

F. *REGNUM* AND *SACERDOTIUM* IN ENGLAND, 1066–1215: CHRONOLOGY AND SHORT DOCUMENTS

Chronology

Kings	Archbishops of Canterbury	Popes
		1049 — Leo IX
		1054 — d. Leo IX
1066 — William I	1070 — Lanfranc	1073 — Gregory VII
1087 — William II	1089 — d. Lanfranc	1085 — d. Gregory VII
1100 — Henry I	1093 — Anselm	1088 — Urban II
	1109 — d. Anselm	1099 — Paschal II
		1118 — d. Panchal II
		(1122 — Concordat of Worms)
1135 — Stephen	1138 — Theobald	1130 — Innocent II
		1143 — d. Innocent II
1154 — Henry II		1154 — Adrian IV
	1161 — Becket	1159 — Alexander III
	1170 — d. Becket	1181 — d. Alexander III
1189 — Richard	1193 — Hubert Walter	
1199 — John	1205 — Stephen Langton	1198 — Innocent III
	(1213 — Langton secures post)	
1216 — d. John	1228 — d. Langton	1216 — d. Innocent III

“Church-State” Documents *temp.* William I

from Henry Gee & W.J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History* (London, 1896), pp. 54–59 (Nos. 14, 15, 17)[†]

CANONS OF THE COUNCIL OF LONDON UNDER LANFRANC, A.D. 1075

The translation here follows Gee and Hardy corrected on the basis of D. Whitelock, M. Brett, and C.N.L. Brooke, *Councils and Synods I: 871–1204* (1981) 2:612–16, where references will be found to the canons (largely from ‘Pseudo-Isidore’) that the authors of these canons used. See the introduction in *id.*, 2:606–12.

In the year of the Lord’s incarnation, 1075, in the rule of William, glorious king of the English, in the ninth year of his reign, there gathered at London in the church of St. Paul the apostle, a council of all the territory of England, specifically, of bishops, abbots and also many persons of the order of religion, at the command of and presiding over the council Lanfranc, archbishop of the church of Canterbury and primate of the whole island of Britain, sitting with him the venerable men Thomas [of Bayeux] archbishop of York, William bishop of London, Geoffrey of Coutance, who, although he was an overseas bishop sat with the others in the council because he had many possessions in England, Walkelin of Winchester, Hereman of Sherborne, Wulfstan of Worcester, Walter of Hereford, Giso of Wells, Remigius of Dorchester or Lincoln, Herfast of Elmham or Norwich [Thetford], Stigand of Selsey [Chichester]¹, Osbern of Exeter, Peter of Lichfield. The church of Rochester at that time lacked a pastor. The bishop of Lindisfarne and Durham, having a canonical excuse, could not be at the council. Because councils had fallen out of fashion in England for many years past, many things were renewed which are known to have been defined by ancient canons too.

[1. *Precedence of bishops.*] So it was ordained according to the fourth Council of Toledo, and those of Milevis and Braga, that bishops should sit according to the time of their ordination, save those who by old custom, or by the privileges of their Churches, have seats by precedence. The old men were asked about this, what they had seen themselves or had received truly and probably from their elders, and for this answer

[†] The book contains no copyright notice; it would appear to be in the public domain.

¹ [Not to be confused with the archbishop of Canterbury of the same name who died in 1072.]

delay was requested and granted till next day. So on the next day they stated unanimously that the Archbishop of York ought to sit at the right hand of Canterbury, the Bishop of London at the left, Winchester next York, but if York be away, London on the right, Winchester on the left.

[2. *Monks to observe rules.*] By the rule of St. Benedict, the Dialogue of Gregory, and the custom of places under rule, monks should hold their proper order: children, especially, and youths should be under guardianship in all places under fit masters assigned them; they should carry lights by night, and all in general should have no property except what is allowed by the authorities. But if any one be discovered at death to hold any property without the licence aforesaid, and shall not restore it before death, confessing his sin with penitence and grief, let not the bells be tolled for him, nor the saving sacrifice be offered for his absolution, nor let him be buried in the cemetery.

[3. *Transference of village sees to towns.*] By the decrees of Popes Damasus and Leo, and by the Councils of Sardica and Laodicea, whereby it is forbidden that bishops' sees should be in villages [*villis*] it was granted by royal favour and the Council's authority to the aforesaid three bishops to migrate from villages to cities—Hermann from Sherborne to Salisbury, Stigand from Selsey to Chichester, Peter from Lichfield to Chester. The case of some who were yet in villages or hamlets was postponed for the king's hearing, then at war in parts beyond the sea.

[4. *Letters dimissory.*] By many decrees of the Roman pontiffs and different authorities of the sacred canons, no one should keep or ordain any clerk or monk without letters dimissory.

[5. *Voice in the Council.*] To restrain the arrogance of some unwise men it was enjoined by general decree that no one speak in the Council, save bishops and abbots, without leave from the metropolitan.

[6. *Prohibited degrees.*] By the decrees of Gregory the Great and the Less let none take a wife from his own kin or that of his deceased wife—or the woman whom one of his own kin has married—within the seventh degree on either side.

[7. *Simony.*] Let no one buy or sell sacred orders or church office which appertains to cure of souls; for this crime was originally condemned by the apostle Peter in the case of Simon Magus, afterwards forbidden under excommunication by the holy fathers.

[8. *Charms.*] Let the bones of dead animals not be hung up anywhere as though to avoid diseases of animals, and let sorcery, soothsaying, divination, or any such works of the Devil be practised by no one; for all such things the sacred canons have forbidden, and those who practise them they have excommunicated by sentence given.

[9. *Judges in capital offenses.*] By the Councils of Elvira and Toledo XI no bishop or abbot or any of the clergy should judge concerning a man to be put to death or to mutilation, nor favour with his authority those who so judge.

[Here follow the signatures of the two archbishops, twelve bishops, and twenty-one abbots, these last being preceded by the Archdeacon of Canterbury.]

LETTER OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR TO POPE GREGORY VII, A.D. 1080

From *The letters of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury*, Helen Clover and Margaret T. Gibson, ed. and trans., Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), p. 131, 133, the only known source.

To Gregory, the most exalted pastor of holy Church, William by the grace of God king of the English and duke of the Normans, sends greetings and the assurance of friendship.

Your legate Hubert, who came to me, holy father, has on your behalf directed me to do fealty to you and your successors and to reconsider the money payment which my predecessors used to send to the Roman Church. The one proposition I have accepted; the other I have not. I have never desired to do fealty, nor do I desire it now; for I neither promised on my own behalf nor can I discover that my predecessors ever performed it to yours. As to the money for almost three years it has been collected without due care, while I was engaged in France. But now that by God's mercy I have returned to my kingdom, the sum already collected is being sent to you by the above-named legate and the balance will be conveyed, when the opportunity arises, by the legates of our faithful servant archbishop Lanfranc.

