The Intellectual Influence of English Monasticism between the Tenth and the Twelfth Centuries

Author(s): R. Graham
Source: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, New Series, Vol. 17 (1903), pp. 23-65
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Royal Historical Society
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678137
Accessed: 22-02-2016 15:21 UTC

THE INTELLECTUAL INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH MONASTICISM BETWEEN THE TENTH AND THE TWELFTH CENTURIES

By MISS R. GRAHAM

Read June 18th, 1903

I

AT the opening of the tenth century monasticism was at its lowest ebb in England. King Alfred's attempts to revive the regular life had failed; some of the monasteries were homes of married priests, many more were ruinous and deserted. When Edgar had come into his kingdom, and was able to fulfil the vow which he had made as a boy to restore the monasteries to their former splendour,[1] the time was ripe for success. The land had recovered from the ravages of war, and 'the three torches'[2] of the Church—Dunstan, Athelwold, and Oswald—were ready to guide him. However, the brief but brilliant revival was checked by national disaster. From the time of the renewed Danish invasions monastic life steadily languished.

The result of the Norman Conquest was a great monastic revival. Under the rule of Lanfranc and their Norman abbots the English Benedictines[3] attained a higher standard of life and of learning. Following the example of William the Conqueror, the Norman barons manifested conspicuous

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 290 (R.S.)

[2] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 25 (R.S.)

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 70 (R.S.)

zeal in the founding of monasteries, and year by year the number increased. The new monastic orders, Augustinians, Cistercians, Præmonstratensians, Gilbertines, and others, gained numerous foundations in the course of the twelfth century. At the close, indeed, English monasticism was at its full flood. Its intellectual influence from the tenth to the twelfth century varied very much in extent and in intensity.

II

'Until Dunstan and Athelwold revived learning in the monastic life,' wrote Ælfric, Abbot of Eynsham, 'no English priest could either write a letter in Latin, or understand one.'[1] The language of exaggeration was pardonable in the monk, who viewed with enthusiasm the diffusion of education at the end of the tenth century, and thus appropriated King Alfred's description of the state of learning in his own day.[2] Alfred's high estimate of the value of education as a factor in the good government of the country[3] and his efforts to extend it were so far successful, that even in the first half of the tenth century it was usual for children of good birth to receive some instruction. Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury (942–959), was taught 'by a certain religious man while a boy in the household of the thegn Athelhelm.'[4] His friend Frithegode, to whom he entrusted the education of his nephew Oswald, was said 'to have been skilled in all the learning of that age in England, both secular and divine.'[5] The characteristics of the style of Odo[6] and Frithegode,[7] their long-

[1] *Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica*, p. 2; Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659.

[2] *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H. Sweet, p. 3 (E.E.T.S.)

[3] Camden, *Anglica Scripta*, ed. 1603, p. 21 (Asserus de Ælfredi Rebus Gestis).

[4] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 404 (R.S.)

[5] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 21 (R.S.)

[6] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 105–107.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 107–159.

winded and pretentious language and their frequent use of Latinised Greek words, were very similar to that of the numerous charters granted in the reigns of Edward the Elder and Athelstan.[1] Moreover the extremely technical character of the charters leads to the conclusion that there must have been some special institution for drawing them up and a number of highly trained clerks. The aged priest, whom the monks of St. Albans found able to read the British books unearthed in the excavations at Verulam during the rule of Abbot Eadmer, was also well skilled in learning.[2]

It is possible, too, as Alfred had set forth as an ideal,[3] that many of the sons of freemen learnt to read in their own tongue. It was for secular men who turned to the monastic life and knew no Latin[4] that King Edgar ordered Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester, to translate the Rule of St. Benedict.[5] Before the revival of learning, therefore, the teachers must have been the parish priests, and the men living in the collegiate churches and such of the older monasteries as had not been deserted after the coming of the Danes.

The lands obtained in the reigns of Edward the Elder and Athelstan by the religious houses of Wenlock,[6] Taunton,[7] Bath,[8] Abingdon,[9] Sherborne,[10] Worcester,[11] Winchester,[12]

[1] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. *passim*, e.g. 423, 579, 895. Cf. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 70: 'Id in omnibus antiquis cartis est animadvertere quantum quibusdam verbis abstrusis et ex Græco petitis delectentur.'

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 26. It is clear that the revival under Abbot Eadmer was contemporary with the general revival in Edgar's reign.

[3] *Alfred's West-Saxon Version of Gregory's Pastoral Care*, ed. H. Sweet (E.E.T.S.)

[4] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, iii. 441, 443 (R.S.)

[5] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 153 (Anglia Christiana Society).

[6] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. 229.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 272.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 351.

[9] *Ibid.* p. 373, 'ad usus monachorum Dei inibi degentium,' A.D. 931.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 394.

[11] *Ibid.* p. 399.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 408, 'ad refectorium fratribus et ad vestimenta,' A.D. 934.

Malmesbury[1] and others show that their inhabitants bore the name of monks and were revered as such. In reality, however, their lives appear to have differed so little from those of the secular priests that Ælfric was justified in saying that in 963 there were no monks in England except at Glastonbury and Abingdon.[2]

In Athelstan's reign the church and other buildings were still standing at Glastonbury, and clerks under the name of monks dwelt within them. Dunstan's parents brought him there to school when he was quite a little boy, and he made rapid progress in learning, quickly outstripping all the scholars of his own age.[3] He studied the Vulgate and such works of the Fathers as he found there. His masters in secular learning were the Irish scholars who came as pilgrims to Glastonbury to visit the tomb of Patrick the Younger.[4] These successors to Clement the Scot, Joannes Scotus, and a host of others were no doubt like them driven out from their own land by the pressure of poverty; but at Glastonbury, too, they found that they had not the wherewithal to live. Accordingly, they set up a school there for the children of high birth, and, as was the practice in the schools of France from the time of the Carolingian revival, they asked no fees for their instruction, but relied, with good reason, on the liberality of the thegns. From these teachers, and with the help of their books, Dunstan seems to have made some study of the different branches of learning included in the Trivium and the Quadrivium.[5] Possibly, too, he acquired some knowledge of Greek. However, such learning as Dunstan's was not the common possession of other young men of his own rank, and it exposed him to the charge 'of studying the vain poems and trifling histories of ancient paganism to be a worker of magic.'[6] A serious illness following upon his disappointments at court led him to take monastic vows to which Ælfheah the Bald,

[1] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, ii. p. 423.
[2] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 259 (R.S.)
[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 7.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 10, 74, 256. [5] *Ibid.* p. 257. [6] *Ibid.* p. 11.

Bishop of Winchester, had previously urged him.[1] In 946 King Edmund seated him in the abbot's chair at Glastonbury.

Under Dunstan Glastonbury continued to be rather a school than a monastery. The Rule of St. Benedict was then unknown in England, and even in the seventh century it had only been firmly established at Wearmouth and Jarrow. As Dunstan relied solely on tradition and his own judgment in setting up his model of the regular life, the monasticism of Glastonbury differed as much from the pure Benedictinism of Fleury as from that of the secular clerks. His most distinguished scholar was Athelwold, who had been ordained priest with him by Ælfheah the Bald. Under Dunstan's guidance Athelwold attained 'a generous skill in the art of grammar and the honeyed sweetness of verse,' . . . he read the Bible and 'the catholic and most famous authors.'[2]

In 953[3] Athelwold was chosen by King Edred to be abbot of the monastery which he proposed to restore at Abingdon. Five clerks of Glastonbury accompanied Athelwold, and in the ten years of his abbacy he received fifty monks. Zeal for learning, the special feature of the restored monasteries of Glastonbury and Abingdon, was further strengthened by intercourse with Ghent,[4] Corbeil,[5] and especially with Fleury, which, after its recent reform by Odo, second Abbot of Cluny, was a model of strict Benedictine observance and famous alike for its school and library.[6]

Oswald, Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York, had profited much by his sojourn at Fleury, and soon after the founding of Ramsey Abbey in 968, 'as the study of letters and the use of schools had almost died out in England,'[7] he requested the Abbot of Fleury to send a teacher to rule the

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 14.

[2] Wulfstan, 'Vita St. Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 87.

[3] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 258.

[4] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 101.

[5] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed J. Stevenson, i. 129.

[6] 'Rules for Monks and Secular Canons after the Revival under King Edgar,' by Mary Bateson. Cf. *English Historical Review*, 1894, pp. 690, 691.

[7] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 42.

schools at Ramsey. The choice fell upon Abbo, who was versed in all of the seven Arts of the Trivium and Quadrivium.[1] He spent two years at Ramsey, during which he diligently instructed the monks. For his English scholars he wrote the treatise 'Quæstiones Grammaticales,'[2] with the metrical prologue, destined, as Mr. Macray has pointed out, 'to test their knowledge alike of language and astronomy.'[3] It was at the urgent request of the monks of Ramsey that he laid aside for a time the study of secular literature to write the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi.' He had heard Dunstan tell the story in the Latin tongue to Ælfstan, Bishop of Rochester, Ælfric, Abbot of Malmesbury, and others who were standing around.[4] In his preface he pleaded the monks' insistence that his book would give pleasure to the Archbishop, and would be no useless monument of so small a man as himself.[5] It seems probable, too, that Abbo wished his work to serve as a model of Latin style in the school of Ramsey and elsewhere, for, in contrast to the turgid writing of the tenth century in England, the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi' has a distinct classical flavour.[6] After the manner of Livy or Cicero, Abbo attributed long speeches to the various actors in the drama, interspersing them with appropriate classical quotations. A notable exception, however, was the use by a messenger of 'parcere subjectis et debellare superbos' as a description of the conduct of the fierce Dane Inguar towards his enemies.[7] Other passages again recall the 'Æneid.'

