

Review article: Church reform – full of sound and fury, signifying nothing?

CONRAD LEYSER

The Clergy in the Medieval World: Secular Clerics, Their Families and Careers in North-Western Europe, c. 800–c. 1200. By Julia Barrow. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2015. xiv + 446 pp., 3 maps. £65 (hardback), £22.99 (paperback). ISBN 9781107086388, 9781107451308.

Episcopal Power and Ecclesiastical Reform in the German Empire: Tithes, Lordship and Community, 950–1150. By John Eldevik. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought Fourth Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2012 (hardback), 2015 (paperback). xv + 315 pp., 2 illus., 4 maps. £64.99, £22.99. ISBN 9780521193467, 9781107530836.

Church and People in the Medieval West, 900-1200. By Sarah Hamilton. Pearson Education Limited: Harlow. 2013. viii + 423 pp. £29.99. ISBN 9780582772809.

Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800–1200. By Maureen C. Miller. Cornell University Press: Ithaca. 2014. xviii + 286 pp., 79 illus. \$77.22, £33.50 ISBN 978080144982, 978801479434.

Medieval Rome: Stability and Crisis of a City, 900–1150. By Chris Wickham. Oxford Studies in Medieval European History. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2015. xixxviii + 501 pp., 12 illus., 9 maps. £35. ISBN 9780199684960.

Like nostalgia, medieval church reform isn't what it used to be. Back in the day, something like three generations ago, the story was very simple. The Roman empire fell, the church survived. Bishops blessed barbarian rulers – but then these rulers overreached themselves, at which point the church put them back in their place.¹ This was reform, a reassertion of the 'right order of the world', in which 'the spiritual sword' wielded by bishops and above all the Bishop of Rome outranked the temporal one, wielded above all by German emperors.² Its iconic moment was 'Canossa': the penance performed in the snow by Henry IV before Pope Gregory VII in January, 1077.³ The rest of European history – the Reformation, the Enlightenment – was seen to conjugate out as the attempt by lay rulers to break free from medieval caesaropapism.

After the Second World War, Church reform went 'live'. As a participant recalls:

In 1950 I, like many Roman Catholics, was thrilled by the publication of Yves-Marie Congar's *Vraies et fausses réformes dans l'Église*. It was like a breath of fresh air, a window being opened after a long winter to allow a whiff of spring to enter.⁴

Congar's was a manifesto for what he called 'autocritique', a radical programme of self-renewal for the communion of the faithful, driven by love for the church and aspiring to a deeper understanding of Christian tradition. It was initially banned. Within a decade, however, Congar and others such as Henri de Lubac and Karl Rahner were being fêted in Rome by Pope John XXIII, and their work placed at the centre of the great reform undertaken by the Second Vatican Council.⁵ The *ressourcement* of the church's future by its past for which Congar had called was an explicit part of the programme. Scholars of the medieval church found themselves conscripted. Gerhart Ladner, for example, an Austrian Jew who had converted to Catholicism and then taken refuge in the US, heard from Pope John XXIII that his study *The Idea of Reform* was to be put before the Council.⁶

For medievalists, there was now much more in play than the re-ordering of church–state relations. In Ladner’s account, *reformatio* was a cosmic process in which fallen Creation might draw closer to the form originally intended for it by the Creator. Ladner’s goal was to write about the reform movement of the eleventh century – but *The Idea of Reform* started far back with the exhortations of the apostle Paul and finished with the monastic theology of Augustine. Ladner never completed the intended second or third volumes. The direction of his thinking was clear – it had been charted in the 1930s, in his doctoral dissertation on the spirituality of eleventh-century reform – and it has been followed up by his pupils.⁷ One of these, John van Engen, writing in the late 1980s, celebrated the sense that reform was now part of the conceptual landscape of all medievalists.⁸

The question for reforming cardinals and historians of reform alike was what to do about the clerical hierarchy, what Congar called ‘l’appareil’. Vatican II could not have been more explicit that ‘the church’ must be seen as a community served by its priests, and not the other way round.⁹ It was hard to avoid the conclusion that the medieval papacy had lost sight of this. Indeed, as Protestant historians had long been keen to stress, there was a drastic difference between priests in early Christianity and the clerical hierarchy of medieval Christendom.¹⁰

In the early church, the point bears emphasis, clergy and laity were not distinct. A ‘bishop’ (from the Greek *episkopos*, meaning ‘overseer’), was supposed to be someone you could obviously trust.

A bishop must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, temperate, sensible, dignified, hospitable, an apt teacher, no drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome and no lover of money. He must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful in every way, for if a man does not

know how to manage his own household, how can he care for God's church? (I Tim. III.1–5)¹¹

The bishops who assembled at the Council of Nicaea conformed to this model – although the privileges they had accrued from the emperor did begin to affect their status as normal householders.¹² Some eight centuries later, however, prelates assembled at Rome at the Second Lateran Council of 1139 decreed that a priest who contracts a marriage after his ordination must know that the marriage is simply invalid; it is merely copulation.¹³ An entire group of men were thus abstracted from the marriage market and from biological reproduction.

Vatican II, for all its expansiveness, refused to open a discussion of clerical celibacy. It was left to scholars to argue when and why priests stopped being seen as 'family men'.¹⁴ From the late fourth century, we start to find decrees on clerical continence.¹⁵ Priests may be married, but they are supposed to abstain from sex having been ordained. In the Greek east, the church absolved deacons and priests from this requirement; conversely it required from its bishops not only continence but also celibacy, i.e. remaining unmarried.¹⁶ In the Latin west, meanwhile, no such distinction was drawn between lower and higher clergy, and we continue to find evidence for married priests and bishops down to the eleventh century.¹⁷

This continuity is worth stressing. It is obscured by the tendency of medievalists to talk about 'the proprietary church': this is no more or less than 'the household church' familiar to students of early Christianity.¹⁸ Our analytical terminology here has been taken captive by the reformers of the eleventh century, who successfully cast the order they were challenging as 'corrupt'. Refusing this perspective, and flattening out our view of the household church from the second century to the eleventh century and beyond will be a prerequisite of moving the discussion forward.

By the turn of the second millennium, reform had become part of the wider narrative of ‘the transformation of the year 1000’, or ‘the feudal revolution’.¹⁹ The reform programme was not simply about ‘moral abuses’ on the part of the clergy. The reformers’ insistence on clerical celibacy, and the campaign against simony, the trafficking of church office, were seen to be driven by a deep social logic. A newly violent regime of exploitation of peasant labour required on the part of the landed elite a new dispensation, dividing out property which would transmit dynastically, and lands which would be held in trust by the church. This was a new blueprint for power and its reproduction in the Latin west.