Pray for us and for the welfare of our kingdom, for we held your predecessors in great regard and it is our desire to show to you above all men unfeigned respect and obedient attention.

WILLIAM AND THE ROYAL SUPREMACY

These three Canons are taken from Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* i. 6. There is nothing to guide us as to the exact date. [More recent scholarship seriously doubts that these items are to be attributed to William I. They fit better with William II. CD]

Tr. from Eadmer, *Rolls Series*, p. 10. Cf. Stubbs, *S. C.* 82.

Eadmer says: 'Some of those novel points I will set down which he (William) appointed to be observed.

...

'1. He would not then allow any one settled in all his dominion to acknowledge as apostolic the pontiff of the City of Rome, save at his own bidding, or by any means to receive any letter from him if it had not first been shown to himself.

'2. The primate also of his realm, I mean the Archbishop of Canterbury or Dorobernica presiding over a general Council assembled of bishops, he did not permit to ordain or forbid anything save what had first been ordained by himself as agreeable to his own will.

'3. He would not suffer that any, even of his bishops, should be allowed to implead publicly, or excommunicate, or constrain by any penalty of ecclesiastical rigour, any of his barons or ministers accused of incest, or adultery, or any capital crime, save by his command.'

"Church-State" Documents William I through Henry II

from Carl Stephenson & Frederick George Marcham, *Sources of English Constitutional History* (rev. ed., New York, 1972), pp. I:35-36, 73-76 (Nos. 17, 30, 33(I))

WILLIAM I: ORDINANCE ON CHURCH COURTS

W[illiam], by the grace of God king of the English, to R[alph] Bainaard, G[eoffrey] de Mandeville, P[eter] de Valognes, and my other faithful men of Essex, Hertfordshire, and Middlesex, greeting.² Be it known to all of you, and to my other faithful men resident in England, that, by the common counsel of the archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all the princes of my realm, I have decided to amend the ecclesiastical law,³ which up to my own time has not been rightly observed in England, nor in accordance with the holy canons. I ordain and, by my royal authority, command that henceforth, when ecclesiastical law is involved, no bishop or archdeacon shall hold pleas in the hundred [court], nor shall he bring to judgment before laymen any cause that pertains to the cure of souls; but whoever has been accused in any cause, or of any offense, under ecclesiastical law shall come to the place named and selected for this purpose by the bishop, and shall there respond in such cause or concerning such offence, submitting to the justice of God and of His bishop, not according to the [judgment of the] hundred, but according to the canons and to ecclesiastical law. If indeed any one, puffed up with pride, neglects or refuses to come for justice before the bishop, let him be summoned once, twice, and thrice. But if, even then, he will not come to make amends, let him be excommunicated; and should there be need to enforce this [ban], let the power and justice of the king or of the sheriff be invoked. Moreover, he who, being summoned, refuses to come before the bishop for justice shall be fined for each [neglect of] summons as contempt of ecclesiastical law. I likewise prohibit and, by my royal authority forbid that my sheriff or reeve or minister of the king, or any layman [whatsoever], shall interfere with the administration of law pertaining to the bishop. Nor shall any layman bring another man to trial [under such law] save by judgment of the bishop. The trial, indeed, shall be carried out nowhere except at the bishop's see, or in such place as he shall appoint for that purpose.

(Latin) [Liebermann, *Gesetze*], I, 485 f.

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON (1164)

In the year 1164 from the Incarnation of the Lord, in the fourth year of the papacy of Alexander [III], and in the twelfth year of Henry II, most illustrious king of the English, there was made, in the presence of the said king this record and recognition⁴ of a certain portion of the customs and liberties and rights of his

² Similar writs were presumably sent to the other shires.

³ *Leges episcopales*, literally, "episcopal laws." For the presence of the bishop in the shire court during the previous period, see Edgar, III, 5 (above, p. 19), and Canute, II, 18 (above, p. 23). And on the "common counsel" in the earlier part of the sentence, see A.B. White, in the *American Historical Review*, XXV, 15 f.

⁴ *Recognitio*, the same word as is often used for the verdict of a jury; see, for examples, no. 33 [forms of original writs from *Glanvill*].

ancestors—namely, of King Henry his grandfather and of others—which ought to be observed and held in the kingdom. And on account of the dissensions and disputes that had arisen between the clergy and the justices of the lord king and the barons of the realm concerning such customs and rights, this recognition was made in the presence of the archbishops, bishops, clergy, earls, barons, and magnates of the realm. Furthermore, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, and Roger, archbishop of York, and Gilbert, bishop of London, and Henry, bishop of Winchester, and Nigel, bishop of Ely, and William, bishop of Norwich, and Robert, bishop of Lincoln, and Hilary, bishop of Chichester, and Jocelyn, bishop of Salisbury, and Richard, bishop of Chester, and Bartholomew, bishop of Exeter, and Robert, bishop of Hereford, and David, bishop of St. David's and Roger, [bishop] elect of Worcester, have granted and steadfastly promised, *viva voce* and on the word of truth, that the said customs, recognized by the archbishops, bishops, earls, and barons, and by the nobler and more venerable men of the realm, should be held and observed for the lord king and his heirs in good faith and without evil intent, these being present⁵ ... and many other magnates and nobles of the realm, both clerical and lay.

Now a certain part of the recognized customs and rights of the kingdom are contained in the present writing, of which part these are the chapters:—

1. If controversy arises between laymen, between laymen and clergymen, with regard to advowson and presentation to churches, it shall be treated or concluded in the court of the lord king.

2. Churches of the lord king's fee⁶ may not be given in perpetuity without his assent and grant.

3. Clergymen charged and accused of anything shall, on being summoned by a justice of the king, come into his court, to be responsible there for whatever it may seem to the king's court they should there be responsible for; and [to be responsible] in the ecclesiastical court [for what] it may seem they should there be responsible for—so that the king's justice shall send into the court of Holy Church to see on what ground matters are there to be treated. And if the clergyman is convicted, or [if he] confesses, the Church should no longer protect him.⁷

4. Archbishops, bishops, and parsons of the kingdom are not permitted to go out of the kingdom without the license of the lord king. And should they go out [of it], they shall, if the king so desires, give security that, neither in going nor in returning, will they seek [to bring] evil or damage to the king or to the kingdom.

5. Excommunicated men should not give security for all future time (*ad remanens*) or take an oath, but [should] merely [provide] security and pledge of standing by the judgment of the church in order to obtain absolution.

6. Laymen should not be accused except through known and lawful accusers and witnesses in the presence of the bishop, [yet] so that the archdeacon shall not lose his right or anything that he should thence have. And if the guilty persons are such that no one wishes or dares to accuse them, the sheriff, on being asked by the bishop, shall have twelve lawful men from the neighbourhood, or the vill, placed on oath before the bishop to set forth the truth in the matter according to their own knowledge.⁸

7. No one who holds of the king in chief, nor any of his demesne ministers, shall be excommunicated; nor shall the lands of any of them be placed under interdict, unless first the lord king, if he is in the land, or his justiciar, if he is outside the kingdom, agrees that justice shall be done on that person—and in such a way that whatever belongs to the king's court shall be settled there, and whatever belongs to the ecclesiastical court shall be sent thither to be dealt with there.

