Throne and Pulpit: The Relationship Between the Medieval Church and the Nascent State During the Pontificate of Alexander III (1159-1181)

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts
with a
Major in History
in the
College of Graduate Studies
University of Idaho
by

Ben Bridges

Major Professor: Ellen E. Kittell, Ph.D.
Committee Members: Sean M. Quinlan, Ph.D.; Janice Capel Anderson, Ph.D.
Department Administrator: Ellen E. Kittell, Ph.D.

May 2017

Authorization to Submit Thesis

This thesis of Ben Bridges, submitted for the degree of Master of Arts with a Major in History and titled "**Throne and Pulpit: The Relationship Between the Medieval Church and the Nascent State During the Pontificate of Alexander III (1159-1181)**" has been reviewed in final form. Permission, as indicated by the signatures and dates below, is now granted to submit final copies to the College of Graduate Studies for approval.

Major Professor: _____ Date: _____
Ellen E. Kittell, Ph.D.

Committee Members: _____ Date: _____
Sean M. Quinlan, Ph.D.

_____ Date: _____
Janice Capel Anderson, Ph.D.

Department
Administrator: _____ Date: _____
Ellen E. Kittell, Ph.D.

Abstract

There is rarely anything glamorous in a job well done, especially when the nature of that work is administrative and bureaucratic. Such is the case of Pope Alexander III. His pontificate (1159-1181) existed in stark counterpoint to one of the most tumultuous centuries of the medieval era. This period was marked by culture and politics and is known by historians as the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Some historians have argued that this represented a period of crisis between the medieval church and the nascent state. Using Alexander's pontificate as a case study I argue it was not. Alexander faced two major conflicts during his pontificate. One by the machinations of Frederick Barbarossa and the other Thomas Becket's inflexibility. Alexander used compromise and diplomacy during both of these conflicts in fact to avoid a crisis in the relationship between church and state.

Acknowledgements

This finished product is the result of many different individuals. Foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Ellen Kittell who has made graduate school challenging and rewarding. I would also like to thank my committee members, Drs. Quinlan and Anderson for their interest and time. Additionally, my thanks to several different History Department professors, who although they had no role in this project certainly influenced my growth as a historian. Finally, thanks to my friends and colleagues for their time, ideas, and critique.

Table of Contents

Authorization to Submit ii
Abstract iii
Acknowledgements iv
Table of Contents v

Introduction 1
Chapter I: The Twelfth Century Renaissance 8
Characteristics 10
Sacerdotium and *Regnum* 13
Intellectual Centers 16
Intelligentsia 26
The Pontificate of Alexander III 29
Chapter II: Barbarossa 34
Papacy and Empire in the Middle of the Century 35
The Papal Schism of 1159 44
Alexander Victorious 51
Chapter III: Becket 60
A History of the Office 61
Controversy 90
Correspondence 105
Chapter IV: Conclusion 116
Bibliography 120

Introduction

Pope Alexander III's pontificate (1159-1181) was a watershed moment, in which Western Europe came of age. Under Alexander's auspices, the papacy continued evolving into a rational apparatus, organized, and orchestrated logically. Simultaneously, burgeoning states consolidated, transforming from private organizations into public ones. The background driving this revolutionary moment was a cultural phenomenon now recognized as the Twelfth Century Renaissance. The *sacerdotium* and the *regnum* were becoming institutionalized. [1]

Alexander faced two major problems during his pontificate. The first was a papal schism, supported by the Holy Roman Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa.[2] The second was a controversy between Henry II of England and Thomas Becket, the Archbishop of Canterbury. The ways that Alexander navigated Barbarossa's and Becket's struggles are emblematic of the cooperation between church and state, out of which both institutions emerged from these conflicts stronger and more compatible. This period also saw a profound explosion of innovation and education which helped strengthen this relationship. Paradoxically, both conflicts of Alexander's pontificate manifested at the intersection of the old and the new; they could not have happened at any other time in the Middle Ages.

---

[1] *Sacerdotium* and *regnum* are the closest equivalents to concepts of 'church' and 'state' from the medieval period. *Sacerdotium* refers to the church's hierarchy and *regnum* to the organizations of secular rule. Another way to understand these terms is in conjunction to their complementary terms: *ecclesia* and *mundus*. The *ecclesia* refers to the sphere of the church, and the *mundus* is everything outside of it. Thus, the *sacerdotium* governs the *ecclesia* and the *regnum* the *mundus*.

Major works on this subject include, Joseph McCabe's *Crisis in the History of the Papacy*; Mary I.M. Bell's, *A Short History of the Papacy*, Margaret Deansey's *A History of the Medieval Church 590-1500*, Walter Ullman's, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* and *A Shorty History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, I.S. Robinson's, *The Papacy 1073-1198*, and a collection of essays published by Cambridge, *Early Medieval Christianities*. Each of these works holds a predominantly medieval church perspective as this thesis focuses on its relationship with the nascent state.

[2] Red beard

Alexander and his contemporaries were politically rational and pragmatic. The historian Robert Somerville described Alexander as a "man who would bargain" and a "theorist of expediency."[3] Alexander understood the importance of calculated action. As such, these problems are an expression of their time and culture at this intersection of the traditional and the modern.

This thesis contends that it was Alexander's focus on bargaining and expediency that prevented conflicts from becoming crises. It thus argues against a notion of crisis between church and state which hiterto has colored our understanding of the past. To that end I have divided my argument into three sections; the Twelfth Century Renaissance, the papal schism under Barbarossa, and the Becket controversy.

The methodology for my research has two broad characteristics, a conceptual framework and a theoretical paradigm. The conceptual framework of this thesis rests on two points – an understanding of conflict vs. crisis and the distinction between international and transnational. Throughout this study, crisis is used to express the worst possible option. It reflects a irreparable breakdown in communications and rationality forcing a change in structure and hierarchy. In contrast, the resolution of the problems, conflicts, and controversies explored in my study shaped and formed a vibrant church and state relationship. In this way, a crisis can be seen as the ultimate end, a solution that refuses to reach an understanding. The other conceptual framework in this thesis concerns the distinction between internationalism and transnationalism. Any medievalist ought to raise concern over the use of either of these terms, as both are predicated on the existence of nations. I argue that during Alexander's pontificate there were boundaries within which a

[3] Robert Somerville, *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163): A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1977), 9.

person could exercise authority; this is in fact the period of the rise of the state. I therefore use internationalism to denote concerted actions intentionally orchestrated between nascent states. Transnationalism is more amorphous and less controlled, by contrast. It is used to refer to ideas above and across boundaries, such as the effects of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. In my thesis internationalism is used in conjunction with political events whereas transnationalism is used in relation to cultural spread.

The theoretical paradigms of this thesis has four aspects. First, this research is historiographic in nature. It challenges an academic narrative and as a result contests several different historiographic traditions. I have three reasons for arguing that the relationship between the medieval church and the nascent state were not in crisis during Alexander's pontificate. I argue that Alexander's conflicts with Barbarossa and Becket are political narratives whose actors are members of both church and state institutions. Secondly, the cultural movement of the Twelfth Century Renaissance affected both church and state. The third aspect of this methodology is the refutation of the Great Man Theory; my analysis looks at the actions of several high-profile individuals who should be seen as representative figures of their respective institutions rather than primary movers of history. As such, at points, it becomes necessary to distinguish the individual from the office to maintain this discussion. The final aspect of this theoretical paradigm is the role of relationships; history is best told as a series of relationships. Beyond the relationship between church and state, relationships are more nuanced, exploring those among class, occupation, entities, and institutions.

Discussion about the relationship between church and state has been ongoing since Augustine's *City of God*. Both Thomas Aquinas and William of Ockham wrote extensively

on the subject.[4] During the Enlightenment, Voltaire, Smith, and Hume, among others, were still debating the issue.[5]

Brian Tierney's *Crisis of Church and State: 1050-1300* represents a paradigm shift in the modern debate on relationship between church and state. In this document book, Tierney weaves the sources together with overlaying interpretations, concluding that the developing institutions were in crisis over the course of the period. Up until Tierney published his research, a scholar studying one institution might consider the other; but after Tierney's groundbreaking work, church and state were examined in relation to each other. By using primary documents, Tierney diagramed this complex relationship, presenting the institutions as naturally hostile, locked in a power struggle over the same body of constituents.

Historians have approached the relationship between church and state in a variety of ways. One way has been to treat the developments of the medieval state and the medieval church independently.[6] Another way has been to perpetuate the idea that the institutions are naturally opposed.[7] Others, still, argue that the relationship was inherently antagonistic and

---

[4] Gerhart B Ladner "Aspects of Mediaeval thought on church and state." *The Review of Politics* 9, no. 04 (1947): 403-422, accessed on Sept. 23, 2016, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1404514.

[5]Daniel Dreisbach, *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State* (New York: NYU Press, 2002).

[6] Two examples that pertain purely to the state are by Powicke and Stephenson. F.M. Powicke, "Presidential Address." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1937): 1-12.1. It is worth noting that in this address, which functions as a historiography, Powicke cites Georg von Below, Fritz Kern, and Heinrich Mitteis, as the founders of the study of the modern state, going so far to argue that since their work, their ideas have only been reinterpreted and reanalyzed by later historians.