The influence of Abbo's classical teaching at Ramsey is of considerable interest. In the Life of St. Oswald,[8] written between 995 and 1005 by a contemporary monk of Ramsey,

[1] 'Vita Sancti Abbonis,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 390.
[2] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 521–534.
[3] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. xxvii.
[4] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] E.g. *ibid.* p. 9. 'Quem, præda facta . . . innoxios.'
[7] *Ibid.* p. 11.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 399–475.

some of the features of the 'Passio Sancti Edmundi' may be observed. Like Abbo, the author was a man of considerable culture and learning, though he made a far more pedantic use of it;[1] like his master, too, he occasionally attempted to give a Virgilian flavour to his writing,[2] but the national tradition had too strong an influence over him. He could not resist the desire to reproduce the enthusiastic rhetoric of Anglo-Saxon poetry in his Latin prose, and the mystical language of the Song of Solomon appealed forcibly to him. Another of Abbo's pupils at Ramsey was Byrhtferth, who wrote commentaries on Bede's mathematical treatises: these show that he too had read widely and was well acquainted with Latin authors.[3]

The restoration of forty monasteries[4] for men in the reigns of Edgar and his sons under the influence of Dunstan, Athelwold, and Oswald resulted probably in the founding of as many schools. Five of these religious houses were restored by Dunstan, eight by Athelwold, seven by Oswald. The abbots were their choice. Ælfric of Malmesbury Dunstan knew to be a man 'of much religion and very great learning;'[5] Wulsy, Abbot of Westminster, and afterwards Bishop of Sherborne, was another of his famous pupils.[6] Osgar of Abingdon, Ethelgar of New Minster, Brihtnoth of Ely, Adulf of Peterborough, were all *discipuli* of Athelwold at Abingdon or Winchester.[7] The first bands of monks sent to Winchester, New Minster, Ely, Peterborough, and Thorney had been trained at Abingdon.[8] The same filiation can be traced in the monasteries of Mercia and East Anglia. The first twelve monks of Ramsey were

[1] E.g. *ibid.* pp. 399, 400.

[2] E.g. *ibid.* p. 413. 'Hortante . . . tripudio.'

[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. xviii, xix.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 214. Of forty-eight, eight were for women. Cf. *Fasti Monastici ævi Saxonici*, ed. W. de Gray Birch.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 302.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 304. *Cf.* also p. 209.

[7] Wulfstan, 'Vita S. Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 92, 93.

[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, i. 348.

sent by Oswald from Westbury with their Prior Germanus,[1] the Winchester clerk who had lived many months at Fleury. Winsig, the first Prior of Worcester, was trained at Ramsey.[2]

In France from the ninth century onwards there were two distinct schools in the monasteries, the 'scholæ claustrales' for the oblates, or children dedicated by their parents to the monastic life, and the 'scholæ canonicæ' or 'clericales,' for clerks and laymen of noble birth.[3] Both were directed by the monks, but the discipline and course of studies differed.[4] At Fleury there had certainly been two distinct schools since 855,[5] and the usage was therefore well known to Oswald,[6] to Germanus,[7] Prior of Westbury, and Osgar,[8] the successor of Athelwold as Abbot of Abingdon. Fleury, too, had recently been reformed by Odo, Abbot of Cluny, and the very essence of the Cluniac Rule was the absolute separation of the oblate in his school,[9] and that wellnigh intolerable supervision which drew forth the enthusiastic comment of Udalric in the eleventh century: 'Whenever I saw with what zeal the boys are guarded day and night, I said in my heart it would be difficult for a king's son to be educated with greater diligence in a palace than even the smallest boy at Cluny.'[10] The capitulary of 817, in which Louis the Pious and Benedict of Aniane laid down that none but oblates should be taught within the monastery,[11] and that no secular clerk or layman should be lodged there,[12] was in the hands of the English

[1] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 36.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 41.

[3] *Les Écoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'Occident*, par Léon Maître, pp. 198, 199.

[4] *L'Abbaye du Bec et ses Écoles*, par M. L'Abbé Porrée, p. 24.

[5] Matthew Arnold, *Schools and Universities on the Continent*, p. 6. *Cf.* Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxix. 387. 'Talibus ergo Abbo ortus parentibus in Floriacensi monasterio scholæ clericorum ecclesiæ Sancti Petri obsequentium traditur litteris imbuendus.'

[6] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 413–419.

[7] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 24.

[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 259.

[9] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, ed. 1655–77, iv. 175–183.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 183.

[11] Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica: Leges*, i. 202, cap. 45.

[12] *Ibid.* p. 202, cap. 42.

reformers.[1] Nevertheless, there is no evidence that they accepted the distinction between the schools. At Glastonbury and Abingdon the revival of learning preceded the introduction of the new Benedictinism from Ghent and Fleury. Dunstan's scholars were of all ages, from the little boy [2] to the man who had already taken priest's orders;[3] the clerks [4] of the household maintained for the services of Glastonbury by Ethelfleda were doubtless among them. Athelwold taught in the school of his cathedral monastery, not scorning even to explain the difficulties of Donatus and Priscian to little boys.[5] Old and young were alike his pupils,[6] and it is important to note that many of them became secular priests.[7]

Possibly in the school of the chief city of the kingdom the clerks who drew up the charters of Edgar and Æthelred received some of their education, for until Canute instituted the royal chancery [8] there is no evidence in England of the existence of a palace school such as that of Charles the Great or Otto I. The preambles of the charters only grew longer as the century advanced,[9] and retained throughout the same characteristics of style as the earlier ones, the characteristics too of the writing of Athelwold,[10] and his disciples Lantfred [11] and Wulfstan.[12]

[1] *English Historical Review*, 1894, pp. 693–5, for a list of English manuscripts containing copies of Benedict of Aniane's 'Memoriale' and the Epitome, the Capitulary of 817, the Rule of St. Benedict with an Anglo-Saxon translation. Among the books marked by John of Glastonbury in 1247 in the library catalogue as 'vetustissimi' were the 'Decreta Caroli et Ludovici regum.' *Cf.* Joannes Glastoniensis, *Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[2] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 28, 46.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 261.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 175.

[5] 'Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica,' p. 1; Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659.

[6] Wulfstan, 'Vita Sancti Æthelwoldi,' Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cxxxvii. 91.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 95.

[8] J. R. Green, *The Conquest of England*, pp. 544, 545.

[9] *Cartularium Saxonicum*, ed. W. de Gray Birch, iii. *passim*, e.g. pp. 308, 450, 453.

[10] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. p. xxvii.

[11] 'Miracula S. Swithuni, Wintoniensis Episcopi, per Lantfredum, Wintoniensem Monachum,' MS. Cotton, Nero E 1, ff. 33–51. For his introductory epistle cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 370.

[12] *Vita S. Swithuni, versibus hexametris, per Wolstanum*, *MS. Reg.* 15, C. vii.

In the absence of direct evidence it is only possible to speculate as to the reasons why the schools were not divided in the English monasteries. So rigid a distinction would not have been in accordance with the fusion of Church and State in every sphere, the special feature of English history before the Norman Conquest. The capitularies of Charles the Great[1] were also known to the reformers. Though schools were established in the monasteries by his capitulary of 787,[2] the separation was not mooted until the capitulary of Louis the Pious in 817. The English bishops may well have decided, as their own system worked very well, that they would not introduce the foreign distinction unless necessity arose. There is no evidence before 1066 of any change. Wulfstan, afterwards Bishop of Worcester (1062–1095), was educated within the monasteries of Evesham and Peterborough: he was not an oblate, for he afterwards joined as a layman in the sports of other young men of his age.[3]

In the 'Concordia Regularis' only a glimpse of the 'school' of boys is to be seen as they come in and go out of church with their masters.[4] Ælfric, however, has given an interesting picture of the boys coming to their master for instruction in his 'Colloquium ad Pueros Linguæ Latinæ Locutione exercendos.'[5] The chief spokesman was the lad who was already professed a monk, but his young companions were ploughboys, shepherds, neatherds, hunters, fishers, bird-catchers, chapmen, tailors, salters, and bakers. The 'Colloquium' also throws some light on the discipline of the school: the boys recognised the virtue in a flogging, but trusted the master to temper justice with mercy.[6] The boys at Ramsey had leave from their master at certain hours in the week to go outside the cloister for play and amusement, and it was

[1] *Cf.* note 1, p. 9.

[2] Bass Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*, pp. 97–99.

[3] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244, 245, 'Willelmus Malmesbiriensis de Vita S. Wlstani Episcopi Wigornensis.'

[4] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. pp. xxx, xxxi.

[5] *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica*, ed. B. Thorpe, pp. 18–36.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 18.

on one of these occasions that four of them happened to break one of the church-bells.[1] It is probable that the co-education of the future monk, clerk, and layman was the cause of milder discipline in England. The traditional gentleness of St. Dunstan is shown in the stories of his appearance on two occasions to protect Osbern (fl. 1090) and the Canterbury schoolboys from the harsh discipline of their masters.[2]

The curriculum of studies in the monastic schools included such knowledge of the Trivium and Quadrivium as was then known in England; but it must have varied greatly in the different monasteries, for throughout the Middle Ages, owing to the comparative scarcity of books, everything depended on the capacity of the individual teacher. Probably many of the scholars, especially of those who were going out into the world again, did not get beyond the Trivium, of which the most important art was grammar. The text-books used were naturally Donatus and Priscian.[3] Finding, perhaps from experience, that these were very difficult for little boys, Ælfric wrote a Saxon Latin grammar which he dedicated to them as a preparatory book.[4] Several other schoolbooks of precisely the same nature as the 'Colloquium' have been preserved:[5] they are specially interesting as illustrations of the methods of teaching languages. Many Anglo-Saxon and Latin glossaries, too, are still extant. At the end of the tenth century some knowledge of Latin seems to have been pretty widely diffused; but as Ælfric then complained of many false translations from Latin into the vernacular,[6] the zeal of the authors must have exceeded their scholarship. Ælfric showed great anxiety, too, that the scribes who copied

[1] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 112, 113.