8. With regard to appeals, should they arise—they should proceed from the archdeacon to the bishop, and from the bishop to the archbishop. And if the archbishop fails to provide justice, recourse should finally

⁵ Here follow in the text thirty-eight names.

⁶ That is to say, the right of appointing to a living, or advowson, held in fee of the king.

⁷ It was over this article that the famous controversy between the king and Thomas Becket took place. For the best interpretation, see Pollock and Maitland, I, 447 f.

⁸ The article deals with trials in ecclesiastical courts, of which the lowest was that of the archdeacon. In the final clause we have our first clear reference to the accusation jury, but it is significant that the institution is described as a feature of established custom under Henry I; see Pollock and Maitland, I, 151, and cf. no. 31 [the Assize of Clarendon].

be had to the lord king, in order that by his precept the controversy may be brought to an end in the court of the archbishop; so that it should not proceed further⁹ without the assent of the lord king.

9. If a claim is raised by a clergyman against a layman, or by a layman against a clergyman, with regard to any tenement which the clergyman wishes to treat as free alms, but which the layman [wishes to treat] as lay fee, let it, by the consideration of the king's chief justice and in the presence of the said justice, be settled through the recognition of twelve lawful men whether the tenement belongs to free alms or to lay fee. And if it is recognized as belonging to free alms, the plea shall be [held] in the ecclesiastical court; but if [it is recognized as belonging] to lay fee, unless both call upon the same bishop or [other] baron, the plea shall be [held] in the king's court. But if, with regard to that fee, both call upon the same bishop or [other] baron, the plea shall be [held] in his court; [yet] so that, on account of the recognition which has been made, he who first was seised [of the land] shall not lose his seisin until proof [of the title] has been made in the plea.¹⁰

10. If any one in a city, castle, borough, or demesne manor of the lord king is summoned by an archdeacon or a bishop for some offence on account of which he ought to respond to the said persons, and if he refuses satisfaction on their summons, he may well be placed under an interdict; but he should not be excommunicated until the chief minister of the lord king in that vill has been called. And if the king's minister defaults in the matter, he shall be in the mercy of the lord king, and the bishop may then coerce that accused man through ecclesiastical justice.

11. Archbishops, bishops, and all parsons of the realm who hold of the king in chief have their possessions of the king as baronies and are answerable for them to the king's justices and ministers; also they follow and observe all royal laws and customs, and like other barons they should take part with the barons in the judgments of the lord king's court, until the judgment involves death or maiming.¹¹

12. When an archbishopric, bishopric, abbey, or priory within the king's gift becomes vacant, it should be in his hands; and he shall thence take all revenues and income just as from his own demesne. And when it comes to providing for the church, the lord king should summon the greater parsons of the church, and the election should be held in the king's own chapel by the assent of the lord king and by the counsel of those parsons of the kingdom whom he has called for that purpose. And there the man elected should, before being consecrated, perform homage and fealty to the lord king as to his liege lord, for life and limbs and earthly honour,¹² saving the rights of his order.

13. If any of the magnates of the realm forcibly prevent an archbishop, bishop, or archdeacon from administering justice, either by himself or through his men, the lord king should bring them to justice. And if perchance any forcibly prevent the lord king from [administering] his justice, the archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons should bring them to justice, so that they may satisfy the lord king.

14. Chattels of those who have incurred royal forfeiture should not be withheld in any church or churchyard against the king's justice; for they are the king's own, whether they are found inside churches or outside them.

15. Pleas of debt, owed under pledge of faith¹³ or without pledge of faith, belong to the king's justice.

16. Sons of peasants should not be ordained without the assent of the lord on whose land they are known to have been born.

Now the [present] record of the aforesaid royal rights and customs was made at Clarendon by the archbishops, bishops, earls and barons, and by the more noble and venerable men of the realm, on the fourth day before the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the presence of the lord Henry, together with his father, the lord king. There are, moreover, other rights and customs, both many and great, of the Holy Mother Church, of the lord king, and of the barons of the realm, which are not contained in this writing;

⁹ Be appealed to the papal court.

¹⁰ The article is obscurely phrased, but its general purport is clear. The preliminary question, whether the land is held in free alms or not, is to be decided in the king's court by a recognition jury—the procedure known as the assize *utrum* (see no. 33C [Glanvill]). Jurisdiction over further litigation is to be determined by the jury's verdict.

¹¹ Clergymen were forbidden by canon law to take life or shed blood.

¹² Cf. no. 26 [*Leges Henrici Primi*], art. 55.

¹³ See Pollock and Maitland, II, 189 f.

they are to be saved to Holy Church, to the lord king and his heirs, and to the barons of the realm, and are inviolably to be observed forever.

(Latin) Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pp. 163 f.

PROHIBE

[The form of the writ of prohibition to an ecclesiastical court is given in full below, § 4, *Glanvill* XII, 21–2.]

The Development of the “Learned Law”

(1) *The Glossators of Roman Law*

1. Irnerius († c.1130)
2. Bulgarus († 1166), Martinus, Hugo, Jacobus († 1178)
- 3a. Vacarius, Rogerius, Johannes Bassianus, Placentinus († 1192)
- 3b. Azo († 1220), Pillius (both students of Johannes Bassianus)
4. Hugolinus, Roffredus, Accursius († 1263), Odofredus

(The next generation are known as “commentators”. Prominent among them are Bartolus († 1357) and Baldus († 1400).)

(2) *The Canonists*

	Ivo of Chartres (c.1100)	
	Gratian of Bologna, <i>Decreta</i> (c.1140)	
Decretists	Decretal Collections	Decretalists
Mr. Roland (before 1148)		1073 — Gregory VII
Huguccio (after 1188)	<i>Compilationes Antiquae</i> (c.1175–1226)	1085 — d. Gregory VII
John the German (Johannes Teutonicus) (1215 X 1217)		
Bartholomew of Brescia (c.1245)	<i>Decretals</i> , Gregory IX (1234)	Henricus de Segusio (Hostiensis) (before 1253)
		Innocent IV (before 1254)
		Bernard of Parma (c.1263)
	<i>Sext</i> , Boniface VIII (1298)	

(3) *The Method of the Learned Law*

GRATIAN, *DECRETA*, part 1, distinction 1,

translated by CD from *Decretum D. Gratiani* (Venice 1572) (the glosses are given as footnotes)

¹Mankind² is ruled by two³ things, to wit, natural⁴ law and customs.⁵ Natural law is what is contained in the law and the Gospel in which everyone is ordered to do to another what he wishes⁶ to happen to himself and is prohibited from inflicting on another what he does not wish to happen to himself—whence Christ in the Gospel: “Everything that you wish that men do to you, you also do to them, for this is the law and the prophets.”