We seem now to be in full-scale retreat from this story of eleventh-century transformation. The ‘feudal revolution’ has been abandoned, or at best ‘reframed’, and confidence is ebbing away from ‘reform’.²⁰ As an astringent intervention in 2008 from Julia Barrow warned us, it is very difficult to find anyone in the eleventh century who used the term ‘reform’.²¹ It’s increasingly difficult to find anyone now. Last year at the 2015 Leeds International Medieval Congress, ‘Reform’ was the year’s theme, generating hundreds of papers, but it was a character in search of a new author, as few speakers wished to be seen wedded to the old paradigm.²²

The studies under review here bear chastened witness to this sea change. John Eldevik’s *Episcopal Power and Ecclesiastical Reform in the German Empire* is concerned to register early on: ‘historians should be cautious in taking a single, paradigmatic reform movement as point of departure’ (p. 17). Chris Wickham’s *Medieval Rome* opens with a chapter ‘Grand Narratives’, plotting a course for their avoidance; he continues with ‘reform’ in scare quotes for the rest of the book. In the Introduction to *Church and People in the Medieval West*, Sarah Hamilton strives to find a point of balance: ‘Narratives are prone to error, but they are also necessary: we need them in order to make sense of seemingly unrelated changes across long periods of time, and we reject them at our peril. But they can [.

. .] also limit our understanding' (p. 21). Maureen Miller's *Clothing the Clergy* is, perhaps, the least troubled, but Miller has already diagnosed 'The Crisis in the Investiture Crisis Narrative'.²³ In *The Clergy in the Medieval World*, Julia Barrow stands by her revisionist scepticism.

When grand narratives collapse, there isn't a power vacuum. On the contrary, the story of power takes centre stage: Tory history moves in. This happened first in 1929. Twelve years after Rutherford's splitting of the atom, Lewis Namier anatomized the structure of eighteenth-century politics.²⁴ The apparent ideological divide between Whigs and Tories masked the network of connections formed in marriages, clientage, and the social whirl, and binding the ruling elite to each other across party lines. Thus was born the 'Namierite' approach; that it was transferable across human history was shown with the appearance ten years later of Ronald Syme's *The Roman Revolution*. In Syme's hands, the great transition from republic to empire in Rome was a story not about the clash between senate and people, but of the strife for 'power, wealth, and glory'. 'In all ages', Syme notoriously pronounces, 'whatever the form and name of government, be it monarchy, republic, or democracy, an oligarchy lurks behind the façade; and Roman history, Republican or Imperial, is the history of the governing class.'²⁵

We are at such a Tory juncture with reform and the medieval church.²⁶ Medieval reformers might thunder about the purity of the church and the dangers of worldly contamination, but we seem increasingly inclined to ignore them. Julia Barrow's study of the clergy does not feel the need to mention even in passing Humbert of Silva Candida, whose *Three Books Against the Simoniacs* has been taken for decades as the great manifesto of the reform programme. His omission here is a remarkable sign of the times.²⁷ Meanwhile, Sarah Hamilton writes: 'These three centuries [900–1200] are characterized as much by continuity as by change. Throughout this period, bishops' and local priests' lives remained closely tied

to the world: noble families controlled appointments to bishoprics and local churches, to the general benefit of the family's wealth and authority' (p. 105). Reform here goes the way of Syme's Roman Revolution, serving only to mask dynastic power.

Perhaps we should not be surprised by this. In the early twenty-first century, 'reform' is a manifestly bad brand. Everybody knows to greet its promises with scepticism at best – and more likely derisive contempt. In *It's Our Turn to Eat: The Story of a Kenyan Whistle-Blower*, Michela Wrong offers a relentlessly clear-eyed account of the anti-corruption campaign instituted in 2003 by the Kibaki government in Kenya, through the eyes of John Kithongo, appointed to lead the campaign.²⁸ Kithongo's disillusion is complete: the government's sponsorship of 'reform' is nothing but a smoke screen for business as usual. What business as usual means, as rival factions in the Kenyan ruling elite are wont to say, is that 'it's our turn to eat' from the trough of the state. It seems likely that Pope Francis will find himself in Kithongo's position as he looks to clean house at the Vatican.²⁹

This can seem a bleak landscape. In what follows, I will suggest that in fact there may be life in reform yet. Ironically, its possible reconstruction is more in evidence in the localized studies of Eldevik and Wickham, or in the material cultural approach of Miller, than in the broader-gauged accounts of Barrow and Hamilton. Looking at what happened 'on the ground' normally prefaces a Tory undermining of a grand narrative. Here, whether intentionally or not, we find may be able to rebuild reform from the ground up.

Critics of reform offer a new orthodoxy. It is perhaps most clearly expressed here in Sarah Hamilton's study. Wearing a great deal of learning very lightly, for which students and their teachers will thank her alike, Hamilton steers her readers away from traditional verities. On the old story, a teleology indeed, all roads led to Rome in 1215, and the Fourth Lateran Council. The explosion of reform in the eleventh century was followed by a century and a half of violent conflicts between popes and emperors, and within reforming circles

themselves. Under the leadership of Innocent III, four hundred bishops came to Rome, and in a monumental series of decrees, defined the shape and structure of Latin Christian society.

The new story unfolded by Hamilton establishes, or re-establishes, a myth of origins. It is not the Gregorian reformers, but Carolingian churchmen who first imagine Latin Christendom. The claim is not that they managed to bring it into being – Carolingian ambition always exceeded wildly what could actually be delivered – but the programme is theirs. All roads here radiate out from their programmatic statements, and in particular from the *Handbooks* of Regino of Prüm (d. 915). Regino, best-known as the chronicler of the collapse of empire, here becomes the prophet of the ecclesial future.³⁰ In his detailed instructions to parish priests on how to direct and respond to the faithful, which drew on a century's intensive prescription, both the medium and the message of the Latin church are articulated. The eleventh century, on this view, is not a great caesura, but a working through of the Carolingian agenda. The campaigns against simony, for clerical celibacy, even 'the formation of a persecuting society', can all be accounted for in these terms.³¹ In so far as it has any meaning, reform is characterized by diversity, even patience and consensus – far from the scenes of apocalyptic conflict demanded by the old story.³² Post-millennial Europe is the scene of a series of jazz improvisations on Carolingian themes; even Lateran IV is not, or not only a grand synthesis, but a further variation on a theme.

This is a bold interpretative reversal, proposed with beguiling calm and lucidity. How does it work? Hamilton's starting point is in her title – *Church and People* – and in her understanding of 'people'. She does not mean an undifferentiated mass. 'The people' have complicated agency, and resist generalization. Hamilton is in fact suspicious of texts, both modern and medieval, in which 'the people' are invoked. Thus whereas it was announced in 1981 that 'one of the most obvious novelties of the eleventh century is the appearance of the crowd on the stage of public events', Hamilton is not so sure.³³ Where crowds appear in our

sources, Hamilton sees biblical templates – the tumultuous crowd scenes in the Gospels – at work. In her treatment, the Peace Councils in West Francia at the start of the eleventh century, which have been seen as a movement of popular religious protest against a new regime of seigneurial domination, resolve back into a series of local initiatives, with noble players in the lead. ‘The people were never mere followers and supporters of clerically led programmes [. . .] Theirs was a symbiotic relationship but it was one which, as this study shows, should never be viewed through a single interpretative lens’ (p. 360).

This is an inclusive and differentiated picture, but of course it is not without its own limits. By ‘people’, Hamilton does not mean ‘Peoples of the Book’. Muslims appear briefly on the receiving end of the First Crusade, but otherwise scarcely at all; likewise Jews, who are mentioned in the context of the work of Peter the Venerable, but otherwise do not feature.³⁴ Put another way, we don’t meet the Jewish shopkeepers beaten up in the Rhineland in 1096, or burnt at York in 1190.³⁵ The rise of Christian anti-Semitism in this period is not part of the story.

