to have been the responsibility of one scribe. The papal registers were very different in nature to the 'literary' collections, which were made up of carefully selected items of correspondence. Alternatively, the registers recorded the majority of the pope's outgoing correspondence.[843] What is also clear is that by the late twelfth century at least, David's contemporaries were aware of these registers and had an understanding of how and why they were compiled. Gerald of Wales (d. *c.*1223) believed the popes had all their letters and privileges concerned with 'difficult cases' (*arduis causis*)

[836] Though an earlier surviving register, of Pope John VIII (d.882) is known from a copy of the late eleventh century. See *The Register of Pope Gregory VII 1073-1085* trans. H. E. J Cowdry (Oxford 2002), xi. Note also that the label 'letter-book' also refers to a register, see Pantin, 'Letter-Books', 201.
[837] R. L. Poole, *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery Down to the Time of Innocent III* (Cambridge 1915), 125.
[838] For instance, see *Gregory Register* trans. Cowdry, nos. 3.17*a* and 3.10*a*.
[839] Ibid., xii.
[840] Stephen of Tournai, *Die Summa über das Decretum Gratiani* dist. LXXXI, ed. J. F. von Schulte, (1891), 104: 'Consuetudo est Romanae ecclesiae quod, cum alicui de magno negotio mittit epistolam, apud se retinet eius exemplum' [It is the custom of the Roman church that, when it sends a letter to anyone concerning great matters, it retains a copy of it for itself].
[841] Ibid: 'Quae omnia exempla in unum librum conficit, quem vocat registrum, ut, si quaestio postea super eodem mergat, proferatur exemplum.' ['All the copies are brought together in one book, which is called a register, so that, if afterwards questioning should overwhelm concerning them, the copies shall be produced.']
[842] Poole, *Lectures*, 128.
[843] Reginald Lane Poole offers a short discussion of registers in R. L. Poole, 'The Early Correspondence of John of Salisbury', *Proceedings of the British Academy,* xi (1924-5), 28.

entered into their registers.[844] Gerald had consulted the register of Eugenius III himself in 1200.[845] Not all papal documents were copied into the registers, and according to Reginald Lane Poole, some of Gregory VII's letters found elsewhere than his register refer to more important decisions than some of those copied in to it.[846] Nevertheless, both Gerald of Wales and Stephen of Tournai understood why these registers were kept, and had some idea of the process behind their compilation. The papal registers were by the end of the century 'perfectly familiar to scribes and ecclesiastics' and it was so easy to consult them that parts could even be stolen.[847] It is no surprise then, that some features of the papal registers came to be replicated.

Aside from the papal registers, there seems to be just one reference by a twelfth-century letter-writer in England to a register. Herbert Losinga (d.1119), bishop of Norwich, informed one of his correspondents that, although he had suggested that Herbert compile a collection of his letters, Herbert had not kept such letters, and 'did not collect them in one body in the form of a register (*registri forma*)'.[848] Presumably Herbert was referring to some kind of record of outgoing correspondence like those produced by the popes. Poole believed that in the twelfth century a 'register', as we might now term it, was a 'volume' into which outgoing letters were copied as they were sent. The letters were usually copied onto loose quires and bound at a later date, meaning the order was sometimes disturbed.[849]

From the thirteenth century registers became more common. In Germany, Albert Behaim (d.1260), dean of Passau, compiled a manuscript for his own personal use, which included letters from his

[844] Gerald of Wales, *Opera* iii, ed. J. S. Brewer (London 1863), 90: 'Registrum autem suum facit papa quilibet, hoc est librum ubi transcripta priuilegiorum omnium et litterarum sui temporis super magis arduis causis continentur'[For the Pope made his register, this is the book where the transcript of all privileges and of his letters concerning difficult cases are contained].
[845] Poole, *Lectures*, 204 and Gerald of Wales, *Opera* iii, 180. For other examples of the twelfth-century registers being consulted, see U. Blumenthal, 'Papal Registers in the Twelfth Century', *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*, ed. P. Linehan (Vatican City 1988).
[846] Poole, *Lectures*, 129-30.
[847] Blumenthal, 'Papal Registers', 150, and 146-7 for a stolen leaf from Alexander III's register.
[848] *Epistolae Herberti Losingae, Osberti de Clara et Elmeri Prioris Cantuariensis*, ed. R. Anstruther (Brussels 1846), no.1: 'Tuarum assiduate litterarum meam conaris corrigere, diligende frater Normanne negligentiam, qua eas quas meis amicis factitaui litteras, non reinui, atque registri forma uni in corpusculo non collegi'.
[849] Poole, 'Early Correspondence', 28.

'registrum'.[850] We begin to see episcopal registers and by the end of the century all English dioceses, seem to have compiled formal registers, albeit that those for Chichester, Ely, Rochester and elsewhere are lost for this early period.[851] These preserved both 'literary' letters and administrative documents such as dispensations or lists of clerks. Christopher Cheney noted that these registers could in fact be made up of more than one codex, as at Norwich, for example, where the surviving registers of ordinations and presentations were originally part of a set that also included registers of outgoing letters, so that documents were divided into groups according to their nature.[852] The most important thing to note here is that the documents within registers almost always appeared chronologically, albeit with occasional lapses in arrangement.[853] Registering was taking place at St Paul's by the end of the twelfth century under Dean Diceto, but these registers were focused on administrative documents and records, for instance, Diceto's visitation of the chapter's properties.[854] Diceto's are the earliest registers known to survive at London.[855]

The modern usage of 'register' is not clearly established and different scholars have used such a label in different ways, but here I have taken it to mean a collection that has come about as a result of 'registering' practices: that is to say that letters were systematically and semi-regularly copied, usually as they entered or left the letter-writer's possession, offering a broadly chronological ordering to the letters. In describing David's collection as a 'register' Brooke applied a label that is unlikely to have been used by contemporaries, and created an impression of David's collection that does not reflect the reality. In aligning it with the papal registers or the later episcopal registers, Brooke implied that

[850] *Das Brief- und Memorialbuch des Albert Behaim*, ed. T. Frenz and P. Herde (Munich 2000), for the mention of a register, see no.92, for the manuscript as Albert's personal codex, see 45-7.
[851] D. M. Smith, *Guide to Bishops' Registers of England and Wales* (London 1981), vii and fn.2.
[852] For instance the Register of Hugh of Wells, bishop of Lincoln (d.1235) survives in twelve rolls which are divided into three sections, see C. R. Cheney, *English Bishops' Chanceries 1100-1250* (Manchester 1950), 100.
[853] Pantin, 'Letter-Books', 203-4.
[854] These were inventoried by Dean Lyseux (d.1456). Printed in *Domesday of St Paul's*, 140-52 but Hale suggests the record comes from the Liber L. In Dean Lyseux's 1447 booklist of the cathedral he lists the Liber B 'Tabula contentorum in majori Registro de Diceto Decani signato cum litera B'. The list is printed in idem, xvi and the fragmentary survival of Diceto's survey is discussed in Yeo, 'Record-Keeping', 36-7.
[855] The known and surviving registers are of Deans Gilbert de Bruera, dated 1455 onwards; John de Appleby, 1383; Thomas Stow and Thomas More, 1400 and 1405; Thomas Lisieux, 1447; Thomas Winterborne, 1475; Robert Sherborn and John Colet, undated; and John Colet 1519, N. Ramsey, 'The Library and Archives to 1897', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004), 414 and fn.14.

David's collection was a record of outgoing (and some incoming) correspondence preserved roughly chronologically. This would put it into Verbaal's 'collection of letters' category. In reality, however, it is not at all this sort of compilation.

Perhaps one reason for this label is the seemingly random nature of the collection. It does not apply the rule of *varietas* expected of a medieval collection: the subject matter of the letters does not widely vary and letters on a similar topic are not broken up and spread throughout the collection, as we have seen above with the letters of recommendation.[856] In his study of around thirty German collections, Bernard Schmeidler proposed that most letter-writers copied their letters incoming and outgoing into a 'register', a file where they might also include other letters of general or special interest. He suggested these would be copied chronologically and that the majority of medieval collections as we have them are revisions of these earlier forms of collection.[857] Schmeidler's work was published just a year before Brooke's article. Schmeidler's critics argued that many of the great collections were instead created from copies of letters held on loose folia or bifolia, rather than through registering. Carl Erdmann argued that 'registrum' could simply stand for 'letter collection', and did not imply any particular pattern of retention.[858] Given the very limited use of the term in the twelfth century, as discussed above, this suggestion does not seem plausible. It seems rather that 'registrum' implied a certain ordering or arrangement to a collection which matched the papal registers.

Leclerq argued that a register might see letters grouped by chronology, but also by subject matter or according to their destination or addressee.[859] However, in this suggestion he was unusual, and it is the chronological aspect of registers that remains their defining feature for most scholars. For example, the editors of the letter collection of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury (d.1089), argued

[856] W. Verbaal, 'Sens: une victoire d'écrivain. Les deux visages du procès d'Abélard', *Pierre Abélard: Colloque international de Nantes*, ed. J. Jolivet, H. Habrias (Rennes 2003), 78: Medieval letter-writers 'accordaient plus d'importance à la variation thématique et stylistique qu'à un classement purement historique et chronologique.'
[857] B. Schmeidler, 'Uber Briefsammlungen des Früheren Mittelalters in Deutschland und ihre Kritische Verwertung', *Arsbok. Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund* (1926), 10-11.
[858] Discussed in L. Wahlgren-Smith, 'On the Composition of Herbert Losinga's Letter Collection', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55 (2006), 241-2; and see also Ysebaert, 'Letter Collections', 49-50.
[859] J. Leclercq, 'Lettres de S. Bernard: histoire ou littérature', *Studi Medievali* serie terza 12.1 (1971), 15. Leclerq also regularly refers to Bernard of Clairvaux's letter collections as registers which as far as I can tell he is alone in doing.

that the description of the collection as a register was 'fatally undermined' by the fact that the letters did not appear in chronological order, though they conceded it was possible the collection was based on an 'unbound register', where the order of letters would have been disturbed in compilation, or that the collection could be based on a register while not being a register itself.[860] Working on the same basis then, David's collection cannot be termed a register since it is not arranged in chronological order. Though it is difficult to date many of the letters, we can see, for instance, that Letter 27, which probably dates after September 1175, appears well before the letters of recommendation from early 1170, which also appear after the Edward the Confessor dossier from 1160.

Difficulties around dating especially plague the first group of letters, but they can all be broadly dated to *c.*1168-1175 X 81, which roughly fits with the general dating of all of the letters in the collection.[861] However, the letters do not appear in a strict chronological order within the group, though they do tend to come from a similar chronological time frame. However, this seems to be a result of their thematic groupings rather than any sign of registering practices.[862] As a result, I would still argue that the evidence suggests that the collection is based on a number of small collections, rather than a register or registers.

Master David's Letter Collection

Constable's categorisations of collections have proved popular with scholars. However, many collections of the twelfth century do not fit neatly into any category. As has been stated by Walter Ysebaert, what began as a 'literary' collection could be re-arranged to become a guide to the *ars dictaminis* and so morph into another type of collection altogether.[863] Other collections may not immediately appear to present any coherence, but a deeper textual reading of the letters shows that such coherence does exist and that many of the surviving collections were carefully and consciously constructed to form a narrative, to present model letters, to serve a didactic purpose, and so on. But,

[860] *Letters of Lanfranc*, 11.
[861] The only exclusions to this being the Edward the Confessor letters.
[862] For this argument elsewhere, see L. Wahlgren-Smith, review of Hudry's *Alain de Lille (?): Lettres familières (1167-1170)*, *Speculum* 81 (2006), 537.
[863] For discussion of this, see for instance Ysebaert, 'Historical Sources', esp. 30-1 and his discussion on the collections of Stephen of Tournai/Orléans in 'Letter Collections', 52-3.

medieval readers and letter-writers did not necessarily categorise collections in this way. A study of the manuscript copies of Peter de Vinea's model letters has shown that Peter's collection was most often copied into manuscripts along with the letters of Transmundus, the letters of Peter of Blois, and the *Morale somnium pharaonis*, an imagined dialogue between Pharoah and Joseph in epistolary form. The divergent nature of these collections (e.g. by blending the more 'personal' tone of Peter of Blois with the fictional *Morale* and the formulary of Peter de Vinea) rendered them perhaps more rather than less desirable as single codexes: 'The *ultima ratio* for a choice was stylistic appropriateness consonant with the aim of the writers.'[864]

This is all to say that although David's collection has been called a 'register' as a result of its unusual nature, and especially as it contains such a large number of letters written by others, this label has obscured the intent behind its compilation. The palaeography and codicology of the collection show that it was compiled in stages with the letters added in groups either copied directly from smaller collections or batches of the letters as they were stored. The former seems more likely as David had access to Foliot's archive, and a select few letters from there were copied into his collection. It is more likely these were added to previously compiled smaller collections than that they were copied as individual letters and then placed into David's archive, for they do not appear amongst the few letters added into empty space.[865] In being compiled from smaller works, David's collection was not unusual. Other collections have been shown to comprise small groups of letters preserved on their own folia. Fulbert of Chartres' literary works, for instance, including his letters, were compiled from smaller gatherings and individual leaves containing a variety of works which could be rearranged.[866] The difference here is that in Fulbert's collection the letters within the individual groups were preserved in a largely chronological order.[867] As shown, Southern believed that John of Salisbury's earlier collection was compiled from drafts preserved on separate sheets of parchment in small

[864] For the original study, see M. Schaller, *Handschriftenverzeichnis zur Briefsammlung des Petrus de Vinea* (Hannover 2002), no.15 and for the subsequent comments, see B. Grévin, 'From Letters to *Dictamina* and Back: Recycling Texts and Textual Collections in Late Medieval Europe (Thirteenth-Fourteenth Centuries)', *Between Fiction and Document*, ed. Bartoli and Høgel, 414-5.
[865] See Chapter One.
[866] *Letters of Fulbert*, ed. Behrends, xxxviii-xxxix.
[867] Ibid., lii.

groups.[868] Adam Marsh's (d.1259) collection, compiled *post mortem* by secretaries, seems to have been compiled from copies or drafts which were preserved on separate leaves or small gatherings.[869] The compiler arranged them into groups according to the rank of their recipients. Much like David's collection, the letters were written in cramped handwriting with one letter following the other immediately and space left at the end of each group.[870]

The preservation of David's works in such format might explain why the two treatises which appear directly after his letter collection were written in the same hand and bound into the volume with his letters. If his letters were originally kept on separate leaves alongside these treatises, the compiler may have chosen to copy the treatises also, though they seem to have recognised that they were separate to the letters and did not include them in the collection proper. As Julian Haseldine has stated in his study of Peter of Celle's collection, though scholars now have deeper knowledge of the process of compilation behind the collections, the intervening stages between archive and final, polished collection are not always evident.[871] David's collection is clearly not a 'polished' product: as shown it does not display *varietas*, many letters are not obviously linked to David, and only relatively few of the letters (less than a third) were written by David himself. This may reflect his social position: he wrote fewer letters than as a bishop might have been obliged to write, and perhaps many of those that he did write were less likely to have been of wider interest. However, it is possible that what we see in David's collection is one of the intervening stages between archive and final collection.[872] There is certainly some conscious arrangement to the letters (see below) and from the codicological evidence we can be sure it was designed as one collection. In this case, then, David's manuscript is perhaps not 'a letter collection' nor is it 'a collection of letters', but rather something in between. It may have been

[868] See above.
[869] *Letters of Adam Marsh* i, ed. Lawrence, xliii-xliv.
[870] C. H. Lawrence, 'The Letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan School at Oxford', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 42 (1991), 221.
[871] Haseldine, 'Literary Memorial', 334: 'It is not always possible, however, to compare the refined and polished letter collections which we have with the bodies of materials from which they were originally compiled, as these usually do not survive'.
[872] For letter collections from different stages of this process, see Alison Beach's comments below on the letter collection of the Admonter nuns, and see the analysis of the different editions of Stephen of Tournai's letter collection by Ysebaert in 'Cinq lettres' 362-3.

designed as a whole to tell the story of David's career through a series of letters preserved for a variety of reasons: historical, political, and administrative.

The 'Narrative' of the Collection

David's collection reflects the themes that dominated his career, including his attempts to secure a pension, his work for Foliot before and after 1170, and his subsequent legal career. The collection presents an overwhelmingly positive view of David and his activities. It begins with his personal letters, which detail his struggles at Bologna and with unnamed foes at St Paul's. These are the most eloquent and flowery of the letters and allow David to show off his letter-writing skills. The collection then progresses to letters which record David's efforts at the Curia on Foliot's behalf during the Becket Dispute, before the inclusion of letter 34 from Foliot to Roger of Worcester accusing David of betrayal. The juxtaposition of Foliot's letters requesting David's aid and praising him with this letter detailing David's supposed 'betrayal' highlights Foliot's fickleness. Letter 34 begins a new group, suggesting that the order of the groupings of letters was not coincidental.

There are then further letters on the Becket dispute, including letters 35 in which Foliot once again writes to David asking for his assistance in securing absolution, and 36 in which the bishop writes to an anonymous cardinal to inform him that David will work on his behalf at the Curia. Again, Foliot's letter detailing David's supposed betrayal is placed in opposition to other of his own letters detailing the efforts David has made, or is about to make, on his behalf. There follows further letters sent by various of the bishops involved in the Becket dispute, ending with an anonymous account of a conference between Becket and papal legates.

Next comes a group of letters on various legal disputes with no obvious connection to David. This is then followed by a group that begins with letters of the Anti-Pope Victor and Alexander III from the years of the schism. It proceeds with another selection of seemingly random letters, and ends with the Edward the Confessor dossier and a final, short and anonymous letter. Confirming the overwhelmingly positive view of David's life and career, the compilation ends with letters of recommendation, including Roger of Worcester's letter to the Pope in defense of David, followed by a

letter sent to David from Bartholomew of Exeter, praising him. The collection ends with the letter from the monks of St Pancras, depicting Master David as their biblical David and asking that he lend them his aid. This final letter ends with a firm directive to remember final judgement: 'Fare well and be of good intent, mindful of last judgement before the dreadful seat of that strict judge.'[873] A warning here perhaps to readers, and a backhanded reference to Foliot's actions as shown in the collection?

It is clear then that the thematic groupings to the letters are not accidental. At least one letter that was actually sent has been split in two, with each half copied into a different section of the collection in order to ensure these parts fit thematically with the letters with which it is surrounded. These are letters 33 and 82 as they appear in David's collection. They are also found in C and in the second manuscript of Foliot's letters, Douce 287. In both of these other copies, letters 33 and 82 appear as one letter. Though a *salutatio* has been added to letter 82 in V it is not complete as it would be in a full epistolary address, and instead seems to have been added by the compiler to illustrate sender and recipient of the letter clearly: 'Dominus papa, episcopo London(iensi), primus cetera'.[874] The first line of Letter 82, which is the second half of the full letter, does not read as if it is the opening line of a letter. It begins: 'Et quoniam dilectus filius noster Magister David...'.[875] Evidently, these letters were sent to Foliot as one. This all suggests then that, either before or at the time that David's collection was compiled, this letter was divided in two. The first section, now Letter 33, was added to David's collection after the group relating to his actions during the Becket dispute, and the latter section, letter 82, was added to the letters of recommendation. Letter 33 is not a part of any of the groups of letters: it was added to its position when the collection was compiled. This shows that the wider collection was designed with these thematic groupings of the letters in mind, and even the 'additional' letters not within the groups were sometimes added to groups on a relevant theme.

This thematic grouping to the letters was, again, not peculiar to David's collection. The drive to organise thematically was a standard part of the rhetorician's duties. Thus the compiler of Lanfranc's

[873] *LDL*, no.90: 'Bene valete et bene velitis et mementote extreme examinis ante tribunal terribile districti iudicis.'
[874] Ibid., no.82.
[875] Ibid.

collection arranged his letters by theme. One group concerned canonistic decisions, another English monastic affairs. This arrangement was not entirely clear cut: two further letters also involved English monastic affairs but were not grouped with other letters on this subject.[876] The editors of the collection suggested that, much like Fulbert of Chartres' collection (and those of David and John of Salisbury), Lanfranc's compilers may have reflected the 'physical' state of the letters, which were preserved in groups on separate bifiolia or leaves.[877] The collection attributed to Alain de Lille is small, but its most recent editor believed the letters were organised both chronologically and thematically, and one reviewer has suggested that the chronological arrangement is a result of this thematic arrangement.[878] Perhaps most strikingly, given David's emulation of him, Bernard of Clairvaux's collection contains groups of letters revolving around particular themes. For example, there is a group concerning assassinations, another group dealing with legal matters, and a dossier relating to Abelard.[879]

Though some of the letters in David's collection do not have any obvious link to him, the evidence does not suggest that they are there by accident. Firstly, the codicology does not show that any leaves were added by mistake, but rather that the collection was intended to be as it is. Secondly, where it is possible to make a textual comparison with other copies of these letters, it suggests that at some time after his efforts at the Curia in the early 1170s, David accessed Foliot's archive and took from it selected letters which he added to his collection.[880] This, considered alongside the separation of one epistle into letters 33 and 82, shows that the smaller collections of letters from which David's collection was copied saw the letters arranged thematically, and this thematic grouping was carried over into the larger collection.

The question remains as to whether the collection was compiled by David. Though there is clear evidence of organisation behind the collection, this is not proof that David himself was the compiler. Other medieval collections were compiled by secretaries or scribes. One strong suggestion that David may have been behind the compilation is the likely heavy editing of many of the letters that can be

[876] *Letters of Lanfranc*, 13-5.
[877] Ibid., 13.
[878] *Alain de Lille*, ed. Hudry, 51, and Wahlgren-Smith, review of *Alain de Lille*, 537.
[879] Verbaal, 'Sens', 79.
[880] See Chapter One.

attributed to him.[881] This, however, may simply suggest that David had a hand in the compilation of the smaller collections from which the larger was compiled. The date of compilation of the whole collection is difficult to ascertain. The latest letters are from *c*.1181 and perhaps even earlier, though this does not necessarily indicate the date of compilation. The clearest suggestion that David may have been involved in the compilation comes from the letters which are not part of the groupings, and therefore presumably were copied into the collection from separate leaves. One of these is letter 33, discussed above. Another is letter 28, which the *salutatio* shows was written by David himself.[882] There are also the final three letters, which were written in a different hand but concern David. This, as well as the clear London link to the manuscript, and the English hand with nonetheless Italianate spellings, all suggests that David was involved in the collection's compilation.[883] If he was not, whoever was evidently sought to present a conspectus of David's career through the collection, as the inclusion of extra, loose, letters written by or concerning David suggests.

David's collection does not fit within Constable's categories. It is not 'archival' as the arrangement of the letters suggests there was a conscious ordering to the letters. It is not strictly 'literary' in that it contains a large number of letters not written by or to David. It is not a 'register' as it is not the result of registering practices. However, this does not mean it should be considered to have no purpose or design. David was himself educated in the *ars dictaminis*, and it is possible that V was his personal manuscript. The arrangement of the letters tells the story of his career, but the range of content and type of letters represent the range of David's own training, skills, and achievements. We see complex discussions of canon law issues, letters of a complicated and elaborate style, quotation of classical authors, stylistic practices taken from Bernard of Clairvaux, glowing letters of recommendation, and evidence of David's skill in negotiation at the Curia.

[881] For this as evidence, see Verbaal, 'Epistolary Voices', 14-5.
[882] *LDL*, no.28: 'Dilecto sibi in domino M. dei gratia nouo nouitio de Stanleh' magister D(avid) London(iensis) salutem et fine commendare principium.'
[883] For this, see Chapter One.