Hence Isidore [of Seville] says in the fifth book of *Etymologies* [before 640]:

Divine laws correspond to nature, human to customs.

canon 1

“All laws are either divine or human, divine laws correspond nature, human laws to custom. ...”

G. THE ANGLO-NORMAN CHURCH

in C. BROOKE, FROM ALFRED TO HENRY III, 871–1272
The Norton Library History of England (1961) 134–52

8. THE ANGLO-NORMAN CHURCH

(1) *Lanfranc and Papal Reform*

THE Normans invaded England under a banner blessed by the pope. One reason for papal favour was the contumacy of Archbishop Stigand, who was finally removed in 1070 and replaced by Lanfranc. There could not be a more remarkable contrast: Stigand was the very image of old corruption, Lanfranc one of the foremost monks and scholars of his day. Lanfranc and William set to work to reform the English Church.

The contrast between the two archbishops has sometimes been taken as a symbol of the effect of the Norman Conquest on the English Church. The Normans, it is said, reformed a corrupt, backward, isolated English Church. But it is now realised that the truth is more complex, more interesting, and less flattering to the Normans. The court of Edward the Confessor had been one of the most cosmopolitan in Europe, it had contacts with France and Lorraine and Scandinavia, and even with the Mediterranean world and with Hungary. The English upper clergy were certainly not isolated before the Conquest. Nor were they corrupt by the standards of the first half of the eleventh century—Stigand is no fair reflection of the general state of the Church. The monastic reformation of Dunstan's day had not entirely lost its force; here and there—as at Worcester under the saintly Wulfstan II (1062–95)—monastic reform was in full swing in 1066. The English Church was still strongly under monastic influence; and even the secular cathedral chapters had all been

¹ *Mankind*. This distinction is divided into two parts. In the first he proves by four [five] canons that mankind is ruled by two things, to wit, laws and customs. In the second part which begins “there is another” [Dist. 1, d. a. c. 6] he poses seven types of law. Jo. de Fat. & Pet. [Johannes Faventinus († c.1187 and Petrus Hispanus (?) († c.1200?)].

² *Mankind*. Dom Gratian, about to treat of canon law, begins with the more simple according to nature, to wit, with natural law, which is older and nobler, for it begins from the fact of rational creatures, as in [Justinian's] *Institutes*, [tit.] concerning the division of things, [sec.] more convenient [J.2.1.11: “It will be thus more convenient to take the older law first: and natural law is clearly the older, having been instituted by nature at the first origin of mankind, whereas civil laws first came into existence when states began to be founded”] He assigns, therefore, many differences of natural law (from) other laws, up to the 15th distinction in which he begins his first proposition concerning canon law, assigning an origin to it.

³ *Two*. The contrary is indicated below [Dist. 96, c.10; a famous canon ascribed to Gelasius which deals with imperial and papal power], but it is ruled by these two as by authors, by those as by instruments. [C. 11, q.1, c.30; which suggests that clerics are to concern themselves with divine things, laymen with those which pertain to the utility of communal living (*ad communis vitae usum*)].

⁴ *Natural*. I.e., divine.

⁵ *Customs*. I.e., customary law, or even human law, whether written or unwritten. [C.25, q.2, c.7; which says that unwritten decisions of the popes have the force of law, as, the gloss notes, do those of the prince.]

⁶ *Wishes*. But do I not wish that another give me his property but not that I give him mine? Expound, therefore, “wishes”, that is “ought to wish”, and it is thus expounded in this place, “Have charity, and do what you wish,” and in this way is the law expounded [Digest 46.3.1: a text which states that where a debtor pays a creditor and does not say to which of his debts the payment should be credited, the creditor must credit the payment to that debt to which he would want it credited if he were the debtor]. Or expound “orders”, that is “counsels”. Thus the word “ask” is put in place of the verb “command”. [C.11, q.3, c.25: a case in which the pope makes an order using the word “I ask”.]

reformed so that their canons should follow some kind of organised rule. English architecture was mean by Norman standards; but in religious art, in painting, and probably in sculpture, England had the mastery in western Europe. The history of manuscript illumination is continuous from the age of Dunstan to the twelfth century. Even before the Conquest English styles were penetrating Normandy; after the Conquest the Norman monks in England adopted the superior techniques of the English; in course of time a subtle blend of native traditions and new themes produced the Anglo-Norman schools of the twelfth century. In some fields of art the Norman Conquest was a disaster, as in sculpture; in some it was the reverse of a conquest, as in illumination; only in architecture did the Conquest bring real development.

The Normans profoundly altered the English Church. In some ways they may have made it better, in some ways worse; they certainly made it different. If we look at Normandy and England together, and at the whole of the reign of William the Conqueror on both sides of the Channel, we immediately see that in church affairs, as in feudal organisation, the Normans changed themselves as much as they changed the English. There is a sense in which the Normans brought the English Church into line with continental fashions. It might have happened anyway in the late eleventh century, because the changes reflected two great movements which dominate the history of the Church at this time: the reform of the papacy, commonly known after its most dramatic figure, Pope Gregory VII (1073–85), as the Gregorian Reform, and the intellectual revival, which started in Italy and France in the eleventh century, and blossomed all over Europe into the Renaissance of the twelfth century. The papal reform was in part a general attack on clerical standards and clerical immorality. The reformers tried to enforce the rule against simony (the sale of church offices) and against the marriage of the clergy. There had been for centuries laws forbidding the clergy to marry, but they had never been strictly enforced over most of Europe. The papacy could claim that it was simply telling people to obey the law (a modest proposal); but in practice, in many places, it was putting into effect a social revolution. To make matters more difficult, the law was still very complicated. The case of Héloïse and Abelard in Paris at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries helps to bring this home to us. After their baby had been born Abelard offered to marry Héloïse. But Abelard was in clerical orders. Héloïse realised that if he married he would be barred from promotion; she was prepared to remain his mistress for the sake of his career. For once Abelard's affection and sense of honour got the better of his vanity; he insisted and they were married. That should have destroyed his career in the Church, but there was a loop-hole. Such a marriage could be dissolved if both parties entered religious communities—and in the end, Héloïse became a nun and an abbess, Abelard a monk and (for a time) an abbot. Their story shows some thing of the tangle of the celibacy laws. It also gives us an insight into what they meant in terms of human suffering. Their passion and tragedy make Héloïse and Abelard unique, but their circumstances cannot have been so unusual. They, and others like them were victims of the forces of change. Their story illustrates one aspect of the change in discipline for which the reformers were fighting.