Carl Stephenson. *Medieval Feudalism.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1942. This is a particularly good example as he treats the medieval church as if it were *in absentia*.

[7] This idea can be found in articles, such as, John Witte Jr. "Facts and Fictions About the History of Separation of Church and State." *Journal of Church and State* 48, no. 1 (Winter 2006): 15-45, monographs, Stephen Ozment, *The Age of Reform: 1250-1550* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), and textbooks, F. Donald Logan, *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages.* 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2013) and Wim and Blockmans and Peter Hoppenbrouwers, *Introduction to Medieval Europe, 300-1500.* 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2014).

more hostile. In this latter school are historians such as Andre Lagarde, who argued the medieval church was a puppet of the nascent state; Gianfranco Poggi, who suggested the antagonism was a result of the church's forcing the maturation of the state; and Hendrik Spruyt, who claimed that the relationship was inherently aggressive.[8] Other historians have given the medieval church a dominate role in the relationship, arguing that it could wield temporal power[9] and influence over the state.[10] One of the more influential works of this view is Walter Ullman's *The Growth of Papal Governments in the Middle Ages*. Ullman argues that the irreparable outcome of the Investiture Controversy divided society into a *societas humane* and a *societas christiana*.[11] This separation gave the *societas humane* an independence that ultimately destroyed the papal government whence it evolved. Finally, there are a few historians who have treated the relationship as a balance of power, between two distinct but equal institutions. Ernst Kantorowicz and Joseph Strayer described church and state as intertwined, Francis Oakley and Henry Mayr-Harting argued it was reciprocal, and Margaret Harvey creatively suggested it as a business partnership.[12] Notable among this last group is Collin Morris, who suggested that the relationship between the medieval church

[8] Andre Lagarde, *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages,* trans. Archibald Alexander. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1915); Gianfranco Poggi, *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978); Hendrik Spruyt, *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors: An Analysis of Systems Change.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

[9] Mgr. Pierre Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* trans. Henri L. Brianceau (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1911).

[10] R. M. MacIver, *The Modern State* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926) and Walter Ullmann, *Principles of Government, and Politics in the Middle Ages* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd. 1961.

[11] Walter Ullman, *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (New York: Barnes & Noble Inc., 1955), 455.

[12] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957); Joseph R Strayer, *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970); Francis Oakley, *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979); Henry Mayr-Harting, *Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1066-1272* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2011); Margaret Harvey, *England, Rome and the Papacy, 1417-1464* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993).

and the nascent state was such that it allowed for the fostered development of the latter out of the former.[13]

My research particularly builds on the works of scholars such as Morris and Tierney. My findings suggest that Alexander's pontificate is emblematic of the cooperation between church and state. Due to the spread of Tierney's volume, this challenges work in other historiographical traditions and reexamines a traditional academic narrative. This in itself is also a contribution to the historiography as it challenges the popular post-Reformation and post-Enlightenment misconceptions of an oppressive medieval church. Some scholars and historians have sought to treat the Reformation and Enlightenment as if they were inevitable. To justify this, they argue that the medieval church must have oppressive and hostile, especially concerning its relationship with the state. Thus, it becomes a point of order to explain when this so-called crisis, as Tierney's work does, happened. My research pushes back against these misguided notions.

Central to my argument is an understanding of the historical context in which these events took place. Historians have described The Twelfth Century Renaissance as an Age of Faith. Educational revival and justification were hallmarks of this phenomenon. Alexander and his contemporaries were products of this phenomenon of which they were part of a cyclical relationship. As we will see, if there had been a crisis between church and state during this period, this cultural phenomenon could not have succeeded. Alexander faced two serious problems during his pontificate, Barbarossa's continuation of the papal schism and the Becket controversy. Due to the reciprocal relationship between these two conflicts Alexander had to manage both in tandem. His calculated action, political diplomacy, and

[13] Colin, Morris, *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050-1250* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

compromise, during both of these situations shows that he understood that that the medieval church and the nascent state functioned best when they worked together.

My study is organized based on these three issues, which also logically have functioned as my organizing principle. The first chapter analyzes the twelfth century renaissance. It explores its characteristics and effects on the medieval church and the nascent state, how its intellectual centers can be seen as symbols of that cooperation, and finally how this resulted in an intellectual class, of which Alexander, Barbarossa, Henry, Louis VII of France, and Becket were all a part. The second chapter places emphasis on Barbarossa, as he not only drove the schism, but his relationship with Alexander shows the pope's ability to work with the state. Finally, we turn to the Becket controversy. This chapter focuses on the Archbishop's relationship with the pope. Additionally, it stresses Alexander's perspective in the controversy by emphasizing the papacy's involvement in English affairs over the course of the twelfth century which is particularly important due to the celebrity of the Becket controversy, which through this exercise can be diminished in its importance.

During Alexander's pontificate, the relationship between the medieval church and the nascent state never entered a crisis. It was rife with conflicts, but each one was resolved during Alexander's lifetime. The Becket controversy concluded before the Archbishop's murder, and Alexander made peace with Barbarossa at Venice. Alexander's ability to manage conflict and compromise necessitated a functional relationship with the nascent states without further division of the medieval church.

Chapter I: The Twelfth Century Renaissance

The Twelfth Century Renaissance was an international event with transnational characteristics as cultural exchange between states led effects across them. The Renaissance of the Quattrocento is one of several phenomena termed a 'renaissance.' During the medieval era there were renaissances. In the Latin West, there were the Carolingian and the Ottonian renaissances and in the Byzantine East, there were the Macedonian and Palelologan renaissances. Each of these was a local experience, patronized by a particular dynasty.[14] The Twelfth Century Renaissance by comparison reached across the European content. In this chapter, we will first turn to the conditions that fostered this phenomenon, then its characteristics, followed by a discussion on intellectual centers and a transnational *intelligentsia* to argue that it affected the relationship between the medieval church and the nascent state. The twelfth century was an age of intellectual exploration and profound spirituality. It was the Age of Faith.[15]

---

[14] Warren Treadgold, ed. *Renaissances Before the Renaissance* (Stanford University Press: Stanford. 1984).

[15] Charles Homer Haskins coined the term 'The Twelfth Century Renaissance' in his eponymous work. He argues it was a European wide phenomenon, with no single catalyst. Haskins provides evidence of cultural renewal: increase in writing and libraries, the revival of science and philosophy, and jurisprudence. As his work attempts to justify the use of the term renaissance, there is particular emphasis on study of Greek and Roman classics.

The collection of essays *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* was published to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of Haskins' publication. Twenty-six essays on topics such as religion, education, art and society, law, and literature, cover the culture of the period. This culture is presented as a dialogue between external elements and a receptive medieval church, thus resulting in a new culture. This dialectic fit into a larger relationship between 'renaissance' and 'renewal'. Two essays are particularly significant. The first, "Terms and Ideas of Renewal" by Gerhart B. Ladner argues the period was one of renewal and creativity. Another essay, Ferrulo's "The Twelfth-Century Renaissance", details the historiography of the renaissance. He divides the scholarship by two categories. Works in the first category concern debates over the term renaissance. The second category is for studies that argue over what constitutes a renaissance. Some scholars, such as Panofsky, Nitze, and Eva M. Sanford, subscribe a narrow use of renaissance, using the Italian Renaissance as a standard of increase in cultural activity. By contrast, other scholars, such as Urban T. Holmes and Haskins, subscribe to a broader definition.

Another approach has been to forgo the term and focus on the cultural sophistication of the period. *The Twelfth-Century Renaissance* by Christopher Brooke is an example of this approach.[15] Other scholars have reframed this discussion in terms of humanism to do away with term entirely, such as in works by Richard Southern and Collin Morris. Yet another approach has been to describe this period as a change in mentality.

Charles Homer Haskins debunked the myth of the Dark Ages in his seminal work *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*. He argued it was a period of educational revival and political reform. According to Haskins, three conditions were necessary to foster the twelfth century's renaissance.[16] First, the exposure of Latin Christendom to the Islamic West. Second, the era's shift from religiopolitical instability to stability created the necessary milieu for a renaissance. Finally, it grew out of similar antecedents. Haskins claimed, "we may simplify the problem to some degree by remembering that we have to deal with an intensification of intellectual life rather than with a new creation and that the continuity between the ninth and the twelfth centuries was never wholly broken."[17] He argued that the Twelfth Century Renaissance was a in continuation of the past.[18]

As a period of historical categorization, the Twelfth Century Renaissance is flexible in interpretation. Some historians also consider the eleventh and thirteenth centuries as part of the phenomenon. For this study, we mark its beginning with the Norman Conquest (1066) and its culmination in the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216). This breaks the renaissance into two halves. The first half also includes the Investiture Controversy and the Second Crusade (1145-1149). A number of notable deaths mark the second half. Bernard of Clairvaux, Pope Eugenius III, and Abbot Suger all died within a few years of each other, and a new generation, Henry II, Barbarossa, and Alexander came into power.