[2] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 137, 141.

[3] 'Ælfrici Grammatica Latino-Saxonica;' Appendix to *Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum*, ed. Somner, 1659, p. 1.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] E.g. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, vol. i. pp. lvi, lviii, lxiii, lxviii.

[6] Ælfric's *Homilies*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 3.

his books should not introduce errors into them.[1] Monks and clergy learned some arithmetic and astronomy, in order to calculate the feasts of the Church aright, and some elements of the theory of music.

The question of the teaching of Greek in the English monastic schools in the tenth century is a difficult one to answer. It has already been suggested as possible that Dunstan learnt Greek from his Irish masters. It was to an Irish bishop that St. Bruno turned when he needed a Greek teacher for the palace school of Otto the Great.[2] If Dunstan had some knowledge of the language, perhaps he taught it to Athelwold and others of his more distinguished pupils. Among the books given by Athelwold to Peterborough was one with the title 'De Literis Græcorum.'[3] On the other hand the verdict of Dietrich, the German commentator on Ælfric, is that he knew no Greek.[4] If Athelwold taught it at Winchester it is difficult to believe that Ælfric, who spent many years in his school,[5] should not have learnt it, though he certainly pleaded that there were many in England more learned than himself.[6] There are hundreds of Greek words in numerous glossaries, and on the whole it is safer to conclude that, with rare exceptions, the knowledge of Greek was confined to these.[7]

The monastic bishops of the tenth century realised that even with the revival of about forty monastic schools only a comparatively small section of the nation could receive education within them. Moreover, with the doubtful exception of Ripon,[8] there was no monastery north of the

[1] Ælfric's *Homilies*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. p. 9. Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 7 (E.E.T.S.)

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 85, n. 7.

[3] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i. 382.

[4] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, vol. ii. pp. xliv.

[5] *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's*, ed. G. W. Kitchin, p. 175, in *Ælfric's Abridgment of St. Ethelwold's Concordia Regularis*, ed. Mary Bateson.

[6] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 9.

[7] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, vol. i. p. lvii. Cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. cxxii.

[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 462.

Humber. The bulk of the people, therefore, had to depend on the parish priests, and accordingly the bishops exercised a careful supervision over them to see that the teaching imparted was as good and as suitable as possible. In this respect, too, the bishops looked back for precedents to the revival of learning under Charles the Great. They took the Capitulary of Theodulf of Orleans[1] as their guide, and the English translation was furnished most probably by Ælfric.[2] Theodulf had laid down that every mass-priest must keep a free school for little boys, but he might receive from their relations what they were willing to give of their own accord.[3] Any priest who wished to put his nephew or any of his relations to learning at any of the churches in the bishop's charge must apply to him, and he would willingly grant his request.[4] In England some at least of the priests had had the privilege of monastic education,[5] but they were forbidden to look down on their less learned brethren,[6] or to take away their scholars from them without their consent.[7] All were commanded to teach the young diligently.[8] In no canon perhaps is the influence of Dunstan more clearly shown than in that enjoining on every priest the knowledge of some handicraft;[9] thereby he would increase knowledge, and by training his pupils in it he would make them useful for his Church.[10] It would be interesting to know how much the people availed themselves of the opportunities offered them for the education of their children. The indication of six days in the month on which it was good to put children to school,[11] by the author of a book of prognostics, suggests that it was a common practice, but he gave no clue to the classes of the nation for whom he was writing.

In the other countries of Western Europe in which the

[1] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, cv. 196, capp. ccxix, ccxx.
[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 207.
[3] *Ibid.* c. xx. [4] *Ibid.* c. xix. [5] *Cf.* p. 9, n. 7.
[6] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 226, cap. xii. [7] *Ibid.* p. 225, cap. x.
[8] *Ibid.* p. 228, cap. li. [9] *Ibid.* p. 225, cap. xi. [10] *Ibid.* p. 228, cap. li.
[11] *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft*, ed. O. Cockayne, iii. 185, 187, 189, 191, 193.

cathedrals were always served by secular canons there were also episcopal schools,[1] but, with the exception of Chartres [2] at the beginning of the eleventh century, they did not attain such fame as those of the monasteries. In England, in Dunstan's old age, there is some evidence of an episcopal school at Canterbury,[3] but the existence of any others is mere conjecture. It is possible that other monastic bishops of cathedrals in the possession of secular clerks gathered scholars around them. Elfweard, Bishop of London (1035–1044), previously monk of Ramsey and Abbot of Evesham, Etheric and Eadnoth, two Ramsey monks, who succeeded each other as Bishops of Dorchester (1016–1034; 1034–1050), were perhaps among them.

Episcopal schools which depend on individual bishops must be carefully distinguished from schools attached to secular cathedrals. Nothing is known of any schools attached to collegiate churches, whether of cathedral dignity or not, during the monastic revival in the reigns of Edgar and his sons. After the Danish conquest collegiate churches again became popular, and Canute favoured them as well as the monasteries.[4] He has indeed been praised by later monastic authors as a promoter of education. Writing before 1090, Hermann of Bury stated that Canute supported boys at both collegiate and monastic schools.[5] Abbot Samson of Bury (1182–1211), himself a schoolmaster, credited Canute with the foundation of a number of grammar schools.[6] Between thirty and forty churches for secular canons are registered in Domesday Book, and a number of these were founded in the reign of Edward the Confessor.[7] It seems probable that, as at Waltham,[8] a school was included in these foundations.

[1] Léon Maître, *Les Ecoles épiscopales et monastiques de l'Occident*, 768–1180, p. 173.

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 113.

[3] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3. Cf. *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. lvii.

[4] W. Hunt, *A History of the English Church from its Foundation to the Norman Conquest*, p. 394.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 46.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 126.

[7] *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. vi.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 15, *cf.* p. 35.

The contents of the English monastic libraries are very suggestive. In the catalogue made by John of Glastonbury of the library in 1247,[1] a considerable number of books are marked as 'vetustissimi.' Many of these were written in English, some of them are set down as useless, others as illegible. It may be concluded, therefore, that these formed the library of the monastery before the Norman Conquest and that most of them were written at the period of its greatest literary activity under Dunstan [2] and his immediate successors. These books included copies of the Bible and of its separate books in Latin and in English, many with glosses, some of the works of the Fathers and of the Carolingian theologians, the historical and theological works of Bede, the writings of Alcuin and Aldhelm, some collections of the older canons, several books of English sermons, many lives of the saints, medical treatises, and the usual text-books such as Donatus and Priscian. The investigation of the sources used by Ælfric justifies the belief that much the same set of books was contained in the Winchester library.[3] From Glastonbury and Winchester many other monastic libraries would be supplied.[4] The English Church alone of all national Churches in the tenth and first half of the eleventh centuries had an extensive ecclesiastical vernacular literature.[5] Leofric's endowment of his cathedral church of Exeter with sixty books, of which twenty-eight were English, affords some idea of the number then written.[6]

The English scholars seem to have resolutely devoted themselves as a religious duty to the diffusion of such knowledge as they possessed. Though the search after more learning must have been a temptation to such a receptive mind as

[1] *Joannes Glastoniensis, Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[2] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N.E.S.A. Hamilton, p. 196.

[3] *Cf.* Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, vol. ii. p. xlv.

[4] For Peterborough, *cf.* Dugdale, *Monasticon*, i. 382.

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert*, p. 58.

[6] *Dictionary of National Biography* (1046–1072).

that of Ælfric, he evidently thought that his brethren were wrong in not resisting it.[1] It is noticeable, however, that they contributed nothing to the advancement of learning. In theology they pursued the uncritical methods of Bede and Alcuin without any regard for new developments abroad.[2] Their conservatism was so strong that no single instance is known of any scholar like Agobard of Lyons,[3] or Claudius of Turin,[4] who protested against the growth of superstition.

In striking contrast with the contemporary revival in Germany, there was no trace of any opposition in England to the traditional teaching of the Church. The very isolation of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom secluded it from the contact with Oriental heretics, which probably kindled the flame abroad.[5] Indeed the authority of the Fathers, of Bede, and of the Carolingian theologians, was incontestable. In all the writings of Ælfric only one instance of a doubt occurs, in the story of the vengeance of St. Thomas,[6] and in this respect Ælfric was a follower of St. Augustine. He held his peace about the chief source of his 'Lives of the Saints,' the 'Vitæ Patrum,' for fear that it should prove a stumbling-block to others.[7] With the dread of heresy before him, Ælfric translated 'sense for sense'[8] instead of word for word, and he entreated Sigeric, Archbishop of Canterbury (990–994), to correct anything which savoured of error.[9] His views on the Eucharist,[10] which were triumphantly quoted by Protestant writers at the Reformation, were taken directly from the work of Ratramnus, which was not generally recognised as heretical until the controversy between Berengar of Tours

[1] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 7.
[2] *Cf.* H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 58.
[3] R. S. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, pp. 38–46.
[4] *Ibid.* pp. 30–39.
[5] *Ibid.* pp. 90, 91.
[6] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 521.
[7] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 4.
[8] *Homilies of Ælfric*, ed. B. Thorpe, i. 1.
[9] *Ibid.* p. 3.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 263–287.

and Lanfranc.[1] Ælfric ignored the speculative interest of the doctrine of predestination which in the middle of the ninth century had divided French scholars into two camps.[2] As a follower of the teaching of Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz, he regarded only the dangerous tendencies of the extreme views set forth by Gottschalk.[3]

There was no general belief in England that the world would come to an end in the year 1000.[4] It is possible, however, that there was some discussion of the subject; for in 971 the writer of one of the Blickling Homilies insisted that the time of the second coming of the Saviour was withheld from the knowledge of men.[5] He[6] and others too naturally expressed the current medieval belief that the day of doom was drawing nigh, and saw in the events of their own day the realisation of Christ's prophecies.