The appearance of popular heresy, by contrast, is duly considered. The book concludes with a chapter on ‘Discipline and Belief’: Hamilton here reckons with the fact that ‘symbiosis’ between church and people often involved real tension. Since R.I. Moore’s *The Formation of a Persecuting Society* (1987), a generation of scholarship has focused with increasing precision on the means through which the clerical elite constructed heretics as a category before finding targets for their accusations.³⁶ We are now in a position to argue that the accusatory machinery for identifying ‘the Cathars’, sought out and destroyed in the south of France in the thirteenth century, arose in the context of arguments among Augustinian canons in the 1120s and 1130s.³⁷ In the *Confessions* and elsewhere, Augustine had devoted a great deal of energy to refuting the teachings of his erstwhile colleagues, the Manichees,

followers of the dualist apostle of Mani (d. 281). Augustine's medieval readers, then, had a ready-made language in which to accuse each other of misguidedness.

Hamilton steers well clear of the 'Did the Cathars exist?' argument.³⁸ She might plead, perhaps, that the Dominicans and the Albigensian crusade are outside her chronological remit. Conversely, she is resolute in starting not with the clerical imaginary but with the rambunctious energies of the laity. She does not deny that clerics invented heresy – but they did so, she argues, in response to lay initiatives. Proactive persecution was rare: bishops were not (yet) witchfinders.

It may have been sporadic, but when it came, the confrontation with heresy was acrid. We don't have to wait until the thirteenth century before the appearance of medieval 'Manichees'. As has been well studied, the first report comes to us from a monk in Aquitaine, Ademar of Chabannes, writing in the 1020s. In 1018, recalls Ademar in his *Chronicle*, 'Manichees arose throughout Aquitaine, seducing the promiscuous populace.' It had been a bad year. Earlier, Ademar recounted:

A nocturnal massacre of men and women occurred at Limoges. For, in the middle of Lent, while the doors of the basilica of the Saviour were opened at nocturnal vigils, the stream of the crowd, like a river flowing into the church, by accident falling over itself, each person trampled the other. And thus more than 50 men and women were trampled by each other and died on the spot.³⁹

Is it too much to infer, as some have done, a link between the disaster and the subsequent appearance of 'Manichees'?⁴⁰ Hamilton warns us, no doubt rightly, to beware 'clerical hyperbole' (p. 256) – but we might also consider the possibility of clerical face-saving. After Hillsborough, we know all too well the lengths to which institutional hierarchies are prepared to go to cover up a failure of crowd control. 'The people' in Aquitaine, like those of

Liverpool, may have known precisely who was responsible, and campaigned in anger to bring them to justice.⁴¹

What, then, of the world of the clergy? The strength and the weakness of Julia Barrow's book is that it aims to provide 'an overview of the forces that shaped the lives of clerics'. How clerics in turn shaped the lives of others is not in the purview. This is a book without heresy – the index moves from 'Hereford, Roger of', to 'Herewald, Bishop of Llandaff' – and 'reform' is at best an ancillary part of this story.

Barrow's chronology has the same basic shape as does Hamilton's. 'As far as a history of the clergy is concerned, the tenth and much of the eleventh century can, indeed be viewed as a continuation of the Carolingian era, the time when we can observe the full implementation of Carolingian innovations over the long term' (p. 6). In this world, boys were ordained young into the priesthood from the age of seven; the principal marker of their careers was their progression through the ranks of the clerical hierarchy, from deacon, to priest, and then bishop. An educational programme accompanied this, but it was through ritual rather than intellectual progression that the stages of their career would be marked.

This was to change at the turn of the twelfth century. As educational opportunities expanded – with the development of cathedral schools, and then universities – literacy became the medium in which a clerical career was articulated. The clergy became the *literati*. That what we call 'clerical work' has deep medieval roots has long been recognized. Alexander Murray's *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (1978) depicted the intellectual sphere in which the *literati* were formed; and the following year Michael Clanchy's *From Memory to Written Record* showed how royal government came to depend upon the service of these men of letters.⁴² What we owe to Barrow is a granular depiction of their institutional culture, from the highest echelons down to the level of the parish.

The book makes two signal contributions. The first is to have offered a sound and accessible account of the emergence of the distinction between ‘secular’ and ‘regular’ priests. As Barrow is well aware, this is a story that starts in the late Roman period, in the face-off between the monastic movement and the episcopacy.⁴³ Juridically, as the Council of Chalcedon affirmed, a bishop was supposed to have authority over any monastic communities in his diocese; but ascetic charisma, generated in particular through sexual continence, was a resource enabling monks not only to ignore episcopal direction, but actively to criticize the priesthood.⁴⁴ This is one way to understand both the pronouncements on clerical sexual continence which we start to see from the late fourth century – as an attempt to keep up with the monastic Joneses – and also the experiments in communal clerical living initiated by bishops such as Eusebius of Vercelli and, in particular, Augustine of Hippo.⁴⁵ These clerical communities sought, like monasteries, to emulate patterns of apostolic living. They followed written rules, *canones* or *regulae*: hence ‘regular clergy’. Their peers who remained ‘in the world’ – *saeculum* – became by default the ‘secular’ clergy.

As Barrow notes, the development of the canonical/regular life of the clergy has not been well charted, and she gives us a proper map.⁴⁶ We move through the initiatives taken by Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766), and then the Council of Aachen (817), up to and beyond the adoption of the *Rule of Augustine* in 1059, and the success of the Augustinian canons in the twelfth century. Barrow leaves to one side the internal wranglings of the Augustinians about Manichees (see above). Her focus is on the pressure the development of the regular clergy put on the ‘secular’ clergy. The whole account of conflict within the ranks of the religious specialists – how monastic criticism of the clergy eventually leads to an internal faultline across the clerical *ordo* – is masterly.

There follows a chapter ‘Clergy as Family Men’, the first serious and sustained discussion of this theme, certainly in English, since Jack Goody’s *The Development of*

Family and Marriage in Europe.⁴⁷ As we have seen, the standard account of Reform assumes (mistakenly) that clerical celibacy was already established in the late Roman period, but that it was honoured more in the breach than in the observance in the early Middle Ages. On this view, which tacitly accepts the reformers' claims at face value, the goal of their campaign was to restore a lost state of purity.

Barrow's navigation of this terrain is admirably decisive. She argues as follows: 'the top families had evolved a strategy to combine clerical celibacy and biological succession, in the form of a dog-legged clerical succession in agnatic kin groups where in each generation the head of a family could count on placing at least one son in a particular church' (p. 129). We've long known about these dynasties, and have been inclined to explain them away: these 'uncles' were actually fathers. Barrow acknowledges a late Roman father-son pattern, but insists that the early medieval uncle-nephew pattern was a viable and well-established practice among the higher clergy. The celibacy campaign we associate with reform was directed against the lower clergy. It was loudly proclaimed, but very slowly implemented in the face of sullen local resistance. 'Reform' then disappears: either it's already happened, or it's a dog whose bark was a lot worse than its actual bite.