Scholarship by Georges Duby and Pere Marie-Dominique Chenu, as well as the obvious influence of Marc Bloch, is reflective of this third approach.

12th Century Europe: An Interpretative Essay by Sidney R. Packard ignores all this discourse and approaches his subject through the perspective of historical compartmentalization. He argues that to best understand the cultural developments of the period, economic and politic aspects of the era must also be considered Thus, he places more emphasis on the century aspect of the term, rather than on the renaissance.

[16]Charles Homer Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927), 12-15.

[17] *Ibid*, 16.

[18] *Ibid*.

The characteristics of the Twelfth Century Renaissance constitue several different elements. The driving force of the renaissance was an educational revival which helped fuel an ongoing period of ecclesiastical reforms. An emphasis on education and rationality encompassed the *ecclesia* and the *mundus*. Existing monastic networks were the foundation for this movement out of which emerged a series of intellectual centers. Like monasteries, these intellectual centers – cathedrals, universities, and towns – allowed for the exchange between ideas of education and reform and the mixing of social classes. Ultimately these characteristics helped shape a transnational network that affected Europe across international boundaries.

The Twelfth Century Renaissance is crucial to understanding Alexander's pontificate because, as the period's cultural environment, it shaped the development of both the church and the state. It also fostered a transnational intellectual community, a kind of *intelligentsia*. Henry II and Barbarossa had more in common with each other than they did those spatially closest to them. This *intelligentsia* allowed Becket to see similarities between himself and Alexander beyond their status as ecclesiastics. By examining this cultural phenomenon, we can gain greater insight into the problems and the players of Alexander's pontificate.

Characteristics

Monasteries

Monasticism played an integral part in Christendom since at least the fourth century.[19] By the sixth, it had become increasingly disorganized. Benedict of Nursia

[19] Originating in the Christian East, monastic life became a popular alternative lifestyle. It was under the auspices of Charlemagne that the rule became the blueprint of western monasticism It was also during the tumultuous ninth century that monasteries earned their reputation as havens for travelers and pilgrims, what

standardized the monasticism of Latin Christendom with his enormously popular *Rule of St. Benedict.* This work implemented a clear order for monastic life. The standardizations of the Benedictines created a web of connected monasteries across Latin Christendom. It also emphasized the importance of reading and education,

Because of their schools and lack of class boundaries, monasteries were the first intellectual centers, and essential to the transmission of knowledge during the early medieval period. Haskins, argued they "saved learning from extinction in Western Europe at a time when no other forces worked strongly toward that end."[20] He claims literacy, libraries, and archives were instrumental in this. Beyond letters and texts, monastic schools were also adept in teaching science and medicine. As monasteries spread so did education.[21]

Monasteries were significant due to the way they broke down social class boundaries.[22] Mainstream medieval society was based heavily on social stratification. Status determined a person's place in society, which in turn determined one's organization and function. This was not the case in monasteries. Monasteries were one of few connections that bridged the secular and profane worlds. Those connections grew exponentially out of a transnational network of monasteries that acted as the renaissance's foundation. Benedictine life remained largely unchanged during the twelfth century, although its popularity started to wane as the medieval church underwent a religious revival at the end of the eleventh

few there were. Thus, we begin to see the emergence of a transnational network of monasteries. (Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 68).

[20] Haskins, 33.

[21] *Ibid*

[22] In the rule it states, "Let her make no distinction of persons in the monastery. Let her not love one more than another, unless it be one whom she finds better in good works or in obedience. Let her not advance one of noble birth ahead of one who was formerly a slave, unless there be some other reasonable ground for it. (Benedict of Nursia, *The Rule of St. Benedict*. Trans. OSB. *OSB. Rule of Benedict. Text, English,* http://www.osb.org/rb/text/toc.html, web. Chapter 2.11: What Kind of Person the Abbess Ought to Be)

century. Alternatives to the Benedictines emerged, such as the Carthusians, Augustinian canons, the Premonstratensians, and Cistercians.[23] Monastic networks grew exponentially as a result of this variety. It was in relation to this network that other intellectual centers began to emerge in the twelfth century.

Educational Revival

The spirit of the Twelfth Century Renaissance was education. The reacquisition of Aristotle from Spain and its subsequent translation was critical to this. Anne Duggan has described the new learning as "based on analysis, argument, and disputation."[24] Rationality defined education. Aristotle's work shaped the idea of the seven liberal arts, which were divided into two categories – the *trivium* and the *quadrivium*.[25] The study of the liberal arts influenced language, literature, poetry, writings, and foremost for our purposes, jurisprudence. Jurisprudence played a significant role in the standardization of canon law. It also had a secular element, as consolidation efforts by secular governments, such as in England and France, were supported by jurisprudence. The justification for the rule of law conflicted with traditional local customs. This tension is emblematic in the conflicts of Alexander's pontificate.

Second to Aristotle was Gratian's *Decretum* (1140), a landmark in the study of canon law. The *Decretum* was significant for two reasons. First, it was a compendium of canon law, containing nearly 4,000 different texts ranging from Church Fathers to interpretations and commentaries. Second, it attempted to resolve some of the greater

---

[23] Haskins 44.

[24] Anne Duggan, *Thomas Becket* (London: Hodder Education, Part of Hachette Livre, UK, 2004), 10.

[25] The *trivium* consisted of grammar, logic, and rhetoric while the quadrivium consisted of arithmetic, astronomy, geometry, and music. (Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 284)

inconsistencies and contradictions. The *Decretum* also notes the shift from a singular view of church and state to a dualistic one and thus presents a framework for this relationship. Alexander, Barbarossa, Henry, and Becket were all familiar with the *Decretum*. [26]

Alexander's association with education is best reflected in the confusion of his formative years. Before assuming the regnum Alexander, his name was Roland Bandinelli. He has classically been confused with two other Rolands, one of whom wrote a popular commentary on Gratian's *Decretum*, titled *Summa Magistri Rolandi*.[27] Another was a master of law. There is no indication that Bandinelli studied law, although he certainly understood its usefulness and importance.[28] This confusion is likely due to Alexander's sobriquet as a 'lawyer-pope' and it speaks to Alexander's association with jurisprudence.

Sacerdotium **and** ***Regnum***

Reform

The impetus of the Twelfth Century Renaissance was a series of reforms that began in the mid-eleventh century. Several popes came from reformed monasteries and applied monastic rigor to church institutions. The Twelfth Century Renaissance continued to facilitate this dramatic reform. For nearly a century the papacy had fought to free itself from secular society's trappings. [29] Plurality, simony and lay investiture gave the *mundus* considerable influence over the *ecclesia*. [30] To resolve these problems, the papacy began to

---

[26] Charles Christopher Mierow, ed., *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 205.

[27] Baldwin, 7-9.

[28] Morris, 402.

[29] Most scholars acknowledge the pontificate of Leo IX (1049-1054) as the beginning of the Gregorian Reforms. In *The English Church: 1066-1154* Frank Barlow has argued for a 'post-Gregorian' period of reform from 1124-1154 (272).

[30] Plurality means holding more than one office at a time. Simony is the selling of church offices. Lay investiture refers to secular authorities appointing abbots and bishops rather than the medieval church.

define its administrative mechanisms and in turn, more clearly define those of the nascent state.

A series of pontificates signal these reform's phases.[31] Under Gregory VII (1073-85), canon law was used to distinguish the church's jurisdiction from secular. Often conflicting with local customs, jurisprudence was increasingly used to support the reforms. In this phase, reformers were staunchly unwilling to compromise. The next phase, under Urban II (1088-1099), was marked by intellectualism and rationality, manifesting in the establishment of a papal curia, a college of cardinals, and the push for papal primacy over bishops. Following this, Calixtus II's pontificate (1119-1124) signaled the Investiture Controversy's end with the Concordat of Worms (1122), the papacy's continued emphasis on jurisprudence, the further clarification of the church's hierarchy, and the ecclesiastical law's further separation from secular. Under Innocent II (1130-1142) the final phase constituted canon law's pinnacle with such works as Gratian's *Decretum*, and the transition between the old and new.[32] This resulted effectively in the rise of what historians have termed 'lawyer-popes,' a series of popes who were characterized by their legal actions and decisions. According to Somerville, "The Roman pontiff was becoming in fact as well as in theory the prime legal arbiter of Latin Christendom, and the dispatch of papal decretal letters – the instruments of centralized administration and justice – increased throughout the twelfth century."[33] Somerville notes the pontificates of Eugenius, Adrian IV, and Alexander particularly. This description of a burgeoning papal bureaucracy mirrors a concurrent revolution affecting the nascent state.

---

[31] This analysis is inspired heavily by Frank Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154* (London: Longman Group Limited, 1979).

[32] *Ibid*, 268-273.

[33] Somerville, 6.

Consolidation

Throughout this time, the medieval church's relationship with the nascent state entered conflict but never crisis. Barlow has argued, "given the political conditions, neither could be envisaged without the other."[34] We see evidence for this in the compromises made by both institutions throughout this period. Alexander's control of the medieval church and his diplomacy with secular rulers reflects this idea applied.