The patriotism and public spirit pervading the English monasteries generated that keen interest in historical study which manifested itself in the vigorous and detailed continuations of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at Abingdon, Worcester, Peterborough, and elsewhere, and in a series of contemporary ecclesiastical biographies from which we derive the greater part of our knowledge of the reigns of Edgar and his sons. The monastic authors before the Norman Conquest were providing materials for a later school of historical writers, but at the same time it is interesting to note that the one attempt at a general history was the chronicle of the ealdorman Ethelweard,[7] a layman and a friend of Ælfric.

No improvement in the Latin style of English writers resulted from the revival of learning in the monasteries. As none of the writings of Dunstan are extant, his style cannot

[1] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 61, n. 4.

[2] R. L. Poole, *Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought*, p. 51.

[3] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 379–383.

[4] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 31, and *American Historical Review*, 1901, pp. 429–439.

[5] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 118.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 106, 116.

[7] *Scriptores Rerum Anglicarum post Bedam*, ed. H. Saville, pp. 473–483

be justly estimated; yet if it differed greatly from that of his contemporaries it would be singular that none of his pupils should show any traces of his influence.[1] Ethelwold's style was marked by obscurity and the frequent use of Greek words.[2] Ælfric alone escaped. Doubtless his constant aim to write plain English gave his Latin style the qualities of clearness and simplicity. William of Malmesbury's comment on the false canons of style of præ-Norman monastic writers is worthy of observation. 'They are importunate judges,' he said, 'who are ignorant that methods of expression vary according to the customs of nations. In a word, the Greeks write "involute," the Romans "splendide," the English "pompatice."'[3]

An attempt to fathom the mind of the people, and to note the effect of such education and teaching as they received through the influence of the Church, is of some interest. The manifold denunciations in sermons of the sin of witchcraft[4] bear witness to a strong belief in heathen superstitions. The stories of St. Dunstan and his several conflicts with the devil[5] merely illustrate the universal belief in the power and material presence of Satan and his army of evil spirits.[6] Under pressure of the Church laws were passed against sorcerers and magicians, but their frequent recurrence showed the prevalence of the practice of divination.[7] The Church, however, only gave the people other superstitions in exchange.

[1] *Cf.* the collection of letters in appendix to *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, *e.g.* pp. 361, 399.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. pp. xxvii–xlv. For the authorship of the 'Concordia Regularis' cf. *Ælfric's Abridgment of St. Ethelwold's Concordia Regularis*, ed. M. Bateson, an appendix to *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St. Swithun's*, ed. G. W. Kitchin, p. 175.

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 344.

[4] Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 371. Cf. *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 60.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W Stubbs, pp. 26, 27.

[6] *Cf.* W. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise of Rationalism*, i. 37, 38, ed. 1887.

[7] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 206, 'De Veneficiis' at the Council of Greatanlea in 928, p. 287, 'Ut sagæ, incantatores etc. exulent' at Council of Eynsham in 1009, p. 306, in 'Leges Ecclesiasticæ Canuti Regis.'

The use of the sign of the cross was recommended as an infallible remedy against demons;[1] the talisman was consecrated by the Church, not forbidden.[2] The growth of relic worship was fostered by the monastic revival.[3] At first it seems to have been due to extreme reverence for the saints, but even then it led to conflicts between monasteries.[4]

Another side of the intellectual influence of English monasticism before the Norman Conquest is to be seen in the political ideal set before the nation. In this respect, too, there is a remarkable contrast with the developments generated by the Cluniac movement on the Continent. The theories of the autonomy of the Church within the State, of the independence of monasticism within the Church, of the world supremacy of the Pope, were unknown in England. In the absence of any speculative discussion of political theory it is only possible to deduce it from the consistent policy of Dunstan and his successors. As the English bishops were almost invariably monks until Canute began the practice of appointing clerks of the Royal Chapel, the influence of the Church may fairly be called monastic.

The ecclesiastical independence of the English Church was very conspicuous. Though from the tenth century the archbishops went to Rome to fetch their palls, it was at first the continuance of a traditional custom rather than the expression of definite subjection to the Papal See. As Dunstan received his pall from so infamous a pope as John XII.,[5] it is not surprising to find that he disregarded a papal dispensation in a matrimonial case, and succeeded in forcing his own view on both Edgar and the recalcitrant noble.[6] In questions of Church organisation expediency

[1] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 46, and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, ii. 371.

[2] *The Blickling Homilies*, ed. R. Morris, Part I. p. 126.

[3] *E.g.* the translation of St. Swithun by Athelwold, Bishop of Winchester.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 127, 128, and *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 280.

[5] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 296.

[6] *Ibid.* pp. 67, 106, 200, 301.

triumphed over papal decrees; Oswald and his successors held the sees of Worcester and York jointly without any sanction of the Papacy. Although the older collections of canons were not unknown,[1] English ecclesiastical law was far more national than that of the Continent.[2] No single mention of the Papacy occurred in the canons of Edgar or Ælfric, or at the Council of Eynsham; only one in the laws of Æthelred,[3] which was merely repeated in the laws of Canute.[4] The feast days of St. Dunstan and St. Edmund were decreed by the Witan.[5]

The legislation of the Witan illustrated the powerful influence of the bishops. Their ideal was an independent theocratic State, a strong united kingdom.[6] Within this State the power of the Church should be more and more direct, the secular laws should be inspired by the ethical spirit of Christianity, the State should co-operate with the Church in the appointment of bishops and abbots[7] and in the making of ecclesiastical laws.[8] It was a practical ideal, and the laws of Edgar, Æthelred, and Canute show how far it was attained; but the close interdependence of Church and State involved the decline of one with the other.

III

'Zeal for letters and religion had grown cold many years before the coming of the Normans.'[9] The frequent and terrible ravages of the Danes recorded in the pages of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from 980 to 1016 proved fatal to the revival of monasticism; it was impossible for learning

[1] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, p. cxii.

[2] Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 45. *Cf.* Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 225–239, 245, 250–255, 286–292, 295, 296, 299–305.

[3] *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, ed. B. Thorpe, p. 147, Æthelred, ix. 26.

[4] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 307, cap. x.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 303, cap. xvii.

[6] *Cf.* Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints*, ed. W. W. Skeat, i. 4.

[7] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. i. p. xxviii. For several instances *cf.* Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *e.g.* in 1043.

[8] W. Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, i. 263.

[9] William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 304.

to flourish among men who lived in daily fear of the coming of the pirate host. When Canute had established peace and restored the monasteries which had suffered in the struggle, the older generation had passed away and their successors did not attain their level. Abbot Leofsin (1029–1045) of Ely set much store by learning,[1] but elsewhere, apparently, there was a general decline. In 1066 it was too early to see any real results of Edward the Confessor's attempts to draw the Church into closer relations with the Papacy[2] and to rekindle the desire for a stricter life by the introduction of foreign abbots and monks.[3] The flourishing state of the Church in Normandy[4] and the conspicuous learning alike of monasteries and cathedrals justified the scorn of the Normans for the intellectual condition of the conquered nation. The difference between the two standards is aptly illustrated in the case of Wulstan, Bishop of Worcester (1062–1095). Though educated within the monasteries of Evesham and Peterborough, and at Worcester schoolmaster, prior, bishop in succession,[5] in 1078 he was threatened with deposition by Lanfranc on the charge of ignorance: he neither knew nor cared to know 'the fables of the poets and the tortuous syllogisms of dialecticians.'[6]

William's policy of substituting Norman rulers in English bishoprics and abbeys was purely political, but through Lanfranc's aid it was destined to raise the intellectual condition of the monasteries. The men who succeeded the English abbots were chosen for their religion and learning

[1] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 200.

[2] E.g. *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, p. 170, Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 690.

[3] *Lives of Edward the Confessor*, ed. H. R. Luard, p. 414; *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 56; *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, vol. i. p. lii.

[4] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, pp. 3–42.

[5] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244–249, 'Willelmus Malmesbiriensis de Vita S. Wlstani Episcopi Wigornensis.'

[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 279.

from the great Norman houses:[1] Paul of St. Albans (1077–1097)[2] came from Caen, Godfrey of Malmesbury (1081–1105)[3] from Jumièges, Scotland of St. Augustine's (1070–1087) from Mont St. Michel.[4] So rapid was the process that although thirteen out of twenty-one abbots who signed the decrees of the Council of London in 1075 were English, only three still held office at the accession of William Rufus.[5] At the same time there was a great increase in the number of monastic foundations in England. Between 1066 and 1135 three monastic cathedrals, thirteen important monasteries for women, eleven for men, seventeen Cluniac priories, sixty cells for foreign houses, besides many for English houses, were founded.[6] These provided for a large number of Norman abbots and monks; *e.g.* the first monks of Battle came from Marmoutier,[7] those of St. Pancras at Lewes with their Prior Lanzo from Cluny.[8] As life in the Norman monasteries was everywhere more or less modelled on that of Cluny, the Norman abbots of English Benedictine houses, like Paul of St. Albans,[9] very readily accepted the constitutions which Lanfranc drew up for his own cathedral monastery as the type of Benedictine observance. A study of the customs of Cluny[10] shows that Lanfranc drew his constitutions[11] from them, and also throws much light upon subjects familiar enough to his contemporaries, but somewhat obscure to-day. It may be that they served the same purpose then as now, for there was a copy of the Customs of Cluny at Glastonbury in 1247.[12]

[1] For a very full list *cf.* H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, pp. 107, 108, notes.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 52.

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 279.