Equally important was the attempt to establish papal supremacy on a new footing. It was not that the popes made new claims, so much as that they found new ways of putting their claims into effect. They created what we call the papal monarchy. The princes and bishops of France first felt the force of the new movement of reform at the dramatic synod of Rheims in 1049, presided over by Pope Leo IX in person. At this assembly, conducted in the presence of the relics of St Rémi, patron saint of the city, the pope ordered any of those present who had committed simony—that is, paid money for his office—to confess. Leo was committing a social gaffe, because his host, the Archbishop of Rheims, had won his preferment in this way; so had a number of the other bishops, including Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances. But Leo got his way: most of the bishops confessed. And though most of them were reinstated, European society suffered a shock from which the popes did not want it to recover.

Simony had been part of the normal process by which kings and princes appointed bishops, and behind the attack on simony lay the threat of an attack on royal control. Apart from their ecclesiastical duties the bishops were officials of the lay power—royal councillors, providers of contingents for the royal army. In countless ways bishops and abbots had always been pillars of royal authority. Many kings and princes had been extremely generous to the Church, and they expected a return—in two ways. They expected the Church to provide knights and they expected prayers. It suited them to have saintly monks and worldly bishops. But in the papal view bishops were spiritual leaders, pastors, shepherds of their flock—they must be spiritual men;

the Church must be free from lay control. In the last analysis, when pope and king fell out, their divergent views on the function of bishops nearly always lay at the heart of the quarrel. Was the bishop a royal official or a father in God? The question was never answered: he had to be both.

The papacy claimed to be a spiritual monarchy; and it claimed in particular to be the fount of justice in spiritual matters. In the twelfth century appeals in all sorts of important and trivial cases affecting ordinary people went to Rome. This was possible because of the development of canon law—the law of the Church—and the intensive activity in the law schools of Europe. Practising lawyers were being taught and textbooks compiled; research was flourishing. This intellectual activity was affecting all sorts of subjects. Scholars were taking books on law, philosophy, theology, on the spiritual life, on history, and even on science from library shelves, blowing the dust off them and finding a world of new ideas in their pages. Schools sprang up; students flocked to well known teachers. A renaissance had begun. Some of this new learning raised difficulties for the Church; from time to time teachers like Abelard were accused of heresy. But on the whole papal reform and the rise of learning were allies. At least we can say that the papal monarchy of the later Middle Ages is unthinkable without the sensational development in the study of law in this period.

At the time of the Council of Rheims in 1049, the Norman Conquest was only seventeen years away; a vital coincidence. Even in that time Duke William and his churches felt and absorbed something of the new spirit. It is one thing to preach a reform; another thing to have it enforced. William the Conqueror won golden opinions from contemporaries and has often been complimented since on his sincerity in the pursuit of church reform. There are many things in his career which make us believe in the reputation; but there are also passages which lead another way. He looked to the great churches of his duchy (and later of his kingdom) for prayers and for knights; and he sometimes appointed an abbot or a bishop notable for producing the one, sometimes for the other—sometimes for both. It is perhaps unfair to judge him by the two great warrior bishops, Geoffrey of Coutances and Odo of Bayeux, who fought at the battle of Hastings, since Geoffrey, a scion of the great house of Montbray or Mowbray and later founder of their fortunes in England, had bought his bishopric before the Council of Rheims, and Odo was William's brother. A more characteristic example perhaps was Gilbert Mamot, Bishop of Lisieux. He was the son of a baron and had been chaplain, head physician, and astrologer to the Conqueror. This is how Orderic Vitalis describes him: 'He was very skilled in the art of medicine, learned and eloquent, flowing in riches and good living, beyond measure inclined to have his will and pamper the flesh. He took his ease, and often indulged in gaming and dicing. In Divine Service he was idle and negligent, and always ready and eager—too eager—to hunt and hawk.' Then he passes to his better qualities—his generosity to the poor, his justice and rectitude, his kindness, and his good advice to the penitent; and his close and friendly relations with his subordinates in the chapter. 'He instructed them in arithmetic, astronomy and physic, and other profound matters, and made them the confidants of his salon and boon companions in his revels.'

From the point of view of an ardent reformer, Bishop Gilbert was an untidy mixture of old corruption and the new learning. From our point of view he seems not a bad example of the material that the Church had to use throughout this period. But the churchman on whom the Conqueror most relied was of a very different stamp.

Lanfranc of Pavia had established his reputation as a master of dialectic and theology before he left Italy as a comparatively young man and settled in the newly founded abbey of Bec in Normandy. He soon gathered a school round him, so that Bec became one of the famous centres of learning north of the Alps. It was often in this sort of way—by students gathering quite informally round a great teacher—that important schools were formed. The organised university grew up only in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

As Archbishop of Canterbury Lanfranc found himself abbot of a leading English community of monks, leader of the English Church and first councillor to one of Europe's most powerful monarchs. He entered into all three tasks with great intelligence, energy, and persistence. We must not underestimate him as monk and theologian, nor yet as politician; but he showed above all in his later years the qualities of a great administrator, and what interests us now is his work as head of the English Church.

Lanfranc's career is an epitome of the story of the Church in the eleventh century. He was born in Italy when new thoughts and new principles of reform were stirring; as a monk he lived the life from which the

inspiration for church reform ultimately sprang; in Normandy and England he observed the dissemination of, and himself disseminated, the principles to which he had been brought up. He had belonged to a generation in Italy which was alive with new ideas; but he had grown up none the less before the special direction of the papal reform could be discerned. He accepted the primacy of the Roman see, but not in the active, aggressive form in which it was proclaimed by Gregory VII. In this one respect, Lanfranc was conservative; and that made him the ideal colleague for the masterful William the Conqueror. Lanfranc's successor, Anselm, had had a very similar career and had been his pupil at Bec; but he was a generation younger, and was more sensitive to the possible dangers of too close links between Church and state. The result was that, though far from being cantankerous by disposition, he found it as difficult to collaborate with the Conqueror's sons as Lanfranc had found it easy to co-operate with the father.

Lanfranc came to England, not as a Norman reforming the decadent English by Norman standards, but as an Italian representing a new outlook in the Church, which had to struggle for a hearing on both sides of the Channel. In the long run, Lanfranc seems to have found the pulse of the Old English Church; when he first arrived, he was far from sensitive to its special needs and special glories. He reformed the calendar, showing little respect for English saints. To replace the *Regularis Concordia*, he produced a new code of monastic customs and regulations aimed to bring English observance more into line with modern French customs. He did not try to enforce it outside his own community in Canterbury, but he clearly expected it to be widely used. Lanfranc was interested in making church law and its operation more efficient. He brought his own law-book with him from Bec and had it circulated. In earlier times there had been no separate law-courts for the Church, and bishop and sheriff had both presided in the shire court. At one of his councils Lanfranc passed a decree establishing church courts separate from the shire—a decree made effective by a celebrated instruction from the king. This combination of conciliar decree and royal writ is characteristic of the close co-operation of king and archbishop. But in some respects Lanfranc's mastery in the Church was storing up trouble for future kings. His frequent ecclesiastical councils, in which the details of reform were planned, gave the leaders of the English Church a sense of community.