Because of the Concordat at Worms (1122), burgeoning nation-states needed to redefine themselves. The Concordat drew a clear distinction between the *ecclesia* and *sacerdotium* on the one hand, and the *mundus* and *regnum* on the other. This newly defined relationship sought to limit struggles between the medieval church and the nascent state.[35] The rise of the medieval state was associated with rulers such Henry, Louis VII, and Barbarossa, whose reigns signaled the growth of centralized government. Although separate from the medieval church, it was also a renaissance. What were becoming England, France, and the Holy Roman Empire, were ruled with both tradition and innovation. Barbarossa's speech to the Romans in 1155 captures his perception of his moment,

> The virtue and the discipline of the equestrian order, its unmarred an unconquerable boldness when advancing to a conflict? Behold our state. All these things are to be found with us. All these have descended to us, together with the empire. Not in utter nakedness did the empire come to us. It came clad in its virtue. It brought its adornments with it. With us are your consuls. With us is your Senate. With us is your soldiery.[36]

Barbarossa clearly saw himself and his empire as the inheritors of a Roman tradition that the city of Rome itself had lost. It evokes the renaissance by harkening back to classical

---

[34] Barlow, *The English Church, 1066-1154*, 274.
[35] Somerville, 5.
[36] Bishop Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, trans. and ann. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 147.

civilization. His awareness of what constitutes a state's bureaucratic institutions and a sense of identity was undoubtedly shared by his contemporaries.

Intellectual Centers

The hallmark of the Twelfth Century Renaissance was cultural cohesion. From the dialectic of reform and revival emerged a series of developments that characterized the renaissance as an age of faith. Physical manifestations - cathedrals, universities, and towns - blended with the rise of an intellectual community wove medieval Europe together. The transnational network and community that emerged was critical to the flow and exchange of ideas and concepts. Although largely within the realm of the medieval church, the success of the renaissance depended on the cooperation between church and state.

Cathedrals

Cathedrals represented a visual reflection of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Cathedrals underwent a revolution during this period. They had always been important in Latin Christendom because bishops were seen as the successors of the apostles. The *cathedra* was the seat of the episcopal see, the local bishop's jurisdiction. Given episcopal authority in the medieval period, cathedrals symbolized clerical power. The cathedral consisted of two parts in the medieval era: the stone building, and the community associated with it.

Cathedral communities included the bishop, his household, and the clergy attached to the cathedral. These clergy were monastic in appearance because they also lived by a series

of rules, and were thus known as canons. [37] Canons were organized into chapters and headed by a deacon.[38] Because of their influence, cathedral chapters had several responsibilities, including selecting the bishop. The final element of this community was the bishop's household. This organization was necessary in implementing the era's reforms. Cognizant of this, Urban II legitimated them through papal bulls on the eve of the renaissance. Communities could be found from Toledo to Canterbury.[39] Record keeping, libraries, and schools were characteristic of these communities' schools and their situation in urban environments provided a convenient source of education, to both the *ecclesia* and *mundus*. Their popularity drew villagers, fleshing out the autonomy of their communities.

The stone buildings also underwent a change of their own. Gothic architecture's spread during this period reflects the cooperation between church and state during the renaissance. In 1137, the abbey at St. Denis was in bad need of repair. Abbot Suger felt that the building was too small to hold the crowds that attended it. His solution was to raise the ceiling and do away with the heavy Romanesque walls. The Gothic revolution was underway.

Three elements characterized Gothic architecture: pointed arches, vaults, and flying buttresses. The purpose of all these features was to create tall buildings with raised ceilings and to let in as much light as possible. The art historian Erwin Panofsky drew parallels between cathedrals and scholasticism and argued that cathedrals were like a theological treatise. He also argued that Pseudo-Dionysus, a sixth century Christian mystic and a patron

---

[37] Haskins, 47; Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 62.

[38] Haskins, 48; *Ibid.*

[39] Christopher Egger, "The Canon Regular: Saint-Run in context" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope, 1154-1159: Studies and Texts*, eds. Brenda Bolton and Anne J. Duggan (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002), 22.

saint of the abbey, wrote about the theological importance of light, beauty, and good, all of which could be translated into aesthetic values of Gothic architecture. [40]

The style spread across Latin Christendom for two reasons. First, was because of the popularity of cathedral schools such as those at Notre Dame du Paris and Chartres Mathematics in the twelfth century came from contact with the Islamic World, and cathedral schools were instrumental in its spread throughout Europe.[41] In this way, cathedral construction can be linked intrinsically to the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Second, was because of the importance of St. Denis. St. Denis served the French monarchy; it was the burial place of its kings and the center of their education. A celebration was held to mark the end of construction and Suger recounted his experience in the *Book of Suger Abbot of St. Denis on What Was Done During his Administration*, which due to the abbey's prominence, helped spread the new architectural style. [42]

Several construction projects began during the pontificate of Alexander, including Notre Dame du Paris and the reconstruction of Canterbury. According to legend, in 1163, it was Alexander himself who laid the cornerstone at Notre Dame.[43] In 1174, Canterbury's quire caught fire, necessitating repairs, done in the modern style. Additionally, gothic

---

[40] Erwin Panofsky, ed. and trans., *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St. Denis, and its Art Treasures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946) and Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (New York: Meridian Books, 1957). Denis is the French form of the name, and the namesake of the abbey was a conglomeration of saints due to naming confusions.

[41] Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 215.

[42] In attendance were five archbishops and thirteen bishops, who crucial to the spread of the new architectural style. Amongst them, Theobald of Bec, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Bernard of Clairvaux and his Cistercians were also in the audience. Jean Truax, *Archbishops Ralph D'Escures, William of Corbeil, and Theobald of Bec: Heirs of Anselm and Ancestors of Becket* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012), 124.

[43] Caroline Bruzelius, "The Construction of Notre-Dame in Paris", *The Art Bulletin* 69, no. 4 (1987): 540-69, accessed on Jan. 24, 2017, doi:10.2307/3050998. Bruzelius despites the story as Alexander did not get along well with the Bishop of Paris. She does note the importance of its symbolism.

constructions also started in Portugal, Belgium, Spain, and Germany, where the style mutated to fit regional differences.[44]

Cathedrals are a striking symbol of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Villagers took pride in their cathedrals, and secular rulers understood the value of patronage, which might also come from supporting the cathedral communities themselves. A cathedral's school and community could draw people from across Latin Christendom. Gothic construction took many years. Those who financed and designed the construction would often never live to see its completion. Not only does this speak to the age's spirituality, it also undoubtedly required the cooperation between church and state.

Universities

Universities were another intellectual center of the renaissance. Their development was an expression of the period's thirst for education.[45] They were home to diverse communities of individuals from across classes and borders. Then, as now, communities at universities consisted of two groups: the students and the *magistri* who taught them. Relationships between masters and students could vary depending on the universities. Although Salamanca, Montpellier, Oxford, and Cambridge also have their modern origins in the twelfth century, it is in the contrast of Paris and Bologna that one is able to appreciate the complexities of the medieval university. The University of Paris was organized from the top down. At the top was the board, on which sat the deans, rector of arts, and proctors. Underneath were the students, who were divided into several 'nations'. Contrariwise, it was

[44] Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 215.

[45] Joseph Strayer and Dana C. Munro, *The Middle Ages: 395-1500.* 5th ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), 268.

the student of Bologna who held the real authority. They exercised their control through protests and strikes.

Three conditions were necessary for the development of universities. First, social organization in towns consisted of independent groups, such as guilds and corporations, and universities functioned as a corporation of scholastics. Second, universities developed in places where there was already a reputation for scholarship from monastic or cathedral schools. Third, principles of self-organization in the form of manuals and commentaries were necessary for cohesion, giving the university a degree of autonomy.[46] Study at a university was surprisingly vast. In contrast to monastic and cathedral schools, students at a university studied the doctrines of the church, rather than the nature of religion.[47] Students also studied the liberal arts, medicine, and jurisprudence.

Universities reflect the transnational characteristics of the Twelfth Century Renaissance, the general importance of education, and an implicit understanding of the relationship between church and state. Like gothic cathedrals, universities were another symbol of the functional relationship between church and state during the twelfth century. Students were trained as clerics, for both church and state institutions.[48] The purpose of their training was to provide both apparatuses with able and better-trained officials.[49] Moreover, university communities were often under secular protections.

An example of the relationship between church and state can be seen in Bologna's university. Historical evidence proves that Alexander at least studied theology there.

---

[46] Astrik L. Gabriel, "Universities" in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages: Vol. 12 Thaddeus Legend to ZwartcNocc.* ed. Joseph R. Strayer (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1983), 282-299.

[47] *Ibid,* 278

[48] Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 278.

[49] *Ibid.*

Thomas Becket studied canon and Roman law a generation later.[50] Frederick Barbarossa was also associated with Bologna. The great masters of Bologna - Irnerius, Martinus, Bulgarus, Jacobus, and Hugo - were all Imperial advisors.[51] In 1156, Barbarossa placed the community of Bologna under the protection of a royal charter.[52] This random conflux at Bologna is important as it shows figures of both church and state saw value in a university education.