[4] Ordericus Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Le Prévost, ii. 209.

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie*, p. 107.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 113, n. 1. [7] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, iii. 233. [8] *Ibid.* p. 1.

[9] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 52.

[10] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iv. 4–226.

[11] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 328–361.

[12] *Joannes Glastoniensis, Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, p. 435.

Under the rule of Abbot Hugh (1048–1108) Cluny was at the real zenith of its greatness; its most famous son, Hildebrand, sat in the chair of St. Peter (1073–1080). A special feature of life at Cluny was the substitution of an extra time for study for the daily manual labour prescribed in the Rule of St. Benedict, or the inclusion of writing under that head.[1] The obligation was considered fulfilled by an occasional day given to manual labour by the abbot and the whole convent, when beans required to be stripped of their leaves, or there was much weeding to be done.[2] The same system was adopted by Lanfranc, and prevailed in England.[3] There is no trace of any compulsory daily manual labour in the extant customs of Benedictine houses; the various officers had servants under them who carried out their commands.

William of Malmesbury held that without a revival of learning other monastic reforms were vain,[4] and all records show that he only expressed the general opinion of his contemporaries, more tersely put in another oft-quoted saying, 'Claustrum sine armario castrum sine armamentario.'[5] Accordingly the first care of the Norman abbots was to increase the libraries. At St. Albans Abbot Paul assigned the tithes of Hatfield and Redbourn for the writing of books and built a scriptorium in which hired writers copied the manuscripts lent him by Lanfranc.[6] The scriptorium continued a special object of interest to his successors.[7] Simon de Gorham (1167–1183) instituted the custom that the abbot should always maintain one writer at his own expense.[8] The list of the books written by his orders was too long for the chronicler to set down.[9] Until the thirteenth

[1] *Cf.* Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny*, iii. 411; S. Maitland, *The Dark Ages*, pp. 375, 389, 390.

[2] D'Achery, *Spicilegium*, iv. 78–80. [3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 328–361.

[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 249.

[5] Martène et Durand, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, i. 511.

[6] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 57.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 76. [8] *Ibid.* p. 192. [9] *Ibid.* p. 184.

century, indeed, St. Albans was fortunate in a succession of learned abbots. Geoffrey of Maine (1119–1146) was summoned from over the sea to take charge of the grammar school connected with the monastery,[1] Warin (1183–1195) was a master of the University of Salerno,[2] John de Cella (1195–1214) a master of Paris, 'in Grammar esteemed a Priscian, in Verse an Ovid, in Physic a Galen.'[3]

At Malmesbury Abbot Godfrey (1081–1105) devoted himself to the formation of a library in which William of Malmesbury was privileged to be his assistant. He found the monks able only to stammer the vulgar tongue and totally ignorant. Under his rule the learning of the monastery equalled any other in England and surpassed many.[4] As William of Malmesbury was educated from early years within the monastery, the books used by him afford some idea of the extent of the library.[5] Under John of Tours, Bishop of Bath (1088–1123), a physician skilled not only in knowledge but by practice, the 'dull and barbarous' monks of Bath became renowned for learning.[6] William of Malmesbury described the monastery of Thorney as 'divinorum philosophorum gimnasia.'[7] At Abingdon Abbot Faricius (1100–1117) opened a scriptorium in which hired writers produced books for the library; many treatises on medicine were included among them.[8] Evidences of other monastic libraries and of endowments of scriptoria might be multiplied.

A comparative collection of extant library catalogues would throw much light on the state of learning within the

[1] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, p. 73.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 194. [3] *Ibia.* p. 217.
[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 431.
[5] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Regum*, ed. W. Stubbs, vol. i. pp. xx–xxii.
[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 194. He left his whole library to the monks of Bath. *Cf.* Dugdale, *Monasticon*, ii. 268.
[7] *De Gestis Pontificum*, p. 327.
[8] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 44, 289.

monasteries until the end of the twelfth century.[1] These[2] show that the chief study was theology, both positive and contemplative. Notable works of contemporaries were rapidly acquired. Anselm's 'Cur Deus Homo' was a usual possession; both Durham and Rochester had a copy of Gilbert de la Porrée's 'Commentary on the Psalter;' the 'Sermons of St. Bernard' were at Peterborough, at Durham, and, in 1150, at Whitby; the 'Meditations of St. Anselm' at Peterborough and Durham. Great importance was attached to a knowledge of the canon law[3] on account of the number of appeals to Rome. The Decretum of Ivo of Chartres, written about 1115, was found everywhere; the Decretum of Gratian, completed about 1142, at Rochester, Peterborough, and Durham. In the second half of the twelfth century,[4] participation in the vigorous study of Roman law in England was shown at St. Albans[5] and at Peterborough; the latter possessed the 'Institutiones Justiniani cum autenticis et Infortiato,' 'Digestum vetus,' 'Tres partes cum digesto novo,' and 'Totum corpus juris in duobus voluminibus.' The books of the 'Organon,' which were not in circulation until the middle of the twelfth century in Western Europe,[6] were at Rochester in 1202, at Glastonbury in 1247. At Durham and at Rochester there were large collections of books of medicine, and some at least were included in every catalogue. If the use of the books had been confined to the monks, there would not be so much justification for an analysis of

[1] *Historical Introductions to the Rolls Series*, by W. Stubbs, p. 437; H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 476.

[2] For the catalogue of Durham of the first half of the twelfth century cf. *Catalogi Veteres Librorum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Dunelm.*, pp. 1–10, Surtees Soc.; for the catalogue of Whitby in 1150 *cf.* Charlton, *History of Whitby*, pp. 112–114; for the catalogue of Rochester in 1202 cf. *A Memorial of the Priory at St. Andrew at Rochester*, by W. B. Rye. The list of books written during the rule of Benedict, Abbot of Peterborough (1177–1193), is in Sparke, *Historiæ Anglicanæ Scriptores Varii*, ii. 98. For the catalogue of the Glastonbury library in 1247 cf. *Joannes Glastoniensis, Chronica*, ed. T. Hearne, pp. 423–444.

[3] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 140, 141.

[4] *Ibid.* vol. ii. par. ii. p. 336, n. 2.

[5] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[6] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 61.

the contents of the libraries. The customs of several Benedictine houses, which may fairly be taken to represent the usual practice in the twelfth century, show that books were lent on an adequate security to persons in general.[1] The characteristic unscrupulousness of the book-borrower in all ages necessitated some provision against his abuse of his privileges. At Abingdon the precentor could not sell, give away, or pledge any books;[2] he might only lend one on the deposit of a pledge of equal or greater value than the book itself. Even under these circumstances only neighbouring churches or persons of conspicuous worth might borrow. No doubt experience prompted the writer to add, 'It is safer to fall back on a pledge than to proceed against an individual.' At Eynsham,[3] perhaps, the library had suffered fewer losses. At any rate, for a sum of money books might be lent by the precentor to persons known or unknown, though sometimes the consent of the abbot, prior, or chapter was necessary. In this monastery the precentor might sell books for a price. At Evesham,[4] provided a proper and sufficient voucher was given, any person might borrow.

The lending of books for an equivalent pledge was the general practice among the Augustinian[5] and Præmonstratensian Canons,[6] and therefore the founding before the end of the twelfth century of over a hundred and thirty Augustinian houses, of which many were noted for learning, and of twenty-one Præmonstratensian houses, added largely to the number of public libraries. The Carthusians also lent books,[7] but in England only the monastery at Witham was founded

[1] *Cf.* J. Willis Clark, *The Care of Books*, p. 74 *et seq.*

[2] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 374–8.

[3] MS. Bodley, 435, cap. xv. sect. viii.

[4] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, ii. 39.

[5] *Customs of Augustinian Canons*, ed. J. W. Clark, p. 62, and J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, p. 71.

[6] *Statuta primaria Præmonstratensis Ordinis*, cap. vii. p. 803, ap. Le Paige, *Bibliotheca Præm. Ord.* ed. 1633.

[7] *Guigonis Prioris Carthusiæ Statuta*, ed. 1510, *Statuta Antiquæ*, part ii. cap. xvi. 9.

before 1200. There was no provision among the Cistercians,[1] at least in the twelfth century in England, for the lending of books outside the order. Probably at that time their libraries were too small and unimportant to allow of it, but their subsequent growth has been carefully traced through the provision of book-rooms.[2] In this respect too the Gilbertines followed the Cistercians; the rule merely allowed the lending of books to other houses of the same order.[3]

Another purpose served by the library was that of furnishing books for the use of the master of the grammar school connected with the monastery.[4]

At Bec, the model of other Norman monasteries, the school for oblates and monks was entirely distinct from that opened by Lanfranc for the sons of the barons and for clerks.[5] At Cluny, in 1150, a hostel was being maintained at the expense of the monastery for clerks of noble birth, who attended the school in the town,[6] and such schools are known to have been provided by other French Cluniac houses.[7] There can be little doubt that in England the separation of the schools was a feature of the Benedictine revival. Moreover it was in accordance with the general policy of William and Lanfranc, the revival of Church councils for ecclesiastical legislation, the separation of spiritual and temporal courts. Gilbert de Gant, son of the founder of Bridlington, spent his early years within that priory.[8] It is probable that there were isolated instances.

The secular school seems to have been regarded as a necessary adjunct of the Benedictine monastery.[9] Though

[1] P. Guignard, *Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne*, p. 237.

[2] J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, pp. 86–89.

[3] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xxxv.

[4] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[5] *Lanfranci Opera Omnia*, ed. Giles, i. 296; cf. *L'Abbaye du Bec et ses Écoles*, par M. L'Abbé Porrée.

[6] Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clxxxix. 1051.

[7] J. H. Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny*, ii. 414.

[8] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part 1, p. 280.