An Example for Future Letter-writers?

One other of Constable's categorisations remains to be mentioned: didactic correspondence, or letters designed to teach their readers. This category includes formularies and collections of model letters. The *ars dictaminis* will be described in more detail in Chapter Five. However, for the purposes of this chapter I will provide a brief overview of the *ars*. Twelfth-century letter-writers were part of a tradition with roots in antiquity, which developed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries into the *ars dictaminis*, the art of dictating or letter writing. The *ars* took its inspiration from Ciceronian rhetorical principles regarding oral rhetoric. Instructions on letter writing were likely taught in Greece and Rome, but as a part of the study of rhetoric and oratory and not as a discipline in its own right.[884] The *ars* developed further throughout late antiquity and the early Middle Ages, and by the mid-twelfth century potential letter-writers could read the rules of the *ars* in manuals or textbooks called variously *artes dictandi, dictamen*, or *summae dictaminis*. Alongside and often joined to these were formularies, or collections of model letters. David would have encountered these during his time at Bologna, and possibly also in the schools in France, if not before.[885] These formularies had a distinct style, differentiating them from the 'literary' collections. The letters might be arranged by subject matter with a table of contents and rubrics indicating the type of letter. The rank and type of recipient was usually varied to display different styles of writing as determined by the social status of a recipient.[886] The contents of a formulary might be arranged according to social standing of recipient or sender.[887] As well as this, the *Maior compilatio* of Bernard of Meung – one of the most popular and significant of these twelfth-century books - separated letters into those to clergy and those to lay men.[888]

[884] C. D. Lanham, *Salutatio Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style, and Theory (Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung, 22)* (Munich 1975), 89 and R. Witt, 'Medieval "*Ars Dictaminis*" and the Beginnings of Humanism: a New Construction of the Problem', *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982), 7-8.
[885] For the development of the *ars* in Italy and France, see Chapter Five.
[886] S. J. Heathcote, 'Master Transmundus, Papal Notary and Monk of Clairvaux in the Twelfth Century', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 21 (1965), 60-1.
[887] *Codex Udalrici* i, ed. K. Nass (Wiesbaden 2017), xlvii, where Nass rules it out from being a formulary as the contents are not arranged in such a way.
[888] Discussed in C. Vulliez, 'L'éveque au miroir de l'*Ars dictaminis*. L'example de la *Maior compilatio* de Bernard de Meung', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 70 (1984), 280 and Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis*, 27.

Formularies might also omit proper names from the letters, abbreviating them to an initial or replacing them with 'N.', *nomen*, in an attempt to anonymise.[889] Some of the letters in the twelfth-century Tegernsee collection abbreviated common names.[890] This was one reason why the editor deemed these letters to be stylistic exercises, rather than 'real' letters.[891] However, this abbreviation also occurred in letters most certainly 'real'.[892] This practice of abbreviating names also occurred in collections that were not formularies, and Alison Beach argued this was in fact 'a common scribal practice, and not the hallmark of a formulary'.[893] Amongst the letters written by David there are ten instances of a name being abbreviated to 'N.', and there is one further instance where a 'Mag(ister) N. London' appears, who must be Nicholas, archdeacon of London.[894] This, in contrast to thirty-six instances where a name is abbreviated to an initial other than 'N.' (e.g. 'Domino R.') or simply abbreviated (e.g. 'Mag(ister) Gil' Lond'). Seven of these instances witness names abbreviated to just an initial.[895] In three of these instances, the abbreviation is due to this being the second instance of that name appearing within the letter and in two instances the initial is 'D.' and clearly David.[896] Beyond this, there are also further cases where an individual is named simply by title, e.g. 'dominus London', but a near contemporary would likely have known who this referred to. These proportions do not suggest that personal names have been purposefully anonymised (i.e. changed to 'N.') in David's letters, for they cover less than a third of cases and may well refer to an actual person.[897] Though some of the personal names in David's letters have been abbreviated to 'N.', this does not occur on a wide

[889] *Codex Udalrici* i, ed. Nass, xlvii.
[890] See for instance *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts*, ed. H. Plechl (Hannover 2002), nos.108, 152, 176.
[891] Ibid., xiii-xiv.
[892] See for instance ibid., nos. 153-4.
[893] A. I. Beach, 'Voices From a Distant Land: Fragments of a Twelfth-Century Nuns' Letter Collection', *Speculum* 77 (2002), 39. For instance, Beach notes that in the collection of the Admonter monks 'N.' often stands in for proper names, as it also does in the collection from the monastery of Reinhardsbrunn. The collections are *Die Admonter Briefsammlung*, ed. G. Hödl and P. Classen (Munich 1983) and *Collectio Reinheresbrunnensis*, ed. F. Peeck (Munich 1978).
[894] Three times in *LDL*, no.1, four times in no.2, once in no.13, and twice in no.27. There is one further instance in no.23 where the name appears to have been scratched out or crossed out to the extent that it is illegible.
[895] Once in *LDL* no.3, once in no.4, and once in no.8, three times in no.16, and once in no.28. Names are abbreviated beyond an initial (including instances where the first name is abbreviated to an initial but a surname or patronym is provided) twice in no.1, twice in no.2, once in no.6, three times in no.7, twice in no.8, once in no.11, once in no.12, once in no.13, two times in no.16, once in no.18, twice in no.21, twice in no.22, once in no.23, once in no.25, six times in no.26 and once in no.28.
[896] The former occurs three times in *LDL*, no.16, the D. appears in nos.4 and 22.
[897] As discussed, this N. may be Nicholas, archdeacon of London, or his nephew.

enough scale to indicate that the compiler wished to anonymise the letters to present them as model letters, preserved only for their style.

For Alison Beach a lack of titles, rubrics, and 'visual cues' such as variation in style or letter size to indicate a new letter, likely ruled out the collection of the Admonter nuns from being considered a formulary.[898] Instead, the chronological arrangement suggests that the collection was once a register or copy book. It is unclear if all the nuns' letters were copied in, or just those of value for their context or style. Some letters were perhaps preserved for both reasons:

> 'Even those addressing specific historical situations or the personal difficulties of individual nuns could be used as models of rhetorical style or the skilful exploitation of biblical images, or simply for the pleasure of reading.'[899]

Some collections might be part formulary. Others - and likely more than has been realised - included a few 'model' or 'exemplar' letters alongside letters that were actually sent, thus blurring the boundaries between what constitutes a 'literary' collection and a formulary. Peter of Blois' collection has been accused of being a collection of literary exercises. In her study of the manuscripts of the collection Lena Wahlgren-Smith argued:

> 'There has been some doubt as to whether Peter's letters should be regarded as genuine letters, written for sending to the persons addressed, or as literary exercises. To my mind there is no reason why the collection, and even individual letters, should not be a mixture of the genuine and the literary.'[900]

John Cotts agreed that Peter's collection cannot have been designed purely as a collection of model letters, for the various manuscript copies were not usually attached to a *summa dictaminis* and 'do not seem as though they would have been useful as models.'[901] Discussing Peter's reliance on the letters of Hildebert de Lavardin for examples of style and content, Cotts concluded that neither Peter nor Hildebert 'wrote merely to provide examples of the *ars dictandi*, yet they were concerned with style

[898] Beach, 'Voices', 39.
[899] Ibid., 42.
[900] Wahlgren-Smith, *Collections of Peter*, 16.
[901] Cotts, *Clerical Dilemma*, 58.

and saw letters as ideal vehicles for flights of literary prowess'.[902] For Peter, income was dependent on writing. He was a teacher, secretary, episcopal chancellor and letter-writer, and his letter collection must surely reflect this. In one letter he wrote that he had collected his letters into one place so that he might display the form of dictating (*dictandi*, i.e. letter-writing) as a type of 'public service' and 'charity'.[903] Not quite a display of humility, but this passage comes from a letter in which Peter discusses a detractor who had tried to attack his opus. He defends his work, promising that his information comes from history and the Bible, and proceeds to include references to classical authors, evidently a way of showcasing his skill.[904] Peter does conform to letter-writing *topoi*: for example he refers to sending batches of letters to his friends, asking them to correct anything inconsistent with a moralising tone. However, this did not actually happen and Peter was simply conforming to the *topos* of modesty.[905] In the same way we should question if this detractor was real, or whether this was simply a chance for Peter to prove the reliability and skill of his letter writing. Peter's writing was his trade, so he had not only to prove his skill but display the extent of his prowess. His letter collection was his way of doing so and in this it reflected his personal concerns, whether or not he intended his letters to serve as models.

In her study of Arnulf of Lisieux's letter collection, Caroline Poling Schriber showed that by rearranging Arnulf's letters in chronological order in his edition, Frank Barlow obscured the nature of the collection as it had been designed by Arnulf. By returning to the manuscripts, Poling Schriber reassessed the corpus and on the basis of the arrangement of the letters and the omission of *salutationes*, she determined that part of the collection was intended to serve as 'a handbook of examples for letter-writers'.[906] This reassessment enabled her to categorise the different groupings of the letters:

1. A Handbook for Letter-writers
2. An Emphasis on Duty

[902] Ibid., 80.
[903] Peter of Blois, ep. 92, *PL* 207, col.289: 'Arguit aemulus, et temeritati ascribit, quod litteras meas passim et varie dispersas in unum colligo: quod formam dictandi praescribo simplicibus, quod publicae utilitati munus deuoti laboris et officium charitatis impendo'.
[904] Ibid.
[905] Walhgren-Smith, *Collections of Peter*, 58.
[906] *LCA*, 4-5.

3. A Miscellany of Private Letters
4. A Litany of Sorrows.

Each of these smaller groups within the collection had a different purpose. The 'handbook' section of the collection contained letters written to a range of recipients on various topics, which Poling Schriber believed were meant to serve as '*exempla*- sample letters that would illustrate the kinds of correspondence a bishop would be expected to write'. The length of the letters varies, and is 'carefully balanced, so that a short note follows a many-paged diatribe'.[907] The first group of letters in David's collection suggests various similarities here: from the contents of the letters and the few *salutationes* preserved we can extrapolate a range of recipients according to social status, and the letters are varied in length. This could suggest that, just as Arnulf's collection was divided into groups with one intended to showcase his letter writing skills, the first group of letters in David's collection was intended to do the same.

Adam Marsh's collection may have been compiled as a formulary book for other English Franciscans. The editor of the collection, Hugh Lawrence, noted that a modern reader might be surprised by any such attempt to preserve Adam's letters, for Adam:

> 'writes in an elaborate and highly convoluted rhetorical style. Immensely complex and rambling sentences, an addition to superlatives, and circumlocution to the point of obscurity, make his prose irritating to read'[908]

The same can very well be said for David's letters and in fact for the correspondence of many medieval writers, but this was precisely why they were preserved for future generations of letter-writers: to demonstrate a high level of letter-writing skill.

David's collection does not contain rubrics or large initials to assist reading, and the compiler was not consistent in his compilation practices. For example, some letters were copied with their *salutationes* and some without, though this was likely a function of the smaller collections in which the letters

[907] Ibid., 19.
[908] Lawrence, 'Adam Marsh', 222.

were originally arranged. There is perhaps some deliberate anonymisation of names, yet this is not universal, and many names are simply abbreviated. The letters do not appear in any real order, aside from the thematic groupings. But David's letters are written to a range of recipients: we have a dean and chapter, a prior, a bishop, and likely some lower down the hierarchy, though these letters often do not preserve their *salutatio*.[909] This desire to showcase a range of correspondents was not unique to David's collection.[910]

Conclusion

David's collection may only cover a small part of his career, but even this adds to the suggestion that the collection was purposefully designed, for it was common for a collection to represent only a part of the writer's life. Some letter-writers deliberately produced multiple collections, with each representing a different stage in their career.[911]

As a result of its plain style and lack of embellishments (at least when compared to other texts written by their scribes), Alison Beach suggested that the collection of the Admonter nuns may represent an intermediate stage in the transmission of the collection, with unfulfilled plans for future editing and polishing.[912] David's collection perhaps also represents an intermediate stage in the compilation process. It is not a well-polished collection, having few rubrics and no decorated initials.[913] The omission or abbreviation of various personal names makes it difficult to determine the events discussed, and it is only through writing style that we can determine which letters were written by David, as many appear without *salutatio*.

Yet, the collection is not unusual for this period. There was and is an abundance of smaller collections like this, filled with an assortment of letters, including those written by the main letter-writer, received by them, or by third parties. Many of these collections have not been studied, let alone edited or translated, and this has skewed our overall view of medieval letter collections. Other examples that

[909] See for instance *LDL*, nos.1, 21-2, 25.
[910] See for instance one of Hildegard of Bingen's letter collections, discussed in Van Egen, '*Persona* of Hildegard', 377 and fn.7.
[911] Haseldine, 'Literary Memorial', 336-7.
[912] Beach, 'Voices', 42.
[913] Excluding the marginal notes concerning Bernard of Clairvaux.

have been studied include Hilary of Orléans' collection, which includes circular letters, a letter written by a student to his father, letters between bishops, letters sent by Hilary, and one to him.[914] Some personal names are abbreviated, particularly those of men without office. It is a small collection, but the letters have been shown to be authentic (or at least to discuss real events). Hilary studied at Orléans, was possibly from there, taught at Angers, and worked for some years for the bishop of Orléans. He was constantly in need of money. The collection was compiled by Hilary himself between 1115 and 1145.[915] The letters include personal correspondence.[916] There are also letters with no obvious link to Hilary and it is unclear why these are in the collection: possibly they were simply of interest to Hilary, perhaps for their literary style.[917] The letters do not appear in chronological order so the collection does not appear to be a register.[918] The collection has a number of similarities with David's and survives in just one medieval manuscript of the thirteenth century.[919]

Another such instance is that recently (albeit controversially) attributed to Alain of Lille, containing just seventeen letters and also surviving in just one manuscript. There is evidence of a thematic grouping to these letters, which appear without full *salutatio* and with personal names omitted. Rubrics added by another hand are vague, for example 'Ad alium inuitatoria ad dilectionem'.[920] The letters, according to their most recent editor, Françoise Hudry, were written by different authors, and some were written to the main letter-writer of the collection.[921] The small collection overall details a short episode in the career of the central letter-writer, who is experiencing a variety of difficulties, with the letters constructing the narrative of the letter-writer's career and the issues he faced.[922] The collection provides little detail on who precisely was involved in these events, much like the letters in

[914] There are two MS copies of the collection, one containing 37 items and one containing just 12.
[915] For the collection and a biographical overview of Hilary, see N. M. Häring, 'Hilary of Orleans and His Letter Collection', *Studi Medievali* serie terza 14.2 (1973).
[916] Ibid., nos.9-10.
[917] Ibid., nos.19, 32.
[918] For instance, the letter inviting Hilary to come to Angers to teach appears after the letter asking him to return from there, ibid., nos.9, 18.
[919] Ibid., 1069-70.
[920] *Alain de Lille*, ed. Hudry, no.8.
[921] Hudry's attribution of some letters to Peter of Blois, Richard of Saint Victor, and even Alain de Lille, has been rightly questioned. See for instance D. Luscombe, review of Hudry's *Alain de Lille (?): Lettres familières* in *Medium Aevum* 75 (2006).
[922] *Alain de Lille*, ed. Hudry, 51.

David's collection, written to those with whom he was in conflict yet without their *salutationes* and offer few identifying features. It is only from their inclusion in the larger collection that we can ascertain these were written by David.

The similarities between these collections suggest that medieval letter-writers of lower status, and in particular those who were not bishops or abbots, still collected their own letters and compiled their own collections, albeit that these were less likely to have been recopied, widely shared, or more generally to have survived. These collections may have been compiled for personal reasons: to serve as a personal record, or perhaps with the intention of being shared amongst a small circle of interested readers. David is fortunate that his collection was bound together with those of Hildebert, Arnulf, and John of Salisbury, perhaps because V was his own manuscript, or was compiled and bound in London within his sphere of influence.

The question remains as to why David made his collection, and no straightforward answer can be forthcoming. It seems that he wished to preserve a record of the most tumultuous period of his career as well as its high points, when he was regularly engaged as an advocate at the Curia. His letters of recommendation may have been preserved for practical use: Wibald of Stavelot's collection has been termed 'a kind of portable archive' for it allowed Wibald to transport useful letters between the two monasteries he was overseeing.[923] It is hard to imagine a full manuscript being carried around. However, the codicological evidence reveals that David's collection was a separate volume for a time, and following his breach with his patron, Gilbert Foliot, the sections displaying his letter-writing skills and the letters of recommendation could well have been useful in securing him new employment.

The collection's eventual inclusion in V amongst other such compilations, suggests it may have been recognised for its style and its literary merits, but also for its historical importance within the Becket dispute. This would explain why it immediately follows the collection of Becket letters in V. Perhaps

[923] *Das Briefbuch abt Wibalds von Stablo und Corvey* i, ed. M. Hartmann, following work by H. Zatschek and T. Reuter (Hannover 2012), xxxviii.

the different groupings of the letters represent a purposeful differentiation, such as that Poling Schriber identified in Arnulf's collection.[924]

[924] Stephen of Tournai's various collections were compiled for different reasons: one to show exemplar letters, another to illustrate the rules of good letter-writing, and another towards the end of his life as a letter memorial, Ysebaert, 'Cinq lettres', 363.

Chapter Five: Internal Aspects of the Letters

In the past three decades or so medieval letters and collections have been examined in studies which go beyond a simple consideration of the historical details they provide, ranging through statistical analyses of the social status of correspondents, to an examination of the biblical allusions made by any particular author.[925] This chapter seeks to consider three of these aspects: the first is David's use of the language of friendship (*amicitia*), and how this differed between correspondents. The second is David's use of and adherence to the rules of the *ars dictaminis*. The third is David's emulation of Bernard of Clairvaux. The focus for this chapter will mostly be upon the letters written by David: letters 1-16, 18, 20-3, and 25-8. A point for consideration is the editing of the letters before their inclusion in the collection. As we have already acknowledged, the letters in the collection may not represent the text of the letters as they were actually sent. As a result, the findings of this chapter should not be considered final. Even so, and even if the letters were heavily edited before inclusion, they still display David's letter writing skill. As such, they tell us much about David's expectations of what a letter should or should not contain.

1: *Amicitia*

Various recent studies of medieval letter collections offer a consideration of the network of the letter-writer. Who could they call upon for support? With whom did they wish to be associated? What was the social range of their correspondence? A statistical analysis of David's recipients is simply impossible due to the lack of *salutationes*. Furthermore, only a small number of David's letters remain (just twenty-five), unlikely to reflect the full range of his correspondents. However, an analysis of the letters chosen for the collection can answer a number of questions nonetheless: to whom was David confident in writing? Who wrote back and in what tone? Which relationships did David choose to record for posterity and which were omitted? The omission of *salutationes* can be notable in itself. Was this the result of editing or did David hope to obscure his correspondence with certain

[925] For instance, see McLoughlin, '*Amicitia*'. For an example of the latter, see the introduction in *Collections of Nicholas* ed. Walhgren-Smith.

individuals? As with other collections, we must remain aware throughout that the letters presented here are likely only a small selection of David's overall epistolary output.[926]

Lord, Ally, or Friend?

The study of friendship or friendly or affectionate language in letters is an area of network studies that has grown in recent decades. Scholars such as Julian Haseldine and John McLoughlin have analysed the language used by writers such as John of Salisbury, Peter of Celle, and Peter the Venerable, to probe the circumstances in which such language was used and to whom.[927] These studies have shown that the language of *amicitia* (from *amicus* = a friend) stands apart from other affectionate terms such as *carissimus* or *dilectissimus*. It was used selectively by letter-writers to particular recipients, sometimes as a response to particular circumstances. Even so, complete strangers might be called 'friend', and so might a mere acquaintance, or one with whom the letter-writer was in conflict.[928] Haseldine found that for Peter the Venerable, directly calling a recipient an *amicus* 'rarely if ever denoted affection, while personal closeness or intimacy had different semantic markers'.[929] The use of this language varied between writers and not all used it in the same way, though there are various common themes. Bernard of Clairvaux reserved the term *amicus* for select correspondents, beyond those people he knew intimately, relatives, or members of his order. Peter the Venerable used it primarily in letters of conflict or appeals, or where he was attempting to establish relations with other orders.[930] Morey and Brooke wrote of Peter the Venerable that 'A kindly, diplomatic and charitable man like Peter the Venerable appears to be on terms of close friendship with everyone in Christendom'.[931] For John of Salisbury, the language of friendship was a means to cement alliances

[926] For instance, when studying the networks of Stephen of Orléans (d.1203) Ysebaert found that Stephen's network based solely on his letter collection differed from that shown through other sources, see Ysebaert, 'Historical Sources', 47.
[927] For this, see the Introduction.
[928] Haseldine, 'Friendship, Intimacy', 251-3, 263, 270, 277, 280. For letters of friendship written with a subtext of irony due to conflict, see C. S. Jaeger, 'Irony and Subtext in Latin Letters of the Eleventh and Twelfth Century', *Between Fiction and Document*, ed. Bartoli and Høgel.
[929] Haseldine, 'Friendship, Intimacy', 255.
[930] Ibid., 270.
[931] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 13.

rather than representative of personal affection.[932] The few letters of David's that survive suggest that he used friendship similarly to these writers, with deliberate selectivity.

David was addressed as 'friend' by several of his correspondents, including bishops. In letter 89, for example, praising David for his efforts on behalf of the canons of Guisborough and asking him to continue on their behalf, Bartholomew of Exeter addressed David as his 'dear brother and most beloved friend in Christ'.[933] For the priory of St Pancras Lewes, David was 'their most beloved friend'.[934] However, David's most important relationship was that with Gilbert Foliot. Preserved in the collection are just three letters (letters 31-2, 35) sent to David from Foliot. To these can be added one further letter that survives in Foliot's collection.[935] There are eight letters probably sent to Foliot from David (letters 1-3, 7, 9-10, 14, 23) with a further five (letters 4-5, 8, 12-13) likely written to Foliot's relatives, men of his household, or men close to him at London. Affectionate language appears throughout Foliot's letters to David. In letter 31 Foliot addresses David in the *salutatio* as his 'beloved son' (*dilectus filius*). In the letter he calls David his 'best beloved' (*karissimus)* and refers to himself as David's 'dearest friend' (*amicus karissimus*).[936] In the *salutatio* to letter 32 Foliot sends David the 'spirit of sincere love' (*sincere dilectionis affectum*), but that is the limit to such affectionate language.[937] In letter 34, writing to Roger of Worcester regarding David's betrayal, Foliot states that he 'trusted [David] as our greatest friend'.[938] In Letter 35 David is again Foliot's 'most beloved friend'. Foliot begins this letter with a request to David: that he make good on the promises of love that he has made and prove these through deeds. 'For', Foliot wrote, 'the proof of affection resides in deeds displayed'.[939] Therein lies the common theme between letters 31 and 35, which display the most friendly or affectionate language. In each of these letters Foliot is asking for David's help in securing absolution. David was Foliot's main envoy at the Curia for a time, so the bishop was heavily reliant upon him. By the time Foliot wrote letter 32, his absolution was secured, and though

[932] McLoughlin, '*Amicitia*', 167.
[933] *LDL*, no.89: 'dilecto fratri et amico in Cristo karissimo'.
[934] Ibid., no.90: 'karissimo amico suo'.
[935] *GFL*, no.190.
[936] *LDL*, no.31.
[937] Ibid., no.32.
[938] Ibid., no.34: 'quem sperabamus amicissimum'.
[939] Ibid., no35: 'Probatio namque dileccionis exhibitio operis est', a reference to Pope Gregory II.

he still required David's services in a general sense, the situation was no longer quite so dire. We can see this use of friendly language by Foliot to other recipients where he asks for aid, where friendship is once again presented as a formal bond accompanied by obligations which must be proved through deeds. One cardinal was addressed as a 'friend and most beloved lord', before Foliot wrote that he should 'extend to me the hand of counsel and assistance, so that you may know me as a friend by things done; you will henceforth possess a friend not only in feeling but the full accomplishment of works'.[940] But for Foliot, friendship was a mutually beneficial relationship. He assured the bishop of Durham that he himself 'neither ought, nor [is] able, to be found wanting' when his friends were in difficulty,[941] and he told the bishop of Chester that if he were to institute his relative to a certain church, 'on account of the conceded favour' both Foliot and other friends of this relative would be more closely bound to the bishop in allegiance.[942] This was the Ciceronian view of friendship: that there was a 'law of friendship' which brought with it 'a sense of formality and mutual obligation'.[943]

What is striking is the relative lack of friendship language in David's responses to Foliot. In letter 3 an unidentified proverb offers one such allusion:

> 'The rich are rarely accounted friends of the poor, either because in the pauper the rich man perceives one who covets not himself but his possessions, or because the pauper, being suspect, is reluctant to request the favour of the rich'[944]

[940] Ibid., no.36: 'ut in oborta michi ad presens necessitate manum michi consilii et auxilii porrigatis, ut quem rerum experientia amicum nondum agnouistis, amicum de cetero non affectu solum sed et operis efficatia plene possideatis.'