The analysis here dovetails with what Barrow says of the regular and secular clergy. This is a story of the clergy at war with themselves, in which we see the rise of class snobbery: the great and the cosmopolitan good lording it over their rural parish priests, who do not know any better. We might note that this account could be put to purposes for which Barrow does not intend it. Competition within the ranks of the clergy is as good as any model of 'reform'. Specifically, it explains very well the emergence of 'Cathar bishops', i.e. local community leaders who come to resent and resist attempts to dictate to them from on high.

But does the model really hold up? On the one hand, it presses hard on thin evidence. The family tree of Gregory of Tours is taken to be representative of the uncle-nephew pattern

– but not enough other examples are adduced fully to convince. This is hardly Barrow’s fault. As she observes, down to the eleventh century ‘it’s impossible to count up numbers of clergy with any precision in cathedral communities (and absolutely impossible to do so for local churches), let alone to obtain information about kinship for any of them apart from a tiny handful’ (p. 149).⁴⁸ On the other hand, the case is not presented ambitiously enough. Substantiating the uncle–nephew hypothesis requires more comment than is offered here on the history of the family. Barrow appeals to ‘the development of primogeniture’ (p. 155), as though this were a given – but decades of argument have been devoted to this. For proponents of ‘the feudal revolution’, the rise of primogeniture was at the centre of a profound reorganization of the family, away from a ramifying early medieval kin group, and towards a single line of agnatic descent.⁴⁹ That the eldest son inherited the family lands required of the younger son a reinvention as a celibate priest, a custodian of institutional property. This account appealed for support to the anthropology of kinship at just the moment, ironically, that anthropologists were calling the whole field of kinship into question.⁵⁰ By the late 1990s, the eleventh-century *mutation familiale* was in trouble, not least thanks to Pauline Stafford’s intervention.⁵¹ Combining Namierite scepticism with an alertness to the politics of gender, Stafford showed that primogeniture was a strategy available to family groups, but its adoption was not a sign of sudden structural change. In the next generation, a different strategy might be important. Older sons might win out eventually, but this took centuries, not decades. In this century, historians of the medieval family haven’t known exactly what to do.⁵² It would be too much to ask of Barrow to resolve this, but until we have a clearer sense of what it meant to be a father, a son, or an uncle across this period, the profile of the cleric as a family man will prove elusive.

In the meantime, we can change the perspective, and ask ‘how did families (however defined) cope in this period?’ – and so turn to the studies of John Eldevik on imperial Italy

and Germany and Chris Wickham on Rome. These books are dense, complex, and satisfying. Both are more committed to accounts of structural change that can usefully be described as ‘reform’ than are the more general accounts of Hamilton and Barrow.

At the close of his study, John Eldevik offers an understated conclusion: ‘the story told here is about families seeking to develop new bases of power’ (p. 266). It is both less and more than that. ‘Families’ remain frustratingly out of reach. We will look in vain for confirmation one way or the other of Barrow’s uncle–nephew hypothesis, because the evidence does not oblige us. Eldevik’s focus is not directly on clerics as family men. He is more interested in diffuse networks of solidarity – but he does not rest content with summoning a parade of networking strategies. There is a story line here to do with the commodification of social relations.⁵³

As Eldevik might more clearly signal, the analytical ground here was first broken a generation ago by Barbara Rosenwein’s *To Be the Neighbor of St Peter*. Returning to the Cluny archive on which Duby had based his account of ‘mutation’ in the Mâcon, Rosenwein warned against a face-value reading of the evidence for castellan violence. It was in the interests of the monks who generated the charters to portray themselves as victims. In Rosenwein’s counter-reading, there was a breakdown of reciprocity and a new adversarial quality to relations between the monastery and its patrons. In the transition from a localized world of mutual favours to a larger society of impersonal transactions, the monastery, more often than not, was the aggressor and emerged victorious.⁵⁴

Eldevik’s concern is the episcopal tithe, the dues paid to bishops by their flocks. It is an unglamorous subject, perhaps, but richly rewarding of the attentions paid to it here. In the traditional account, the early medieval church established the collection of tithe, the Carolingians enforced it, and then, after the collapse of the empire, tithe was alienated; ‘reform’ was indeed a restoration of dues to the church. Eldevik is having none of this – it

was never this simple – but he also knows that we have told the story this way because that is how reformers themselves told it. A refrain of the book is the fundamental point that reform is as much about a change in historical perspective as anything else. Like individual conversion, institutional reform happens after the event, as the protagonists look to make narrative sense of what has happened to them.

We attend three different theatres, starting in Lucca, passing across the Alps to Salzburg, and thence to Mainz, to the heart of the German empire during the Investiture Contest. In Lucca, we meet a local elite who have long-established ways of doing business with each other. Episcopal ‘alienation’ of the right to tithe is to be found from the ninth century. In the late tenth century, under Bishop Teudgrim, ‘alienation’ proceeded apace – but this is to be understood not in terms of weakness or ‘corruption’, but as part of a well-understood practice of network-building. In the first half of the eleventh century, this face-to-face society broke down, as local families lost their grip on episcopal office. Milan, the fastest-growing city in the Latin west, now ‘bossed’ Lucca, appointing Anselm I (1057–61) and then his nephew (NB!) Anselm II (1073–86). While retaining his post at Lucca, the former became Pope Alexander II; the latter was, not coincidentally, a fearsomely learned canonist, working in close cooperation with Gregory VII. For all that, the Anselms found they could not easily reclaim the tithes: the best they could do was to forbid what they saw as further asset-stripping of the church (p. 170). Under the Anselms, then, the story of ‘alienation’ became a reality.

In Salzburg, the story starts in a similar way, but has a different outcome (in so far as we can tell: the Salzburg church preserves nothing like the archival record of the Church at Lucca). The bishopric was in the hands of two families in the Bavarian aristocracy. In 1060, an outsider Gebhard was appointed. His first move was to ingratiate himself with the local elites. He also built up a following of his own dependants. When the families died out in the

early twelfth century, a new episcopal regime was in place to take over. In Italy, then, we see the eventual triumph of the commune at the expense of episcopal power; in Austria, the bishop is the beneficiary of a new, instrumentalized social dispensation.

Eldevik's account opens and closes with the feud over control of tithes between Archbishop Siegfried I of Mainz and the great monastic houses of Fulda and Hersfeld. In 1073, in the presence of King Henry IV, both sides reached an ill-tempered compromise – but this broke down almost immediately, and the parties then faced each other across the divide that fell across the empire in the 1070s. Siegfried join the ranks of the papal party, and the monasteries cleaved to their king. Our informant here is Lampert of Hersfeld, with an obvious *parti pris*. We should beware the claim that Siegfried was the aggressor. The truth Lampert captures, in Eldevik's compelling reconstruction, is that the monasteries were victims of their own success in drawing near to the royal court. Already in the 1020s, 'monastic reform' had bound them close to Henry II, loosening their ties with the local political environment. There was a gap here into which the archbishop of Mainz, not an impressive figure in the early eleventh century, could re-establish himself as a local player.

The battle in the 1070s for control of the tithes thus reached back deep into the eleventh century – and it aligns with the larger narrative of the change in political culture across the empire. The crisis of the gift economy was hardly confined to the 'religious sphere'. Argument about tithes and their alienation mirrored the debate about simony, which mirrored in turn the debate between Henry IV and his nobility about grants of land and their reversibility.⁵⁵ Across the west, Eldevik concludes, bishops did not prove themselves adept at the new dispensation.