[9] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 600, n. 2.

no record of the actual foundation of any one of these schools remains, there is ample evidence of their existence. The relations between the grammar school and the monastery are shown at St. Albans and at Bury St. Edmund's. The master was a secular scholar,[1] chosen by the abbot or some other officer of the monastery. In the three instances known of the appointments at St. Albans, the choice fell upon men of high intellectual attainments. Geoffrey of Maine was summoned from abroad by Richard, the second Norman Abbot (1097–1119).[2] As he did not arrive in time he lost the post, and until it should again fall vacant he became master of the school at Dunstable. Under the rule of Abbot Warin (1183–1195) the mastership of the school was held first by Alexander Neckham,[3] a master of the University of Paris, and afterwards for many years with conspicuous success by the abbot's nephew, Warin, a master of Salerno.[4] As early as 1090 a monk named Hermann, of the newly founded cell of St. Albans at Binham in Norfolk, was in charge of a school there.[5]

Abbot Samson's (1182–1211) endowment of five marks towards the payment of the master,[6] and his provision of free lodgings for scholars attending the grammar school at Bury,[7] were intended to put higher education within the reach of the poorest. Rich and poor alike might live in his hostel, and forty poor boys paid no fee at all for their teaching.[8] His policy was evidently regarded by his biographer as the outcome of his own experience. As a poor clerk he had been indebted to William, master of the school of Diss in Norfolk, for leave to attend without any payment.[9] At the University of Paris he had been supported

[1] *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 600, note 2.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 73.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 196. *Cf.* H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 323.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 396.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 77, 78, 145.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 296.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 249.

[8] MS. Harl. 1005, f. 126.

[9] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 248.

by a chaplain from the profits of the sale of holy water.[1] On his return to England his precarious existence as a schoolmaster, not even sure of five or six marks a year, led him to become a monk of Bury,[2] and probably for the same reason other schoolmasters[3] too were among the brethren over whom he was abbot. However, the consideration for poor scholars and schoolmasters alike which marked Alexander III.'s decree,[4] issued at the Lateran Council in 1179, warrants a belief that Samson acted upon it. As the decree was certainly promulgated in England[5] and generally known,[6] and the schools at St. Albans and Canterbury[7] were also, to some extent, endowed, it may be assumed that this was the general relationship between the grammar school and the monastery. At a later date there were schools on two other manors belonging to Bury St. Edmund's, at Beccles and at Mildenhall,[8] to which officials of the monastery appointed the master.

Grammar schools were attached to the houses of Augustinian canons except, perhaps, to some which concentrated all their attention on hospitals. In some instances, as at Waltham,[9] at Huntingdon,[10] at Canterbury,[11] and at Christchurch, Twinham,[12] where they took the place of secular canons, they merely continued the schools of their predecessors. At Dunstable Henry I. handed over the schools

[1] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, p. 247.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 241.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 324.

[4] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, xxii. 227. *Cf.* the Lateran Council of 1215, xxii. 999, cap. xi.

[5] Cf. *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 179, and William of Newburgh, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 219.

[6] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 498, 555.

[7] H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. p. 601.

[8] MS. Harl. 1005, f. 102^{v}. Cf. *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, iii. 182.

[9] *The Foundation of Waltham Abbey*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 15, 35.

[10] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. p. 79.

[11] H. Böhmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfrancs von Canterbury*, p. 174; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part ii. p. 615.

[12] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. pp. 304, 305.

of the town to their charge.[1] Alexander Neckham was master there before he went to St. Albans.[2] It was at Merton that Thomas Becket received his early education.[3]

There is no evidence that the Cistercians in the twelfth century made any provision for secular education, nor would this have been consistent with their general policy. They planted their churches in remote and desolate places, far from human habitation; unlike the Benedictines who frequently allowed their naves to be used as parish churches, the Cistercians reserved theirs for their lay brethren.[4] The Gilbertine canons also were forbidden by their founder to teach any boys except novices in any of the double houses of the order.[5] From other evidence, too, it seems probable that a school was attached to the single houses,[6] but before 1200 only four of these existed.

The standard of education in the grammar schools of collegiate churches and of monasteries must have varied greatly. In some instruction was limited to grammar and the rudiments of logic, in others the subjects of higher education were imparted.[7] It may be fairly conjectured that in the schools dependent on the greater monasteries, in which learning steadily increased, the standard rose with the appointment of masters who had studied at the universities of Paris and Salerno, and possibly of Bologna too. However, after the rise of the universities, the education given in grammar schools in their neighbourhood, and probably afterwards elsewhere, would be more or less elementary.[8]

[1] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vi. part i. p. 240.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 196.

[3] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, iii. 14.

[4] W. H. St. John Hope, *The Abbey of St. Mary in Furness*, pp. 34, 35.

[5] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part i. p. xliii.

[6] There was a master of the schools at Malton in 1245. *Cf.* MS. Laud, 642, f. 3 (Bodleian Library).

[7] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, vol. iii. p. 4. *Cf.* J. H. Round, *The Commune of London*, p. 117.

[8] H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, vol. ii. part ii. pp. 601, 476. *Cf.* Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the Earliest Times to* 1535, p. 70.

Although after the Norman Conquest heathen beliefs were not nearly so prevalent, yet no progress was made in the direction of rationalism. The multiplication of miracles which occurred, especially in monastic churches, and the magnifying of their importance by monastic writers promoted the growth of superstition. The scorn of the Normans for English saints[1] was only an expression of their contempt for the subject race, and it rapidly evaporated. In spite of Lanfranc's rationalistic theory as to the nature and object of miracles, set forth in his popular 'Elucidarium sive Dialogus de Summa totius Christianæ Theologiæ,'[2] there was a vast increase in the number recorded throughout this period.[3] An instance of the result of this general belief in miracles is shown in the ease with which, in 1201, some of the country people received two impostors as St. Nicholas and St. Andrew.[4]

There were a number of doctors within the English monasteries. At Bury Hermann related how Herfast, Bishop of Thetford (1070–1086), was cured of an injury to his eye by the skill of Abbot Baldwin (1065–1098) and through the virtue of the bones of St. Edmund.[5] When Baldwin was in Normandy, as physician of William the Conqueror, he had some relic of St. Edmund with him.[6] In the time of Abbot Samson (1182–1211), Master Walter was a renowned doctor, and gained much money for the monastery by his cures.[7] Other instances of monks skilled in the practice of physic might be mentioned, among them

[1] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson, ii. 284. 'Ad tantum [Abbas Ethelelmus] etiam devolutus est ut prohiberet ne aliqua memoria neque memoratio fieret de sancto Athelwoldo, neque de sancto Edwardo; dixit enim esse Anglicos rusticos nec etiam debere ecclesias quas ibi fundaverunt.' Cf. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 420; Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, ed. M. Rule, pp. 350–353.

[2] *Lanfranci Omnia Opera*, ed. J. A. Giles, ii. 264.

[3] *E.g.* the Miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury, cf. *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, vols. i., ii., iii.; the Miracles of St. Gilbert of Sempringham, *cf.* MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, B. 1, ff. 140ᵛ–168.

[4] *Annales Monastici*, ed. H. R. Luard, ii. 74.

[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. p. 62.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 72.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 223, 297.

Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon (1100–1117).[1] Towards the end of Henry II.'s reign four English monks of St. Albans were masters of the University of Salerno,[2] which was purely a medical school.[3] In consideration of the close relations between England and the Norman kingdom of Sicily at that time, it is unlikely that they were isolated representatives. However, in accordance with the Rule of St. Benedict, the monk might only use his art for the good of his monastery.[4] The practice of medicine was forbidden, as unbecoming to his profession, by the Lateran Council in 1139,[5] and again in 1179[6] and in 1215.[7]

In spite of much intercourse with the Continent, and with the East at the time of the Crusades, it was the boast of William of Newburgh that the plague of heresy had never infected England. Heresy was rife in France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, but the thirty German Paulicians who landed in England converted only one woman, and she recanted when they were condemned at the Council of Oxford in 1166.[8]

The Norman Conquest gave a great impetus to historical study, already the most intellectually important side of monasticism in England. The cultured Norman abbots and monks were at one with their English brethren in their interest in the history of their own monasteries, of their country, and of the great ecclesiastics of the past. That interest, however, cannot be fairly assessed at the number of historical works written, much less of those remaining to us; the monk could only write at the command of his superiors.[9] The aim of those in authority was to provide some account

[1] *Cf.* p. 24, note 8.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii Sancti Albani*, ed. H. T. Riley, i. 194–196.

[3] H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 77.

[4] *Regula S. Benedicti*, cap. lvii.

[5] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, xxi. 528, cap. ix.

[6] Vol. xxii. p. 373, cap. ii. [7] Vol. xxii. p. 1010, cap. xxii.

[8] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 131–134.

[9] *Simeonis Monachi Opera Omnia*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 3 (R.S.); Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 123. Cf. *Les Monuments primitifs de la Règle Cistercienne*, ed. Ph. Guignard, p. 266; Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. li.

of the history of the monastery, the lives of its special saints and benefactors, and a record of its possessions and privileges. Thus while a monk at Ely, the Norman Goscelin [1] (*c.* 1098?) wrote the Life of St. Ethelreda, at Ramsey that of St. Ivo, and, after he was transferred to Canterbury, the lives of St. Augustine and his first six successors. Hermann of Bury wrote the miracles of St. Edmund at the request of Abbot Baldwin.[2] Folcard, Abbot of Thorney (fl. 1066), composed the lives of St. Adulf, St. Botulf, and St. John of Beverley.[3] At Canterbury an Englishman, Osbern the precentor (fl. 1090), wrote the lives of St. Dunstan [4] and St. Elphege [5] by Lanfranc's wish. His successor and fellow countryman Eadmer added another life of St. Dunstan [6] and lives of Odo,[7] St. Wilfrid,[8] and, at the urgent request of the monks of Worcester, the life of St. Oswald.[9] Though the special object of the Norman writers was to increase the fame of their monasteries, yet the Anglo-Saxon motive for compiling lives of the saints was not absent from some of them. Eadmer [10] and Gervase of Canterbury [11] alike regarded them as instructive to the greater number of men, who learnt more easily from example than from precept.