[941] *GFL*, no.266: 'Cum itaque amicis nostris et his precipue quos nature nobis unit ratio, in suis negotiis deesse nec debemus nec possumus, de strenuitate vestra magis quam de merito confidentes, vestram attentius exoramus benignitatem quatinus quod in prouectu vestrorum scilicet W. et H. laudabiliter cepistis feliciori fine consumetis' ['Therefore, when an affair of this particular nature unites in our friends and in the now, we neither ought, nor are we able to be wanting in their troubles. More particularly, trusting in your activities and merits, we prevail upon your kindness more attentively, that you laudably took in hand the advancement of your men, namely W. and H. to a more fruitful limit'].

[942] Ibid., no.257: 'Diuina ergo misericordia viscera pietatis vestre commoueat, et que nobis est ad vos dilectio simul et deuotione in cumulum caritatis accedat, quatinus prefatum R. in prescripto negotio dignemini promouere et ob indultam sibi gratiam tam nos quam ceteros amicos suos vestris velitis obsequiis artius obligare.' ['Divine mercy moves the entrails of your piety, and it is from us that love, at the same time as devotion, approaches you in the accumulation of affection, until you deign to advance the aforesaid R. in the pre-mentioned matter, and on account of the conceded favour, you should want to bind more closely to your allegiance us, as much as others of his friends.']

[943] Haseldine, 'Friendship Circle', 240-1.

[944] *LDL*, no.3: 'Unde rari diuites pauperum reperiuntur amici, dum vel dies a paupere non se sed sua queri coniectat, vel dum pauper quia suspitiosus diuitem ad gratiam incurare formidat'.

This is the closest David comes to mentioning friendship in a letter to Foliot, and it seems he is here providing an explanation of why a poor man such as himself fears to invite a rich man, such as Foliot, to friendship. This rumination over rich men having poor friends also appears in a letter of Arnulf of Lisieux's, as he writes to Bishop Robert of Lincoln:

> 'The rich raised out of poverty snub friends with the same poverty, fearing that some trace of the old destitution remains within them. Worse, they respect and esteem only those whom fortune favours, and they rejoice in clinging only to highly placed individuals, so that the majesty of their honour is not burdened by the crowing about of their inferiors and the lowly approach of ordinary people'[945]

David does, however, use some other affectionate language when writing to bishop Gilbert. He speaks, for instance, of his 'filial affection' for Foliot, and sends a 'filial submission'.[946] Besides this, he writes regularly of his faithfulness and obedience to Foliot: '[you will find] no-one rendered more faithful to you before mankind than I have been thanks to that favour and benefit that I received from you'.[947] Elsewhere, David writes that after receiving a letter from Foliot 'the devoted love I once had in serving you is now repaid to me with yet greater devotion',[948] and in another letter he has made a vow of 'obedience' (*obsequium*) to Foliot, for whom he holds his 'obedience in trust'.[949] David's own portrayal of his relationship with Foliot defines it fundamentally as a formal, subordinate relationship. In fact, David at one point refers to himself as a 'faithful agent' of Foliot.[950] Their relationship is clearly not equal, since David is not able to refer to Foliot as a friend in the way that the bishop can in writing to David. Instead, he writes of himself as the bishop's spiritual son or servant. He is bound to the bishop in fidelity and obedience rather than through friendship.

It was the same when David corresponded with Arnulf of Lisieux. Arnulf wrote: 'it is good for friends, when they are apart from each other, to remember each other' and as a result of this he had

[945] *Letters Arnulf*, no.4, trans. *LCA*, no.1.02.
[946] *LDL*, no.7: 'Filialem...subiectionem'.
[947] Ibid., no.1: 'neminem fideliorem vobis effectum hominio quam ego factus sum ea gratia quam a vobis accepi et beneficio'.
[948] Ibid., no.7: 'affectum quem ad obsequia vestra deuotum habui, michi reddidit deuotiorem.'
[949] Ibid., no.10: 'obsequium fidele'.
[950] Ibid., no.13: 'fidele mancipium'.

spoken to Henry II and Richard of Ilchester on David's behalf.[951] However, David's response does not refer to their friendship. For him, Arnulf is his 'most beloved Lord' and David is 'one of his [men]'.[952] David is, he wrote to Arnulf, 'confident in a great many things from your innate goodness' and he wrote of the 'hospitable grace full of all reverence and obedience which you [Arnulf] held from me' and he sent a gift from his 'so great affection' but did not refer back to the friendship Arnulf wrote of.[953] Once again, as with Foliot, Arnulf's status as bishop means David cannot be his friend, instead he is the subordinate in their relationship which he frames through the language of obedience and affection rather than friendship.

David does not entirely refrain from mentioning friendship in his letters. Letter 4 does not preserve the name of its recipient but the contents suggest it was written to a canon of London, possibly Master Henry of Northampton.[954] In the *salutatio* David makes an appeal: 'His David, and not his "would-be friend"'.[955] This discussion continues:

> 'As they say, love is not sincere where the scruples of doubt stir up the dregs of suspicion. From the time when your legation carried you to Rome, my pledge of sincere love has neither tired nor withered within me. For which reason, astonishment failed entirely to smite my soul, that in your letters to me you chose to address me as 'would-be friend'. Do you seek the opportunity, the richer you become, to cast off a poor friend? Or has someone or something tempted you not to honour the pledge of mutual love? It was once considered better to try a friend than to mistrust him'.[956]

David is challenging his recipient to live up to the friendship he thought existed between them. Just as Augustine increased his use of affectionate language and addresses of friendship when writing to those with whom he was most insecure, so David penned his longest discussion of friendship when he

[951] Ibid., no.17, trans. *LCA*, no.307.
[952] *LDL*, no.18: 'Karissimo suo et Domino, Arnulfo...suorum quidam'.
[953] Ibid: 'Et certe de vobis innata bonitate confido quamplurimum...Quicquid fuerit, hospitalem illam gratiam totius venerationis et obsequii plenam qua me habuistis dum aput vos fui...que vobis mitto munuscula, non tam ex se quam ex quanto mittuntur affectu acceptate'.
[954] See ibid., no.4 fn.1.
[955] Ibid.: 'Suus .D. sine utinam amicus'.
[956] Ibid.: 'Sincera non est ut aiunt dilectio, ubi scrupulus dubietatis fecem generat suscipionis. A diebus illis quibus te Romam misit leg(ati)o, sincere dilectionis quam feci promissio, nec ociosa nec sterilis inuenta est in me. Unde non satis animam meam percellit admiratio, quid sibi velit litteris tuis insertum: "et utinam amico". An occasiones queris ut ditior effectus ab amico paupere recedere possis, ante quisquam facinauit repromisse mutue dilectionis vota non soluere. Prius erat amici experimentum sumere, quam de amico dubitare.'

felt most as risk of losing it.[957] Now that his recipient has gained greater wealth, he hopes he will not forget his poor friend. He is challenging his friend to test him before doubting him. David's friendship is a tangible relationship, which he is prepared to prove through deeds. Even so, he expects his friends materially to repay his efforts on their behalf.

David has another recipient that he calls a friend: Prior Odo of Christ Church, Canterbury. Odo is his 'dearest friend', and David informs Odo he has a request of him, though he does not commit it to writing. This letter seems to break David's policy - and general friendship guidelines - of not referring to anyone above him in status as a friend, though of course a prior was not quite as important as a bishop. The reason for this may have been two-fold. Firstly, Odo and the monks of Christ Church were no friends to Becket during his lifetime. Odo become prior in 1168, during Becket's exile and without his assent. Odo found himself in trouble when he disregarded the papal prohibition against the Young King's coronation and was even suspected of aiding and abetting in Becket's death.[958] After the martyrdom, Odo needed to reform his reputation, and he may have formed a mutual alliance with David in this respect. Odo's status as monk may have meant David was more comfortable addressing him in friendly terms, for friendship was seen by monks as an extension of divine love with both a spiritual and political aspect.[959] We see this where David writes to 'M.', novice of Stanley, referring to him as his 'most beloved friend in Christ'.[960] David sends a lengthy and flowery letter containing a host of biblical quotations and spiritual exhortation, particularly focussed upon what seems to have been an intense devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, chief patron and protectoress of the Cistercian order. The whole letter is framed in admonishment, as David warns continually of the dangers of embarking upon a course of action (i.e. taking monastic vows) that may later be regretted or, worse, abandoned. Even so, he writes 'it is more glorious to perish having dared great things, than from

[957] For Augustine, see B. P. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (New edn, Ithaca 2010), 52.
[958] R. M. Thomson, 'Canterbury, Odo of (*d.*1200)', *ODNB*.
[959] See for instance R. W. Southern, *Saint Anselm: a Portrait in Landscape* (Cambridge 1990), esp. chapter 7.
[960] *LDL*, no.28: 'amice in Christo karissime'.

timidity to dare nothing great'.[961] By calling his recipient his friend David takes the sting off his sterner words:

> 'Therefore take heed, I pray you, most beloved friend in Christ, seeing that I do not recall your daring so as to terrify you with the prospect of failure, but rather to urge you to perseverance'.[962]

In his study of clerical *admonitio*, Björn Weiler found that *admonitio* was sometimes framed as emerging from the bonds of *amicitia*: friendship 'entailed the obligation to ensure that friends performed their duties'.[963] Here, David was admonishing his 'friend', a novice, to adhere to his new vows and to prove that his daring (in taking these vows) 'not be counted against you as a sin of fickleness or rash temerity, but rather that in the end, both with God and amongst men, you deservedly emerge with the title and achievement of magnanimity and constancy'.[964] The reference to *amicitia* was included precisely to show that David's words of warning came as a result of his friendship with his recipient, and as such he was obliged to offer them.

There are, then, just three instances of David directly referring to an individual as his friend, and a few more scattered references to him having friends. The corpus of letters written to or from David is so small that we should be wary of any firm conclusions. However, it appears that his use of *amicitia* broadly corresponds to the way it was used by other letter-writers. Like John of Salisbury, David used the language of *amicitia* towards his equals or near equals, but avoided using it to Gilbert Foliot and Arnulf of Lisieux who as bishops were firmly above him in the social hierarchy.[965] In fact he used very little affectionate language in general to Foliot, and where he did it often accompanied a descriptor such as 'filial', which firmly placed him as subordinate to Foliot as his spiritual 'father'.

---

[961] Ibid.: 'Et utique licet gloriosius interdum magnis ausis excidere quam de pusillanimitate magnum nichil audere'.
[962] Ibid.: 'Videas itaque oro amice in Cristo karissime, quoniam ausum tuum non recolo ut te terream in ruinam, sed magis ut inuicem ad perseuerantiam.'
[963] B. Weiler, 'Clerical *admonitio*, Letters of Advice to Kings and Episcopal Self-Fashioning, *c*. 1000- *c*.1200', *History* 102 (2017), 550.
[964] *LDL*, no.28: 'ut ausus tuus non ad leuitatis, non ad temeritatis tibi vitium imputetur, sed magnanimitatis potius et constantie nomen et effectum aput D(eu)m et homines in fine sortiri meratur.' ['so that your daring shall not be imputed to the your vice of fickleness and not heedlessness, but rather in the end it shall deserve to be allotted to the name and accomplishment of magnanimity and perseverance before God and men'].
[965] McLoughlin, '*Amicitia*', 172-3.

Those directly referred to as his 'friend' - an anonymous canon of London, Prior Odo, and the novice of Stanley - were much more his equals. The canon in particular would have been known to David and the letter is an appeal for help. Just as for Foliot, friendship was an alliance that required proof through deeds, so David promised to prove his friendship when he could:

> 'Certainly, if at any time the Lord gives me opportunity to repay you in kind, you shall prove me through works of love not just your friend but your best beloved'.[966]

This was a similar promise to the one David made to other correspondents such as Foliot, but there it was couched in terms of him proving his fidelity and making up for slights.[967] Evidently he viewed friendship in the same vein as his more formalised relationship with his patron: both brought obligations. In one respect, David does differ from other letter-writers, in that we have no letters from him which could be directly defined as 'letters of friendship', i.e. letters written with no other purpose than to make contact with the recipient.[968] This may reflect his relatively low social status: he could only appeal to friendship with those close to him in standing, thus limiting his pool of potential friends. It might seem strange then that David is happy to call Prior Odo his friend, but the two had met and engaged in negotiations. As the bishops' representative in these matters David's standing was at least temporarily increased, whilst Odo's had almost certainly been eclipsed in the aftermath of Becket's murder. As stated earlier, we must be wary of drawing firm conclusions from the small corpus at our disposal. However, it does seem broadly true that, where David used the language of *amicitia*, he did so in the same way as his contemporaries.

2. The *Ars Dictaminis*

[966] *LDL*, no.4: 'Et certe si quandoque michi Dominus oportunitatem dederit, parem vobis vicem in aliquo rependere, et dilectionis opere probare me non solum amicum sed etiam amicissimum experieris.'
[967] For example in ibid., no.10 David wrote of the 'benefits' he had received from Foliot and promised that 'since it is not for my smallness to seek to reply in kind as to an equal, I stand willing and grateful to do what I can in deeds of grace'. In no.1 he notes that Foliot has accused him of ingratitude, but promises that 'if ever I find opportunity...I shall the more freely compensate you with deeds'.
[968] Though it is extremely difficult to categorise medieval letters and any such categorisation is problematic, broadly speaking medieval letters can be grouped thematically according to purpose and this has been attempted by some studies. For one such example and a discussion of the different categories, see Haseldine,' Friendship Circle', 250.

The *ars dictaminis* provided guidelines for twelfth-century letter-writers, rooted in classical and patristic traditions of rhetoric. In the early Middle Ages illiterate rulers were reliant upon skilled clerks to compose letters and documents on their behalf, leading to the creation of formularies containing a range of model letters.[969] Of course, not every conceivable situation could be covered, and skilled letter-writers were needed to plug the gaps. The Investiture Contest, after the 1050s, spurned a flurry of letter-writing, which led to increased demand for skilled clerks able to compose a range of documents. By the mid-twelfth century, students at the schools had access to manuals of the *ars dictaminis*, called *artes dictandi* or *dictamen*, which provided guidelines on letter writing, usually accompanied by model letters. It is generally agreed that the earliest surviving manual was composed *c*.1087 by Alberic, monk of Montecassino (d.1108), but it is likely Alberic was following in an earlier tradition.[970] Alberic's work seems to have been designed as a guidebook for his students.[971] He provided model letters and suggested a five-fold division of letters into their constituent parts, to aid with composition, though he discussed only the first of these, the *salutatio*.[972] Subsequently, under one of Alberic's pupils, John of Gaeta, the use of the *cursus* was revived at the Curia. The *cursus* was a form of rhythmic prose which proscribed that particular cadences be used at the end or in the middle of *clausulae*.[973] John encouraged its use as papal chancellor (1089-1118), then as Pope Gelasius II.[974]

This next stage in the development of the *ars* is often associated with Adalbert Samaritana, critic of Alberic and the first known *dictator* to be associated with Bologna.[975] Adalbert adopted for himself the title *dictator*: a new term which designated those whose profession was the teaching of the *ars*. He

[969] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 199-202.
[970] For a brief overview of the debate over who 'invented' the *ars dictaminis*, see L. Perelman, 'The Medieval Art of Letter-Writing: Rhetoric as Institutional Expression', *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*, ed. C. Bazerman and J. Paradis (Madison, Wisconsin 1991), 100. For Alberic, see F. Hartmann, 'Eloquence and Friendship. Letter-Writing Manuals and the Importance of Being Somebody's Friend', *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, c.1000-1200*, ed. S. Steckel, N. Gaul, M. Grübert (Berlin 2014), 71-5.
[971] C. H. Haskins, *Studies in Mediaeval Culture* (Oxford 1929), 173.
[972] L. J. Paetow, *The Arts Course at Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric* (Illinois 1910), 72.
[973] Camargo, *Ars dictaminis*, 25. There were three types of *cursus*: *romanae curiae*, the *planus*, *tardus*, and *velox*, see A. Boureau, 'The Letter-Writing Norm, a Mediaeval Invention', *Correspondence: Models of Letter-Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*, ed. R. Chartier, A. Boureau, and C. Dauphin, trans. C. Woodall (Cambridge 1997), 37.
[974] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 203.
[975] Haskins, *Mediaeval Culture*, 173.

wrote his *Praecepta dictaminum* between 1111 and 1118. Here he told readers that a true *dictator* must have knowledge of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic.[976] Alberic was followed by Hugh of Bologna, whose *Rationes dictandi prosaice* noted that in the *salutatio* a fitting adjective should be added for the recipient dependent upon their status.[977] This discussion of *salutationes* was to dominate much of the works of later *dictatores*.[978] Hugh was followed by the Anonymous of Bologna who composed his *Rationes dictandi c*.1135.[979] As a result, by *c*.1140 the basic doctrines of the *ars* were firmly established, with 'later changes being largely in emphasis rather than in substance'.[980]

William Patt has claimed that the *ars dictaminis* was not 'a localised product…but rather a cultural development which occurred more or less simultaneously in Italy, France, Germany, and perhaps other parts of Europe as well'.[981] Although the Italian treatises may have spread into France as early as the 1130s,[982] it has been suggested that early French letter-writers ignored the rules of the *ars*.[983] However, it was the French *dictatores* who had the greatest effect on the *ars* after its inception in Italy, and it was they who were responsible for the standard addition to dictaminal treatises of a section on the *cursus*.[984] By the end of the century there were a number of well-renowned centres of study for the *ars* in France including Paris, Orléans, and Chartres. As shown above, Paris gained a widespread reputation for learning, particularly amongst those seeking careers in royal or ecclesiastical administration.[985] It is unclear if the *ars dictaminis* was taught there as a distinct discipline, but students in Paris seem to have received training in letters.[986] The French *ars dictaminis*

[976] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 212-3.
[977] Ibid., 215-6.
[978] Many considered the structure of society and its relationship to the salutation of a letter, see Constable, 'Structure of Society', 253.
[979] Heathcote, 'Master Transmundus', 51-2. For the Anonymous, see *Three Rhetorical Arts* ed. Murphy, 4.
[980] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 213, and see W. D. Patt, 'The Early *Ars Dictaminis* as Response to a Changing Society', *Viator* 9 (1978), 146.
[981] Patt, '*Ars Dictaminis*', 139.
[982] One manuscript of the Italian *dictator* Adalbert of Samaritana's work from c.1130-50 contains a number of letters relating to Northern France, suggesting it might have been copied there by French scholars, Haskins, *Mediaeval Culture*, 176.
[983] Constable, *Letters*, 35; C. Vulliez, 'Un témoin de l' "*ars dictaminis*" français du XIIe siècle, le manuscript Additional 18382 de la British Library', *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* (1990), 228.
[984] Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis*, 34-5.
[985] See Chapter Two.
[986] Peter of Blois suggested so at least, though he is not necessarily the most reliable of sources, see J. J. Murphy, 'Quintilian's Influence on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing in the Middle Ages and Renaissance' reprinted *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. J. J. Murphy (Aldershot 2005), 173.

had its own distinct style compared to the Italian. It was more 'humanistic', with greater elaboration, multiple adjectives, and frequent quotations from classical authors.[987] This led to a 'syntactically complex' and 'highly embellished epistolary style'.[988] The development of the *ars* in England was rather slower, and the first *dictamen* of English provenance (the *Libellus de arte dictandi rhetorice* most often attributed to Peter of Blois) was composed no earlier than 1180. The 1180s have therefore been assumed to be the decade when the *ars dictaminis* reached England.[989] Though called the first 'English' treatise, by its own admission the *Libellus* relies on three sources, two of which were French and the other Italian.[990] The treatise was not popular and survives in full in just one manuscript. Instead, it was Peter's letter collection that became popular, and in general it seems that it was such model collections that garnered the most interest in twelfth-century England rather than the treatises which circulated more widely elsewhere.[991] Only from 1220s or so did the treatises became popular here, with many surviving copies of treatises by the French and Italian *dictatores* stocking English libraries.[992] The English *ars dictaminis* favoured the French style of the *ars*, rather than the Italian.[993]

Adapting the six parts of oral rhetoric as defined by Cicero, five parts of a letter were laid out according to the treatises.[994] These were the *salutatio* (opening address), *captatio benevolentiae* or *exordium* (the introduction, written to secure the reader's good will and prepare them for a message or request), *narratio* (the main part of the message which should be as brief as possible), *petitio* (the actual request), and the *conclusio* (a suitable ending, designed to stay in the reader's mind).[995] Some treatises dedicated great space to defining how the social status of correspondents should be acknowledged. The *salutatio* was heavily centred around social status, as the Anonymous of Bologna

[987] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 226; Hartmann, 'Eloquence', 83.
[988] Camargo, *Medieval Rhetorics*, 2.
[989] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 211-2 and ibid., 1.
[990] Camargo, *Medieval Rhetorics*, 43.
[991] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 239.
[992] For a survey of these, see E. J. Polak, *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters: A Census of Manuscripts Found in Part of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States of America* (Leiden 1994), 253-400.
[993] Camargo, *Medieval Rhetorics*, 2.
[994] The six parts of an oration were defined as the *exordio, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio or refutatio* and the *conclusio*, Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 10-15.
[995] N. Denholm-Young, '*Cursus* in England', *Collected Papers of N. Denholm-Young* (Cardiff 1969), 59 fn.1; Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis*, 22-3.