Towns

Towns were a third intellectual center that formed part of another transnational network tied together by the Twelfth Century Renaissance. They were yet another place where social classes mixed. Both church and state understood the importance of towns and would plant them for economic, political, and military purposes.[53] They were notoriously autonomous and valuable in an alliance. The rising number of free communes speaks to the growth of towns, centers of trade, cultural exchange, and resistance. Medieval Europe was urbanizing.

By 1100 there was an agricultural surplus and population was increasing.[54] The political stability that fostered the leisure time necessary for a renaissance also revived economic exchange. Some towns were revivals of old Roman sites, others were planted on crossroads of trade routes, and still others because of natural geographic features, such as harbors. Towns could spring up, or they could be planned intentionally. Not all towns

---

[50] Duggan, *Thomas Becket,* 14.

[51] Astrik L. Gabriel, "Universities" in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages,* ed. Joseph Strayer, vol. 12, *Thaddeus Legend to ZwartcNocc* (New York: Scribner's Sons. 1983). 284.

[52] *Ibid*

[53] Reyerson, 316.

[54] Kathryn L. Reyerson, "Urbanism, Western European" in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages,* ed. Joseph Strayer, vol. 12, *Thaddeus Legend to ZwartcNocc,* 316

disappeared after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, such as Northern Italy, which had never ceased being urban.[55] Salerno, Bari, Naples, Amalfi, Venice, and others were part of a trade system linking Italy with North Africa and the Near East.[56] The same cultural exposure to the Muslim World during this period had a dramatic impact on trade. Moreover, the Crusades played a significant role in bringing the rest of Western Europe into this trade system.[57]

In 1158, after conquering Lombardy, Barbarossa held a diet at Roncaglia. The council's purpose was to affirm Barbarossa's control in Italy and be crowned Holy Roman Emperor.[58] Significantly, four jurists from Bologna decided the rights of the conquered cities and their relationship with the Empire. The conclusions drawn at Roncaglia were justified by Roman Law. Not all of the towns complied, for example, Milan resisted until it was destroyed in 1162.[59] By the end of the decade, the Lombard League, consisting of twenty-six cities, joined with Milan to resist imperial influence in Italy.[60] The importance of towns during this period is significant. In response to Roncaglia, Barbarossa extended special legal protection rights to all students of law in the Empire, notably including those at Bologna.[61] The success of the Lombard League against Barbarossa was undoubtedly an inspiration to towns in a similar position.[62] German and French towns during this period held similar autonomy.[63]

---

[55] Strayer and Munro, 219-222.
[56] Reyerson, 315.
[57] *Ibid.*
[58] Baldwin, 29-30.
[59] Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 162.
[60] *Ibid.*
[61] *Ibid,* 280.
[62] Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 165.
[63] *Ibid,* 307.

Before the twelfth century, medieval society was largely isolated. Roads were dangerous, and travel was rare. The image of untraveled and overgrown roads is a vivid contrast to the pilgrims' highways at the end of the century. Roads are also a strong symbol of the growing transmission of knowledge and cultural exchange during the renaissance. Intellectual centers gave the Twelfth Century Renaissance its vitality and anchored it in materiality. They were independently part of a series of transnational networks connecting like and similar facets. Built out of the already existing network of monasteries, each of these networks, in turn, brought cohesion to Western Europe in a profound way. Furthermore, each in its own right, cathedrals, universities, and towns, reflects the cooperation between church and state. Collectively they show the success of the renaissance.

Intelligentsia

The transnational cohesion of the Twelfth Century Renaissance fostered the development of an *intelligentsia*. This community of intellectuals transcended regional boundaries and consisted of lay and ecclesiastical figures. The communication and influence of this community's members show that the relationship between church and state was not in crisis during Alexander's pontificate. Alexander and Becket were part of this community, but so were Henry, Louis, and Barbarossa. The most effective way to express the significance of this *intelligentsia* is by case-study. The twelfth century was an era of some of the medieval era's most notable figures: Hildegard of Bingen, Bernard of Clairvaux, and John of Salisbury.

Hildegard of Bingen is perhaps the most emblematic figure of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. A polymath, Hildegard is known for her music, theology, science, medicine,

and botany.[64] Renowned in her lifetime, Hildegard is especially transnational through her correspondence – of which nearly four hundred letters are still extant. The product of a monastic education, her correspondence and other works reveal a profound intellectual and a transnational network of individuals.[65] In addition to correspondence with the famous and the forgotten, her collection of letters is full of familiar individuals: Bernard,[66] Pope Eugenius,[67] Pope Adrian IV.[68] These connections evoke a community beyond international boundaries.

Hildegard also wrote to both Alexander and Barbarossa during the schism. To Alexander, she offered her support. [69] She also corresponded with some of the most significant Alexandrine advocates in the Empire; Conrad the Archbishop of Mainz and Eberhard the Archbishop of Salzburg.[70] Significantly, both of these Alexandrines, among others, suffered political loss for their papal position. Hildegard did not. Her correspondence with Barbarossa began at least by 1152, the year of his coronation as King of Germany.[71] In her first letter, written upon this coronation, Hildegard characteristically offers advice.[72] Her

[64] Hildegard was cloistered at St Disibod's, a Benedictine monastery, near Mainz. She wrote on theology, plants, composed music, and her visionary theology. A decade later, Hildegard's work was judged vaild by Pope Eugenius at the Synod of Trier. Hildegard became a transnational figure, establishing several connections. Due to her popularity, she went on to found two monasteries.[64] She died in 1179 at the age of 81.

[65] In her correspondence, she encourages, offers advice, reprimands, and admonishes. Several of her letters are to abbots, abbesses, monks, and nuns. Her correspondence contains both sermons and religious allegory, giving a glimpse of the religious vitality of monastic life.

[66] Hildegard of Bingen to Bernard of Clairvaux, in *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* eds. and trans. Joseph L. Baird and Radd K. Ehrman, vol.1, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 24; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Ibid,* 31.

[67] Pope Eugenius to Bingen, *Ibid,* 35.

[68] She supported his interdict on Rome.

[69] Bingen to Pope Alexander III, *Ibid,* 45.

[70] Bingen to Conrad, Archbishop of Mainz, *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* vol. 1, 73; Eberhard, Archbishop of Salzburg, to Bingen, *Ibid,* 84.

[71] Baird and Ehrman, eds., *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* vol. 3, 112.

[72] Bingen to King Frederick, *Ibid,* 112.

cordiality gave way to admonition in future letters when the Empire supported the schismatics. [73]

A letter also exists written from Barbarossa to Hildegard. concerning Hildegard's notoriety as a visionary. He writes, "We inform you, holy lady, that we now have in hand those things you predicted to us when we invited you to our presence while we were holding court in Ingelheim (1163)."[74] Unfortunately, what those predictions were have been lost to time, and scholars continue to debate. In this same letter, Barbarossa asks Hildegard and her sisters to continue to keep him in their prayers.[75] This last detail is significant because Hildegard continued to do so throughout the schism.[76] As an Alexandrine supporter, this intention is exemplary of her religious conviction and that of the Twelfth Century Renaissance as an age of faith. Her experience represents one expression of the period's *intelligentsia*.

Bernard of Clairvaux represents a different expression of the period's *intelligentsia*. Historians have called him the *de facto* ruler of the medieval church from 1125 to 1153.[77] His experience reflects a functional relationship between church and state during the twelfth century. In addition to his correspondence,[78] these qualities are reflected in Bernard's role in international and his conflict with Peter Abelard.

---

[73] Some argue that the tone of these letters is so extreme that they could have only been written during the schism. For further discussion see *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* vol. 3.

[74] The Emperor Frederick to Bingen, *Ibid,* 113.

[75] *Ibid.*

[76] Bingen to the Emperor, *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen,* vol. 3, 114-115.

[77] Strayer and Munro. 245-247; Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 201-202. In contrast to Hildegard who was a Benedictine, Bernard is known for his reforms of the Cistercians, an order reformed Benedictines. Shortly he joined the Cistercians, his superior sent him to found a new monastery at Clairvaux, where he was appointed abbot. Following a conflict with the abbey at Cluny, Clairvaux attracted international acclaim. Bernard became an immensely popular celebrity. The popularity of the Cistercians exploded

[78] Like Hildegard, a good majority of his correspondence concerns monastic life. Several letters are addressed to abbots, particularly in France, their contents which detail similar issues of Hildegard's letters: advice, admonishment, a critique of lifestyle, and love.