The Normans continued the practice of chronicling monastic and national events, but they used the Latin language; at Peterborough alone after 1075, and only until 1154, the chronicle was continued in Anglo-Saxon.[12] In the course of the twelfth century most of the Benedictine monasteries appear to have kept chronicles. The provenance

[1] *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials*, ed. T. D. Hardy, ii. 82, 83 (R.S.)
[2] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 26–92.
[3] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, vol. i. p. lii, pp. 240–260.
[4] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, pp. 69–161.
[5] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 123–147.
[6] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, 161–249.
[7] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 78–87.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, i. 161–226.
[9] *Ibid.* ii. 1–59.
[10] *Ibid.* ii. 42.
[11] Cf. *Gervasii Monachi Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 86 (R.S.)
[12] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 235.

of some of these is difficult to trace, for the chronicle of one monastery was incorporated into that of another without any acknowledgment, and interpolations were freely made.[1] However for local events they were and are first-hand authorities of great value, and for national history they proved faithful reproductions of independent authorities. In his prologue to his own Chronicle Gervase of Canterbury (fl. 1188) noted the various nature of these compilations and condemned some of the writers who strayed into the province of the historian.[2] Some chroniclers, like Florence of Worcester (d. 1118),[3] were chiefly concerned with national history; others, again, like the chroniclers of Ramsey[4] and Abingdon[5] and Thomas of Ely,[6] found their chief sources in their own monastic archives, and used general history only as a setting for local events.

As contemporary historians also the monks were greatly distinguished. Most of the ecclesiastical biographies were their work. Milo Crispin,[7] a monk of Westminster, wrote the life of Lanfranc, Eadmer[8] that of Anselm; Coleman, a monk of Worcester, produced an Anglo-Saxon life of Wulstan, from which William of Malmesbury drew his materials;[9] several of the Canterbury monks[10] contributed lives of Thomas Becket; Jocelin of Brakelond[11] was the biographer of Abbot Samson of Bury; the official life of

[1] Cf. *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi Benedicti Abbatis*, ed. W. Stubbs, vol. i. p. xi.

[2] *Gervasii Monachi Cantuariensis Opera Historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 87.

[3] Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, English Historical Society.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray.

[5] *Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon*, ed. J. Stevenson.

[6] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, Anglia Christiana Society.

[7] *Beati Lanfranci Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis Opera Omnia*, ed. J. A. Giles, i. 281–313.

[8] *Eadmeri Opuscula duo de Vita S. Anselmi*, ed. M. Rule, pp. 305–424.

[9] Wharton, *Anglia Sacra*, ii. 244–249.

[10] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, i., ii. 1–279, 299–323.

[11] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 209–336.

St. Gilbert was the work of one of his canons.[1] The monks had a high conception of the worth of their historical studies. Eadmer wrote the story of the struggles of Anselm with William II. and Henry I. to afford precedents for future generations;[2] William of Malmesbury deemed it shameful to be ignorant of the history of England,[3] and showed a due appreciation of the connection between literature and politics;[4] the Augustinian canon, William of Newburgh, wrote to increase knowledge and to warn posterity by the lessons of history.[5]

The increasing popularity of history, so apparent in the reign of Henry II., was due in great part to the influence of the numerous historical works produced in the monasteries and to their teaching of the value of precedent. In the monastic libraries Henry of Huntingdon, Ralph de Diceto, Roger Hoveden, and others found the requisite materials for the earlier portions of their work. Moreover subsequent historical writers might learn from the greatest monastic historians the function of criticism, a philosophic judgment, and the most fitting style. The new methods of historical writing adopted by monastic authors after the Norman Conquest were the outcome of the use of dialectic in theology and philosophy by Lanfranc, Anselm, and their pupils. Lanfranc taught a right use of authorities; Anselm, as William of Malmesbury noted, the justification of authority by reason.[6] Indeed, many of the canons of modern historical teaching are duly set forth in the pages of William of Malmesbury and William of Newburgh. Both carefully weighed their authorities. Internal evidence proved the

[1] MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, B 1, ff. 33–168.

[2] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 1 (R.S.)

[3] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 4.

[4] William of Malmesbury, *De Gestis Regum Anglorum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 467.

[5] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 3.

[6] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 76.

veracity of Gildas and Bede to William of Newburgh,[1] while a skilful analysis of the contents of the 'Historia Britonum,' a comparison with other authorities, and an appeal to reason resulted in his rejection of Geoffrey of Monmouth.[2] After delving in the aumbry at Glastonbury and reading all the works on St. Dunstan, both Latin and English, William of Malmesbury recognised the general harmony of older writers.[3] He considered that Osbern's work was discredited by ignorance of the antiquities of Glastonbury, but as many books were burnt in the fire at Canterbury in 1070 there was some excuse for him.[4] Ignorance of Anglo-Saxon prevented Faricius, Abbot of Abingdon, from writing an adequate life of St. Aldhelm, and the fame attained by Faricius in other fields ought not to prejudice readers of William of Malmesbury's rival life.[5] In writing of contemporary events William of Newburgh showed equal care and judgment in sifting evidence. For his account of the death of William, Archbishop of York, in 1154, he sought the testimony of several witnesses and obtained an independent opinion from doctors.[6] He had the courage to record prodigies which were told him by absolutely reliable witnesses, and moreover, unlike most of his contemporaries, the wisdom to refrain from putting his own interpretation upon them, regarding them as beyond his understanding.[7]

There was a general belief among the monks that style had a dangerous influence on the popular mind. William of Newburgh urged that it was no criterion of historical

[1] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 11, 18.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 11–18.

[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 289.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 251–253.

[5] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, pp. 330, 331.

[6] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 80, 81.

[7] *Ibid.* pp. 84, 308.

accuracy, for Gildas wrote execrably,[1] Geoffrey of Monmouth with marvellous fascination.[2] William of Malmesbury justified his life of St. Dunstan on the ground that the older writers lacked grace and therefore remained unread,[3] while Osbern, on the other hand, had used rhetoric to cover his lack of truth.[4] Samson of Bury took up his pen to rewrite the miracles of St. Edmund in a sober style.[5] Richard of Ely shrank from the use of rhetoric.[6] The general use of Latin instead of the vernacular for literary purposes after the Norman Conquest resulted in the speedy development of a distinctly good style. Osbern of Canterbury, Hermann of Bury,[7] and Senatus Bravonius[8] of Worcester clung to old traditions, and derived their somewhat turgid language from their slavish imitation of the Vulgate. The succeeding generations profited by the revival of classical study, and wrote grammatical Latin which, though somewhat free, was yet a living language. The graceful style of Eadmer, the forcible simplicity of William of Malmesbury, and the neatly finished periods of William of Newburgh were admirable models.

The influence of monasticism on the evolution of political theory in England was very considerable. The slow acceptance of the Hildebrandine conceptions of the Papacy, and of the ensuing relations between Church and State, was in great measure due to the fact that the Benedictine monasteries entirely abstained from propagating them. Owing to the circumstances of the monastic revival, the political ideas emanating from Cluny, and most forcibly expressed by Gregory VII., gained no adherents in England. As in

[1] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 11.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 12.
[3] *Memorials of St. Dunstan*, ed. W. Stubbs, p. 250.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 288.
[5] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 107.
[6] *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart, p. 94.
[7] *Memorials of St. Edmund's Abbey*, ed. T. Arnold, i. 26–92.
[8] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 60–97.

Normandy, the monasteries accepted the reformed life of Cluny without adopting the hierarchical government of that order; moreover in 1135 there were only seventeen Cluniac houses in England, and all of them were alien priories. Accordingly the Benedictine monks took no exception to the claims of William I. and William II.[1] to decide whether pope or antipope should be recognised, and the acknowledgment of no pope in England for ten years after the death of Gregory VII. was not a stumbling-block to them.[2] Florence of Worcester[3] and William of Malmesbury[4] alike chronicled with remarkable indifference the existence of rival popes.

In his adhesion to Urban II. Anselm stood practically alone against the King, barons, bishops, and abbots. His uncompromising enunciation of the Hildebrandine theory at the Council of Rockingham in 1095 filled his hearers with horror and confusion.[5] Though many of the bishops then had been servants of the Crown, all the abbots[6] present united with them against Anselm. They made no attempt to set forth any opposing theory, but in advising unqualified submission to the King they showed their belief in the independence of the National Church.[7] In spite of their personal sympathy with Anselm, even the monks of his own cathedral did not understand his views on papal autocracy.[8] The principles involved in the investiture struggle excited no passionate feelings in monastic writers; the general ecclesiastical attitude is represented in the comment made by Hugh, the Chanter of York, on the futility of the points at issue.[9] In the strife between successive Archbishops of York

[1] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 52. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex Chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, ii. 29, 99.

[4] *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis De Gestis Regum*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 498, and *De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum*, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, p. 85.

[5] *Eadmeri Historia Novorum in Anglia*, ed. M. Rule, p. 57.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 63. [7] *Ibid.* pp. 58–63.

[8] 'Epistolarum Sancti Anselmi' lib. iii. No. C; Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clix. 138.