wrote: 'It is...necessary for us to be guided by the ranks of the persons involved.'[996] The *Libellus de arte dictandi rhetorice* attributed to Peter of Blois listed the different types of persons: the greatest (*summe*) such as the pope; the lofty (*sublimes*) such as kings, the middling (*mediocres*) such as deans, the private (*private*) such as clerics without rank, and the lowest (*infime*) such as those involved in 'civic work'.[997] The recipient's name should always appear first, unless the sender was a man of higher importance. The *exordium* was described by the Anonymous as 'a certain fit ordering of words effectively influencing the mind of the recipient'. There were a few ways a letter-writer could secure goodwill, through humility, praise, or an appeal to a shared emotion such as 'intimacy', 'affection' or 'lordship and service' etc.[998] When writing to an enemy or opponent the *exordium* should employ 'indirection and dissimulation', for if one referred to an opponent's 'disgraceful deeds' directly he might be provoked to hatred. In the same way, exposure of a correspondent's 'cowardice or debauchery' would lead to contention.[999] Goodwill should not be captured only by the *exordium*, wrote the author of the *Libellus*, but by every part of the letter.[1000] The *narratio* was 'the orderly account of the matter under discussion', and it was expected to be brief and plain.[1001] The Anonymous of Bologna wrote of nine types of *petitio*: 'supplicatory, or didactic, or menacing, or exhortative, or hortatory, or admonitory, or advisory, or reproving, or even merely direct.'[1002] The *conclusio* was used to imprint the letter on the recipient's mind. For example, the Anonymous wrote, a letter-writer might finish with a phrase such as 'If you do this, you will have the entirety of our fullest affection' or instead: 'if you fail to do this you will without doubt lose our friendship.' This section could be left out if superfluous.[1003]

As the *ars dictaminis* developed it became a welcome subject of study for those wishing to pursue a career in administration. It was strongly linked with the study of law, and served a need for growing

[996] The Anonymous of Bologna, 'The Principles of Letter-Writing', *Three Rhetorical Arts*, ed. Murphy, 8.
[997] [Peter of Blois] 'Libellus de arte dictandi rhetorice', *Medieval Rhetorics* ed. Camargo, 52.
[998] Anonymous, 'Principles', 55 where 'intimacy' or 'fellowship' or 'blood proximity' should be declared, 'Ab utraque simul quociens familiaritas siue societas siue sanguinis propinquitas declaratur'.
[999] Ibid., 17.
[1000] [Peter of Blois], 'Libellus', 55-6: 'Non solum autem in exordio captatur beneuolencia a persona mittentis vel recipientis, set etiam in qualibet epistolae particula'.
[1001] Anonymous, 'Principles', 18; [Peter of Blois], 'Libellus', 56.
[1002] Anonymous, 'Principles', 18.
[1003] Ibid., 19-20.

administrative systems desperate for skilled men.[1004] In the twelfth century, as well as being renowned for the study of law, Bologna became a famous centre of training in the *ars dictaminis*.[1005] However the official record of the *ars dictaminis* as a branch of study there does not begin until about 1200, suggesting teaching in the subject may not have been formalised until the end of the twelfth century.[1006]

As a student of the schools of Paris and Bologna, a bishop's clerk, and most importantly as a letter-writer, David would have known the rules of the *ars dictaminis*, so the aim here is to analyse his adherence to such rules. It is sensible to begin with the first part of a letter: the *salutatio* or greeting. When writing to Gilbert Foliot, as shown above, David sends a 'filial submission' (*Filialem...subiectionem*), the same *salutatio* used in a letter probably sent to another bishop.[1007] This is echoed in the *salutationes* of letters sent from Foliot to David, where David is his 'beloved son' (*dilectio filio suo*), 'dear son and most beloved friend' (*dilectio filio et amico suo karissimo*), or simply 'his beloved' (*dilectio suo*).[1008] Three times David writes of himself as '*minimus suorum*' ('the least of theirs'), once probably to Foliot, once perhaps to Archbishop Richard of Canterbury, and to the dean and chapter of London.[1009] Writing to Arnulf of Lisieux, he refers to himself as one of Arnulf's (faithful?) men (*suorum quidam*).[1010] Prior Odo is his 'dearest friend' (*amico karissimo*) in an evident change from the greetings afforded to bishops.[1011] The novice of Stanley was David's 'beloved in the Lord' (*Dilecto sibi in domino*), entirely fitting for a new monk.[1012] David's humility was sometimes further shown when he chose to send with his greeting 'a filial submission' as above;[1013] or three times when he is 'of modest usefulness' (*munus modicum*).[1014] It is hard to

[1004] G. Constable, 'Dictators and Diplomats in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Medieval Epistolography and the Birth of Modern Bureaucracy', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992), 37; Witt, '*Ars Dictaminis*', 4; Camargo, *Ars Dictaminis*, 32.
[1005] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 224.
[1006] Paetow, *Arts Course*, 74.
[1007] *LDL*, nos.7, 15.
[1008] Ibid., nos.31-2, 35.
[1009] Ibid., nos.14, 16, 21.
[1010] Ibid., no.18, and no.20 which may also be to Arnulf.
[1011] Ibid., no.22.
[1012] Ibid., no.28.
[1013] Ibid., nos.7, 15, 27.
[1014] Ibid., no.14.

generalise based on the few *salutationes* that survive, but it is clear that David did adhere to the rules of the *ars dictaminis* by always placing the addressee's name before his own in the *salutatio*. He took care to provide the necessary declarations of humility to bishops and properly described himself as small or modest. The *salutationes* are often extremely brief. It is difficult to say how much of this has survived through the editing process that preceded the manuscript's making, but even where the full *salutatio* appears to survive, such as in letter 21, it is short, and though David calls himself 'minimus' he does not labour the point with further flourish.[1015]

The next part of the letter was the *exordium*, intended to secure the reader's goodwill. David almost always included an *exordium* in his letters and it is often long, eloquent, and flowery. It also often blends into the *narratio*, so it is difficult to distinguish these two parts. In Letter 2, for example, the *exordium* runs to around one third of the letter's length and expresses David's great affection for his recipient, who was probably Gilbert Foliot:

> 'I rejoiced, because, to judge by your representation, you seemed to be happier than usual, calming my spirit...The works of piety double the joy which...you alone mercifully magnify in me and mine...my whole soul bursts forth in your grace...my filial affection for you has either stiffened nor grows stiff.'[1016]

It was only then that David launched into his *narratio*, describing his financial difficulties, before presenting his *petitio*, asking for a year's payments from his prebend. Just under one third of letter 14 is dedicated to the *exordium* where the recipient was promised:

> 'The omnipotent Lord shall repay you the deeds of piety, love, and grace, which at one time you magnified in me before all men...the Lord knew that if it were necessary

[1015] Ibid., no.21.
[1016] Ibid., no.2: 'Letus factus sum quia faciem vestram solito letiorem michi vestra presentauit imago, et animo meo me quietum reddidit...Geminant letitiam pietatis opera, que...solus misericorditer in meis magnificatis et me...Habet igitur anima mea unde tota vobis erumpat in gratiam...In diem hanc erga vos in me filialis nec torpuit nec torpet affectio.'

> in your allegiance, I would joyfully expose not only myself but my body to sudden dangers, if any such arise.'[1017]

Letter 27 presents a similar sentiment, where the recipient was reminded of their previous relationship with David and promised future rewards:

> 'In me you have multiplied the cultivation of such complete reverence and full favour, which whenever I am with you is increased day by day, so that may He who can (namely God your inspiration), repay you in kind. If it were within my power to respond as to an equal, he who proves himself the truest of men in good deeds should know that I would rather repay such favours in deed rather than word.'[1018]

In letter 15 the *exordium* is focussed on thanking the recipient for past favours:

> 'It remains close to my heart, and nor has forgetfulness ever wafted from my memory, that when I undertook that business of yours, you did me great honour and favour, for which I now beseech you, your devoted servant.'[1019]

David relies on the memory of this past assistance to secure aid, for he tells his recipient that this past favour has caused him more trouble than gain, bringing him 'more brawl than banquet'.[1020] The *exordium* of Letter 3 also takes up around one third of the letter, and focuses on gaining the recipient's sympathy, this time through a proverb:

> 'Amongst the various inconveniences attendant upon poverty, we read of one in particular: that the poor man is believed to pursue the prize and not the patron. Whence the rich are rarely accounted friends of the poor, either because in the pauper

[1017] Ibid., no.14: 'Retribuat vobis Dominus omnipotens opera pietatis, dileccionis et gratie, que quandoque pre omnibus hominibus magnificastis in me...Nouit Dominus quia si quandoque tempus accepero, non solum mea si qua fuerint vobis gratanter exponam, sed et corpus meum si neccesse fuerit in obsequium vestrum, periculis subitiam'.
[1018] Ibid., no.27: 'Illius itaque cultus totius venerationis et gratie pleni, quem dum aput vos eram de die in diem semper augmentando in me super me multiplicastis, gratam vobis vicem rependat qui potest et quem habuistis inspiratorem Deum...si quandoque tempus accepero, in agendis gratiarum actionibus opere pleniorem exhibiturus deuotionem'.
[1019] Ibid., no.15: 'A pectore meo non excidit nec unquam a mem(oria) m(ea) v(entilauit) o(bliuio) id plurimum honoris et gratie quod michi fecistis...id enim solum quod recolo condigna gratiarum actione compensare non sufficio'.
[1020] Ibid.: 'Res enim est que plus mihi rixe quam dapis attulit'.

> the rich man perceives one who covets not himself but his possessions, or because the pauper, being suspect, is reluctant to request the favour of the rich.'[1021]

David then offers a gentle rebuke, before returning to his attempts to flatter his recipient and secure their goodwill:

> 'I speak saving your reverence, but not even today would you have received them (i.e. these letters), had it not been for the token and favour of your regard, delivered in your own letters, that dispelled all suspicion and reluctance. I rejoice therefore, and am esteemed in my soul above others, that forgetfulness has not wafted me from your memory, but that you treasure me in your breast'.[1022]

He continues with a promise present in a number of the letters:

> 'Whatever I am, so, God willing, shall I be better in future, and wherever I may be, dragged by the fates to whatever place, I shall have arrived there with zeal, zealous for your honour, since I serve you with complete devotion, ready, whenever opportunity arises, to prove that devotion by deeds by which, and by which alone, I may with favour repay the favours done to me'.[1023]

It is only then the *petitio* is presented: 'One thing there is that I would wish by my pleading to persuade you, that you extend better assistance to the lord G. your kinsman and archdeacon'.'[1024] It is the same in Letter 4 which appears to begin with a proverb:

> 'It is an old established truth that he who strives in confidence speaks confidently, and he who hesitates inspires hesitation[1025]. As they say, love is not sincere where the scruples of doubt stir up the dregs of suspicion. From the time when your legation

[1021] Ibid., no.3: 'Inter cetera que circumueniunt egestatem incomoda, et hoc unum legitur...Unde rari diuites pauperum reperiuntur amici, dum vel diues a paupere non se sed sua queri coniectat, vel dum pauper quia suspitiosus diutem ad gratiam incurare formidat'.
[1022] Ibid.: 'Salua vestra reuerentia loquor, sed nec adhuc hodie suscepissetis, nisi q(uonia)m insigne vestre non indicium me litteris vestris et gratia preueniendo, hanc de medio suspitionem tulerisset et formidinem. Gaudeo itaque et est quod ab anima mea pre ceteris diligatur, quod a memoria vestra me non ventilauit obliuio.'.
[1023] Ibid.: 'futurus ero melius, ubi sim...zelo vestrum et ero ze(lans) ho(norem) vestrum, quoniam affectu toto vos diligo, et si quandoque tempus accepero dilectionis affectum opere probabo'.
[1024] Ibid.: 'Unum est de quo precibus meis vos exor(atum) cupio, quatenus domino G archidiacono consang(uineo) vestro'.
[1025] ?Unidentified.

> carried you to Rome, my pledge of sincere love has neither tired nor withered within me'.[1026]

This time the *exordium* takes up around two thirds of the letter before the *narratio* and *petitio* are presented. Letter 8 devotes over nine of its fifteen lines to the *exordium,* and letter 9 seems to be entirely *exordium,* with only two final vague sentences which are perhaps a veiled *petitio*. This suggests there may have been an accompanying oral message, for as the Anonymous of Bologna wrote, 'if the Narration is not used, the letter will not be whole.'[1027] Letter 10 devotes over seven of its twelve lines to securing the recipient's good will, and letter 11 over six lines of seventeen.[1028] There are just two exceptions amongst the shorter letters, without such lengthy *exordiae*. The first is letter 7, which only devotes just over three of nineteen lines to the *exordium* although the reason for this is given: 'so that I do not waste your time'.[1029] The second is letter 5, written as ever to an anonymous recipient, but one who is not Foliot, and who David has written to for aid and from whom he has received a positive response. The Anonymous of Bologna wrote that

> 'If the matter at hand is honourable, or if the auditor is known to be friendly, we should seek goodwill immediately and clearly; if it is not honourable, we should use indirection and dissimulation'.[1030]

It seems David has interpreted this to mean that where he was unsure of a positive reception, he should indulge in a lengthy and flowery *exordium*. This is the case with his letters to Foliot where they have entered into dispute and David is uncertain of the reception his letter will receive. In writing to the recipient of Letter 5 he is assured of a welcome reception because the recipient has indicated this previously. So, though David includes a brief nod to an *exordium* ('I rejoice because … your joys were made known to me'. This forms a part of the *narratio* rather than appearing as a separate part of the letter.[1031]

[1026] Ibid., no.4: 'Antiquum et vetus est fidenter loquor qui fidenter diligit, et qui hesitat hesitare facit. Sincera non est ut aiunt dilectio, ubi scrupulus dubietatis fecem generat suspicionis. A diebus illis quibus, te Romam misit leg(ati)o, sincere dilectionis quam feci promissio, nec ociosa nec sterilis inuenta est in me.'
[1027] Anonymous, 'Principles', 20.
[1028] *LDL*, nos.10, 11.
[1029] Ibid., no.7: 'Sed ne vos vestraque tempora morer'.
[1030] Anonymous, 'Principles', 17.
[1031] *LDL*, no.5: 'letus factum sum, quia vestra leta...michi'.

The same rule holds for letter 18, written to Arnulf of Lisieux as a response to letter 17 which had praised David, informing him that Arnulf has spoken to the king on his behalf, and indirectly calling him a friend.[1032] David responds with a lengthy *narratio*, containing musings on his own London background and his student days abroad. He hopes that Arnulf remembers the city of London, which 'misfortune of fate cast down in misery'.[1033] This was a response to a discussion regarding David's toponym.[1034] Later in the letter David finally presents the *petitio*, though it appears as a general hope for favour rather than a specific request:

> 'if that title from birth shall condemn me, blameless, to the displeasure of man, it is possible for your magnificence to unite a great many things to divine goodness...Indeed, I am confident in a great many things from your innate goodness, since the works of piety and grace which the nobleness both of your soul and splendid race began in me'.[1035]

Letter 18 ends with a lengthy *conclusio* which effectively doubles up as the *exordium*, reminding Arnulf that:

> 'that hospitable grace full of all reverence and obedience which you held from me...I say that the Lord will repay that grace to you with deserved repayment...I am sending a small gift to you, it is sent not so much from itself but from so great affection.'[1036]

There is no overt *exordium* here, instead it is once again spread throughout the *salutatio* and the main body of the letter. David could already be assured of good will from Arnulf.

The *exordium* is also passed over in Letter 12, where David begins with just one sentence of sympathy for his recipient:

[1032] *LDL*, nos.17-18.
[1033] Ibid., no.18: 'infilicitas fati precipitauit in miseriam'.
[1034] In ibid., no.17.
[1035] *LDL*, no.18: 'si me inmeritum a natiuitate titulus ad hominum dampnat offensam, potens est magnificentia vestra diuine bonitati quamplurimum cooperari...Et certe de vobis innata bonitate confido quamplurimum, quoniam opera pietatis et gratie que tam animi vestri quam generis nobilitas in me magnifice inchoauit'.
[1036] Ibid: 'hospitalem illam gratiam totius venerationis et obsequii qua me habuistis dum aput vos fui...illam inquam gratiam condigna vice rependat vobis Dominus...que vobis mitto munuscula, non tam ex se quam ex quanto mittuntur affectu'.

> 'Seriously ill to the point of despairing of any cure, I heard how the hand of the Lord had been raised against you, and my pain was doubled.'[1037]

The reason for foregoing the usual niceties soon becomes clear:

> 'Even so, I marvel that amidst such admittedly high anxieties, you should entirely have neglected me and mine. For you know that, after the Lord, I trust in you uniquely and specially before any other living soul.'[1038]

The omission of an *exordium* here is deliberate. The circumstances of the letter and David's perceived betrayal by his recipient have in this case overruled his usual tendency to dwell upon the *exordium*, and his faith in the recipient is included only as a way of emphasising his betrayal. It is curious that the *exordium* is glossed over here due to conflict, where it was not omitted in letters to Gilbert Foliot written in similar circumstances. The letter ends with a final damning sentence: 'I cannot remain quiet given how long I hoped for better things from you than you have so far delivered.'[1039] The difference here may be the recipient's status. Just as in his use of *amicitia*, and in his *salutationes*, David needed to consider his status relative to his recipients. Where Foliot was a bishop, and so letter writing conventions dictated that he must be accorded respect, letter 12 was not written to Foliot but to someone David believed should be providing him with financial support, possibly Nicholas, archdeacon of London, with whom, as shown, David may have entered into dispute. Just as he felt able to use the language of *amicitia* to a fellow canon, so he was able and willing to omit any form of *exordium* when writing to a near equal.

In letter 16, the *exordium* does not appear in its usual place. Here, David begins with his excuse for his delay in writing, and then passes straight on to the *narratio* and *petitio*. It is interesting that David avoids the usual attempts to secure goodwill at the start of the letter, because the letter concerns his disagreement over Doddington, and whoever he was writing to seems to have been one tasked with

[1037] Ibid., no.12: 'Egritudine gravi correptus et que desperata fuit quoad curam ab homine, audivi quoniam et aggrauata fuerit manus Domini super vos et geminatus est dolor meus.'
[1038] Ibid.: 'Miror tamen quod inter has vestras licet summas angustias, omnino me neglexeritis in meis. Scitis enim quoniam, statim post Dominum, unicam et singularem pre omni anima que vivit in carne, in vobis habuerim fidutiam.'
[1039] Ibid.: 'Silere non possum quoniam longe melius de gratia vestra speraui, quam hucusque mecum egeritis.'

settling matters.[1040] Instead, after the *petitio*, David informs his recipient: 'I will be held in reverence, mindful of that first generosity and grace which I found in your eyes'.[1041] The letter certainly has a less obsequious tone than others in the collection and we can perhaps see why, when David names his recipient as his advocate in another quarrel, possibly that he was experiencing with St Paul's.[1042] David could already trust then, that his recipient would aid him, for that recipient was already his advocate elsewhere, and as discussed above just as he omitted the *exordium* when he was sure of his recipients' goodwill, so could he choose to include a much shorter *exordium* when he was sure of a favourable reception. He does, though, choose to end with a memorable *conclusio*, where he reminds his recipient of the trust he was placing in him:

> 'I am trusting in you, that of my church you will provide more fully for yours and better than for me, which indeed is better for your honour than for my convenience. God forbid it is to be considered that his judgement should ever decide to my advantage, and the Roman pontiff should commit his judgement of all to grace.'[1043]

Though the *exordium* is omitted from letter 16, the *conclusio* has been adapted to serve a similar purpose, likely a reflection of the high status of the recipient.

The *exordium* is also omitted from letter 21 to the dean and chapter of St Paul's. This is curious because it is evident from the letter that David is in some trouble, and must begin with a lengthy rehearsal of excuses as to why he had not returned to London as requested. The letter conveys the sense that David was not prepared to grovel for forgiveness, though he does refer to himself as 'useless and insignificant'.[1044] Even the *conclusio* is brief. One explanation for this may lie in David's position at the time of writing. By his own report, it was written while he was away on the bishop's business and he may have considered that this effectively protected him from any backlash from the

[1040] See Chapter Two.
[1041] *LDL*, no.16: 'tenebor reuerentiam, memor illius prime liberalitatis et gratie quam in oculis vestris inueni'.
[1042] Ibid.: 'domini et aduocati mei'.
[1043] Ibid.: 'De vobis enim confido quod ecclesie mee immo magis vestre potius quam michi, quod honori meo immo magis vestro potius quam meo comodo, prospicietis. Absit enim arbitrari quod umquam ipsius arbitrium mecum inique decernat, cuius omne iuditium Romanus pontifex ad gratiam commendat.'
[1044] *LDL*, no.21 : 'inutilem et minimam'.

chapter. Therefore, he did not need to dwell upon praise and flattery. Perhaps it was this confidence (or arrogance?) which led to his problems with the chapter in the first place.

Letter 22 to Odo also seems to omit the *exordium*, though in the *salutatio* Odo is David's 'dearest friend' and David sends 'a greeting and spirit of great love'.[1045] The Anonymous of Bologna wrote that 'very often the largest part of the securing of goodwill is in the course of the *salutatio* itself'.[1046] Where the *salutatio* adequately secures goodwill, the Anonymous wrote, a letter-writer may proceed directly to the *narratio* or *petitio*, as David does here. David does nonetheless include a positive *conclusio:*

> 'For the hospitality and serenity of countenance that you have shown me, may the Lord repay you in kind, as I shall myself repay if ever I find the time'[1047]

Letter 23 contains only *narratio*. The reason for this is evident from the context: it is a 'secret' letter (in that the name of sender and recipient were purposefully hidden) purely designed to convey news; there was no time to waste on niceties. Letter 26 contains what appears to be a short *exordium* but rather than aiming to secure goodwill through flattery, it instead seems to be acting as a reminder of the recipient's responsibilities:

> 'If I have always had need of your undeserved help beyond what is customary, much or indeed the whole of my life depends upon you. Whence, if ever you were less than careful in my affairs, I have work for you in which you should not be found remiss'[1048]

The letter continues with a lengthy *narratio* and various orders for the recipient. It is in these orders that we find our explanation for the lack of lengthy or obsequious *exordium*: whoever David is writing to has responsibility for his archive. David feels comfortable in using imperatives or future verbs to

[1045] *LDL*, no.22: 'Domino suo et amico karissimo O(dono) Dei gratia priori Cant(uariensi) dictus magister D(avid) salutem and plurime dileccionis affectum'.
[1046] Anonymous, 'Principles', 17.
[1047] *LDL*, no.22 : 'De hospitalitatis gratia et vultus serenitate quam michi pretendistis, vicem vobis Dominus rependat rependam et ego'.
[1048] Ibid., no.26: 'Si semper vestro indigni auxilio, modo magis solito indigeo, multa enim immo tota portio vite mee pendet a vobis. Unde si quandoque in negotiis meis minus diligens extitistis, opus habeo ne modo remissus inueniamini.'

this recipient: 'Curate', 'addiscetis', 'retinebitis'.[1049] He does not need to dwell over a lengthy *exordium* because he is already confident his recipient will do as he asks.

As the above discussion demonstrates, though David spent little time dwelling on his *salutationes*, he did take care over the *exordiae* and in some cases went to great efforts to secure his recipients' goodwill, through flattery, through discussions of friendship or fidelity, or through the promise of future reward. The letters with the longest *exordiae* do not preserve their *salutationes* so the recipient cannot always be securely determined, but many of these can be shown to have been written to Gilbert Foliot. These lengthy *exordiae* may well be the result of editing: as the letters were copied into the collections the *exordiae* could have been lengthened. The *exordiae* are the floweriest sections of the letters and best show off David's linguistic prowess. They also include the most quotations or allusions. Usually, the letters with the longest *exordiae* are also the most personal, with loud laments over the 'betrayal' of David by anonymous enemies or, perhaps more importantly, by his recipients. For example, in letter 1 David promises he is faithful to his recipient and he will prove this through his actions, but also devotes great space to refuting any allegations against him, and asks 'what has your child done, my lord, to deserve such wrong from you'?[1050] In this case, the *exordium* is sometimes used both to secure the recipients' goodwill, to remind them of their former goodwill in contrast to their more recent actions, or to remind them of their responsibilities towards David. So in letter 3, in the middle of the *exordium*, the recipient is gently rebuked for not writing back. Yet, when writing to someone of lower status with whom he is in dispute, David is prepared to forego the *exordium*.