In politics, Bernard resolved political tensions in Germany, mediated disputes between German and Italian twons, and brought medieval Europe together after the Double Election of 1130's papal schism. He traveled throughout the Holy Roman Empire, the Italian cities, the Norman Kingdom of Sicily, and France. It was Bernard who convinced Henry I of England to back Innocent II. The schism ended in 1138 when Innocent emerged the undisputed victor and Bernard's efforts successful. Bernard's experience is also notable for its conflict between traditional monasticism and scholasticism, a product of the renaissance's new learning.[79] Where Bernard is the epitome of monastic learning during the Twelfth Century Renaissance, Peter Abelard is emblematic of scholasticism. The two spent nearly twenty years in conflict.[80]

Abelard is perhaps the most boisterous figure of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. He attended the cathedral school at Notre Dame du Paris, and throngs of students flocked to him when he returned there to teach. His professional career was dramatic and intermittent.[81] His professional life, nearly inseparable from his personal, was marked by the starts and stops of a voice constantly challenging authority. His tendency to challenge and contest scholastics led to his wandering in and out of Paris. The Synod of Soissons (1121) charged and found Abelard guilty of heresy and condemned him and his teachings.[82] The sincerity of

---

[79] Based on dialectic reasoning, this innovative approach tried to resolve contradictions by inference. Scholasticism was also heavily based on Aristotelian logic, and a product of the renaissance.

[80]Benedict XVI reframed the contest between Bernard and Peter Abelard. Benedict argued that both sought understanding, Bernard through faith, and Abelard through reason. (Pope Benedict XVI, "St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter Abelard" *L'Osservatore Romano: Weekly Edition in English,* Baltimore, MD: The Catholic Foundation, accessed on Jan. 28, 2017, https://www.ewtn.com/library/PAPALDOC/b16ChrstChrch95.htm,) Benedict's framework juxtaposes the conflicts between university and monastic education during the Twelfth Century Renaissance.

[81] Strayer and Munro 263-264; Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers, 277; His infamous affair with Heloise proved to be a professional setback, as he was forced to become a monk at St. Denis. After a period of silence following the clamor of the affair, Abelard again began to teach, drawing huge crowds.

[82] As part of his sentence he was confined to a monastery. Shortly after that, the penalty was lifted, and Abelard returned to St. Denis. A year later, when Suger became the new abbot, Abelard was allowed to leave the monastery. Abelard, managing to strain relationships wherever he went, eventually came back into

these sentences could not compete with his popularity. By 1136, he was teaching at the University of Paris, where John of Salisbury heard his lectures. It was during this period that Abelard wrote some of his most famous works on theology, logic, and commentary. His fame as a master lecturer helped encourage the spread of dialectics and logic and a university education. Historians argue that Abelard was key in spreading Aristotle's and Plato's teachings and thus the core ideas of the period's educational revival. Bernard publicly defeated Abelard. Abelard appealed to Innocent II, but Abelard was excommunicated. He died shortly thereafter.[83]

Having bested Abelard, Bernard was at the height of his unofficial power. Three years later, Bernard's pupil, Eugenius, was elected to the papacy and Bernard was subsequently commissioned to preach the Second Crusade.[84] Bernard died in 1153. Alexander canonized him in 1174. This fast turnaround speaks to Bernard's immense popularity.

John of Salisbury, the youngest of the figures detailed in this study, is part of a different generation. As a student of the University of Paris, his experience is a crucial facet of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. In 1136, he traveled from England to Paris to hear Abelard's lectures on rhetoric and reason.[85] John studied at Paris for twelve years.[86] Sometime later he finished his education and joined the Abbey of Moutiers-la-Celle in Troyes. In 1148, he attended the Council of Reims, which was presided over by Pope

---

contact with Heloise. In 1129, Suger expelled the nuns at Argenteuil, claiming the property for St. Denis. In the meantime, Heloise founded her own order of nuns with Abelard as its abbot. He also wrote the rule by which the nuns were to live, emphasizing the importance of studying When word of this spread, crowds of students flocked to him.

[83] Strayer and Munro, 260-264.

[84] Strayer and Munro 247.

[85] Duggan theorizes that Becket may have also heard some of Abelard's lectures. Duggan, *Thomas Becket,* 12.

[86] Duggan, *Thomas Becket,* 14.

Eugenius, the same year that Eugenius had presided over the Synod of Trier and validated Hildegard's work.[87] There he was introduced by Bernard to Theobald, the Archbishop of Canterbury, afterward joining his household as a clerk. In this position, he was familiar with the close interactions between church and state.

John appears in works about Becket as one of his contemporaries and supporters. If we flip this perspective, and look at Becket as one of John's colleagues, we can see the permeable boundaries between church and state during this period. John never left the sphere of the *ecclesia*. As a student, he was taught by monastics and later became one himself. As Theobald's clerk, he was privy of the state, but only from his own sphere. Becket, by contrast, floated between the *ecclesia* and *mundus*. His upbringing was almost entirely secular before entering Theobald's household. He became Lord Chancellor of England, a prominent position in secular government, after leaving the Archbishop's service. When Theobald died, Becket returned once more to the *ecclesia*. John, of course, is significant in his own right. By his death, he was noted as the era's distinguished intellectual, second only to Anselm.

These brief examples offer a glimpse of the renaissance's *intelligentsia*. The celebrity of Hildegard and Bernard drew people to them, either physically or through correspondence. These connections helped bridge distances across Latin Christendom. These individuals and their contemporaries were drawn together by politics, religion, and education, all significant issues during this period. Their status as a class reflects the renaissance's transnational nature. Finally, these three examples are representative of the *intelligentsia*'s pivotal role in the relationship between church and state. Hildegard and

[87] Christopher N.L. Brooke, "Adrian IV and John of Salisbury" in *Adrian IV, the English* Pope, 7.

Bernard were both monastics, yet Hildegard corresponded with the ruling elite, and Bernard was explicitly involved in political issues and led a strong religious revival. John, as a student and clerk, reflects the ease with which a person could be involved in both church and state affairs. Thus, because of the Twelfth Century Renaissance, educated individuals would have more in common with like-minded individuals than those people spatially closest to them. Like the renaissance itself, this was not a new phenomenon but an intensification caused by a cultural revival.

The Pontificate of Alexander III [c. 1100-5 – d. 1181: Office 1159 – 1181]

Roland Bandinelli, the future Alexander III, was born in Siena in the early twelfth century.[88] As the central figure of the Twelfth Century Renaissance, it is not surprising that Bandinelli was noted for his education.[89] His years before the papacy are significant because of his education and learned diplomacy. After studying at Bologna, he taught there, from 1139-42.[90] Then he joined the cathedral chapter at Pisa and eventually became the deacon.[91] Baldwin argues that Roland would have taught at the cathedral school while there. Historians have taken note of the influence of Gratian and Abelard on Bandinelli's

[88] Cardinal Boso, *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, intro. Peter Munz, trans. G.M. Ellis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973), 43. Alexander's history prior to becoming pope has been the subject of much scrutiny. Significantly, his origins and his formative years have been hotly contended. Although of Siena, his family is disputed. His status as a lawyer-pope is also contended. Scholarship by Noonan and Weigand argues that he was not the same Roland who wrote a gloss of Gratian's *Decretum* nor a third Roland who wrote theological treatises. Scholars agree that he taught at Bologna, and some argue this is evidence for his own training there as well. Nearly every scholar appeals to Boso's work in some way or other.

[89] Boso, described him as "a man of great eloquence, well enough learned in the writings of both human and divine authors, and skilled by careful practice in the understanding of them; moreover, he is a man of the Schools…" (Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 43)

[90] Baldwin logically deduces that to give lectures at Bologna, Roland himself would have had needed a prestigious educational background. The spatial proximity of Siena to Bologna is another indicator.

[91] Baldwin, 5.

writings.[92] Education continued to play a major role in Alexander's pontificate, as he advocated its expansion and the burgeoning university system.[93]

His diplomacy skills were learned through experience. In 1148, the same year as the Council of Rheims, Eugenius promoted Roland to the cardinalate. He later rose to Papal Chancellor, a position he held through Anastasius IV's and Adrian's pontificates.[94] As Papal Chancellor, he was involved in the delegations of both the Treaty of Constance and the Treaty of Benevento.[95] He was also at Besançon. This experience was fundamental in shaping Alexander's papal diplomacy. Historian Kenneth Pennington writes, "Furthermore, Alexander's expertise dictated that secular rulers were to be persuaded, not confronted. His experiences as a legate had perhaps taught him the virtues of compromise."[96] This virtue of compromise would be crucial to his survival throughout the schism.

Three characteristics stand out in Alexander's pontificate: his international presence, the small number of councils and synods, and its longevity. Alexander held an international presence, — one of the first popes to do so. The international claims of the papacy's influence were finally grounded in reality, justified by jurisprudence and his influence extended throughout Europe. At one end of Latin Christendom, he was involved in missionary efforts in Scandinavia.[97] At the other end, he proclaimed Henry II of England as

---

[92] Baldwin, 7-9. Baldwin also includes a gloss on the *Decretum*. Roland's authorship has since been disputed. Baldwin tries several connections between Roland and Gratian, although these appear more like wishful thinking than historical evidence.

[93] Baldwin, 6.

[94] Kenneth Pennington "Alexander III (1159-81)" vol. 1 *The Great Popes Through History: An Encyclopedia.* ed. Frank J. Coppa (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002), 114; Baldwin 5, 29.

[95] Pennington, 114. Baldwin suggests that the Treaty of Constance was Roland's first serious diplomatic mission

[96] Pennington, 117.