Lanfranc himself was only Archbishop of Canterbury; but he compelled the Archbishop of York to admit an entirely novel claim that Canterbury had primacy over York—a primacy of age and distinction it may have had before, but not the primacy Lanfranc claimed. A united Church under Lanfranc's guidance suited the king; and it may be that he found advantage, too, in Lanfranc's wider ambition. Lanfranc pursued his claim to be 'primate of all Britain' further than William pursued his efforts to assert suzerainty in Wales and Scotland. The Norman infiltration in Scotland and Wales was hardly under way in 1087, and Ireland was untouched. But Lanfranc asserted his leadership in parts of Scotland and in Dublin, though the conquest of the Welsh Church did not effectively begin before the early twelfth century; King William made a 'pilgrimage' to St David's over thirty years before a Norman was established there as bishop.

Lanfranc resisted papal intervention except in technical matters like the conferment of the 'pallium', the archbishop's scarf of office, and normal diplomatic exchanges. Simony and clerical marriage he attacked. In his handling of marriage, he was cautious and tactful; and it used to be said that this was owing to the special circumstances of the English Church. But it was the Norman clergy, not the English, who had the reputation of being among the most uxorious in Europe: two reformers of the period who preached celibacy to the Norman clergy were nearly lynched—one by the clergy, the other by their wives. One of Lanfranc's councils decreed that married priests could retain their wives; but no married men were to be ordained to higher orders in the future—and this decree seems to have been made to suit Norman as well as English churchmen. In the event it was a couple of generations before this was at all generally enforced among the upper clergy, much longer before it was enforced among the lower.

Lanfranc and his Norman associates, the archbishops of Rouen, with much help and some hindrance from their colleagues on the episcopal bench, and much cautious encouragement and some obstruction from their king and duke, were engaged in the common task of introducing the new European fashions of ecclesiastical life and thought both to the English and the Norman Churches

(2) *The Cathedrals*

The Normans altered the complexion of the English Church in two particularly obvious ways: they replaced most of the upper clergy with themselves, and they converted the bishoprics and larger abbeys into feudal baronies. Bishops and abbots always had been leading royal councillors; now they became the suppliers—sometimes even the leaders—of feudal contingents. Some of them were appointed for their capacity to manage knights and plant them on the estates of suffering abbeys. Not many perhaps: William was too conscientious and Lanfranc too powerful for many cynical appointments to be allowed. But the feudal contingents were often extremely large—several abbeys had to produce forty or even sixty knights.

By the Conqueror's death most of the abbots, and all the bishops save St Wulfstan of Worcester (1062–95), were new-comers. So were a large proportion of the cathedral clergy. The cathedral chapters, indeed, were often completely remodelled. The English cathedrals had been peculiar in being served by two quite different kinds of community. Many were served by chapters of canons; a few by monks with the bishop as titular abbot, and a prior occupying the stall of the dean. Monastic chapters were an insular peculiarity, and some of the Normans looked askance at them. But the monastic chapters soon won Lanfranc's patronage, and more were founded not long after the Conquest. The chapters of canons were mostly in a weak state at the time of the Conqueror's accession; such as they were, they were all under some form of a rule, binding them, in theory at least, to a communal, celibate life. They were not chapters of 'secular' canons, living independent lives in houses in the cathedral close, such as those to which the Normans were accustomed.

The English cathedrals—Durham, Norwich, Winchester, and several others—are the greatest surviving monument to Norman energy. For their day the Norman cathedrals were immense structures, heavy and usually, before the time of Henry I, crude in construction; but extremely impressive. They were in marked contrast to their Saxon predecessors. The Saxon cathedral at North Elmham in Norfolk was less than 140 feet long. A Norman cathedral was rarely less than twice this length. The size of North Elmham corresponded with that of churches built on the Continent two centuries before; recent continental movements had increased the scale of church building tremendously. Sometimes the Normans rebuilt, as at Winchester or Canterbury. Often they moved the cathedral to a larger centre of population, and started afresh, as at Old Salisbury, Chichester, Norwich, and Bath. The last two were monastic chapters, the first two secular; and at Salisbury Bishop Osmund (1078–99) founded the chapter which was to be the model for most English secular cathedrals, with a dean and dignitaries and a large body of canons, each with a separate income. The close link of bishop and chapter was emphasised by the presence of the bishop's chief officers, the archdeacons, among the canons. The secular chapter, the dignitaries, the archdeacons, were all Norman innovations—not based on any single Norman model, but an adapted version of what was normal in the north of France. In this respect their institutions and their architecture were of a piece. The Salisbury model is derivative, but not purely derivative; Norman architecture was based on Norman and continental models, but new ideas and new techniques were added to the Norman or Romanesque style in buildings like Durham Cathedral.

Why did the Normans build so large? The new continental fashions included a love of processions, growing ceremonial of every kind; demanded, too, a supreme effort to build a stately home for the saint who lived in it. Winchester Cathedral was the highest effort of Norman building; and it is a symptom of the rapidity with which Norman and English settled down together that it was built to house the shrine of a native English saint, St Swithun.

(3) *The Monasteries*

Monasteries and monks played a very conspicuous part in the Norman Church; not quite so conspicuous at court as in the days of Dunstan, but among the people at large, considerably more so. Between 1066 and 1154 the number of monastic houses in England rose from 48 to nearly 300; the number of monks from about 850 to well over 5,000—at a time when the total population was perhaps one-thirtieth of what it is today. Counting heads is a crude way of measuring changes in monastic life, but it tells us something. It reminds us that this was the golden age of medieval monasticism. The great religious movement of the eleventh century started in monasteries in different parts of Europe. From 1050 to 1150 a great number of the Church's leaders were monks; many of the best minds of the day were being recruited into monasteries; and this was so in England as on the Continent.

The housing of increasing numbers of monks is among the reasons why Norman monasteries and Norman cathedrals were built so large. To understand the kind of changes which were taking place, let us move forward to the middle of the twelfth century, and inspect the life in one of the great Cistercian monasteries being founded and built at that time. Then we can return to compare the Cistercians with the other leading Orders of the day.