And so to Rome, guided by a scholar not known for his patience with either Whig or Tory history. Grand Narratives are wrong, Chris Wickham insists, not because they mask oligarchic continuity, but because they obscure our view of structural change. Looking

straight at him, Wickham stares Syme down. To the doyen of lurking oligarchy, he says:

‘Reconstruction of family relationships is interesting only to a few’ (p. 185). An intellectual mandarin makes history in its own image – which history is all the poorer and duller for it.

On this basis, Wickham proceeds with boundless energy to reintroduce us to Roman families we think we know (the Pierleoni and the Frangipani), and to introduce us for the first time to the many that we don’t (such as the Bracciuti, the Normanni, and the Boboni), but without whom there is no understanding the politics of the city across the period. We meet also the butchers and pepper traders, bleachers and dyers populating what remained, until at least 1100, the largest city in the Latin west. Ten Luccas would fit into Rome; and every ten years, Wickham reckons, regime change meant a change of guard politically (p. 219). This is Rome as a medieval New York: a city in constant motion, defined by its ebullient fractiousness.

And we have a Roman Revolution worthy of the name. In the 1040s, an oligarchy is broken open. Until this point, the city has been in the hands of a traditional aristocracy who have run the city on a more or less horse-trading basis. From the mid-eleventh century, we can track a ‘privatization of justice’ and a widening of opportunity, in which office-holding is no longer as relevant in the brokering of disputes. A new institutional forum develops – the Roman senate – in which new, more diverse elites can take their place. This is effectively a ‘commune’. The historiographical upshot is that Rome, finally, takes its place among Italian cities and in the wider urban landscape of medieval Europe.

This analytical gain is achieved by a huge effort of will. Wickham refuses the gravitational pull of the papacy and papal historiography. For the first time, perhaps, we have a social history of Rome and its bishop not driven by moralism of one sort or another. The myths of pornocratic depravity in the tenth century and moral redemption in the eleventh are set aside. The money with which the city was associated (although there was very little coin

in Rome) is not read as a sign of corruption.⁵⁶ ‘The sacral and the venal overtones of money gifts were not in contradiction’, Wickham insists (p. 347). Only towards the end of the book is a twinge of anti-clerical hostility felt. Wickham brings his readers to stand with the crowd in the Ferragosto procession (on 15 August, the Feast of the Assumption), and comments: ‘The lay hierarchy of the city was here swept into a re-enactment of quite an elaborate theological argument, every year on a stifling August night’ (p. 327).

What of reform? Here the book is less sure-footed. On the one hand, ‘reform’ is cast as part of the historiographical problem. If the goal is to avoid the papal Grand Narrative, one may understand why Wickham should hold it at arm’s length. On the other hand, ‘reform’ is an integral part of his story. Wickham acknowledges that the convulsion in civic government from 1044 to 1150 began with the deposition of the Tusculan Pope Benedict IX for simony – the first time a successor of Peter had been so removed – and the arrival in Rome of the ‘reform’ party, a group whose ‘commitment to far-reaching change [. . .] recalls the early years of the Russian Revolution’ (p. 29). Humbert (here Umberto) of Silva Candida is duly present and correct, but his *Three Books Against the Simoniacs*, composed in the late 1050s in Rome, do not feature.

In sidelining the successors of St Peter, then, *Medieval Rome* also ‘blanks’ Simon Magus, from whom simony took its name.⁵⁷ This might have surprised medieval Romans. Simon was Peter’s great rival, and part of the sacred fabric of the city. The basilica of S. Maria Nova in the Roman forum contained the stone on which, from the fifth century, Simon is said to have died at Peter’s hands.⁵⁸ The narrator here, as far as the Romans were concerned, is St Clement, in the (Pseudo-Clementine) *Recognitions*, a wildly popular novelistic account of the adventures of St Peter and his followers around the Mediterranean. It is not a coincidence that Suidger of Bamberg, the first reform pope to succeed the simoniac Benedict IX, took the name ‘Clement’.

There is more to say, likewise, on the Roman clergy as family men.⁵⁹ In the late ninth and early tenth century, the bishop of Rome might well be a married man. Later this became a cause for scandal – Liudprand of Cremona made notorious the attempt of the House of Theophylact to establish a dynastic hold on the papacy – but at the time it could pass without comment, as with Pope Hadrian II and his wife.⁶⁰ By the mid-twelfth century, however, the bishop of Rome and his priests were no longer husbands. In 1139 at the Second Lateran council, as we saw above, clerical marriage was comprehensively outlawed. Wickham notices this, and he is alert to the wider historiography of the *mutation familiale*, but within the framework he has established others will need to develop an account of the ‘celibate revolution’ from the 1050s down to the Second Lateran Council. Did reform make a difference to the Roman household church – or did it in fact continue down to the Borgias?

One possibility here is to look not at the depth, but at the surface: Maureen Miller shows how this might be done. Her *Clothing the Clergy* brings us the sheer fabulousness of the medieval clergy. As we turn the pages of Miller’s book, brushing past the Vitalis chasuble or the golden boots of Pope Clement II, we are reminded that these were high priests dressed in high style. Black cassocks and dog collars have made us forget that western Europe, as well as ancient Israel, or early modern Meso-America, had its grand ritual practitioners whose task it was to perform the sacrifice on behalf of the whole community.⁶¹ Even when under physical duress, it was incumbent on them to retain their studied poise. An early foray in the book shows us Pope Gregory VII being manhandled by kidnappers, but keeping his priestly garments in place.

Miller charts the development of what she calls ‘the ornate style’ from the Carolingian period, but she insists that eleventh-century reformers were the key impresarios of the sacerdotal look. So successful, in fact, was the ornate style, that the Second Lateran Council had to rein in the excesses of clerical dress:

We also enjoin that bishops as well as clergy take pains to be pleasing to God and to humans in both their interior and exterior comportment. Let them give no offence in the sight of those for whom they ought to be a model and example, by the excess, cut, or colour of their clothes, nor with regard to their tonsure, but rather, as it is fitting for them, let them exhibit holiness.⁶²

On reform, then, Miller looks to hold a balance. She is happy to see a story start with the Carolingians, but is not ready to cancel eleventh-century reform. At times, indeed, her account affirms traditional verities: ‘The reform movements of the eleventh century brought changes in nearly every aspect of ecclesiastical life’ (p. 35). But Miller is impatient with the artificial polarities in which reform has been discussed. Everyone, in her view, wanted reform, just as everyone was against sin: the question was, what that actually meant. This inclusiveness is perhaps too anodyne: not everyone did want reform. While married priests found themselves attacked in the streets in Milan in the 1050s, when the archbishop of Rouen demanded that priests in his diocese give up their wives, his priests threw stones at him.⁶³

But this isn’t a book about social dynamics: its focus is the politics of fashion. The story of the peacock plumage of the clergy has hidden depths. The makers of clerical vestments were female. In the period when women were being shunted off the sacerdotal stage, when the reformers’ purity drive looked to set distance between women and priests, women’s prowess with cloth drew them back in. One way to read this would be that it added insult to injury: women were made literally to stitch themselves up. Miller sees it the other way. She proposes that there was a strange intimacy established between priests and the women who clothed them. The relic sewn into the alb of Bernulf of Utrecht was a secret shared by the wearer and the women who had hidden it.