[97] He created the Archbishopric of Uppsala and addressed the problems of the churches in Estonia and Finland. Alexander was acquainted with Eskil, the Archbishop of Lund, who was perhaps responsible for this impetus. At the time, Eskil was in exile in Clairvaux, due to a conflict with the King of Denmark. Significantly, Eskil was the reason for the Diet of Besançon

the Lord of Ireland and Afonso the King of Portugal. The effectiveness of this influence is evidenced by the fact that as pope, he held only a handful of councils and synods. The most significant of these was the Third Lateran Council in 1179. [98] As had become customary after a papal schism, an ecumenical council was convened to repair damages.[99] The Third Lateran Council holds a significant place in the history of the medieval church and can be seen as a symbol of Alexander's pontificate. Similarly, it was the crucial middle step between the era of Gregorian reforms and Innocent's Fourth Lateran Council, the most important council of the medieval era. It too was shaped by the Twelfth Century Renaissance, placing emphasis on sensible reform and compromise. Alexander's ideas about reform were distinctly different from older, more stiff ideas and they were different enough to make Becket look archaic by comparison.

The final characteristic of Alexander's pontificate was its length. Although eighteen of the nearly twenty-two years were spent in schism, his sheer familiarity provided a remarkable stability. Alexander won favor as people simply got used to his being there. Of the seventeen popes in the twelfth century, only four reigned longer than ten years. By contrast, Barbarossa ruled for thirty-five years, Henry for almost the same amount of time, and Louis was into his fourth decade when he died. In an age where governance was still based on personal relationships, this had a significant impact. Alexander's reign was able to offer a semblance of this stability.

---

[98] Somerville notes that this decline in councils was part of a noticeable trend, as from the Second Lateran Council, which concluded the Double Election of 1130's schism, and Adrian's death, only two councils were held. Rheims and Cremona were both met in 1148 by Eugenius (Somerville 5).

[99] In addition to ending the schism promulgated by Barbarossa it also is significant for its series of canons; condemning such things as usury, simony, forced taxations on churches, sodomy, and perhaps most importantly, the Cathar Heresy. Although this council had little effect on the Cathars themselves, it set a precedent for the actions of Innocent III, who would launch a crusade against the heresy.

His pontificate is a blend of the dramatic and the mundane. The drama of schism and controversy tends to dwarf the rest of Alexander's reign. In an era of explosive politics and dramatic personalities, Alexander stands out for being reasonable and practical. Despite his dispute with Barbarossa, he demonstrates that the medieval church and nascent state were not in crisis as their cooperation determined his survival. Alexander's pontificate is the linchpin in the medieval papacy and he was the bridge figure. It is the fruition of a phase begun by Gregory and continued under the likes of Eugenius and Adrian. It is also the beginning of another phase that would culminate with Innocent III. Peter Munz has described it as, "In short, without departing in any from the general inspiration of the Gregorian Reform Movement, Alexander's practical experience and statesmanship provided an institutional framework for it and translated the high-sounding phrases of Gregorian propaganda into administrative realities."[100] The maturation of the Twelfth Century Renaissance during this time was instrumental in this transition.

The conflicts in Alexander's pontificate could have only taken place during the Twelfth Century Renaissance because they were intrinsically linked to the renaissance's tensions between tradition and innovation. The papal schism occurred because of a division between custom and convenience. The course of the schism was also entirely dependent on the involvement of towns, who as a third belligerent in the conflict, allied themselves with Alexander to remove Barbarossa's control. The Becket controversy echoes similar tensions. Becket and Henry quarreled over customs and innovations. Becket also clashed with Alexander in a comparable way. As we will see, Becket remained staunchly obdurate throughout the controversy and his stance is particularly reminiscent of early church

[100] Peter Munz, ed., *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, 9-10.

reformers who preferred conflict over compromise. Alexander, by comparison, was much more willing to make a deal and his policies are the continuation of his predecessor's.

Chapter II: Barbarossa

Our point of departure now turns to the Second Crusade. Promulgated by Eugenius and preached by Bernard, the failure of the Second Crusade played a significant role in rearranging international alliances in the middle of the century. The papacy's standing suffered significantly. The alliance between Conrad III and Louis VII was shattered. Conrad turned to the Byzantine Emperor and Louis allied with Roger II of Sicily at the behest of Suger. At the same time, the Sicilians were at war with the Byzantines, bringing Louis and Conrad into tension.[101] Due to political instability, no one went to represent England, thus reflecting its respective position in affairs during this time. This transition marks the renaissance's second half

At the same time, several deep-seated political issues simultaneously came to a head in Italy. Fragile relationships between the Holy Roman Empire, the papacy, the Norman Kingdom of Sicily, and towns, were set to explode. The early medieval history of Italy is convoluted. Jockeying tensions between five distinct groups in their struggle to maintain authority defined this period of Italian history. First were the Byzantines, who had settled the peninsula following the fall of the western half of the Roman Empire. Their influence rose and fell throughout the period. Second were the Germans, who had had a presence in Italy since Charlemagne had conquered the Lombards. The Lombards were not wiped out, but annexed to imperial territory. Third, were the rising of powerful city-states, notably in the north, but including Rome, and those in the future Papal States. Fourth were the Normans, who arrived in the early eleventh century. The Normans had been brought in as mercenaries and adventurers, but had decided to stay, and take Southern Italy for

[101] John H. Hill, "Crusades and Crusader States: To 1192" in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. Joseph Strayer, vol. 4, *Croatia to Family Sagas, Icelandic*, 37-38.

themselves. Finally, the papacy itself was also a player in this. It had attempted to exert temporal power with varying success. A series of shifting and alternating alliances between these different groups defined the early medieval period. For our purposes this is relevant due to the way it affected the papacy. Tensions in the papal curia concerning these relationships played a crucial role in the papal schism of 1159.

The papal election following the death of Adrian IV in 1159 proved to be the breaking point. Alexander's pontificate was a period of political tempest, which he navigated by diplomacy and compromise. I will argue that despite these problems, the overarching relationship between the medieval church and nascent state was not in a crisis. This is because the schism was political in nature, rather than theological, as will be analyzed by looking at a series of complex relationships. To show this, I focus on Barbarossa as the main representative of Alexander's relationship with the state. First, we examine Barbarossa's relationship with the papacy before Alexander's pontificate, then we turn to the papal schism of 1159, and finally Alexander's triumph over Barbarossa's machinations. This methodological approach will elucidate the interdependent relationship between church and state.

Papacy and Empire in the Middle of the Century

Frederick Barbarossa emerged on the political scene following the Second Crusade. He succeeded his uncle, Conrad III, as King of the Germans, in 1152.[102] Barbarossa reigned for a remarkably long time, and by 1190, he had claimed Germany, Italy, Burgundy, and the Holy Roman Empire. Baldwin argues that an understanding of Alexander depends on an

[102] Even though Conrad had an infant son, also named Frederick.

understanding of Barbarossa.[103] This is because Barbarossa's policies caused the papal curia's split in 1159. As the main impetus in the schism, he coordinated the opposition, courted the kings of England and France, and attempted to thwart Alexandrine coalitions. Although Barbarossa's reign was marked by conflict, schism, and military campaigns, he, like Alexander, was also a master of diplomacy. He understood the effect of political compromise and the benefits of a functioning relationship with the papacy. When he and Alexander finally made peace in 1177, he knew this relationship was in his own best interest, which in turn represented a culmination of Alexander's policies and strategies. It

[103] Baldwin, 25. It should not be surprising to find that much of the existing scholarship concerning one of the most important Holy Roman Emperors is in fact in German. However, due to the popularity of medieval studies, a great deal of sources also exist in English. Due to his prominent effect and involvement in the twelfth century, he appears across a wide variety of sources from the primary to the tertiary. Interpretations of him vary widely; romantic, national, and political. For our purposes, we can sort some of this by focusing on his relationship with the medieval church and his engagement with Alexander.

William Stubbs, a particularly classical and whiggish historian, offers a typical romantic interpretation in *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 476-1250* (1908). The following excerpt is a case example, "We get the full beauty of the German character in its strength, its purity, its kindness and patience, its gentleness and good faith, coupled with the lion-like strength and valour, the magnificence, the civilised and the humanised, knightly deportment of the medieval cavalier" (211). Stubbs acts as a Barbarossa apologist, defending him at every turn and turning the papacy into an outright antagonist.

In a similar vein, Norman Cantor's *The Civilization of the Middle Ages* (1963) also romanticizes Barbarossa and turns Alexander into his antagonist. Less ham-fisted than Stubbs', Cantor's approach pits Barbarossa against a series of obstacles, and acts as a political narrative. Cantor also includes a discussion on Barbarossa's legacy and the sleeping king mythology.

Other interpretations of Barbarossa try to balance him and Alexander more evenly. Peter Munz, in a piece written for the monumental *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, strives for a more objective interpretation. Munz presents Barbarossa as an apt politician, with Alexander as his foil. Munz also argues that Barbarossa ended the schism due to political events in the empire, contextualizing the schism with a German perspective.