The ruins of the abbey of Rievaulx ... still dominate an almost unspoiled stretch of country near Helmsley in Yorkshire. They have been much altered since the twelfth century, but the plan is essentially what it always was—that is, what all Cistercian plans were supposed to be. It lay isolated, surrounded by its own fields and sheep pastures; a large complex of buildings served within and without by its own community. The choir monks maintained divine service and formed the core of the monastic body; a large number of illiterate or semi-literate lay brothers tilled the fields and maintained the flocks. The buildings, like many Norman monasteries, were far larger than Saxon monasteries had usually been; but in the eleven-sixties they had to house 140 choir monks and 500 lay brothers. This was quite exceptional, even among the Cistercians, even at Rievaulx. But the church always had to be large, not only to house the monks, but also to provide chapels in which those choir monks who were priests—as most were—could celebrate daily mass. Next to the church, usually on the south side (as at Rievaulx) to catch the sun, lay the open square of the cloister, surrounded by a covered walk, at this date unprotected against the wind, where the monks could work or walk—an extraordinary and singularly unsuitable survival of the open courtyard of Mediterranean lands, where monastic customs had first been established in the West. Round the cloister lay the main offices and public rooms of the abbey. Above the east walk was the dormitory, where all the monks slept. About two o'clock every morning the community went down a staircase from the dormitory into the church for the first office of the day; and then after a brief rest, there followed for them the main body of daily offices and masses lasting until about half past eight. Beside the church, beyond the sacristy, under the dormitory, and with its main door in the east walk of the cloister, lay the chapter house. To this room the monks came next, for the daily chapter, where matters of business and discipline and the like were discussed. Then followed a short period for reading in cloister, and a longer period of work in the fields. In the south walk of the cloister lay the door to the most imposing of the conventual buildings, the refectory, the monks' dining-room. They visited it only twice a day at most. After the midday meal (and in summer a siesta) they worked again and read; then went to church for the evening offices of vespers and compline, and so to bed. Communal prayer, private prayer, spiritual reading, and work in the fields had each their share of the monks' waking hours.

In many respects the Cistercian life differed from that lived in other communities. It was based, like that of most monastic Orders, on the rule of St Benedict, which had grown steadily in prestige since the sixth century when it was written. In the early eighth century a centralising movement in the Frankish Empire had made St Benedict's rule, coupled with additional customs compiled by St Benedict of Aniane, the official rule of all Frankish monasteries. Although this move meant rapidly lost its force, the reformers of the tenth century, whether of Cluny, Gorze, or Glastonbury, all looked to the combined works of the two Benedicts as the source of their way of life. This meant a very elaborate ritual filling an ever increasing part of the day; it meant here and there a flourishing school within the monastery; it meant that the monks did no manual work. one of the effects of the intellectual revival of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was that monastic leaders came to know more and more thoroughly the ancient books on the spiritual life, and above all, to read them freshly, without the accretions of tradition laid over them, as though they had just been discovered for the first time. The eleventh century saw many groups of hermits, or monks leading something like the life of hermits, formed in Italy and France, under the inspiration of the lives of the desert fathers, and of their great interpreter to the West, John Cassian (of the early fifth century). Some of these developed into real hermit Orders, like the Carthusians. The Carthusian Order has altered least of all religious Orders in the 850 years of its existence. The monks still live in their cells a life of total silence, only meeting occasionally in the church and for conferences. Some of the hermits, however, came to form more normal Benedictine communities. In their way of life the influence of both Benedict and Cassian is very evident. The English Carthusians were few in number, but they included St Hugh, especially famous for combining, in later life, the austerity of his Order with the office of Bishop of Lincoln (1186–1200).

The Cistercians, who first sought their vocation at Cîteaux in 1098, came to be the most famous of these new Orders. They owed their exceptional fame to the groundwork, both spiritual and constitutional, of the third abbot, the English Stephen Harding, and to the dynamic inspiration of St Bernard (died 1153), abbot of the daughter abbey of Clairvaux. Several of the most distinguished of the English houses, including Rievaulx and Fountains, were daughters of Clairvaux, founded under Bernard's own instruction.

It may well have been the founders of Rievaulx, passing through York early in 1132, who fired a number of the leading spirits in the Benedictine house of St Mary's, York, with a desire to follow the Cistercians into uninhabited places. St Mary's lay near the heart of a busy city; the Cistercians looked for the silence and solitude of a deserted spot away from the cities. They looked for solitude for the community and for space for fields which their own lay brothers could till. The Benedictine abbeys were often in cities, and they had no lay brothers, so that it did not matter to them if their estates were not compact and close. So vital, indeed, was solitude to the Cistercians, that on occasion they created it by moving villages, almost like an eighteenth-century landowner laying out a park.

The insurgent group in St Mary's, York, prepared to leave the abbey late in 1132. The abbot refused his permission—he did not wish to lose so many of his best monks. The monks appealed to the Archbishop of York, Thurstan, who was sympathetic. The archbishop visited St Mary's, but was mobbed by the abbot's party, and had to take refuge, with the monks who had appealed to him, in the abbey church. In the end he and they escaped, and the group of monks, now in touch with St Bernard, were established in a remote and wild spot near Ripon, given to them by Thurstan. To the modern visitor the ruins of Fountains, made more romantic by the skill of an eighteenth-century landscape gardener, have a unique enchantment. But they are the memorial of a very exacting life; and before the great stone buildings went up, when the first community lived in temporary huts round the great elm which gave them their first shelter, life there must have been exceedingly austere.

The most distinguished of the English Cistercians was St Ailred, the third abbot of Rievaulx. We can get quite an intimate picture of this attractive, patriarchal abbot from the contemporary life written by his disciple, Walter Daniel. Ailred was a kindly, friendly superior—he gave his monks more opportunity for discussion more spiritual conferences, than can have been common. One has the impression that human relations were more intimate and life less severe than in some communities; but physical conditions were certainly austere, and Ailred himself gave a stern example of asceticism. His biographer, however, quotes him as saying that 'it is the singular and supreme glory of the house of Rievaulx that above all else it teaches tolerance of the infirm and compassion with others in their necessities.' This is a very attractive quality, and helps us to understand Walter's famous remark that on feast days you might see the church crowded with the brethren like bees in a hive, 'unable to move forward because of the multitude, clustered together, rather, and compacted into one angelical body'. Rievaulx was a haven of peace for the many rather than a home of strict vocation; and this is a striking fact, because one of St Bernard's most telling charges against Cluny was that it let monks in without a strict novitiate. The Cistercians recruited over 1,400 choir monks and founded over fifty houses in their first twenty-five years in England, and this sensational growth can be paralleled in many parts of western Europe. It shows that they were never very strict in accepting candidates. To us the monastic vocation seems a very special one, suitable only for the few. In their first enthusiasm the Cistercians, like many other religious Orders and movements, felt themselves to have found the best path to heaven, and found it difficult to deny access to any man. In their early days they attracted a wide variety of character and talent, including many of the best minds of the age. They were in the forefront of several movements, and contemporaries felt them to be so. In one of his letters St Bernard compared the spiritual life to Jacob's ladder, on which the angels went up and down but did not stand still. So, he argues, in the spiritual life, 'you mount—or you fall: you cannot stay still'. There were bad monks and evil influences even then; but down to the third quarter of the twelfth century many communities seemed to be mounting.