Following this line, Miller makes the highly telling suggestion that the priestly life was a space of complicity for mothers and their sons. Although she does not pursue it, what

this conjures is the possibility of triangulating the family politics of clerical celibacy. Who was it who decided that a young man would not marry? His father or his uncles had less to do with this, perhaps, than did his mother. Having been traded herself in an increasingly competitive marriage market, which, on the whole, worked to the detriment of her property rights, was clerical celibacy a form of maternal revenge? The suggestion would require substantiation – but there is at least one case we know where something like it is in play.

We turn to the alluring witness of Guibert of Nogent, a younger son with little prospect of family inheritance, but also with no little literary ability. He styled himself as a modern Augustine in a modern post-reform world, and his mother as a Monnica, eager to ensure his career prospects in the face of paternal indifference.⁶⁴ Guibert does not spare the details in his account of his mother's sexual travails.⁶⁵ When she married Guibert's father, she made an enemy of his stepmother, who set witchcraft against her to prevent the marriage from being consummated. After seven years, counter-magic eventually released her, and she started to bear children. Guibert was the youngest of these, but his mother nearly died giving birth to him: only an emergency dedication of the baby to the Virgin Mary saved mother and child. Guibert's father died when he was a few months old, and his widowed mother had to fight off new suitors. She was determined that Guibert remain celibate – that he not join the ranks of men whose attentions she herself had to endure.

This determination itself causes problems, as Guibert explains. Her plan to launch Guibert as a priest was morally compromised. The idea was to call in a debt owed to Guibert's older brother, and so to have him assigned a clerical living. The post was, however, already occupied. Its incumbent, notoriously, lived with a woman. After some fifty years of decrees against such arrangements, Guibert's family were confident that they could oust the man and install Guibert. What they did not reckon with was the stubbornness of the incumbent, and his capacity to mobilize opinion in his favour. Making no attempt to defend

himself against the charge of sexual impurity, the priest pointed out that Guibert's acquisition of office would be simoniac – involving the trading around of clerical office. In the event, the taint of simony proved stronger, and Guibert's family backed down.⁶⁶

As Guibert bitterly intends, the story shows the limits of the reform movement. Whatever the bold papal proclamations, priests are hardly men without families. However much some may think of Europe after 1000 as a newly globalized society, the participants in this story all know each other. Clerical office is here fully enmeshed in the politics of the household and of inheritance. Does this mean that reform has made no difference? A minimalist answer is that at least the terms in which politics are conducted have changed. Reform has supplied a new lexicon of claims and accusations with which the traditional scramble for preferment can be conducted. But we might be tempted to conclude, like critics of political correctness, that very little has really changed.⁶⁷

Guibert does not stop here. Having recounted his own failed advancement, he turns in the immediate sequel to the cautionary tale of Evrard de Breteuil. Here was a young heir who had everything, who renounced it all for the sake of a life of radical apostolic purity – only to find one day that his very name and identity had been assumed by a con artist.⁶⁸ To his own face, the man claimed to be Evrard. 'Astonished at the incredible effrontery of this wicked man, Evrard refused to address his phantom self [*simulacri illius*], if I may call him that.'⁶⁹ Suitably chastened, Evrard joined a monastery. The moral Guibert draws from his story is that established institutional identities are safest. This was to be his own path – he wrote, of course, as abbot of the small house of Nogent – and it had been set for him by Evrard, his spiritual brother.

Here is a witness to a new world created by reform, and to its dangers. *Reformatio* could go too far: a man might reify or refashion himself beyond recognition. Escape from the family matrix was possible – and it was vertiginously dangerous. Guibert takes refuge in the

memory of his mother, and in so doing he leads us to a subtler understanding of the motor of Tory history. It does not foreground the power of oligarchy out of a contempt for the vacuity of ideas. As an observer remarked of Lewis Namier: ‘Far from denying the potency of social and political ideologies, he was frightened by their power to disturb, and he was inclined to regard them as the neurotic symptoms of a society, as traumatic visitations.’⁷⁰

Worcester College, Oxford

CONRAD LEYSER

* With thanks to the editors of *EME*, and to Kate Cooper, Henrietta Leyser, Amanda Power, and Benjamin Savill for encouragement and correction.

¹ A. Fliche and V. Martin (eds), *Histoire de l'Église: depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, 24 vols (Paris, 1934–62). See esp. vols 7 and 8 (1940): E. Amann and A. Dumas, *L'Église au pouvoir des laïcs (888–1057)*; and A. Fliche, *La Réforme grégorienne et la reconquête chrétienne (1057–1123)*, resuming his earlier study, *La Réforme grégorienne*, 3 vols (Louvain, 1924). F. Laplanche, ‘De l’*Histoire de l'Église* de Fliche et Martin à l’*Histoire du christianisme*’, *Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise en France* 2000 (86), pp. 685–90 reviews the project and its sequel.

² G. Tellenbach, *Libertas. Kirche und Weltordnung im Zeitalter des Investiturstreits* (Stuttgart, 1936); trans. R.F. Bennet, *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Controversy* (Oxford, 1940). On Gelasius and the ‘Two Swords theory’, from a huge bibliography, starting places are G. Demacopoulos, *The Invention of Peter: Apostolic*

Discourse and Papal Authority in Late Antiquity (Philadelphia, 2013), pp. 89–95, and I.

Robinson, ‘Church and Papacy’, in J.H. Burns (ed.), *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought* (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 252–305, at pp. 288–305. G. Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley, 1979) retains its power; S. Patzold, *Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008), pp. 155–57 maps with precision the uptake of Gelasius at the Synod of Paris, 829.

³ From another huge bibliography, one may gratefully begin with T. Reuter, ‘Contextualizing Canossa: Excommunication, Penance, Surrender, Reconciliation’, in his *Medieval Politics and Modern Mentalities*, ed. J.L. Nelson (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 147–66. See further S. Weinfurter, *Canossa: die Entzauberung der Welt* (Munich, 2006).

⁴ Y. Congar, *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église* (Paris, 1950) – its impact recalled by R.A. Markus, ‘Church Reform and Society in Late Antiquity’, in C.M. Bellitto and L.I. Hamilton (eds), *Reforming the Church before Modernity: Patterns, Problems and Approaches* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 3–19, at p. 3.

⁵ For an introduction, see J.W. O'Malley, *What happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge, MA, 2008).

⁶ G. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, MA, 1959); for the uptake by the papacy, see his *Erinnerungen*, eds H. Wolfram and W. Pohl, *Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 617* (Vienna, 1994), p. 67.

⁷ See e.g. G. Ladner, 'Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: A Comparison of their Concepts of Renewal', *Viator* 4 (1973), pp. 1–26; and see now J. Howe, *Before the Gregorian Reform: The Latin Church at the Turn of the Millennium* (Ithaca, 2016), esp. pp. 7–10 on Ladner, the author's doctoral supervisor.

⁸ J. Van Engen, 'Images and Ideas: The Achievements of Gerhart Burian Ladner, with a Bibliography of his Published Works', *Viator* 16 (1989), pp. 85–115, at p. 100. We might note the article immediately following Van Engen's: J. Barrow, 'Education and the Recruitment of Cathedral Canons in England and Germany 1100–1225', pp. 117–38.