[9] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 110: 'Sed si fas est dici, adhuc habet ecclesia decimantes mentam et anethum, et colantes culicem et

and Canterbury over the profession of obedience demanded by the Mother Church, each party in turn appealed to Rome as a political move.[1] If the result was successful the authority of the Pope was triumphantly quoted, but both parties denied his right to exercise any authority when the judgment was unfavourable to them. A conspicuous consensus of opinion is to be seen from a comparison between the anonymous treatise composed by a secular canon of York shortly after 1104,[2] and the letter to Calixtus II. in 1119 from Ralph, Archbishop of Canterbury,[3] written with the aid of the Christchurch monks. Both based the claims of their respective sees on the authority of ancient documents; both reminded the Pope that he could not change the decrees of his predecessors.[4] Both struck at the roots of the hierarchical claims of the Papacy by denying the power of the Pope to alter the relations between one Church and another,[5]

deglutientes camelum, de manuali investitura tumultuantes, de electionis et consecrationis libertate nihil mutientes.'

[1] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 98–220.

[2] Printed for the first time as an appendix to *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im XI. und XII. Jahrhundert*, by H. Böhmer, pp. 436–497.

[3] *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 228–258.

[4] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 480: 'Hoc itaque decretum inter eos ordinavit beatus Gregorius et hoc reverenter exsecutus est beatus Augustinus, nec legitur quod alter ab altero consecratus sit vel professionem fecerit. Hoc, inquam, decretum nulli unquam mutare vel destruere jure licuit, nec etiam apostolicæ sedi. Sicut dicit papa Zozimus scribens Narbonensibus: "Contra statuta patrum aliquid concedere vel mutare, nec huius sanctæ sedis potest auctoritas." Apud nos enim inconvulsis radicibus vivit antiquitas, cui sancti patres sanxere reverentiam.' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 248: 'Solent enim Romani pontifices de observandis indeclinabiliter decretis antecessorum suorum ante consecrationem suam profiteri, et mihi quisquam audeat imponere quatinus ecclesiæ meæ privilegia debeam evacuare? Quod si forte alicuius occasionis tantum nefas presumam attingere, certum est quod spiritalis reus adulterii quia primam fidem irritam feci. Hinc profecto beatus Gregorius scribit ita: "Grave nimis," inquit, "et contra sacerdotale constat esse propositum velle cuiusquam ecclesiæ privilegia olim indulta confundere." Quod autem nec ipsi summo pontifici liceat sanctorum patrum traditionibus contraire Zosimus papa sic testatur: "Contra statuta," inquit, "patrum aliquid concedere vel mutare, nec huius quidem sedis potest auctoritas."'

[5] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, pp. 437–452, *e.g.* p. 445. 'Non tamen Romanos pontifices dampnare volumus, set Christum et apostolos suos ipsis præferimus, et ordinis unitatem dividere et dignitatem episcopalem in aliquo minuere

by insisting on the fallible nature of his judgment,[1] by questioning his right to summon bishops to his court.[2]

In the second half of the twelfth century the spread of the new monastic orders in England was an important factor in the altered relations between Church and State. The Cistercians recognised the interference of no bishop save the Pope; they were under his special protection, and therefore upheld his authority over that of any national ruler, and their organisation was cosmopolitan. In the disputed succession to the see of York in 1143[3] their appeals to a Cistercian pope, Eugenius III., resulted in the instalment of their own candidate, Henry Murdac, Abbot of Fountains, to the discomfiture of King Stephen and Henry, Bishop of Winchester.

The influence of the Cistercian teaching over an order composed of English men and women, and founded in England between 1131 and 1139, was illustrated in the attitude of the Gilbertines in the conflict between Becket and Henry II. When Becket fled from the Council of Northampton in 1164 they aided his escape from England

nolumus. . . . Verbi gratia: ut est illa sententia Gelasii papæ, quæ dicit: "Illud etiam adnecti placuit, ut facultates ecclesiæ et dioceses, quæ ab aliquibus possidentur episcopis, jure sibi vendicent, quod tricennalis lex conclusit, quia et ultra triginta annos nulli liceat pro eo appellare, quod legum tempus excludit."' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 249: 'Et quidem in sæcularibus judiciis solent minores potestates cum suis inferioribus quæcunque inter se discrepare videntur, in sua curia tractare nec ante majoris potestatis curiæ præsentari, quam justitiæ veritatem in sua deprehendantur violasse, nec judicatur ibi debere quemquam subire judicium donec investiatur, unde sine judicio passus est spoliari. Qua in re nec sacri canones dissentire videntur, qui etiam ad veritatis diffinitionem triginta vel quadraginta annorum investituram in rebus ecclesiasticis satis esse testantur.'

[1] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 436: 'Secundum summi pontificis personam super omnes homines est, secundum hominis personam inter homines, secundum peccatoris personam infra homines.' Cf. *Historians of the Church of York*, ed. J. Raine, ii. 250: 'Quocirca viderit sanctæ sedis Apostolicæ summa justitia, si spoliari debet per surreptionem unius hominis quod potuit haberi per spatium tanti temporis.'

[2] H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat*, p. 246; *Historians of the Church of York*, ii. 251.

[3] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 56.

by passing him from house to house of their order.[1] Though falsely charged before the King's justices in 1165 with having sent money abroad to Becket, Gilbert of Sempringham replied that he would rather suffer exile than swear to his innocence. As a loyal son of the Church he would have thought it right to help the Archbishop in every way he could, and his oath, therefore, might be misunderstood.[2]

Though the Benedictines showed jealousy of the new monastic orders which were robbing them of their popularity, they became rapidly imbued with the political ideals of their rivals. The Crown had failed to protect them from outrage in the troublous years of Stephen's reign, the new orders enjoyed freedom of election and immunity from financial and other burdens. Accordingly the great Benedictine houses sought the same privileges from the Papacy,[3] and in some instances even they forged bulls of early date.[4] The acceptance of the Pope as supreme protector involved the adoption of the Hildebrandine theories, and the claims made by Becket on behalf of the Church found favour with all his monastic biographers.

This change of attitude is very visible in the quarrel between the Canterbury monks and Baldwin, the Cistercian Archbishop (1185–1193). The monastic party in England was divided,[5] but each side regarded the Pope as supreme arbiter and finally bowed to his judgment. In the twelfth century popular regard and the consent of the bishops and the Crown

[1] *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, ed. J. C. Robertson, iii. 323–325, iv. 44–55.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xvii.

[3] *E.g.* the following sought papal protection :—St. Augustine's, Canterbury, in 1139, Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, ed. 1885, No. 8004; Malmesbury, in 1151, *ibid.* No. 9466; Sherborne, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8855; Rochester, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8870; Westminster, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8878; Peterborough, in 1146, *ibid.* No. 8965; Abingdon, in 1152, *ibid.* No. 9567. Malmesbury and Peterborough also obtained privileges of election and exemption from episcopal jurisdiction. *Cf.* Jaffé, No. 9466, *Registrum Malmesbiriense*, ed. J. S. Brewer, i. 346, 348.

[4] *Chronicon Abbatiæ Rameseiensis*, ed. W. D. Macray, pp. 99, 176.

[5] *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reign of Richard I.*, vol. ii. p. xliii.

no longer sufficed to create an English saint. A decree of canonisation was sought for Edward the Confessor from Alexander III. in 1161,[1] for Gilbert of Sempringham from Innocent III. in 1202.[2]

Towards the end of the twelfth century intolerance of the Jews was steadily increasing in spite of the favour with which they were regarded by the Crown. In accordance with successive decrees of Lateran Councils,[3] the friendly feelings manifested by St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin,[4] Abbot of Westminster, gave place to bitter enmity. Three important Benedictine monasteries lent currency to the blood accusation by burying the martyrs within their churches, and kept the stories before the minds of the people by recording miracles worked by St. William of Norwich,[5] St. Harold of Gloucester,[6] and St. Robert of Bury.[7] In the Rochester library, in 1202, there were three books against the Jews,[8] and another was included in the Reading catalogue in the middle of the thirteenth century.[9] Thus the Benedictines furnished an intellectual justification for the hostility of the towns to the privileged aliens in their midst, of the impoverished lesser barons, and of the Cistercians, who owed nine of their northern houses to the money of Aaron of Lincoln.[10] Even William of Newburgh regarded the massacres of the Jews in 1189 as the direct working of the Divine Providence.[11]

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, i. 434.

[2] Dugdale, *Monasticon*, vol. vi. part ii. p. xxv.

[3] Labbe, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Collectio*, ed. Cossart, p. 231.

[4] 'De Fide Ecclesiæ contra Judeos,' addressed to Anselm by Gilbert Crispin; Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, clix. 1063.

[5] Martyred in 1144; cf. *The Jews of Angevin England*, ed. J. Jacobs, p. 19.

[6] Martyred in 1168; cf. *ibid.* p. 45.

[7] Martyred in 1181; cf. *ibid.* p. 75.

[8] 'Arma contra Judeos,' 'Magister Andrea contra Judeos,' '[Liber] qui vocatur Bartholomeus contra Judeos;' *cf.* W. B. Rye, *A Memorial of the Priory of St. Andrew at Rochester*.

[9] 'Petrus Aleunei contra Judeos;' *cf.* Supplement to Coates, *History of Reading*, ed. 1802.

[10] *Jewish Quarterly*, July 1898.

[11] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.*, ed. R. Howlett, i. 298.

Between the tenth and the twelfth centuries the education of the nation owed very much to monasticism. Before the Norman Conquest the monastic schools were the best in England, and trained patriots as well as scholars. After 1066 their influence was relatively far greater on account of the rapid increase in their numbers and their higher standards of learning, but in the course of the twelfth century their influence became proportionately less through the multiplication of rival schools and the rise of the universities.

In the field of literature the monks exercised a paramount influence through the continuous development of their historical work in various directions, in the re-editing of old materials, in the provision of new ones, and in the formation of style. Through their appeals to precedents they forced the claims of the study of history upon the Crown and the nation.

The political theories adopted at the several stages of the development of English monasticism were reflected in the history of the nation.