This difference in status becomes clearer when we consider the way David describes himself in the letters. In letter 1, likely sent to Foliot, he talks of his 'insignificance' (*Parvitas mea*); he is the recipient's child (*puer vester*); the recipient is his Lord; David talks of 'the eye of your piety...and the highness of your honour'.[1051] This humility accompanies a lengthier *exordium* as a technique to gain

[1049] *LDL*, no.26.
[1050] Ibid., no.1: 'In quo, quero, mi domine, puer vester de vobis tam male meruit, ut eum nota proditoris insigniretis et nomine?'
[1051] Ibid.: 'Videat igitur vestre pietatis oculus, et honoris vestri celsitudo decernat'.

the recipient's goodwill and secure the result that David hoped for. These longer and more flowery letters also represent a time when David was at his most vulnerable, with enemies at home at St Paul's, financial worries, and lack of support from his patron. Even were they edited after the fact, this memory must have spurred on his lengthier musings. This was a time he was most in need of aid and the *exordium* must have seemed of vital importance to help him get what he needed from those most able to provide it. Conversely, when he had been assured of his recipients' goodwill through prior dealings, David did not dwell upon a lengthy *exordium*.

David's letters show that he was fully aware of the conventions of the *ars dictaminis*, and he complied with its rules when he wanted to, through the use of proper *salutationes*, lengthy *exordiae*, or memorable *conclusiones*. However, he might also choose to ignore certain rules when it suited, by omitting *exordiae* or including as brief a *salutatio* as possible.

3. In the Style of St Bernard of Clairvaux

It was common for twelfth-century writers to model their letters on those of the greater letter-writers of the past. This included classical authors such as Cicero, as well as the Christian fathers, Augustine and Jerome. There were also more recent writers to imitate. Peter of Blois's model was Hildebert of Lavardin.[1052] There are 'echoes' of Hildebert's writing throughout Peter's collection: two instances have been identified where he uses phrases from Hildebert's letters, and Peter incorporated passages from Hildebert's other works in his sermons.[1053] Peter wrote that he was required to memorise certain of Hildebert's letters, so it is unsurprising that Hildebert became his model.[1054] For David, the writer to emulate was Bernard of Clairvaux, and this is signposted through marginal rubrics next to three letters in the collection. Bernard was one of the most prolific letter (and general) writers of the twelfth century, canonized in 1174, with his fame widespread throughout Western Christendom. Morey and Brooke called him the 'supreme master of the art of letter-writing in the twelfth century'.[1055] There were manuscript copies of his *De consideratione* in at least 24 English medieval libraries, and at least

[1052] Cotts, *Clerical Dilemma*, 73-82.
[1053] Ibid., 74.
[1054] Peter of Blois, ep. 101, *PL* 207, col.314.
[1055] Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 9.

21 had his *Sermones super Cantica canticorum*.[1056] Bernard's works were held in cathedrals and monasteries across Europe, though the majority of manuscripts were kept in France or northern Europe.[1057] Leclerq found 119 twelfth-century copies of Bernard's letters, either surviving in collections or in isolation.[1058] The collections were held in at least 13 different medieval libraries of Great Britain.[1059] The two main collections of his letters were first composed towards the end of Bernard's life, then revised after his death by his secretary, but even during his lifetime smaller collections were circulated.[1060] We should not wonder then that Bernard's letters were clearly accessible and of interest to a medieval letter-writer.

Bernard's writings were popular and influential. Indeed, he played an important role in the formation of the Orléanais style of the *ars dictaminis* which had its own characteristics, including regular use of parallelisms, antithesis, assonance, and alliteration.[1061] Within only a few years of his death Bernard's letters were in demand. In 1157, John of Salisbury asked Peter of Celle to send him Bernard's letters along with an anthology (*flores*) of the abbot's works. Peter immediately sent a copy of the letters for he had one in his possession, but he could not fulfil the second part of the request.[1062] It is no surprise that Nicholas of Clairvaux, Bernard's disgraced secretary who also wrote a large number of the abbot's letters, relied heavily on Bernard's work when composing his own letters. Excluding the Bible, it is Bernard who is cited most often in Nicholas's letters, and Bernard's influence also comes through in Nicholas' style.[1063]

Herbert of Bosham wrote a lengthy letter to Henry de Beaumont upon his elevation to the see of Bayeux which was modelled on Bernard's *De consideratione* and *Canticum canticorum*.[1064]

[1056] For these and copies of his other works, see *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books*, ed. N. Ker (2nd edn. London 1964).
[1057] Of the 1444 manuscripts he examined Leclerq was able to locate the provenance of 922, and he listed their distribution in J. Leclercq, 'Etudes', 22-8.
[1058] Ibid., 39.
[1059] Including: Leicester, Glastonbury, York St Mary's, St Augustines Canterbury, Christ Church Canterbury, St Martin's Dover, Peterborough, the Austin Friars of York, Glasgow cathedral, the Cistercians of Meaux and Rievaulx, *Medieval Libraries*, ed. Ker.
[1060] Leclercq, 'Lettres', 2.
[1061] Heathcote, 'Master Transmundus', 59.
[1062] *LJS*, nos.31-2.
[1063] *Collections of Nicholas*, ed. Wahlgren-Smith, xlvii.
[1064] Giles printed only a small part of the letter, see Barrau, 'Scholarship as a Weapon', 88-9.

Strikingly, just as in David's collection, this modelling was clearly signposted in the manuscript of Herbert's collection, with a rubric noting 'In this letter are gathered elements from the treatise of Bernard of Clairvaux, who wrote it at the request of Pope Eugenius'.[1065] Both David and Herbert were keen to acknowledge their model, which Julie Barrau has emphasised was unusual for writers of this time. For Herbert, Barrau suggested, the reason may be linked to his residency with the Cistercian brothers of Ourscamp.[1066] David's decision to imitate Bernard is more surprising. There is a distinct lack of biblical allusion and quotation in his letters, whilst Bernard's were brimming with biblical imagery. John of Salisbury wrote that Bernard was:

> 'So saturated in the Holy Scriptures that he could fully expound every subject in the words of the prophets and the apostles. For he had made their speech his own, and could hardly converse or preach or write a letter except in the language of scripture'[1067]

Writing in 1322, Robert of Basevorn declares of Bernard:

> 'He more than the rest stresses Scripture in all her sayings, so that scarcely one statement is his own which does not depend on an authority in the Bible or on a multitude of authorities'[1068]

Whilst David's own letters contain the odd biblical reference, these are far fewer in number. Furthermore, many of the letters in David's collection were written during or just after the time in which he was part of Foliot's household. Foliot spent his youth at Cluny where he became prior, before becoming prior of Abbeville and abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St Peter's Gloucester. He retained Cluniac links and on becoming bishop of London received a letter of congratulations from Abbot Hugh of Cluny, who wrote that Foliot's elevation to London 'is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes'.[1069] Bernard's own collections are littered with letters detailing the rivalry

[1065] Discussed and translated in ibid., 93.
[1066] Ibid., 93.
[1067] Trans. in C. Monagle, 'John of Salisbury and the Writing of History', *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014), 225.
[1068] Robert of Basevorn, 'The Form of Preaching', trans. L. Krul *Three Rhetorical Arts*, ed. Murphy, 131.
[1069] *MTB*, v, no.20, trans. Morey and Brooke, *Foliot*, 3.

between the Cluniacs and his own order, the Cistercians.[1070] Bernard is then perhaps an unlikely choice for emulation in letters written to Foliot. It is possible that David had his own Cistercian connection, for as we have seen he wrote to a novice of Cistercian Stanley, though the letter suggests his connection was with the individual rather than the community.[1071] He can also be linked to the Augustinians, as he acted on behalf of Augustinian Guisborough and may have retired to Augustinian Merton. There may be some link to the Cluniacs as he provided aid to the Cluniac monks of Lewes.[1072] None of these links is sufficient to prove firm adherence to any particular order, though perhaps letter 28 points to some deeper affinity with Stanley for which there is no further evidence. On balance, David's decision to mirror Bernard is more likely a result of Bernard's literary prowess rather than any great affiliation with the Cistercians. The same was true for Arnulf of Lisieux, who Frank Barlow suggested may have considered himself as another Bernard to Alexander III's Pope Eugenius, pointing to one letter in particular to the Pope which contains allusions to the *De consideratione.*[1073]

According to a marginal rubric, letter 1 is 'In the style and words of Bernard of Clairvaux'.[1074] One of the first allusions comes around halfway through, at first seeming rather frivolous. After promises to Foliot that he has not betrayed him, David writes that 'I await a more appropriate time for explanations, should, God willing, an occasion arise in future better grasped in speech than in writing'.[1075] Similar phrasing is used in two of Bernard's letters. One, to Eskil, archbishop of Lund, and the other to Geoffrey, abbot of St Médard of Soissons. Eskil and Bernard were great admirers of one another, and Eskil harboured a desire to enter Clairvaux. Though Bernard's letter was a positive one, and not written at a time of crisis as was David's, some of the sentiments in Bernard's letter must have resonated. Because of the love he has for Eskil, wrote Bernard:

[1070] See for example Bernard's letter to his nephew, Robert, who had been promised to Cluny by his parents but later joined the Cistercians. Robert then experienced some doubts as to whether he should in fact be at Cluny. *Bernard Epistolae* i, no.1.
[1071] *LDL*, no.28.
[1072] See ibid., no.90.
[1073] *Letters Arnulf*, xl and *LDL*, no.35, trans. *LCA*, no.1.25.
[1074] *LDL*, no.1: 'Stilus Beati B. Clareuallensis et verba'.
[1075] Ibid.: 'aptiore tempore pandenda reseruo, si quandoque, auctore Domino, futurus sit efficacior sermo viuus quam scriptus, et acceptior lingua quam littera'.

> 'Your troubles are...my own...Whatever provokes you touches me and wrings my heart, and whatever oppresses you weighs on me too. I believe I owe you and you owe me all the favour and affection that absent friends can bestow on one another'[1076]

Writing at a time of crisis, David surely hoped Foliot might write back with a similar sentiment. 'I am undaunted but not untruthful', wrote Bernard:

> 'It is your condescension that makes me bold. How, but for this, could I ever dare to presume so much? How otherwise, could a small person like myself ever dare to hope for so much from a great man like you?'[1077]

David might have had a better response had he alluded to this, but he must have trusted that readers would understand the reference. Then we come to the section to which David did allude, where Bernard must excuse his absence:

> 'Would that I had the power from on high to say all this to you and not write it, so that I might open my heart to you by word of mouth rather than by the written word. Certainly the living word is more welcome than the written word, and the tongue more eloquent than the pen; for the eyes of the speaker lend credence to his words, and the expression of the face conveys affection better than the pen. But, being absent from you...I must satisfy myself with the second best alternative of a letter'[1078]

Bernard reuses this theme in his letter to Abbot Geoffrey of St Médard. Here, he asks Geoffrey to pass on a letter to the Abbot of Anchin who is angry with him:

> 'I could have better appeased his anger by word of mouth than by letter for, in matters like this, the living word is better than the written word and the tongue than the pen. The pen cannot so well express a meaning as the expression of the face; the look in the eyes attests the sincerity of the speaker'.[1079]

[1076] *Bernard Epistolae*, no.390; trans. *LSB*, no.424.
[1077] Ibid.; trans. ibid.
[1078] Ibid; trans. ibid.
[1079] Ibid., no.66; trans. ibid., no.69.

It is perhaps this letter David was thinking of when he wrote his own. It is clear from Letter 1 that he believed Foliot was angry with him. David promised he had not acted against him, and begged Foliot not to listen to the 'idle talk of evil men or the lies of the wicked'.[1080] Here, David believed he could better appease Foliot if he was able to see him in person, just as Bernard believed he could appease the Abbot of Anchin if he could meet him directly.

Letter 2 is accompanied by a rubric alluding to Bernard: 'This is the sermon in the image of man, in the same style and words'.[1081] In this letter, David quotes from one sent from Hildebert of Lavardin to Bernard, where Hildebert requests Bernard's friendship:

> 'I believe that most people are aware that balsam is known by its smell and a tree by its fruit. In just the same way, dearest brother, by your reputation I know that your life is holy and your doctrine is pure.'[1082]

David quotes from this letter in the *exordium* to Letter 2:

> 'I was made happy, because your image presented your face to me as happier than usual...The works of piety doubled in joy which, as I hear, you alone mercifully extolled in me and for me, and they produced for me a great sign of your restored love and grace. For we are accustomed to know the balsam from its smell, and the tree from its fruit.'[1083]

Bernard's reply must be the sort of response David hoped he himself might receive: 'Your letter was so much to your own credit as well as to mine that I was most happy to receive it'.[1084]

Letter 13 was also modelled on Bernard, and contains the most extensive quotation from his works. Unlike Letters 1-2 it also contains references to the *De consideratione* and is full of biblical echoes. The *De consideratione* was the most copied and edited of Bernard's works during the Middle Ages.

[1080] *LDL*, no.1: 'vos exoratum cupio, ne malorum hominum rumusculis et iniquorum fraudibus'.
[1081] Ibid., no.2: 'Imago hominis sermo est eiusdem stilus et verba'.
[1082] *Bernard Epistolae,* no.169; trans. *LSB*, 185.
[1083] *LDL*, no.2: 'Letus factus sum quia faciem vestram solito letiorem michi vestra presentauit imago...Geminant letitiam pietatis opera, que ut audio solus misericorditer in meis magnificatis et me, que redintegrate vestre dilectionis et gratie, michi plurimum pariunt indicium. Nam ex odore balsamum, et ex fructu arborem dinoscere solemus.'
[1084] *Bernard Epistolae,* no.123; trans. *LSB*, no.126.

Leclerq found at least sixty twelfth-century copies of it.[1085] The treatise began as a letter written to Eugenius III, but turned into something else as it presented Bernard's theories on papal power.[1086] David's Letter 13 was written to an anonymous member of Foliot's household, possibly a treasurer of St Paul's. The letter focuses on David's troubles with Foliot, where he seeks to explain his actions by placing the blame squarely on others:

> 'the fault was not mine. I feel no guilt: I will not blanch in opposing any man who was heard speaking around my lord of this before me.'[1087]

David also quoted from other of Bernard's letters which concern conflict, including a letter to Innocent II discussing the scandals of Abelard and Arnold of Brescia, Abelard's pupil. The passage mirrored in David's letter is one where Bernard asserts that he had not wished to enter into a public debate with Abelard, but:

> 'Unwillingly and sorrowfully, I bowed to the advice of my friends, who saw how everyone was preparing as if for a show, and feared that my absence would serve only to increase the influence of the man and the scandal of the people, also it seemed that his errors might appear to be confirmed if there were no one to answer and refute them.'[1088]

For David, it was not a heretic he must battle but rather members of his own household.[1089]

David echoes another of Bernard's sentiments, included in a letter to the Curia after the election of Eugenius III, former monk of Clairvaux, who Bernard writes of as having been torn from his life as a 'rustic' and plunged into the heady world of the papacy: '[I]t must be your concern, dearest friends, to help and comfort with your fervent support what is clearly the work of your hands.'[1090] David refers to

---

[1085] Leclercq, 'Etudes', 38.
[1086] For further discussion, see C. R. Evans, *Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford 2000), 152-4.
[1087] *LDL*, no.13: 'Nichil ad me quoad culpam...Nichil michi conscio nec culpa pallebo ad cuiusquam hominum obiectum ex his que me coram, circa dominum meum loquentem audierit'.
[1088] *Bernard Epistolae*, no.189; trans. *LSB*, no.239.
[1089] *LDL*, no.13: 'But what is more ugly than to wage war with those whom you lived as a household. No scandal should be made among the people and claws should not grow from an enemy on account of our confusion' ['At quid turpius quam bellum gerere cum quibus familiariter vixeris? Ne ergo scandalum fieret in populo et de confusione nostra cornua crescerent aduersario'].
[1090] *Bernard Epistolae*, no.237; trans. *LSB*, no.315.

himself as just such a man, though in the third person to preserve a modicum of humility: 'Amongst his [presumably Foliot's] men, there is one to cherish anxiously with burning zeal, who is fixed in all by his hands.'[1091] Does David see himself as another Eugenius here? Plucked from obscurity and placed into the most important of roles, so in dire need of support? Bernard's letter to his nephew Robert is referred to, as David excuses his own actions through Bernard's words: 'To fly persecution implies no fault in him who flees but in him who persecutes.'[1092] As a child, Robert had been promised to Cluny by his parents, but as an older teenager had joined the Cistercians instead and taken vows as a Cistercian monk. Robert was later reminded of his parents' vow by the prior of Cluny, and he left Clairvaux for Cluny. David uses his letter to promise he is not excusing himself from any wrongdoing, but also not recalling wrongs: 'I am not removing blame, I am not refusing charges, I am not recalling injuries.'[1093] Another of Bernard's harsher letters is alluded to, this one to John, abbot of the Cistercian Abbey of Buzay, who left Buzay for solitude. 'I cannot say with how great a bitterness of soul and sadness of heart I write to you, dearest John' begins Bernard, before lamenting that despite writing to John twice already his words have had no effect. He encourages John to return to Buzay for he has been deceived by 'a lying spirit in the mouths of false prophets', and David believes Foliot has been tripped up in a similar way.[1094] Further allusions to Bernard's letters and the *De consideratione* are used to emphasise the cunning and trickery of those who have deceived Foliot, and to advise him not to believe too readily.[1095] The latter reference to Bernard's words comes from a section of the *De consideratione* where Bernard is advising the Pope not to believe too easily, for this leads to great men becoming angry and delivering premature judgements against the innocent.[1096] Overall, David uses Bernard's words indirectly to criticise Foliot for too easily believing those who have spoken against him. By sharing his views through Bernard's words, David can write

[1091] *LDL*, no.13: 'Sua interest feruentibus studiis sollicite fouere, quod totum suis manibus constat elaboratum'.
[1092] Ibid.: 'Fugere persecutionem persequentis culpa est, non fugientis.', cf. *Bernard Epistolae*, no.1.
[1093] Ibid.: 'Non discutio culpas, non retracto calumpnias, non recordor iniurias', trans. *LSB*, no.1.
[1094] *Bernard Epistolae*, no.233, trans. *LSB*, no.312; cf. *LDL*, no.13: 'Ad cor igitur dominum meum redire iubete, et ut sibimet indignetur quod spiritus mendax in ore pseudoprophetarum supplantauit eum'.
[1095] *LDL*, no.13: 'et illius callide vulpecule que vineam suam florentem demolitur, de cetero doctus sit cauere versutias, facilitas credulitas, h(ec) est ut aiunt, cuius fere si foret immunis inter eos qui vestris in partibus cathedras ascenderunt, solus et singularis communi resideret iudicio.'; Cf. *Bernard Epistolae*, no.248, trans. *LSB*, no.324, and Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*, Liber ii Caput xiv.
[1096] Bernard of Clairvaux, *De consideratione*, Liber ii Caput xiv.

in stronger terms than he might were he writing with his own. Just as Barlow suggested that Arnulf of Lisieux was covertly portraying himself as a new Bernard, to Alexander III's Eugenius, so David appears to be doing the same, sometimes with himself as Bernard and Foliot as Eugenius, but also the other way round when it suited.

The opening of David's collection with two letters that emulate Bernard's writings seems also to be a nod to the two letters which opened various versions of Bernard's collection. The first of these was written to Bernard's nephew, Robert, discussed above. The second was written to Fulk, later archdeacon of Langres, who had been professed as an Augustinian canon but was later persuaded to leave the canons and return to the world. As Wim Verbaal has highlighted, the theme of the two letters is 'the accordance of word and deed', i.e. that one must keep vows once made, and this theme continues throughout Bernard's collection.[1097] This theme is overtly present in David's letters also. David begins Letter 1 by exploring what he owes his correspondent: 'In that same culture of respect and full favour by which you retained me, albeit as the trifle that I was to you, God will repay you in kind'. But, David offers:

> 'I myself am of such insignificance that I cannot repay as to an equal. I do merely what I now can, which is to say that if ever I find opportunity to do that which I now desire and recollect with feeling, I shall the more freely compensate you with deeds'.[1098]

David emphasises in letter 2 that his recipient's efforts on his behalf have restored his faith.[1099] In letter 10 he laments that he has not been able adequately to respond to the vow of love and obedience he had made and promises that when he can, he will compensate through deeds.[1100] Throughout his

[1097] Verbaal, 'Voicing your Voice', 119-20.
[1098] *LDL*, no.1: 'Illius cultus venerationis et gratie pleni quo me tenuistis exiguum...Paruitatis mee non est quod pari quam rependere vice. Ago quod nunc possum, si quandoque tempus accepero, quod nunc desiderans et affectibus recolo, factis libentius compensabo.'
[1099] Ibid., no.2: 'The works of piety double the joy which, as I hear, you alone mercifully magnify in me and mine, offering clear proof of the restoration of your love and favour.' ['Geminant letitiam pietatis opera, que ut audio solus misericorditer in meis magnificatis et me, que redintegrate vestre dilectionis et gratie, michi pluriumum pariunt indicium.']
[1100] Ibid., no.10: 'Were I able to respond as I would like to the benefits that you showered on me with open hand, and to the favour I found with you, without doubt you would obtain sure proof of the greatest gratitude, and fullness of delight and obedience...I stand willing and grateful to do that I can in deeds of grace'. ['Dileccionis et obsequii plenitudinem, si beneficiis que quandoque larga manu contulistis in me, et gratie quam coram vobis inueni pro voto possem respondere, proculdubio plurimum gratitudinis certum a me sumeretis experimentum...si quandoque tempus accepero...factis libentius compensabo.']

letters David emphasises his vows of obedience and fidelity, usually to Gilbert Foliot, and promises to prove his gratitude in future through deeds, expecting his recipients to likewise prove themselves to him.

Bernard of Clairvaux was a prolific and widely admired letter-writer, respected even during his lifetime, and emulated by letter-writers writing just decades after his death. As far as the evidence allows, David's decision to mirror Bernard's writing was based on this alone. In doing so, he could not only borrow favoured words and phrases from Bernard in an attempt to further develop his own high writing style, but he could also emulate Bernard's relationship with his correspondents.

Conclusion

This thesis has sought to re-evaluate the letter collection of Master David of London, with the intention of providing an insight into the letter-writing and collecting practices of a twelfth century cleric. It has been shown that based on the palaeography, codicology, and contents of the letter collection, David's collection was compiled by David himself, using both his own archive and the archive of Bishop Gilbert Foliot of London. An analysis of the manuscript containing the collection has shown that there are clear signs that each section contained within was originally separate, but there are suggestions that they were joined at an early date. Knowing this is David's letter collection, and not just a collection of his letters, allows a new approach to the contents. That is to say, it suggests that the letters with no clear connection to David, for example the Edward the Confessor dossier, may well provide an insight into one stage of his career - in this case his role at St Paul's with regard to St Erkenwald. Such 'miscellaneous' letters should therefore not be discarded or considered as separate to the rest of the collection as has previously been supposed. Only when the collection is considered in its entirety and in its original order can David's intentions in compiling it be made clear.