⁹ Influential here was H. de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: l'eucharistie et l'église au Moyen Âge: étude historique* (Paris, 1944).

¹⁰ See e.g. H.C. Lea, *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church* (Philadelphia, 1867); R. Sohm, *Das altkatholische Kirchenrecht und das Dekret Gratians* (Leipzig, 1918). G. Wills, *Why Priests? A Failed Tradition* (New York, 2014) is a Roman Catholic uptake of this theme.

¹¹ See further, D. Hunter, "'A Man of One Wife': Patristic Interpretations of 1 Timothy 3:2, 3:12, and Titus 1:6 and the Making of Christian Priesthood", *Annali di storia dell'esegesi* 32 (2015), pp. 333–52.

¹² On clerical privilege, see now J. Dillon, *The Justice of Constantine* (Ann Arbor, 2012), esp. pp. 148–9.

¹³ Second Lateran Council, canon 7; see N. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols (London, 1990), I, p. 197.

¹⁴ See the debate between R. Gryson, *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique, du premier au septième siècle* (Gembloux, 1970), and H. Crouzel, *Mariage et divorce, célibat et caractère sacerdotaux dans l'Eglise ancienne: études diverses* (Turin, 1982).

¹⁵ See D. Callam, 'Clerical Continence in the Late Fourth Century: The Evidence of the Decretals', *Theological Studies* 41 (1980), pp. 3–50.

¹⁶ D. Hunter, 'Married Clergy in Eastern and Western Christianity', in G. Peters and C. Anderson (eds), *A Companion to Priesthood and Holy Orders in the Middle Ages* (Leiden, 2016), pp. 96–139.

¹⁷ A good vantage point is L. Melve, 'The Public Debate on Clerical Marriage in the Late Eleventh Century', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 61 (2010), pp. 688–710. Meanwhile, the women and children involved are starting to get their due: see F. Griffiths, 'Women and Reform in the Central Middle Ages', in J.M. Bennett and R.M. Karris (eds), *Women and Gender in Medieval Europe* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 447–63; E. van Houts, 'The Fate of Priests' Sons in Normandy with Special Reference to Serlo of Bayeux', *Haskins Society Journal* 15 (2013), pp. 57–106.

¹⁸ See e.g. P. De Mey, T. Knieps-Port le Roi and G. Mannion (eds), *The Household of God and Local Households: Revisiting the Domestic Church* (Leuven, 2013); S. Wood, *The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West* (Oxford, 2006).

¹⁹ See esp. R.I. Moore, *The First European Revolution* (Oxford, 2000), and the use made of it by K.G. Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (Manchester, 2005).

²⁰ ‘La mutation de l’an mille . . . on n’en parle plus’: R. le Jan, in conversation, Paris, 9 March 2016. See C. West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation between Marne and Moselle, c. 800–c. 1100* (Cambridge, 2013).

²¹ J. Barrow, ‘Ideas and Applications of Reform’, in T.F.X. Noble and J.M. Smith (eds), *The Cambridge History of Christianity Volume 3: Early Medieval Christianities, c.600–c.1100* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 345–62.

²² The strand’s organizer, Steven Vanderputten, has given his own steer: see in particular his *Monastic Reform as Process: Realities and Representations in Medieval Flanders, 900–1100* (Ithaca, 2013).

²³ M. Miller, ‘The Crisis in the Investiture Crisis Narrative’, *History Compass* 7 (2009), pp. 1570–80. The same author’s earlier study, *The Formation of a Medieval Church: Ecclesiastical Change in Verona, 950–1150* (Ithaca, 1993), pp. 12–13 offers an overview of work on reform in French/Italian.

²⁴ L. Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III* (London, 1929). See further L. Colley, *Lewis Namier* (London, 1989); M. Bentley, *Modernizing England's Past: English Historiography in the Age of Modernism, 1870–1970* (Cambridge, 2005).

²⁵ R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 11, 7. Syme is usually read as commenting on contemporary continental, and in particular, Italian politics, with Augustus cast as Mussolini. For the suggestion that what he in fact had in mind was the emergence of professional politicians in Britain since 1918, see I. Gradel, ‘Syme’s Roman Revolution – and a British One’, in K. Ascani *et al* (eds), *Ancient History Matters. Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydesgaard on his Seventieth Birthday* (Rome, 2002), pp. 297–303.

²⁶ It goes without saying that this is not a comment on the political affiliations of any of the authors whose work is under review here. For a wider view of where we are, see J. Vernon, *Distant Strangers: How Britain Became Modern* (Berkeley, 2014), esp. pp. xi–xvi.

²⁷ There is also no mention of Humbert’s *Three Books* in Howe, *Before the Gregorian Reform*.

²⁸ M. Wrong, *It’s Our Turn to Eat: The Story of a Kenyan Whistle-Blower* (London, 2009).

²⁹ See e.g. G. Nuzzi, *The Merchants in the Temple: Inside Pope Francis’ Secret Battle against Corruption in the Vatican* (New York, 2015); P. Vallely, *Pope Francis: Untying the Knots: The Struggle for the Soul of Catholicism* (London, 2015).

³⁰ Regino of Prüm, *Libri duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. W. Hartmann (Darmstadt, 2004); for his *Chronicle*, see S. MacLean, *History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: The Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg* (Manchester, 2009).

³¹ W. Pezé, 'Amalaire et la communauté juive de Lyon. À propos de l'antijudaïsme Lyonnais à l'époque carolingienne', *Francia* 40 (2013), pp. 1–26. I owe this reference to Charles West.

³² Earlier calls for a more differentiated approach to reform include W. North, 'The Fragmentation and Redemption of a Medieval Cathedral: Property, Conflict, and Public Piety in Eleventh-Century Arezzo', in P. Gorecki and W. Brown (eds), *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture* (Aldershot, 2003), pp. 109–30.

³³ R.I. Moore, 'Family, Community and Cult on the Eve of the Gregorian Reform', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser. 30 (1980), pp. 49–79, at p. 49.

³⁴ D. Iogna-Prat, *Ordonner et exclure: Cluny et la société chrétienne face à l'hérésie, au judaïsme et à l'islam, 1000–1150* (Paris, 1998); English trans. *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000–1150)*, trans. G. Robert Edwards (Ithaca, 2002).

³⁵ See now S. Watson and S. Rees-Jones (eds), *The York Massacre of 1190 in Context* (Woodbridge, 2013).

³⁶ R.I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Power and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250* (Oxford, 1987; 2nd edn 2007). See further R.I. Moore, *The War on Heresy: Faith and Power in Medieval Europe* (London, 2012) to which Hamilton is unlikely to have been able to respond.

³⁷ U. Brunn, *Des Contestataires aux 'Cathares'. Discours de réforme et propaganda antihérétique dans le pays du rhin et de la Meuse avant l'Inquisition* (Paris, 2006).

³⁸ See P. Biller, 'Review, *The War on Heresy*', in *Reviews in History*, with Moore's response at <<http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1546>> [accessed 1 July 2016]; about to appear in A. Sennis (ed.), *Cathars in Question* (York, 2016).