(4) *The Schools*

One of the movements in which monks played a leading part in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries was the revival of intellectual life. North of the Alps monastic libraries played a part only second to cathedral libraries in supplying the material for the revival. It is significant that three of the greatest names in Italian

learning in the eleventh century, Peter Damian, Lanfranc, and Anselm, became monks. Two of these men became Archbishops of Canterbury. The upper clergy formed a thoroughly cosmopolitan society. The clergy had an international language, Latin; they came and went freely in the schools of western Europe, especially in France and Italy. There was still much freedom in the organization of these schools: the reputation of a great teacher could make a school, his disappearance mar it. It was only as the twelfth century went on that university organisation began to crystallise; but already at the opening of the century Bologna had achieved the preeminence for the study of law which it was to hold for centuries; and Paris in Abelard's day was winning a special fame for philosophy and theology. England had her higher schools, mostly cathedral schools; but it is not until the end of the twelfth century that Oxford begins to be in any sense eminent, and not until the thirteenth that Oxford and Cambridge grew into universities.

Anselm was the dominant figure in English learning at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. But in spite of his immense prestige, and although he gathered pupils and disciples round him at Canterbury, his intellectual influence was limited to a small circle, and confined by the circumstances of his office, and by his frequent absences from England. None the less, his distinction serves to remind us that monks still played an important role in English learning well into the middle of the twelfth century. This is especially true in theology, hagiography, and the writing of history, in which English monks, led by William of Malmesbury, excelled. But to get an impression of the scope of learning and the ways in which it spread at this time, and of the life of scholars, one must look at the careers of a few individuals. Here are three examples.

The chief studies of the higher schools were theology and law; the foundation for these was broad, including almost every discipline known at the time (with special emphasis on Latin grammar, rhetoric and dialectic, or logic), but the summit of recognised sciences was comparatively narrow. This makes the exceptional career of Adelard of Bath all the more interesting. He was born before the eleventh century was out, and lived well into the middle of the twelfth. He studied at Tours and Laon—two French cathedral schools; he travelled in Greece, Asia Minor, Sicily, south Italy, and probably Spain. He formed an extraordinary link between Moslem and Christian learning; between the two great Norman states of England and Sicily; between literacy and statecraft. He was probably one of the men learned in Arabic and Greek mathematics who had a hand in developing the accounting techniques in the English Exchequer. His main work lay in more academic fields, in translating Greek and Arab philosophical and scientific treatises—it was Adelard who first introduced Euclid to the West. But he was sufficient of a courtier to write a treatise on falconry for Henry II when Henry was a boy.

A contemporary of Adelard's, meanwhile, was making a more conventional career for himself as a theologian in the schools of Paris. What makes Robert Pullen's career remarkable is that, when already one of the foremost theologians in the French schools, he elected to teach in England—at Exeter and Oxford—in his middle years. In the eleven-forties he returned briefly to Paris, and was then swept into the papal curia, made a cardinal and papal chancellor; he died in 1146.

One of the students who sat at Pullen's feet in Paris in the eleven-forties was a young Englishman called John of Salisbury. John had already heard most of the lecturers who were making the humanist studies of Chartres and the philosophical and theological studies of Paris celebrated at this time. At Chartres he acquired his immense classical learning, his love of *belles lettres*, his elegant Latin. At Paris he saw many of the great teachers of the day, starting with Abelard himself. He was twelve years a student, gathering one of the most substantial educations a man has ever had; and then he had to search for employment. His time in France brought him in contact with two distinguished abbots, Peter of Celle, who gave him temporary employment and became his closest friend, and St Bernard of Clairvaux. To his friendship with Peter we owe one of the few really intimate correspondences which survive from the Middle Ages. But it was Bernard who helped him to employment in the household of Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury. Canterbury was his headquarters from 1147 to Theobald's death in 1161. There he met many of the leading ecclesiastical administrators of his generation, and made friends with his patron's successor-to-be, Thomas Becket. Much of John's first years under Theobald were spent in journeys to the papal curia; his fascinating book of reminiscences, the *Memoirs of the Papal Court* (*Historia Pontificalis*), is based on his experiences during these visits. It was also in this period that he made, or renewed, his friendship with an English cardinal, Nicholas Breakspear, later to be pope as Adrian IV (1154–9)—the only Englishman to have held the office; a man who, as pope, began what was to

prove a long and bitter conflict with the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa. In doing so Adrian worked out in his life principles of ecclesiastical liberty which were also strongly held by John. Unfortunately that part of the Memoir which dealt with Adrian IV has been lost—if it was ever written. But what survives reveals John's skill in portraying his contemporaries in witty, though not usually malicious fashion. In Theobald's last years John was his personal secretary, writing many of his letters; but John also had leisure to bring out his most substantial books, the *Policraticus* and the *Metalogicon*. The former is a vast rambling encyclopedia of learning and lore on political theory and related (often remotely related) themes; it was dedicated to Thomas Becket, now royal Chancellor, and covered every topic in which John thought his friend ought to be concerned in his new office. At the same time he wrote a shorter book on contemporary logical theories and their sources, the *Metalogicon*, also dedicated to Thomas, to which we owe our knowledge of John's early career, and his famous description of the great teachers of his day. After Theobald's death and Becket's succession, John joined the latter's household, and he was mainly engaged in defending his friend's case and vindicating his memory until fortune brought him back, at the very end of his life, to the cathedral in whose shadow he had received the main intellectual inspiration of his life; he was Bishop of Chartres from 1176 until his death in 1180.

In John of Salisbury several of the finest traditions of twelfth-century learning were represented. He is best remembered as one of the most learned scholars of his day, at least in the pagan classics; and as a distinguished humanist. Humanism is an ambiguous and confusing word; but whether we look in it for devotion to the classics or for a deep sense of human values, both are present in John—the latter perhaps not so powerfully as the former. In many respects he and a few others like him foreshadowed the humanism of the later Renaissance. He knew no Greek; his passion for the great figures of the past was diffuse. Perhaps he differs most from scholars of the fifteenth century in the way he saw the classics through the spectacles of post-classical writers, especially of the pagan and Christian writers of the later Empire. John's outlook was entirely Christian.

Though not endowed with a high measure of physical courage, John held clear convictions and expressed them forcibly in his writings. Like many men who passed through the schools at this time, and came in contact with current theological and legal doctrine, he held clearly fixed in his mind the supremacy of the papacy in spiritual affairs and the ultimate supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal. Thus conviction as well as loyalty to friend and patron made him support Thomas Becket. It would be wrong to think of John as typical in this respect. It came as a great surprise to most contemporaries that Becket, after a normal clerical career in the schools, in the service of the archbishop and of the king, emerged when archbishop as a strong exponent of these views. The leading churchmen of the day were brought up in two worlds: in the world of lay custom of their parents and secular relations, and of the king whom most of the bishops had at one time served; and also in the clerical world of the schools, in which they learned the theory of papal and clerical supremacy. In the minds of most of them custom held a stronger place than in John of Salisbury's or Thomas Becket's. But the conflict in which they became involved can be understood only as part of the story of English politics in the century after the Conqueror's death; and to this we must now return. [See above, p. 6. Ed.]