Through his letters, David displayed his knowledge of the *ars dictaminis*, his ability to write in complex and elaborate Latin, and his emulation of Bernard of Clairvaux, a well-respected letter writer. Through his collection, David demonstrated his knowledge of the law (both civilian and canon), his skill in diplomacy, and his intimacy with the unwritten but pivotal conventions of the papal curia. He took care to highlight the many positive reviews and recommendations he had received from a variety of individuals: everyone from the Pope to the 'humble' convent of St Pancras. He surely sought to restore his reputation in the aftermath of Gilbert Foliot's accusations against him, portrayed here as the ungrateful and unfounded accusations of a former patron, one beloved by David, who should have been his greatest defender. Certainly we are no closer to uncovering the truth of the affair, and it is suspicious that David provides no proper detail of the charges laid against him. Yet, if he hoped his collection would leave a more positive image of his life and career, it is clear that he succeeded.

It is hoped that that the new edition of David's collection provided here will offer the opportunity for further study. Future research should consider in greater detail the links between David's collection and that of Gilbert Foliot, uncovering further evidence of record-keeping practices at London. Further investigation might also seek to gain greater insight into David's legal training, and his use of the law(s). Further research might also confirm him as the glossator 'D' found at Bologna in the 1180s.

Overall this thesis has demonstrated that there was more to say about David's collection than either Brooke or his successors have allowed, but that this is only possible as a result of the new edition and translation of the collection found in Appendix One. There other collections much like this, as well as smaller dossiers, with letters anonymised and without *salutationes*, sometimes containing letters even more repetitive than David's. Often these have been considered to be exemplar collections, designed to accompany guides to the *ars dictaminis* or to supply models for twelfth-century letter-writers. Yet, assumptions such as these must be questioned. Such collections also deserve further study, and by considering the context of their creation and compilation they will one day have much more to offer their modern scholarly audience.

Bibliography

Manuscripts

Brussels, Royal Library, MS 3723

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 295

Cambridge, Trinity College, MS R. 9. 17

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Plutei 14.18

London, Lambeth Palace, MS Lambeth 136

London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius B ii

London, British Library, MS Royal 8.A.xxi

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 937

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Cave E Musaeo 249

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 287

Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson Q.f. 8

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vaticana Latina 15369

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vaticana Latina 6024

Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Sala.Cons. Rosso 36 (1)

Unpublished Materials

Barnaby, J. *A Church for Becket? The Canterbury Dispute and the Canterbury Letters 1183-1200* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of East Anglia, 2019)

Burton, J. *The Origins and Development of the Religious Orders in Yorkshire c1069 to c1200* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York, 1977)

Hirata, Y. *John of Salisbury and his Correspondents: A Study of the Epistolary Relationships Between John of Salisbury and his Correspondents* 3 vols. (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1991)

Karn, N. *Monastic Letter Collections of the Twelfth Century in England* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford, 2002)

Levy, R. *The Cartulary of Little Dunmow Priory* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Virginia, 1971)

McLoughlin, J. *John of Salisbury (c.1120-1180): The Career and Attitudes of a Schoolman in Church Politics* (Unpublished PhD thesis, Trinity College Dublin, 1988)

Rathbone, E. *The Influence of Bishops and of Members of Cathedral Bodies in the Intellectual Life of England, 1066-1216* (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1935)

Primary Sources

Acta Pontificum Romanorum Inedita 3 vols, ed. J. Pflugk-Harttung (Tubingen, Stuttgart 1881-6)

Adam Marsh, *The Letters of Adam Marsh* i, ed. C. H. Lawrence (Oxford 2006)

Aelred of Rievaulx, *The Life of Saint Edward, King and Confessor, by Blessed Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx*, trans. J. Bertram (Guildford 1990)

Alain de Lille (?): Lettres Familières (1167-1170), ed. F. Hudry (Paris 2003)

Alan of Tewkesbury, *Alan of Tewkesbury and his Letters*, ed. M. Harris (Montserrat 1976)

The Anonymous of Bologna, 'The Principles of Letter-Writing', trans. *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*, ed. J. J. Murphy (London 1971)

Anselm of Canterbury, *Letters of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury* i, ed. S. Niskanen (Oxford 2019)

S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia iv, ed. F. Schmitt (Boston 1938)

Arnulf of Lisieux, *The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux*, trans. C. Poling Schriber (New York 1997)

The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, ed. F. Barlow (London 1939)

Augustine, *De bono coniugali and De sancta virginitate*, ed. P. G. Walsh (Oxford 2001)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. B. Scott James (Spencer, MA 1953)

S. Bernardi Opera 7 vols, ed. J. Leclercq and H. Rochais, trans. M. Duchet-Suchaux and H. Rochais (Paris 1997-2012)

The Book of Fees: Commonly Called Testa De Nevill i, ed. H. C. Maxwell Lyte (London 1920)

The Book of St Gilbert, ed. R. Foreville and G. Keir (Oxford 1987)

Boso, *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, trans. G. M. Ellis (Oxford 1973)

Cafari Annales et Continuatorum Annales Ianuae a.1099-1294, ed. G. H. Pertz (Hannover 1863)

Calender of Papal Register Relating to Great Britain and Ireland: Volume 1, 1198-1304, ed. W. H. Bliss (London 1893)

Cartulaire de Sauxillanges, ed. H. Doniol (Clermont-Ferrand and Paris 1864)

Cartulaire général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers 4 vols, ed. J. Delaville Le Roulx (Paris 1894-1906)

Cartularium monasterii sancti Johannis Baptiste de Colecestria 2 vols, ed. S. A Moore (London 1897)

Cartularium prioratus de Gyseburne, Ebor. Dioceseos, Ordinis S. Augustini, Fundati A. D. MCXIX 2 vols, ed. W. Brown (Durham 1889-94)

The Cartulary of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in England 2 vols, ed. M. Gervers (Oxford, 1982, 1996)

Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral, ed. W. Capes (Hereford 1908)

Chartes et Documents de L'Église de Clermont Antérieurs Au XIIe Siècle, ed. E. Grélois and M. Saudan (Paris 2015)

Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis i, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain (Paris 1889)

The Chartulary of the Priory of St Pancras of Lewes ii, ed. L. F. Salzman (Lewes 1934)

Chronicon Abbatiae de Evesham, ed. W. Dunn Macray (London: Rolls Series, 1863)

Cicero, *De Senectute, De Amicitia, De Divinatione*, trans. W. A. Falconer (London 1922)

De Officiis, ed. W. Miller (London 1928)

On Duties, ed. M. T. Griffin and E. M. Atkins (Cambridge 1991)

Codex Udalrici i, ed. K. Nass (Wiesbaden 2017)

Collectio Reinheresbrunnensis, ed. F. Peeck, (Munich 1978)

The Correspondence of Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury 1162-1170 2 vols, ed. A. Duggan (Oxford 2000)

Councils and Synods: With Other Documents Relating to The English Church i pt.ii, ed. D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C. N. L. Brooke (Oxford 1981)

Das Briefbuch abt Wibalds von Stablo und Corvey i, ed. M. Hartmann, following work by H. Zatschek and T. Reuter (Hannover 2012)

Das Brief-und Memorialbuch des Albert Behaim, ed. T. Frenz and P. Herde (Munich 2000)

Die Admonter Briefsammlung, ed. G. Hödl and P. Classen (Munich 1983)

Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts, ed. H. Plechl (Hannover 2002)

The Domesday of St Paul's of the Year M.CC.XXII, ed. W. Hale (London 1868)

Early Charters of the Cathedral Church of St Paul, London, ed. M. Gibbs (Camden 3rd series, London 1939)

Early Yorkshire Charters xi, ed. C. T. Clay, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series (Wakefield 1963),

English Episcopal Acta i: Lincoln 1067-1185, ed. D. M. Smith (Oxford 1980)

English Episcopal Acta ii: Canterbury 1162-1190, ed. C. R. Cheney and B. E. A. Jones (Oxford 1986)

English Episcopal Acta iii: Canterbury 1193-1205, ed. C. R. Cheney and E. John (Oxford 1986)

English Episcopal Acta iv: Lincoln 1186-1206, ed. D. M. Smith (Oxford 1986)

English Episcopal Acta v: York 1070-1154, ed. J. E. Burton (Oxford 1988)

English Episcopal Acta vi: Norwich 1070-1214, ed. C. Harper-Bill (Norwich 1990)

English Episcopal Acta vii: Hereford 1079-1234, ed. J. Barrow (Oxford 1993)

English Episcopal Acta xi: Exeter 1046-1184, ed. F. Barlow (Oxford 1996)

English Episcopal Acta xii: Exeter 1186-1257, ed. F. Barlow (Oxford 1996)

English Episcopal Acta xv: London 1076-1187, ed. F. Neininger (Oxford 1999)

English Episcopal Acta xviii: Salisbury 1078-1217, ed. B. R. Kemp (Oxford 1999)

English Episcopal Acta xx: York 1154-1181, ed. M. Lovatt (Oxford 2000)

Episcopal Acta xxiv: Durham 1153-1195, ed. M. G. Snape (Oxford 2002)

English Episcopal Acta xxv: Durham 1196-1237, ed. M. G. Snape (Oxford 2002)

English Episcopal Acta xxvi: London 1189-1228, ed. D. P. Johnson (Oxford 2003)

English Episcopal Acta xxvii: York 1189-1212, ed. M Lovatt (Oxford 2004)

English Episcopal Acta xxxi: Ely 1109-1197, ed. N. Karn (Oxford 2005)

English Episcopal Acta xxxiii: Worcester 1062-1185, ed. M. Cheney, D. Smith, C. Brooke, and P. Hoskin (Oxford 2007)

English Episcopal Acta xxxiv: Worcester 1186-1218, ed. M. G. Cheney, D. Smith, C. Brooke, and P. Hoskin (Oxford 2008)

Epistolae Cantuariensis in *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I* ii, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1865)

Études sur quelques manuscrits de Rome et de Paris, ed. A. Luchaire, (Paris 1899)

Facsimiles of Royal and Other Charters in the British Museum, ed. G. F. Warner and H. J. Ellis (London 1903)

Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1066-1300 11 vols, ed. D. E. Greenway *et al*. (London 1968-2011)

Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae 1300-1541: Volume 5, St Paul's London, ed. J. M. Horn (London 1963)

The First Register of Norwich Cathedral Priory Norfolk Record Society xi, ed. H. W. Saunders (Norwich 1939)

Fulbert of Chartres, *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. F. Behrends (Oxford 1976)

Gerald of Wales, *De principis instructione: Instruction for a Ruler*, ed. R. Bartlett (Oxford 2018)

Giraldi Cambrensis Opera iii and viii, ed. J. S. Brewer (London 1863, 1877)

The Autobiography of Giraldus Cambrensis, ed. H. E. Butler (London 1937)

Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera Historica* in *The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury* i, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1879)

Gilbert Foliot, *Gilberti ex Abbate Glocestriae Episcopi Primum Herefordiensis Deinde Londoniensis Epistolae* 2 vols, ed. J. A. Giles (London 1845)

The Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot, Abbot of Gloucester (1139-48), Bishop of Hereford (1148-63), and London (1163-87), ed. A. Morey and C. N. L. Brooke (Cambridge 1967)

Hildegard of Bingen, *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen* i, trans. J. L. Baird and R. K. Erhman (Oxford 1994)

Histoire généalogique de la maison d'Auvergne ii, ed. E. Baluze (Paris 1708)

Horace, *Epistles Book I*, ed. O. A. W. Dilke, (revised end. London 1961)

Ivo of Chartres, *Yves de Chartres: Correspondence*, ed. J. Leclercq (Paris 1949)

John Flete, *The History of Westminster Abbey*, ed. J. Armitage Robinson (Cambridge 1909)

John of Salisbury, *The Metalogicon of John of Salisbury*, trans. D. D. McGarry (Berkeley and LA 1955)

The Letters of John of Salisbury, i. The Early Letters, ed. W. J. Millor and H.E. Butler (Oxford, revised edn. 1986)

The Letters of John of Salisbury, ii. The Later Letters (1163-1180), ed. W. J. Millor and C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford 1979)

Lanfranc, *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson (Oxford 1979)

The Life of King Edward Who Rests at Westminster, ed. F. Barlow (2nd edn. Oxford 1992)

The Lives of Thomas Becket, ed. M. Staunton (Manchester 2001)

Martin of Braga, *Martini Episcopi Bracarensis Opera Omnia*, ed. C. W. Barlow (New Haven 1950)

Materials for the History of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury 7 vols, ed. J.C. Robertson and J.B. Sheppard (Rolls Series, London 1875-85)

Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books, ed. N. Ker (2nd edn. London 1964).

Nicholas of Clairvaux, *The Letter Collections of Nicholas of Clairvaux*, ed. L. Walhgren-Smith (Oxford 2018)

Osbert of Clare, *The Letters of Osbert of Clare Prior of Westminster*, ed. E. W. Williamson (London 1929)

The Owl and the Nightingale. Cleanness. St Erkenwald, trans. B. Stone (Harmondsworth 1971)

The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, ed. E. Knowles (5th edition, Oxford 1999)

Papal Decretals Relating to the Diocese of Lincoln in the Twelfth Century, ed. W. Holtzmann and E. Kemp (Hereford 1954),

Papsturkunden in England 3 vols, ed. W. Holtzmann (Berlin 1930-52)

Patrologia cursus completus. Series Latina, ed. J. P. Migne, 217 vols (Paris 1844-55)

Peter of Celle, *The Letters of Peter of Celle*, ed. J. Haseldine (Oxford 2001)

Peter the Venerable, *The Letters of Peter the Venerable* 2 vols, ed. G. Constable (Cambridge, MA 1967)

Peter the Venerable Selected Letters, ed. J. Martin in collaboration with G. Constable (Toronto 1974)

Peter of Blois, *The Later Letters of Peter of Blois*, ed. E. Revell (Oxford 1993)

[attributed to Peter of Blois] 'Libellus de arte dictandi rhetorice', *Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition: Five English* Artes Dictandi *and Their Tradition*, ed. M. Camargo (Binghampton 1995)

Pipe Rolls, various vols. for Henry II and Richard I listed by monarch/exchequer year and published in London by the Pipe Roll Society

Ralph Diceto, 'Ymagines Historiarum', *The Historical Works of Master Ralph de Diceto, Dean of London* 2 vols, ed. W. Stubbs (New edn., Cambridge 2012)

Regesta Anglo-Normannorum iii, ed. H. A. Cronne, and R. H. C. Davis (Oxford 1968)

Regesta Pontificum Romanorum Ab Condita Ecclesia: Ad Annum Post Christum Natum MCXCVIII t.II, ed. P. Jaffé, W. Wattenbach, S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald (2nd edition, Leipzig 1888)

Regestrum Statutorum et Consuetudinum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Sancti Pauli Londoniensis, ed. W. Sparrow Simpson (London 1873)

The Register of Pope Gregory VII 1073-1085, trans. H. E. J. Cowdry (Oxford 2002)

Richard FitzNigel, *Dialogus de Scaccario: The Dialogue of the Exchequer*, trans. E. Amt and S. D. Church (Oxford 2007)

Richard of Cirencester, *Speculum Historiale De Gestis Regum Angliae* ii, ed. J. E. B. Mayor (London 1869)

Robert of Basevorn, 'The Form of Preaching', trans. *Three Medieval Rhetorical Arts*, ed. J. J. Murphy (London 1971)

Robert Grosseteste, *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, trans. F. A. C. Mantello and J. Goering (Toronto 2010)

Robert of Torigny, 'The Chronicles of Robert de Monte', *The Church Historians of England* iv pt.ii, trans. J. Stevenson (London 1856)

Roger of Howden, *The Annals of Roger de Hovedon* i, trans. H. T. Riley (London 1853)

(incorrectly attributed to Benedict of Peterborough) *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis* i, ed. W. Stubbs (London 1867)

Rotuli de Dominabus et Pueris et Puellis de XII Comitatibus, ed. J. H. Round (London 1913)

The Saint of London: The Life and Miracles of St. Erkenwald, ed. E. G. Whatley (Binghamton 1989)

Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, ed. W. Stubbs (Oxford 1870)

Stephen of Tournai, *Die Summa über das Decretum Gratiani*, ed. J. F. von Schulte (1891)

Lettres D'Étienne de Tournai, ed. J. Desilve (Paris 1893)

Simon of Tournai, *Les Disputationes de Simon de Tournai*, ed. J. Warichez (Louvain 1932)

Taxatio ecclesiastica Angliae et Walliae auctoritate P. Nicholai IV. Circa A.D. 1291, ed. T. Astle, S. Avscough, and J. Caley (London 1802)

Terence, *The Woman of Andros. The Self-tormentor. The Eunich*, ed. J. Barsby (Cambridge, MA 2001)

Thomas saga erkibyskups ii, ed. E. Magnùsson (RS, London 1883)

The Thurgarton Cartulary, ed. T. Foulds (Stamford 1994)

Twelfth-Century English Archidiaconal and Vice-Archidiaconal Acta, ed. B. R. Kemp (Woodbridge 2001)

Westminster Abbey Charters 1066-c.1214, ed. E. Mason, J. Bray, and D. J. Murphy (London 1988)

William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea* i, trans. E. Atwater Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York 1943)

William of Malmesbury, *The Deeds of the Bishops of England (Gesta Pontificum Anglorum)*, trans. D. Priest (Woodbridge 2002)

Gesta Regum Anglorum i, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford 1998)

The Vita Wulfstani of William of Malmesbury, ed. R. Darlington (London 1928)

Secondary Sources

Baggs, A. P., Keeling, S. M. and Meekings, C. A. F. 'Parishes: Fowlmere', *A History of the County of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely: Volume 8*, ed. A. P. M. Wright (London 1982)

Bainton, H. 'Literate Sociability and Historical Writing in Later Twelfth-Century England', *Anglo Norman Studies 34*, ed. D. Bates (Woodbridge 2012)

'Epistolary Documents in High-Medieval History Writing', *Interfaces: A Journal of Medieval European Literature* (2017)

Baldwin, J. W. '*Studium et regnum*: The Penetration of University Personnel into French and English Administration at the Turn of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Revue des études islamiques* 44 (1976)

'Masters at Paris from 1179 to 1215', *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. R. L. Benson and G. Constable (Oxford 1982)

Barlow, F. 'The English, Norman, and French Councils Called to Deal with the Papal Schism of 1159', *EHR* (1936)

Thomas Becket and his Clerks (Canterbury 1987)

'John of Salisbury and His Brothers', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 46 (January 1995), 95-109

Edward the Confessor (2nd edn. Yale 1997)

Thomas Becket (Berkeley 1986, 2nd ed. London 2000)

Barraclough, G. 'The Making of a Bishop in the Middle Ages: The Part of the Pope in Law and Fact', *The Catholic Historical Review* (1933)

Barrau, J. 'Gilbert Foliot et l'Ecriture, un exegete esn politique', *Anglo-Norman Studies 27*, ed. J. Gillingham (Woodbridge 2005)

'John of Salisbury as Ecclesiastical Administrator', *A Companion to John of Salisbury*, ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014)

'Scholarship as a Weapon: Herbert of Bosham's Letter Collection', *Herbert of Bosham: A Medieval Polymath*, ed. M. Staunton (Woodbridge 2019)

Barrow, J. 'Cathedrals, Provosts and Prebends: a Comparison of Twelfth-Century German and English Practice', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 37 (1986)

‘Origins and Careers of Cathedral Canons in Twelfth-Century England’, *Medieval Prosopography* 21 (2000)

‘The Clergy in the Diocese of Hereford in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries’, *Anglo-Norman Studies 26,* ed. J. Gillingham (Woodbridge 2004)

‘Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, *c.*900-*c.*1200’, *Anglo-Norman Studies 30,* ed. C. P. Lewis (Woodbridge 2008)

‘Way-Stations on English Episcopal Itineraries, 700-1300’, *EHR* 127 (2012)

Bartlett, R. *Why Can the Dead do Such Great Things? Saints and Worshippers from the Martyrs to the Reformation* (Princeton 2013)

Beach, A. I. ‘Voices From a Distant Land: Fragments of a Twelfth-Century Nuns’ Letter Collection’, *Speculum* 77 (2002)

Billot-Vilandrau, C. ‘Charlemagne and the Young Prince: A Didactic Poem on the Cardinal Virtues by Giles of Paris (C.1200)’, *Virtue and Ethics in the Twelfth Century,* ed. I. P. Bejczy and R. G. Newhauser (Leiden 2005),

Binski, P. *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven 1995)

Birkett, H. ‘The Struggle for Sanctity: St Waltheof of Melrose, Cistercian in-house Cults and Canonisation Procedure at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century’, *The Cult of Saints and the Virgin Mary in Medieval Scotland,* ed. S. Boardman and E. Williamson (Woodbridge 2010)

Bloch, M. ‘La Vie de S. Édouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare’, *Analecta Bollandiana,* 41 (1923)

Blumenthal, U. ‘Papal Registers in the Twelfth Century’, *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Medieval Canon Law,* ed. P. Linehan (Vatican City 1988)

Bollerman, K. and Nederman, C. J. ‘The “Sunset Years”: John of Salisbury as Bishop of Chartres and the Emergent Cult of St. Thomas Becket in France’, *Viator* 45 (2014)

‘John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket’, *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014)

Boureau, A. ‘The Letter-Writing Norm, a Mediaeval Invention’, *Correspondence: Models of Letter-Writing from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century,* ed. R. Chartier, A. Boureau, and C. Dauphin, trans. C. Woodall (Cambridge 1997)

Bozoky, E. ‘The Sanctity and Canonization of Edward the Confessor’, *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend* (Woodbridge 2009)

Brundage, J. ‘The Teaching and Study of Canon Law in the Law Schools’, *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234,* ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington DC 2008)

Burton, J. and Kerr, J. *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge 2011)

Brooke Z. N. and Brooke C. N. L. ‘Hereford Cathedral Dignitaries in the Twelfth Century’, *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 8 (1944)

‘Hereford Cathedral Dignitaries in the Twelfth Century- Supplement’, *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 8 (1946)

Brooke, C. N. L. 'The Composition of the Chapter of St Paul's, 1086-1163', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 10 (1951)

'The Deans of St Paul's, *c*.1090-1499', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 24 (1956)

'The Earliest Times to 1485', *A History of St Paul's Cathedral and the Men Associated With It*, ed. W. R. Matthews and W. M. Atkins (London 1957)

(Assisted by G. Keir) *London 800-1216: The Shaping of a City* (London 1975)

'John of Salisbury and his World', *Studies in Church History, Subsidia* 3, ed. M. Wilks (Oxford 1984)

Brooke, Z. N. 'The Register of Master David of London and the Part He Played in the Becket Crisis', *Essays in History Presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. H. W. C. Davis (Oxford 1927)

'The Effect of Becket's Murder on Papal Authority in England', *The Cambridge Historical Journal* 2 (1928)

The English Church and the Papacy: From the Conquest to the Reign of John (Cambridge 1989)

Brundage, J. 'Legal Learning and the Professionalization of Canon Law', *Law and Learning in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Second Carlsberg Academy Conference on Medieval Legal History 2005*, ed. H. Vogt and M. Münster-Swendsen (Copenhagen 2006)

Caiazzo, I. 'Teaching the *Quadrivium* in the Twelfth-Century Schools', *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools*, ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019)

Camargo, M. 'The English Manuscripts of Bernard of Meung's *Flores dictaminum*', *Viator* 12 (1981)