³⁹ Ademar, *Chronicon* III.49, cited and trans. R. Landes, 'Between Aristocracy and Heresy: Popular Participation in the Limousin Peace of God, 944–1043', in T. Head and R. Landes (eds), *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response around the Year 1000* (Ithaca, 1992), pp. 184–218, at p. 203 and n. 99 (which explains the textual complexities involved).

⁴⁰ See further R.I. Moore, 'Postscript: The Peace of God and the Social Revolution', in Head and Landes (eds), *The Peace of God*, pp. 308–26, esp. pp. 323–4.

⁴¹ As not all *EME* readers may know, on 15 April 1989, ninety-six people, supporters of Liverpool Football Club, died in a crush at Hillsborough, a stadium in Sheffield. The inquest into their deaths in 2016 concluded that they had been unlawfully killed as a result of gross police negligence in allowing the crush to develop, and showed that the police had sought systematically to cover this up. See P. Scraton, *Hillsborough: The Truth* (Edinburgh, 1999; 2nd edn 2016).

⁴² A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978); M. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066–1307* (Oxford, 1979; 3rd edn 2012).

⁴³ See on this in general, G. Dagron, 'Les moines et la ville: Le monachisme à Constantinople', *Travaux et mémoires* 4 (1970), pp. 229–76; D. Caner, *Wandering Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2002).

⁴⁴ See further K. Cooper, 'Insinuations of Womanly Influence: An Aspect of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy', *Journal of Roman Studies* (1992), pp. 150–64; for an attempt to draw lessons for the eleventh century, see C. Leyser, 'Custom, Truth, and Gender in Eleventh-Century Reform', in R. Swanson (ed.), *Gender in Christian Tradition, Studies in Church History* 34 (London, 1998), pp. 75–91.

⁴⁵ Ladner, *Idea of Reform*, pp. 350–427; C. Leyser, 'Augustine in the Latin West, 430–c. 900', in M. Vessey (ed.), *Blackwells Companion to Augustine* (Oxford, 2012), pp. 450–64.

⁴⁶ See also J. Barrow, 'Chrodegang, His Rule, and its Successors', *EME* 14 (2006), pp. 201–12.

⁴⁷ J. Goody's *The Development of Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge, 1983).

⁴⁸ In some cases, of course, it is possible: see e.g. J. Barrow, 'Hereford Bishops and Married Clergy c. 1130–1240', *Historical Research* 50 (1987), pp. 1–8.

⁴⁹ Put most succinctly in R.I. Moore, 'Duby's Eleventh Century', *History* 69 (1984), pp. 36–49.

⁵⁰ J. Carsten, *After Kinship* (Cambridge, 2004).

⁵¹ P. Stafford, 'La Mutation Familiale: A Suitable Case for Caution', in J. Hill and M. Swan (eds), *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 103–25. See further, D. Sabeau, S. Teuscher and J. Mathieu (eds), *Kinship in Europe: Approaches to Long-Term Development* (New York and Oxford, 2007); S. McDougall, 'The Making of Marriage in Medieval Europe', *Journal of Family History* 38 (2013), pp. 103–21.

⁵² Carsten, *After Kinship* and C. Thompson, *Making Parents: The Ontological Choreography of Reproductive Technologies* (Cambridge, MA, 2005) plot developments in anthropology to which historians have yet to respond.

⁵³ Compare Charles West's analysis of 'reification': see West, *Reframing*.

⁵⁴ B. Rosenwein, *To be the Neighbor of St Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property* (Ithaca, 1989); and still further back, J.-F. Lemarignier, 'Exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme clunisienne', in *À Cluny: Congrès scientifique. Fêtes et cérémonies liturgiques en l'honneur des saints Abbés Odon et Odilon 9–11 juillet 1949* (Dijon, 1950), pp. 288–340.

⁵⁵ K.J. Leyser, 'The Crisis of Medieval Germany', in T. Reuter (ed.), *Communications and Power in Medieval Europe: The Gregorian Revolution and Beyond* (London, 1994), pp. 21–49.

⁵⁶ The absence of coin is noted by A. Rovelli, 'Monetary Circulation in Byzantine and Carolingian Rome', in J.M.H. Smith (ed.), *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West* (Leiden, 2000), pp. 85–99.

⁵⁷ Simon Magus makes one fleeting appearance (p. 340). Simon's medieval presence is in general under-studied; a start was made by H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'Simon Magus in South Italy', *Anglo-Norman Studies* 15 (1992), pp. 77–90.

⁵⁸ See *Liber Pontificalis*, notice for Paul I, ed. L. Duchesne, 3 vols (Paris, 1886–1957), I, p. 465, with discussion and further references at p. 466.

⁵⁹ See further, T. di Carpegna Falconieri, 'Il matrimonio e il concubinato press oil clero romano (secc. 8–12)', *Studi storici* 41 (2000), pp. 943–71, to which Wickham does direct attention.

⁶⁰ *Annals of Saint-Bertin*, s.v. 868. On Liudprand, see C. Leyser, 'Episcopal Office in the Italy of Liudprand of Cremona, c. 890–c.970', *English Historical Review* 125 (2010), pp. 795–817.

⁶¹ In Orthodox and Coptic communities, this is perhaps more obvious.

⁶² Second Lateran Council, Tanner, *Decrees* I, p. 197, as cited by Miller, p. 11.

⁶³ See further, J. Lynch, 'Marriage and Celibacy of the Clergy: The Discipline of the Western Church' *The Jurist* 32 (1972), pp. 14–38 and 189–212, at p. 194.

⁶⁴ See further R.I. Moore, 'Guibert of Nogent and his World', in H. Mayr-Harting and R.I. Moore (eds), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C Davis* (London, 1985), pp. 107–17; J. Rubenstein, *Portrait of a Medieval Mind: Guibert of Nogent* (New York, 2002); and B. McGuire, 'In Search of the Good Mother: Twelfth-Century Celibacy and Affectivity', in C. Leyser and L. Smith (eds), *Motherhood, Religion, and Society in Medieval Europe, 400–1400: Essays Presented to Henrietta Leyser* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 85–105.

⁶⁵ Guibert de Nogent, *Monodiae* I.2–3, 12–13, ed. E.R. Labarge (Paris, 1981), pp. 8–30, 74–96.

⁶⁶ Guibert, *Monodiae* I.7, ed. Labarge, pp. 42–8.

⁶⁷ P. Fouracre, 'The Use of the Term *beneficium* in Frankish Sources: A Society Based on Favours?', in W. Davies and P. Fouracre (eds), *The Language of Gift in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 62–88, at pp. 83–8.

⁶⁸ Discussed in C. Leyser, 'Cities of the Plain: the Rhetoric of Sodomy in Peter Damian's *Book of Gomorrah*', *Romanic Review* 86: 2 (1995), 191–211 at pp. 210–11.

⁶⁹ Guibert, *Monodiae* I.7, ed. Labarge, p. 56; trans. J. McAlhany and J. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent, Monodies and On the Relics of Saints* (New York, 2011), p. 23.

⁷⁰ J.L. Talman, 'The Ordeal of Sir Lewis Namier: The Man, the Historian, and the Jew', *Commentary* (February 1962), as cited by Bentley, *Modernizing England's Past*, p. 151.