'The *Libellus de arte dictanti rhetorice* Attributed to Peter of Blois', *Speculum* 59 (January 1984)

'Toward a Comprehensive Art of Written Discourse: Geoffrey of Vinsauf and the *Ars Dictaminis*', *Rhetorica* 6 (1988)

Ars Dictaminis, Ars Dictandi (Turnhout 1991)

'A Twelfth-Century Treatise on '*Dictamen*' and Metaphor', *Traditio* 47 (1992)

Medieval Rhetorics of Prose Composition: Five English Artes Dictandi *and Their Tradition* (Binghampton 1995)

'Defining Medieval Rhetoric', *Rhetoric and Renewal in the Latin West 1100-1540: Essays in Honour of John O. Ward*, ed. C. J. Mews, C. J. Nederman, and R. M. Thomson (Turnhout 2003)

Chaplais, P. *English Diplomatic Practice in the Middle Ages* (London 2003)

Cheney, C. R. *English Bishop's Chanceries 1100-1250* (Manchester 1950)

From Becket to Langton: English Church Government 1170-1213 (Manchester 1956)

Cheney, M. 'The Compromise of Avranches of 1172 and the Spread of Canon Law in England', *EHR* 56 (April 1941)

‘Gervase, Abbot of Prémontré: A Medieval Letter-Writer’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 33 (1950)

‘Pope Alexander III and Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179: The Exchange of Ideas’, *Monumenta Iuris Canonici* Series C 5 (Vatican City 1976)

‘William FitzStephen and his Life of Archbishop Thomas’, *Church and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to C. R. Cheney on his 70th Birthday*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke, D. E. Luscombe, G. H. Martin, and D. Owen (Cambridge 1976)

Roger, Bishop of Worcester 1164-1179 (Oxford 1980)

Clanchy, M. T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (3rd edn. Chichester 2013)

Cohn, E. S. ‘The Manuscript Evidence for the Letters of Peter of Blois’, *EHR* 41 (1926)

Colk, T. ‘Twelfth-Century East Anglian Canons: A Monastic Life?’, *Medieval East Anglia*, ed. C. Harper-Bill (Woodbridge 2017)

Constable, G. *Letters and Letter-Collections* (Turnhout 1976)

‘The Structure of Medieval Society According to the *Dictatores* of the Twelfth Century’, *Law, Church, And Society: Essays in Honour of Stephan Kuttner*, ed. K. Pennington and R. Somerville (University of Pennsylvania 1977)

‘Dictators and Diplomats in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Medieval Epistolography and the Birth of Modern Bureaucracy’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46 (1992)

‘Monks and Clerks in Search of the *Beata Schola*: Peter of Celle’s Warning to John of Salisbury Reconsidered’, *Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe 1000-1200*, ed. S. N. Vaughn and J. Rubenstein (Turnhout 2006)

Cotton, H. M. ‘The Role of Cicero’s Letters of Recommendation: “Iustitia versus Gratia?”’, *Hermes* 114 (1986)

‘Greek and Latin Epistolary Formulae: Some Light on Cicero’s Letter Writing’, *The American Journal of Philology* 105 (1984)

Cotts, J. ‘Peter of Blois and the Problem of the “Court” in the Late Twelfth Century’, *Anglo-Norman Studies* 27 (Woodbridge 2004)

The Clerical Dilemma: Peter of Blois and Literate Culture in the Twelfth Century (Washington DC 2009)

Cox Russell, J. ‘The Canonization of Opposition to the King in Angevin England’, *Anniversary Essays in Mediaeval History*, ed. C. Taylor (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1929)

Crook, B. M. ‘General History of Lewes Priory in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries’, *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 81 (1940)

Crosby, E. U. *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the* Mensa Episcopalis (Cambridge 1994)

The King’s Bishops: The Politics of Patronage in England and Normandy, 1066-1216 (New York 2013)

Croydon, F. E. ‘Abbot Laurence of Westminster and Hugh of St Victor’, *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 2, ed. R. Hunt and R. Klibanksy (London 1950)

D'Aiuto, F. and Vian, P. *Guida Ai Fondi Manoscritti Numismatica, A Stampa Della Biblioteca Vaticana (Studi e Testi 466) I: Dipartimento Manoscritti* (Vatican City 2011)

De Gussem, J. 'Bernard of Clairvaux and Nicholas of Montiéramey', *Speculum* 92 (2017)

Delhaye, P. 'L'Organisation Scolaire au XIIe Siècle', *Traditio* 5 (1947)

Delisle, M. L. 'Les Écoles d'Orléans, au douzième et au treizième siècle', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* 7 (1869)

Denholm-Young, N. '*Cursus* in England', *Collected Papers of N. Denholm-Young* (Cardiff 1969)

Dieudonné, A. *Hildebert de Lavardin, évêque du Mans, archevêque de Tours (1056-1133): Sa vie. Ses lettres* (Paris 1898)

Dronke, P. 'Mediaeval Rhetoric', *Literature and Western Civilization* ii, ed. D. Daiches and A. Thorlby (London 1973)

Duffy, E. 'St Erkenwald: London's Cathedral Saint and His Legend', *The Medieval English Cathedral: Papers in Honour of Pamela Tudor-Craig*, ed. J. Backhouse (Donington 2003)

Dugdale, W. *The History of St Paul's Cathedral in London, from its Foundation until these Times* (London 1658)

Duggan, A. *Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters* (Oxford 1980)

'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', *The World of John of Salisbury, Studies in Church History, Subsidia* 3, ed. M. Wilks (Oxford 1984)

'Diplomacy, Status, and Conscience: Henry II's Penance for Becket's Murder', *Forschungen zur Reichs-, Papst- und Landesgeschichte. Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht* i, ed. K. Borchardt and E. Bünz (Stuttgart 1998)

Thomas Becket (London 2004)

'Thomas Becket's Italian Network', *Pope, Church and City: Essays in Honour of Brenda M. Bolton*, ed. F. Andrews, C. Egger and C. M. Rousseau (Leiden 2004)

'Authorship and authenticity in the Becket correspondence', *Vom Nutzen des Edierens. Akten des internationalen Kongresses zum 150-jährigen Bestehen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung (Vienna, 3-5 June 2004)*, ed. B. Merta, A. Sommerlechner and H. Weigl (Vienna/Munich 2005)

'The Price of Loyalty: The Fate of Thomas Becket's Learned Household', *Thomas Becket: Friends, Networks, Texts and Cult* (Aldershot 2007)

'Henry II, the English Church and the Papacy, 1154-76', *Henry II: New Interpretations*, ed. C. Harper-Bill and N. Vincent (Woodbridge 2007)

'Law and Practice in Episcopal and Abbatial Election before 1215: with special reference to England', *Élections et pouvoirs politiques du VIIe au XVIIe siècle* (Paris 2008)

'*Alexander ille meus:* The Papacy of Alexander III', *Pope Alexander III (1159-81): The Art of Survival*, ed. P. Clarke and A. J. Duggan (Farnham 2012)

'Becket is Dead! Long Live St Thomas', *The Cult of St Thomas Becket in the Plantagenet World, c.1170-c.1220* (Woodbridge 2017)

'Master Herbert: Becket's *eruditus*, Envoy, Adviser, and Ghost-Writer?', *Herbert of Bosham: A Medieval Polymath*, ed. M. Staunton (Woodbridge 2019)

Duggan, A. and Duggan, C. 'Ralph de Diceto, Henry II and Becket', *Authority and Power: Studies on Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. B. Tierney and P. Linehan (Cambridge 1980)

Duggan, C. 'The Becket Dispute and the Criminous Clerks', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 35 (1962)

Twelfth-century Decretal Collections and their Importance in English History (London 1963)

'The Reception of Canon Law in England in the Later-Twelfth Century', *Monumenta Iuris Canonici* Series C i (Vatican City 1965)

'Bishop John and Archdeacon Richard of Poitiers. Their Roles in the Becket Dispute and its Aftermath', *Thomas Becket: Actes du Colloque International De Sédières 19-24 Août 1973*, ed. R. Foreville (Paris 1975)

Edbury, P. and J. G. Rowe, *William of Tyre: Historian of the Latin East* (Cambridge 1988)

Edwards, K. *The English Secular Cathedrals in the Middle Ages* (Manchester 1967)

Evans, C.R. *Bernard of Clairvaux* (Oxford 2000)

Eyton, R. W. *Court, Household and Itinerary of Henry II* (London 1878)

Faith, R. 'Estates and Income, 1066-1540', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004)

Ferruolo, S. C. *The Origins of the University: The Schools of Paris and Their Critics, 1100-1215* (Stanford 1985)

'*Parisius-Paradisus*: The City, Its Schools, and the Origins of the University of Paris', *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*, ed. T. Bender (Oxford 1988)

Fredborg, K. M. 'The Scholastic Teaching of Rhetoric in the Middle Ages', *Cahiers de l'Institut du Moyen-Âge Grec et Latin* 55 (1987)

Frova, C. 'Le scuole municipali all'epoca delle università', *Vocabulaire des écoles et des méthodes d'enseignement au moyen âge: Actes du colloque Rome 21-22 octobre 1989*, ed. O. Weijers (Turnhout 1992)

Foreville, R. 'Canterbury et la canonisation des saints au XIIe siècle', *Tradition and Change: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Chibnall*, ed. D. Greenway, C. Holdsworth, and J. Sayers (Cambridge 1985)

Gabriel, A. L. *Garlandia: Studies in the History of the Mediaeval University* (Notre Dame, Indiana 1969)

Post, G., *The Papacy and the Rise of the Universities*, ed. William J. Courtenay (Leiden 2017)

Gervers, M. 'A History of the Cartulary of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England (British Museum Cotton ms, Nero E vi)', *Scriptorium* 28 (1974)

Gibson, R. 'Letters into Auto-Biography: The Generic Mobility of the Ancient Letter Collection', *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature*, ed. T. Papanghelis, S. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (Berlin 2012)

Gillingham, J. 'Royal Newsletters, Forgeries and English Historians: Some Links Between Court and History in the Reign of Richard I', *La cour Plantagenêt (1154-1204). Actes du Colloque tenu à Thouars du 30 abril au 2 mai 1999,* ed. M. Aurell (Poitiers 2000)

Giordano, S. *Le Istruzioni Generali di Paolo V: Ai Diplomatica Pontifici 1605-1621* (Tübingen 2003)

Giraud, C. and Mews, C. 'John of Salisbury and the Schools of the 12th Century', *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014)

Gonod, B. *Chronologie des évêques de Clermont et des principaux événemens de l'histoire ecclésiastique de l'Auvergne* (Clermont-Ferrand 1833)

Goubier, F. and Rosier-Catach, I. 'The *Trivium* in the 12th Century', *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools,* ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019)

Gransden, A. *Historical Writing in England: c.550 to c.1307* (London 1974)

Gray, J. W. 'The *Ius Praesentandi* in England from the Constitutions of Clarendon to Bracton', *EHR* 67 (October 1952)

Grévin, B. *Rhétorique du Pouvoir Médiéval: Les Lettres de Pierre de la Vigne et la Formation du Langage Politique Européen (XIIIe-XV2 Siècle)* (Rome 2008)

'L'*Ars Dictaminis* Entre Enseignement et Pratique (Xiie-XIVe Siécle)', *Revue de Synthèse* 133 (June 2012)

Greenaway, D. 'The Succession to Ralph de Diceto, Dean of St Paul's', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 39 (1966)

'Historical Writing at St Paul's', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004,* ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004)

Grévin, B. 'From Letters to *Dictamina* and Back: Recycling Texts and Textual Collections in Late Medieval Europe (Thirteenth-Fourteenth Centuries)', *Medieval Letters- Between Fiction and Document,* ed. C. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout 2015)

Grigoli, L. 'A Cistercian Copy of Eadmer's "Life of Anselm" (BHL 0526) from Northern England and the Canonization of Anselm of Canterbury by Thomas Becket', *St Anselm Journal* 10 (2015)

Grünbert, M. ' "Tis love that has warm'd us." Reconstructing Networks in 12th Century Byzantium', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 83 (2005)

Gullick, M. 'A Twelfth-Century Manuscript of the Letters of Thomas Becket', *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 2, ed. P. Beal and J. Griffiths (Oxford 1990)

Hanrahan, J. 'Cathedral Schools: The Institutional Development of Twelfth-Century Education', *The Canadian Historical Association: Report of the Annual Meeting* 43 (1964)

Harper-Bill, C. 'Bishop William Turbe and the diocese of Norwich, 1146-74', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 7, ed. R. A. Brown (Woodbridge 1984)

Haskins, C. H. 'The Life of Medieval Students as Illustrated by their Letters', *The American Historical Review* 3 (1898)

Studies in Mediaeval Culture (Oxford 1929)

Heathcote, S. J. 'Master Transmundus, Papal Notary and Monk of Clairvaux in the Twelfth Century', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 21 (1965)

Hallam, E. and Everard, J. *Capetian France 987-1328* (2nd edn. Harlow 2001)

Häring, N. M. 'Hilary of Orleans and His Letter Collection', *Studi Medievali* serie terza 14 (1973)

Hartmann, F. 'Eloquence and Friendship: Letter-Writing Manuals and the Importance of Being Somebody's Friend', *Networks of Learning: Perspectives on Scholars in Byzantine East and Latin West, c.1000-1200,* ed. S. Steckel, N. Gaul, and M. Grünbert (Berlin 2014)

Haseldine, J. 'Friendship and Rivalry: The Role of Amicitia in Twelfth-Century Monastic Relations', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 44 (1993)

'Understanding the Language of *amicitia*. The Friendship Circle of Peter of Celle (c.1115-1183)', *Journal of Medieval History* 20 (1994)

'The Creation of a Literary Memorial: The Letter Collection of Peter of Celle', *Sacris Erudiri* 37 (1997)

'Love, Separation and Male Friendship: Words and Actions in Saint Anselm's Letters to his Friends', *Masculinity in Medieval Europe,* ed. D. M. Hadley (Harlow 1999)

'Thomas Becket: Martyr, Saint- and Friend?', *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting,* ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford 2001)

'Friends, Friendship and Networks in the Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux', *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses* 57 (2006)

'The Monastic Culture of Friendship', *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism,* ed. J. G. Clark (Woodbridge 2007)

'Monastic Friendship in Theory and in Action in the Twelfth Century', *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse,* ed. A. Classen and M. Sandidge (Berlin 2010)

'Friends or *amici*? *Amicitia* and monastic letter-writing in the twelfth century', *Varieties of Friendship: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Social Relationships,* ed. B. Descharmes, E. Heuser, C. Krüger, T. Loy (Göttingen 2011)

'Friendship, Intimacy and Corporate Networking in the Twelfth Century: The Politics of Friendship in the Letters of Peter the Venerable', *EHR* 126 (2011)

'Affectionate Terms of Address in Twelfth-Century Latin Epistolography: A Comparative Study of the Letters of Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter the Venerable, and Peter of Celle', *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 23 (2013)

'Friendship Networks in Medieval Europe: New Models of a Political Relationship', *Amity: The Journal of Friendship Studies* 1 (2013)

Haskins, C. H. 'Henry II as a Patron of Literature', *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Thomas Frederick Tout,* ed. A. G. Little and F. M. Powicke (Manchester 1925)

Heales, A. *The Records of Merton Priory* (London 1898)

Hearn, M. F. 'Canterbury Cathedral and the Cult of Becket', *The Art Bulletin* 76 (March 1994)

Helmholz, R. H. *The Profession of Ecclesiastical Lawyers: An Historical Introduction* (Cambridge 2019)

Hirata, Y. 'John of Salisbury and Thomas Becket', *Medieval History* 2 (1992)

'St Anselm and Two Clerks of Thomas Becket', *Anselm: Aosta, Bec and Canterbury*, ed. D. Luscombe and G Evans (Sheffield 1996)

Collected Papers on John of Salisbury and his Correspondents (Tokyo 1996)

'John of Salisbury, Gerard Pucelle and *Amicitia*', *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Haseldine (Stroud 1999)

Holdsworth, C. 'The Reception of St Bernard in England', *Bernhard von Clairvaux: Rezeption und Wirkung im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit*, ed. K. Elm (Wiesbaden 1994)

Holmes U. T. 'The Idea of a Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *Speculum* 26 (1951)

Holopainen, T. ' "Lanfranc of Bec" and Berengar of Tours', *Anglo-Norman Studies 34* (2012)

Holtzmann, W. *Studies in the Collections of Twelfth-Century Decretals: From the Papers of the Late Walther Holtzmann*, ed. C. R Cheney and M. G. Cheney (Vatican City 1979)

Hudson, J. 'Administration, Family and Perceptions of the Past in Late Twelfth-Century England: Richard FitzNigel and the Dialogue of the Exchequer', *The Perception of the Past in Twelfth-Century Europe*, ed. P. Magdalino (London 1992)

Hunt, R. W. 'English Learning in the Late Twelfth Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 19 (December 1936)

'The Preface to the *Speculum ecclesiae* of Giraldus Cambrensis', *Viator* 8 (1977)

Jaeger, C. S. *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (University of Pennsylvania 1994)

'Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century "Renaissance"', *Speculum* 78 (2003)

'Irony and Subtext in Latin Letters of the Eleventh and Twelfth Century', *Medieval Letters-Between Fiction and Document*, ed. C. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout 2015)

Jenkins, J. 'St Thomas Becket and Medieval London', *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* (2020)

Keats-Rohan, K. S. B. 'John of Salisbury and Education in Twelfth Century Paris from the Account of his *Metalogicon*', *Histories of Universities* 6 (1987)

Keene, D. 'From Conquest to Capital: St Paul's *c.*1100-1300', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004)

Kemp, E. W. 'Pope Alexander III and the Canonization of Saints: The Alexander Prize Essay', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 27 (1945)

Canonization and Authority in the Western Church (Oxford 1948)

Ker, N. R. ed. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain: A List of Surviving Books* (2nd edn. London 1964)

Kidson, P. 'Gervase, Becket, and William of Sens', *Speculum* 68 (October 1993)

Knowles, D. *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket* (Cambridge 1951)

The Monastic Order in England (2nd edn. Cambridge 1963)

Thomas Becket (Cambridge 1973)

Knowles, M. D. Duggan, A. J. and Brooke C. N. L. 'Henry II's Supplement to the Constitutions of Clarendon', *EHR* 87 (October 1972)

Knowles, D. Brooke, C. N. L. and London, V. ed. *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, I. 940-1216* (Cambridge 2001)

Kouamé, T. 'The Institutional Organisation of the Schools', *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools,* ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019)

Kuttner, S. and Rathbone, E. 'Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century: An Introductory Study', *Traditio* 7 (1949-51)

Kuttner, S. *Repertorium der Kanonistik: (1140-1234)* (Vatican City 1937)

'La Réserve papale du droit de canonisation', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 4th series 17 (1938)

'Bernardus Compostellanus Antiquus: A Study in the Glossators of the Law', *Traditio* 1 (1943)

Landau, P. 'The Development of Law', *The New Cambridge Medieval History IV: c.1024-c.1198 Pt.I* (Cambridge 2004)

Lanham, C. D. *Salutatio Formulas in Latin Letters to 1200: Syntax, Style, and Theory* (Munich 1975)

Lawrence, C. H. 'The Letters of Adam Marsh and the Franciscan School at Oxford', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 42 (1991)

Leach, A. F. 'St Paul's School Before Colet', *Archaeologia* 62 (1910)

Leclercq, J. 'La collection des lettres d'Yves de Chartres', *Revue Benedictine* 56 (1945-1946)

'Etudes sur S. Bernard et le texte de ses écrits', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 9 (1953)

'Lettres de S. Bernard: histoire ou littérature?', *Studi Medievali* serie terza 12 (1971)

Lesne, E. *Les Écoles de la fin du VIIe siècle a la fin du XIIe* (Lille 1940)

Leyser, K. 'Frederick Barbarossa, Henry II and the Hand of St James', *EHR* 90 (1975)

Liebermann, F. 'The Annals of Lewes Priory', *EHR* 17 (1902)

Liverani, F. *Il Papato, l'Impere e il Regno d'Italia* (Florence 1861)

Lohrmann, D. 'Ein Ingenieurtraktat des frühen 15. Jahrhunderts aus der Bibliothek des Lelio Ruini, Bischof von Bagnoregio (1613-21)', *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 80 (2000)

Luscombe, D. review of Hudry's *Alain de Lille (?): Lettres familières* in *Medium Aevum* 75 (2006)

Major, K. 'The "Familia" of Archbishop Stephen Langton', *EHR* 48 (October 1933)

Martin, J. 'Uses of Tradition: Gellius, Petronius, and John of Salisbury', *Viator* 10 (1979)

Martin, R. H. 'A Twelfth-Century Manuscript of Cicero's De Officiis', *The Classical Quarterly* New Series 1 (1951)

Marritt, S. ' "All this I say against the rage of archdeacons against my poor fellow citizens": Archdeacons' Authority and Identity in Twelfth-Century England', *History: The Journal of the Historical Association* 102 (2017)

Mason, E. *Westminster Abbey and Its People c.1050-c.1216* (Woodbridge 1996)

Matthew, D. J. A. 'The Letter-Writing of Archbishop Becket', *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting,* ed. R. Gameson and H. Leyser (Oxford 2001)

Mayr-Harting, H. 'Hilary, Bishop of Chichester (1147-1169) and Henry II', *EHR* 78 (1963)

'Henry II and the Papacy, 1170-1189', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965)

McDonald, P. 'Poor Clerks' Provisions: A Case for Reassessment?', *Archivium Historiae Pontificae* 30 (1992)

McEwan, J. *Seals in Medieval London 1050-1300: A Catalogue* (Woodbridge 2016),

McGuire, B. P. *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250* (New edn, Ithaca 2010)

'Bernard's Life and Works: A Review', *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux* ed. B. P. McGuire (Leiden 2011)

McHardy, A. K. 'Bishops' Registers and Political History: a Neglected Resource', *The Foundations of Medieval English Ecclesiastical History: Studies Presented to David Smith*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke (Woodbridge 2005)

McLoughlin, J. '*Amicitia* in Practice: John of Salisbury (*circa* 1120-1180) and his Circle', *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. D. Williams (Woodbridge 1990)

Maleczek, W. 'Die Kardinäle von 1143 bis 1216. Exklusive Papstwähler und erste Agenten de päpstlichen *plenitudo potestatis*', *Geschichte de Kardinalats im Mittelalter,* ed. J. Dendorfer (Stuttgart 2011)

Merlet, L. 'Lettres d'Ives de Chartres et d'autres personnages de son temps (1087-1130)', *Bibliothèque de l'ecole des Chartes* 16 (1855)

Mews, C. J. 'The Schools and Intellectual Renewal in the Twelfth Century: A Social Approach', *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools,* ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019)

'Rethinking Scholastic Communities in Latin Europe: Competition and Theological Method in the Twelfth Century', *Medieval Worlds* 12 (2020)

Monagle, 'John of Salisbury and the Writing of History', *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014)

Morey, A. *Bartholomew of Exeter, Bishop and Canonist: A Study in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge 1937)

Morey, A. and C. N. L. Brooke, *Gilbert Foliot and His Letters* (Cambridge 1965)

Mullett, M. 'Friendship in Byzantium: Genre, Topos and Network', *Friendship in Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Haseldine (Stroud 1999)

'The Detection of Relationship in Middle Byzantine Literary Texts: The Case of Letters and Letter-Networks', *L'epistolographie et la poésie épigrammatique: projets actuels et questions de méthodologie* (Paris 2003)

Murphy, J. 'The Earliest Teaching of Rhetoric at Oxford', *Communication Monographs* 27 (1960)

‘Alberic of Monte Cassino: Father of the Medieval *Ars Dictaminis*’, *The American Benedictine Review* 22 (June 1971)

Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance (Berkeley and LA 1974)

Medieval Rhetoric: A Select Bibliography (Toronto 1989)

‘Quintilian’s Influence on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing in the Middle Ages and Renaissance’, *Latin Rhetoric and Education in the Middle Ages and Renaissance,* ed. J. J. Murphy (Aldershot 2005)

Nadeau, A. ‘Notes on the Significance of John of Salisbury’s *Vita Anselmi*’, *Twenty-Five Years (1969-1994) of Anselm Studies: Review and Critique of Recent Scholarly Views,* ed. F. Van Fleteren and J. C. Schnaubelt (New York 1996)

Newcourt, R. *Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense: Comprising An Ecclesiastical History of the Diocese of London* (London 1708)

Nicholas, D. ‘Economy’, *The Central Middle Ages: Europe 950-1320,* ed. D. Power (Oxford 2006)

Niskanen, S. *The Letter Collections of Anselm of Canterbury* (Turnhout 2011)

Olsen, G. W. ‘Twelfth-Century Humanism Reconsidered: The Case of St Bernard’, *Studi Medievali* serie terza 31 (1990)

Orme, N. *English Schools in the Middle Ages* (London 1973)

Medieval Schools: From Roman Britain to Renaissance England (New Haven 2006)

Paetow, L. J. *The Arts Course at Medieval Universities with Special Reference to Grammar and Rhetoric* (Illinois 1910)

Pantin, W. A. ‘English Monastic Letter-Books’, *Historical Essays In Honour of James Tait,* ed. J. G. Edwards, V. H. Galbraith, and E. F. Jacob (Manchester 1933)

Papaopannou, E. N. ‘Michael Psellos: Rhetoric and the Self in Byzantine Epistolography’, *L’epistolographie et la poésie épigrammatique: projets actuels et questions de méthodologie,* ed. W. Hörandner and M. Grünbart (Paris 2003)

Patt, W. D. ‘The Early *Ars dictaminis* as Response to a Changing Society’, *Viator* 9 (1978)

Peltzer, J. ‘Henry II and the Norman Bishops’, *EHR* 119 (2004)

‘The Angevin Kings and Canon Law: Episcopal Elections and the Loss of Normandy’, *Anglo-Norman Studies 27,* ed. J. Gillingham (Woodbridge 2005)

Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c. 1140- c.1230 (Cambridge 2007)

Pennington, K. ‘*Epistolae Alexandrinae*: A Collection of Pope Alexander III’s Letters’, *Miscellanea Rolando Bandinelli, papa Alessandro III,* ed. F. Liotta (Siena 1986)

‘The Beginnings of Law Schools in the Twelfth Century’, *A Companion to Twelfth-Century Schools,* ed. C. Giraud (Leiden 2019)

Pepin, R. ‘John of Salisbury as a Writer’, *A Companion to John of Salisbury,* ed. C. Grellard and F. Lachaud (Leiden 2014)

Perelman, L. 'The Medieval Art of Letter Writing: Rhetoric as Institutional Expression', *Textual Dynamics of the Professions: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*, ed. C. Bazerman and J. Paradis (Madison, Wisconsin 1991)

Piper, A. 'New Evidence for the Becket Correspondence and John of Salisbury's Letters', *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. M. Wilks (Oxford 1984)

Pizzinat, I. 'Monsignor Francesco Liverani (1823-1894) E Le Sue *Reminiscenze*', *Studi Romagnoli* 26 (1975)

Polak, E. J. *Medieval and Renaissance Letter Treatises and Form Letters: A Census of Manuscripts Found in Part of Western Europe, Japan, and the United States of America* (Leiden 1994)

Poling Schriber, C. *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas versus Old Ideals* (Bloomington and Indianapolis 1990)

Poole, R. L. *Lectures on the History of the Papal Chancery Down to the Time of Innocent III* (Cambridge 1915)

'The Masters of the Schools at Paris and Chartres in John of Salisbury's Time', *EHR* 35 (July 1920)

'The Early Correspondence of John of Salisbury', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 11 (1924-5)

Poupardin, R. 'Dix-huit lettres inédites d'Arnoul de Lisieux', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 63 (1902)

Pranger, M. B. 'Bernard the Writer', *A Companion to Bernard of Clairvaux*, ed. B. P. McGuire (Leiden 2011)

Preiser-Kapeller, J. 'Letters and Network Analysis', *A Companion to Byzantine Epistolography*, ed. A. Riehle (Leiden 2020)

Purvis, J. S. and Smalley, B. 'Gilbertus Universalis, Bishop of London (1128-34), and the Problem of the <<Glossa Ordinaria>>', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1935)

Queller, D. 'Thirteenth-Century Diplomatic Envoys: *Nuncii* and *Procuratores*', *Speculum* 35 (April 1960)

Ramsey, N. 'The Library and Archives to 1897', *St Paul's: The Cathedral Church of London, 604-2004*, ed. D. Keene, A. Burns, and A. Saint (New Haven 2004)

Reynolds, L. D. ed. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford 1983)

Richardson, H. G. 'The Schools of Northampton in the Twelfth Century', *EHR* 56 (October 1941)

Richardson, H. G. and Sayles, G. O. *The Governance of Mediaeval England from the Conquest to Magna Carta* (Edinburgh 1963)

Richardson, M. 'The *Ars dictaminis*, the Formulary, and Medieval Epistolary Practice', *Letter-Writing Manuals and Instruction from Antiquity to the Present*, ed. C. Poster and L. C. Mitchell (Columbia 2007)

Robinson, I. S. 'The "Colores Rhetorici" in the Investiture Contest', *Traditio* 32 (1976)

'The Dissemination of the Letters of Pope Gregory VII During the Investiture Contest', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34 (1983)

Rolker, C. *Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres* (Cambridge 2010)

Round, J. H. *The King's Serjeants & Officers of State* (London 1911)

Rouse, R. H. '*Florilegia* and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans', *Viator* 10 (1979)

Rowse, D. 'The King's Chamberlain, Richard Ruffus, c.1140s-1202, and his Family', *Foundations* 3 (2010)

Saltman, A. 'Two Early Collections of the Becket Correspondence and of Other Contemporary Documents', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 22 (1949)

Theobald Archbishop of Canterbury (London 1956)

Sapir Abulafia, A. 'Intellectual and Cultural Creativity', *The Central Middle Ages: Europe 950-1320,* ed. D. Power (Oxford 2006)

Sarti, M. and Fattorini, M. ed. *De claris archigymnasii Bononiensis professoribus, A saeculo XI usque ad saeculum XIV* i (Bologna 1772)

Saurette, M. 'Peter the Venerable and Secular Friendship', *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse,* ed. A. Classen and M. Sandidge (Berlin 2010)

Savioli, L. ed. *Annali Bolognesi* i (Bassano 1784)

Sayers, J. 'The Vatican Archives, the Papal Registers and Great Britain and Ireland: the Foundations of Historical Research', *The Foundations of Medieval English Ecclesiastical History: Studies Presented to David Smith,* ed. C. N. L. Brooke (Woodbridge 2005)

Scattergood, J. ' "Saint Erkenwald" and its Literary Relations', *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. S. Powell (Donington 2017)

Schmeidler, B. 'Uber Briefsammlungen des Früheren Mittelalters in Deutschland und ihre Kritische Verwertung', *Arsbok. Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund* (1926)

Schofield, J. *St Paul's Cathedral Before Wren* (English Heritage 2011, repr.2012)

Scholz, B. 'The Canonization of Edward the Confessor', *Speculum* 36 (January 1961)

'Two Forged Charters from the Abbey of Westminster and Their Relationship with St. Denis', *EHR* 76 (1961)

Schulte, J. F. *Zur Geschichte der Literatur über das Dekret Gratians* iii (Vienna 1870)

Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts von Gratian bis auf die Gegenwart i (Stuttgart 1875)

Shirley, V. 'Classical Rhetoric and the Art of Letter Writing in Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*', *Viator* 50 (2019)

Shuffelton, G. 'London Histories', *Medieval Historical Writings,* ed. J. Jahner, E. Steiner, E. M. Tyler (Cambridge 2019)

Smalley, B. *The Becket Conflict and the Schools* (Oxford 1973)

Smith, T. W. 'English Episcopal Acta and Thirteenth-Century Petitions to the Pope', *Archives* 40 (2014)

‘First Crusade Letters and Medieval Monastic Scribal Cultures’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 71 (2020)

Sogno, C. B. K. Storin, and E. J. Watts, ‘Introduction’ to *Late Antique Letter Collections: A Critical Introduction and Reference Guide*, ed. idem (Oakland, California 2006),

Soria, M. ‘Alexander III and France: Exile, Diplomacy and the New Order’, *Pope Alexander III (1159-81): The Art of Survival*, ed. P. Clarke and A. J. Duggan (Farnham 2012)

Southern, R. W. ‘Some New Letters of Peter of Blois’, *EHR* 53 (1938)

review of: Millor, S. and H. Butler, and Brookes’ *The Letters of John of Salisbury vol.i: The Early Letters (1133-1151), EHR* 72 (1957)

review of: Morey and Brookes’ *Letters and Charters of Gilbert Foliot* and *Gilbert Foliot and his Letters, EHR* 83 (October 1968)

Medieval Humanism and Other Studies (Oxford 1970)

‘The Schools of Paris and the School of Chartres’, *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* ed. R. L. Benson and G. Constable (Oxford 1982)

‘Towards an Edition of Peter of Blois’s Letter-Collection’, *EHR* 110 (1995)

Sparrow Simpson, W. ‘Two Inventories of the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, London, dated respectively 1245 and 1402’, *Archaeologia* 50 (1887)

S. Paul’s Cathedral Library: A Catalogue (London 1893)

Staunton, M. *Thomas Becket and His Biographers* (Woodbridge 2012)

The Historians of Angevin England (Oxford 2017)

‘An Introduction to Herbert of Bosham’, *Herbert of Bosham: A Medieval Polymath*, ed. M. Staunton (Woodbridge 2019)

Stein, P. ‘Vacarius and the Civil Law’, *Church and Government in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to C. R. Cheney on His 70th Birthday*, ed. C. N. L. Brooke, D. E. Luscombe, G. H. Martin and D. Owen (Cambridge 1976)

Stubbs, W. *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects* (Oxford 1887)

Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series (London 1902)

Sweeney, T. *Priests of the Law: Roman Law and The Making of the Common Law’s First Professionals* (Oxford 2019)

Tahkokallio, J. ‘The Classicization of the Latin Curriculum and “The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century”: A Quantitative Study of the Codicological Evidence’, *Viator* 46 (2015)

Taliadoros, J. ‘Law and Theology in Gilbert of Foliot’s (*c*.1105/10-1187/8) Correspondence’, *The Haskins Society Journal* 16 (Woodbridge 2005)

Law and Theology in Twelfth-Century England: The Works of Master Vicarius (c.1115/1120-c.1200) (Turnhout 2006)

Thomson, R. M. ‘William of Malmesbury as Historian and Man of Letters’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 29 (1978)

‘John of Salisbury and William of Malmesbury: Currents in Twelfth-Century Humanism’, *The World of John of Salisbury*, ed. M. Wilks (Oxford 1984)

‘England and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance’, *Past & Present* 101 (1983)

Tilliette, J-Y. ‘Le vocabulaire des écoles monastiques d’après les prescriptions des ‘consuetudines’ (XIe-XIIe siècles)’, *Vocabulaire des écoles et des méthodes d’enseignement au moyen âge: Actes du colloque Rome 21-22 octobre 1989*, ed. O. Weijers (Turnhout 1992)

Turcan-Verkerk, A. ‘L’introduction de l’*ars dictaminis* en France. Nicholas de Montiéramey, un professionel du *dictamen* entre 1140 et 1158’, *Le Dictamen Dans Tous ses États*, ed. B. Grévin and A. Turcan-Verkerk (Turnhout 2015)

Turner, R. V. ‘Richard Barre and Michael Belet: Two Angevin Civil Servants’, *Medieval Prosopography* 6 (1985)

The English Judiciary in the Age of Glanvill and Bracton c.1176-1239 (Cambridge 1985)

‘Changing Perceptions of the New Administrative Class in Anglo-Norman and Angevin England: The Curiales and Their Conservative Critics’, *Journal of British Studies* 29 (1990)

Ullmann, W. *Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories of the Medieval Canonists* (London 1949)

The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages (London 1955)

Van Egen, J. ‘Letters, Schools, and Written Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries’, *Dialektik und Rhetorik im frühen und hohen Mittelalter*, ed. J. Fried (Munich 1997)

‘Letters and the Public *Persona* of Hildegard’, *Hildegard von Bingen in ihren historischen Umfeld* ed. A. Haverkamp (Mainz 2000)

Verbaal, W. ‘Sens: une victoire d’écrivain. Les deux visages du procès d’Abélard’, *Pierre Abélard: Colloque international de Nantes*, ed. J. Jolivet, H. Habrias (Rennes 2003)

‘Epistolary Voices and the Fiction of History’, *Medieval Letters- Between Fiction and Document*, ed. C. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout 2015)

‘Voicing your Voice: The Fiction of a Life: Early Twelfth-Century Letter Collections and the Case of Bernard of Clairvaux’, *Interfaces* 0.4 (2017)

Verger, J. ‘Dès écoles du XIIè siècle aux premières universités: réussites et échecs’, *Renovación Intellectual Del Occidente Europeo (siglo XII)* (Pamplona 1998)

Vincent, N. ‘The Pilgrimages of the Angevin Kings of England 1154-1272’, *Pilgrimage: The English Experience from Becket to Bunyan* (Cambridge 2002)

‘The Murderers of Thomas Becket’, *Bischofsmord im Mitterlalter*, ed. N. Fryde and D. Reitz (Göttingen 2003)

review of Hudry’s *Alain de Lille (?). Lettres familières (1167-1170), Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005)

‘Jocelin of Wells: The Making of a Bishop in the Reign of King John’, *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier* ed. R. Dunning (Woodbridge 2010)

‘Beyond Becket: King Henry II and the Papacy (1154-1189)’, *Pope Alexander III (1159-81): The Art of Survival*, ed. P. Clarke and A. J. Duggan (Farnham 2012)

'Thomas Becket', *Making and Remaking Saints in Nineteenth-Century Britain,* ed. G. Atkins (Manchester 2016)

review of McEwan's *Seals in Medieval London 1050-1300: A Catalogue, History* 102 (2017)

'John Allen Giles and Herbert of Bosham: The Criminous Clerk as Editor', *Herbert of Bosham: A Medieval Polymath,* ed. M. Staunton (Woodbridge 2019)

'Shall the First be Last? Order and Disorder amongst Henry II's Bishops', *Authority and Power in the Medieval Church, c.1000-c.1500,* ed. T. W. Smith (Turnhout 2020)

Voigts, M. C. 'Brevis et Pura Narratio: Bernard of Clairvaux's Disregard of the *ars dictaminis*', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 68 (2018)

von Moos, P. *Hildebert von Lavardin 1056-1133* (Stuttgart 1965)

Vulliez, C. 'L'évêque au miroir de l'*Ars dictaminis*. L'example de la *Maior compilatio* de Bernard de Meung', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 70 (1984)

'Un témoin de l' "*ars dictaminis*" français du XIIe siècle, le manuscrit Additional 18382 de la British Library', *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* (1990)

Wahlgren-Smith, L. *The Letter Collections of Peter of Blois: Studies in the Manuscript Tradition* (Gothenburg 1993)

'Peter of Blois and the Later Career of Reginald fitzJocelin', *EHR* 111 (1996)

review of Hudry's *Alain de Lille (?): Lettres familières (1167-1170)* in *Speculum* 81 (2006)

'On the Composition of Herbert Losinga's Letter Collection', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55 (2006)

Walker, K. 'Westminster Abbey, King Stephen, and the Failure to Canonize King Edward in 1139', *Royal Studies Journal* 5 (2018)

Ward, J. 'Rhetoric in the Faculty of Arts at the Universities of Paris and Oxford in the Middle Ages: A Summary of the Evidence', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevii* 54 (1996)

'What the Middle Ages Missed of Cicero', *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Cicero,* ed. W. Altman (Leiden 2015)

Webber, T. 'L'Ecriture des documents en Angleterre au XIIe siècle', *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 165 (2007)

Wei, I. P. 'From Twelfth-Century Schools to Thirteenth-Century Universities: The Disappearance of Biographical and Autobiographical Representations of Scholars', *Speculum* 86 (2011)

Intellectual Culture in Medieval Paris: Theologians and the University, c.1100-1330 (Cambridge 2012)

Weigand, R. 'The Development of the *Glossa ordinaria* to Gratian's *Decretum*', *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234,* ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington DC 2008)

'The Transmontine Decretists', *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234,* ed. W. Hartmann and K. Pennington (Washington DC 2008)

Weiler, B. 'Clerical *admonitio,* Letters of Advice to Kings and Episcopal Self-Fashioning, *c.*1000-*c.*1200', *History* 102 (2017)

Welter, L. 'La chapitre cathédral de Clermont: sa constitution, ses privilèges', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 41 (1955)

Wieruszowski, H. *The Medieval University: Masters, Students, Learning* (Princeton 1966)

Wilson C. 'The Shrine of St Erkenwald on Paper and in Reality', *Saints and Cults in Medieval England: Proceedings of the 2015 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. S. Powell (Donington 2017)

Winroth, A. 'The Teaching of Law in the Twelfth Century', *Law and Learning in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the Second Carlsberg Academy Conference on Medieval Legal History 2005*, ed. H. Vogt and M. Münster-Swendsen (Copenhagen 2006)

Witt, R. 'Medieval "*Ars Dictaminis*" and the Beginnings of Humanism: a New Construction of the Problem', *Renaissance Quarterly* 35 (1982)

'On Bene of Florence's Conception of the French and Roman Cursus', *Rhetorica* 3 (1985)

Yarrow, S. 'The Cult of St Erkenwald at St Paul's Cathedral', *Old St Paul's and Culture* ed. S. Altman and J. Buckner (London 2021)

Yeo, G. 'Record-Keeping at St Paul's Cathedral', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 8 (1986)

Ysebaert, W. 'Ami, client et intermédiare: Étienne de Tournai et ses réseaux de relations (1167-1192)', *Sacris Erudiri* 40 (2001)

'Medieval Letter-Collections as a Mirror of Circles of Friendship? The Example of Stephen of Tournai, 1128-1203', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 83 (2005)

'Cinq lettres inconnues d'Étienne d'Orléans (1128-1203)', *Sacris erudiri* 45 (2006)

'Medieval Letters and Letter Collections as Historical Sources: Methodological Questions and Reflections and Research Perspectives (6th-14th centuries)', *Studi Medievali* 50 (2009)

'Medieval Letters and Letter Collections as Historical Sources: Methodological Questions, Reflections, and Research Perspectives (Sixth-Fifteenth Centuries)', *Medieval Letters-Between Fiction and Document*, ed. C. Bartoli and C. Høgel (Turnhout 2015)

Websites

Amt, E. 'Lucy, Richard de (*d*. 1179)', *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/17149, accessed 05/01/2020]

APOSCRIPTA database- Lettres des papes ed. B. Oury [http://telma-chartes.irht.cnrs.fr/en/aposcripta/notice/143371, accessed 07/01/2021]

Aubert, R. 'ANTONELLI, Giacomo' in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 2 (1961) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giacomo-antonelli_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, accessed 13/04/2021]

Barlow, F. 'Bartholomew (*d*.1184)', *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1577, accessed 10/04].

'Theobald (*c*.1090-1161)', *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/27168, accessed 15/10/2021]

Blount, M. N ‘Glanville, Gilbert de (*d*. 1214)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10792, accessed 21/12/2020]

Brooke, C. N. L. ‘Foliot, Gilbert (*c*.1110–1187)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9792, accessed 24/11/2017]

Carrannante, A. ‘MAI, Angelo; in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 67 (20060 [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/angelo-mai_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, accessed 16/01/2022]

Cheney, M. ‘Roger (c.1134-1179), Bishop of Worcester’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23960, accessed 26/08/2020]

Donahue, C. ‘Pucelle, Gerard (*d*. 1184)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/49666, accessed 21/12/2020]

Duggan, A. J. ‘Ridel, Geoffrey’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23618, accessed 06/12/2020]

Duggan, C. ‘Richard [Richard of Dover] (*d*.1184)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23514, accessed 07/12/2020]

‘Reginald *fitz* Jocelin [*called* Reginald Italus, Reginald Lombardus] (*c*.1140-1191)’, *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9613, accessed 09/12/2021]

Farmer, D. ‘Erkenwald (Earconwald)’, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (5 rev. ed Oxford 2011) [https://www-oxfordreference-com.uea.idm.oclc.org/view/10.1093/acref/9780199596607.001.0001/acref-9780199596607-e-570?rskey=jfIY3N&result=576, accessed 23/09/2021]

‘GRASSI, Can. Reg. of S. Maria di Reno, Ildebrando (?-1178)’ [https://cardinals.fiu.edu/bios1152.htm#Grassi, visited 08/06/2021]

Greatrex, J. ‘Clarembald (*fl*.1155-1173)’, *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5451, accessed 19/11/2021]

Harper-Bill, C. ‘Oxford, John of (*d*.1200)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/21058, accessed 09/05/2019]

‘William [*called* William Turbe]’, *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/29466, accessed 15/10/2021]

Hudson, J. ‘Ilchester, Richard of (*d*.1188)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/23515 accessed 09/05/2019]

‘Richard *fitz* Nigel [Richard *fitz* Neal] (*c*.1130-1198)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/9619 accessed 23/02/2021]

Luscombe, D. ‘Salisbury, John of (late 1110s-1180)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14849, accessed 15/12/2017]

Malusa, L. ‘PASSAGLIA, Carlo’ in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 81 (2014) [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-passaglia_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/, Accessed 13/04/2021]

Mason, E ‘Lawrence (*d*.1173), abbot of Westminster’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/16168, accessed 26/10/2018]

Murphy, M. ‘Cumin [Comyn], John (*d.* 1212)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6043, accessed 09/05/2019]

Neininger, F. ‘Gilbert [Gilbertus; *called* Gilbert the Universal] (*d.*1134)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10673, last accessed 04/09/2020]

Rigg. J. M. (revised R. V. Turner) ‘Barre, Richard (*b. c.* 1130, *d.* in or after 1202)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/1510, accessed 05/06/2020]

Rolker, C. ‘Manuscripts of Ivo’s Correspondence’ [https://ivo-of-chartres.github.io/letters/webmanuscripts.pdf, accessed 03/02/2022]

Southern, R. W. ‘Blois, Peter of (1125 X 30-1212)’, *ODNB* [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/22012, accessed 08/02/2018]

Summerson, H. ‘Thornham [Turnham], Stephen of (*d.*1213/14)’, *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/27885, accessed 14/02/2022]

Thomson, R. M. ‘Canterbury, Odo of (*d.*1200)’, *ODNB* [https://doi-org.uea.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/20544 , accessed 26/05/2021]

‘The Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church: Biographical Dictionary’ [https://cardinals.fiu.edu/bios1144.htm#Bobone, accessed 11/04/2021]

‘The Letters of St Jerome’ [http://www.tertullian.org/fathers2/NPNF2-06/Npnf2-06-03.htm#P4761_1305404, accessed 21/08/2020]