Still other interpretations are more nationalist. Beyond politics and romanization, these interpretations present Barbarossa as intrinsically German. The best example of this is reflected in a quote by Edward Freeman, who once wrote, "He has become, as it were, the patriarch of a nation, and his memory still lives in the German heart as the impersonation of German unity" (Cited in Mierow, ix). Such interpretations also invoke the sleeping king mythology.

Finally, there are the Alexandrine source interpretations of Barbarossa. In his biography of Alexander, Boso presents Barbarossa as both wily and cunning. Some of Alexander's historians, such as Robert Somerville, evoke a similar antagonism. Still others, such as Baldwin, strive for objectivity. Baldwin's interpretation has two facets. First, is Barbarossa' dichotomy as a successor of Charlemagne and the inheritor of Roman tradition. Second, Baldwin presents Barbarossa as a paradox and seems unsure of which conclusions to draw about him. He too presents him as something of a foil. Moreover, Baldwin also includes a historiography based on the historians he read to reach such inconclusions. For historians writing in English, he cites: G. Barraclough, and A.L. Poole and Ugo Balzani. For those writing in German, K. Jordan, and A. Hauck. For those writing in French, E. Jordan.

speaks a great deal about Alexander that he ultimately defeated the threat of one of the most powerful Holy Roman Emperors.

In this study, Barbarossa symbolizes Alexander's relationship with the state. Before Alexander, Barbarossa was willing to cooperate with the papacy. During the schism, Barbarossa's ends are chiefly political, as is best reflected in his conflicts with the Lombard League. The schism was resolved during Alexander's and Barbarossa's lifetimes, thus showing that compromise between church and state was possible and could be achieved through military and political means.

Eugenius and Adrian

Barbarossa's relationship with the papacy was rocky from the beginning. In 1152, the selection of the bishop of Magdeburg was in stalemate. Barbarossa chose between the candidates to resolve the problem. Bishop Otto, Barbarossa's biographer, justifies Barbarossa's intervention,

> For the court holds and declares that when the controversy between the empire and the papacy concerning the investiture of bishops was settled, under Henry V, it was granted by the Church that when bishops died, if there happened to be a division in the choice of a successor, it should be the prerogative of the prince to appoint as bishop whomsoever he might please, with the advice of his chief men; and that no bishop-elect should receive consecration before having obtained the regalia from the prince's hand through the scepter.[104]

Eugenius however, saw Barbarossa's involvement as lay investiture. The significance here is that Barbarossa used this same argument in 1159 when the papal curia divided. Then, as in this instance, the papacy did not agree with him. In response to Barbarossa's actions,

[104] Otto, 119.

Eugenius sent a letter to the German bishops, reprimanding them for allowing lay translation to take place. The letter reads,

> We charge you , therefore, by this present writing that you no longer lend your favor to that cause, and that you endeavor by your exhortations so to influence our very dear son Frederick (whom God has exalted at this time to the eminence of royal authority to preserve the liberty of the Church) that he himself desist from his purpose in this matter, and no longer bestow his favor upon that same cause in opposition to God, in opposition to the sacred canons, in opposition to demands of his royal dignity…[105]

Eugenius was disappointed with Barbarossa. He goes on to mention that if Barbarossa had petitioned him, he would have granted his appeal.[106] Instead, lay investiture, despite the resolution of the Concordat of Worms (1122) thirty years before, continued to take place. Eugenius' stance is by no means anti-imperial, but rather consistent with papal policy. Despite this problem, Eugenius called on Barbarossa for help when Rome underwent a political revolution led by Arnold of Brescia.

Arnold of Brescia, a pupil of Abelard's, was perhaps more outspoken than his teacher.[107] He sought to apply Abelard's philosophies in radical ways, advocating apostolic poverty and outspokenly condemning the medieval church's temporal power.[108] The Church condemned Brescia at both the Synod of Soissons (1121) and the Second Lateran Council (1139). In 1145, Eugenius reached out to him, bidding him to reconcile in Rome.[109] Brescia's arrival was the match that sparked a revolution. At the time, republican fervor was

---

[105] Pope Eugenius, "To his venerable brothers," (August 1152), quoted in Otto, 122.

[106] *Ibid.* This problem would continue to plague Eugenius' successor Anastasius IV, finally resolving in the spring of 1154 (Mierow, 123).

[107] The historiography concerning Brescia pertains to two aspects: his political abilities and the degree of his heresy. For more on Brescia; see Peter Partner, *The Lands of St. Peter* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973).

[108] Paul Hetherington, *Medieval Rome: A Portrait of the City and its Life*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1994. 17.; also Partner.

[109] M. S. Miller, "Arnold of Brescia" in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, vol. 1, *Aachen-Augustinism*, 540..

boiling in Rome, and Brescia gave the movement a voice. [110] Inspired, the Roman citizens revived the Senate and proclaimed themselves independent of not only the papacy but the oligarchy as well.[111] Within months, Eugenius was forced to flee Rome, seeking refuge in France. The threat of Brescia would outlive him.

At the end of his pontificate, Eugenius began to regain some authority. He reached out to Barbarossa, and they agreed to the Treaty of Constance (1153). As per the treaty: the Germans would not make peace with either the Normans or the Romans without papal consent; Rome would be made to accept its pre-revolutionary status; and the Byzantines would not be allowed to resettle their territory in Italy.[112] When Eugenius died later that year, Barbarossa renewed the treaty with Adrian IV.[113] Following this alliance, in an unprecedented move, Adrian put Rome under interdict and demanded Brescia's expulsion. In cooperation, the Romans surrendered him to papal authority. Brescia fled to Tuscany, where he was captured by Barbarossa' forces and turned back to the Romans. Brescia was condemned by trial and sentenced to death; his body was burned and his ashes thrown into

[110] Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope,* 217; Hetherington 16-17

[111] Susan E. Twyman, "*Summus Pontifex.* The Ritual and Ceremonial of the Papal Court" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope,* 49.

[112] Partner 188. John of Salisbury, a supporter of Alexander, gives an account of this event. He writes, "For I was at Rome, under the rule of the blessed Eugenius, when, in the first embassy sent at the beginning of his reign, his intolerable pride and incautious tongue displayed such daring impudence. For he promised that he would reform the rule of the whole world, and subject the world to Rome, and, sure of success, would conquer all things, -if only the favour of the Roman pontiff would aid him in this. And this he did in order that against whomever he, the emperor, declaring war, should draw the material sword, -against the same the Roman pontiff should draw the spiritual sword. He did not find any one hitherto who would consent to such iniquity" John is clearly angered that Barbarossa suggested the primacy of his own suggestions rather than the papacy's. John of Salisbury, "Concerning the Council of Pavia. June 1160" *in Medieval Sourcebook: The Struggle Between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III 1160-1177* (New York: Fordham University, 1997) accessed on Sept. 24, 2015, http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/source/barbarossa1.asp.

[113] Anastasius IV: 8 July 1153 – 3 Dec. 1154, is Eugenius' immediate predecessor. His pontificate was quite brief however.

the Tiber. In return for his help, Adrian promised to crown Barbarossa the new Holy Roman Emperor.[114]

A series of unfortunate events plagued Adrian's pontificate, made only worse by his brief tenure in office. [115] The latter half of the 1150s saw a particularly tumultuous season of Italian politics: the German empire was in the hands of a capable ruler; the Normans in Sicily had conquered nearly all of Italy's southern peninsula; and Rome's republicanism remained as violent as ever. Although an able pope, Adrian was no match.[116]

Three events mark the relationship between the Emperor and the papacy during Adrian's pontificate: Sutri, the Norman advance, and Besançon. Barbarossa became increasingly unwilling to compromise over this sequence. The compounding difficulties with the papacy began to wear on him. Alexander's biographer, Cardinal Boso, explicitly portrayed Barbarossa as initially cooperative with the papacy and implicated Octavian

---

[114] Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV", in *Adrian IV, the English Pope*, 217; Miller 540; Logan 125; Partner 185-188.

[115] Historians have been kind to Adrian. His biographer describes him as followers, "For he was very kind, mild, and patient: accomplished in English and Latin, fluent in speech, polished in eloquence, an outstanding singer, and an excellent preacher… distinguished in every aspect of his character" (Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope*, 217) Although obviously biased, it is significant that Boso chose to highlight these characteristics. Christopher N.L. Brooke has described him as "an eminently practical man and a diplomat ("Adrian IV and John of Salisbury" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope*, 9). Anne Duggan presents him as a capable and energetic pope set in a situation beyond his control. She particularly notes his pragmatism and courage and resolve to maintain papal dignity (""*Totius christianitatis caput.* The Pope and the Princes" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope*).

[116] Historiography at this juncture is obsessed with pinpointing the break between the papacy and the empire, dividing the papal curia into a pro-imperial and pro-Sicilian faction, even before Adrian's death. Baldwin, Logan, and Partner all offer specific points where the relationship is broken. Anne Duggan's "*Totius christianitatis caput.* The Pope and the Princes" shows that these events have to be considered in connection with each other. She argues that most sources are post-schism, placing the blame on Adrian, rather than Alexander. Duggan states "Reading backwards in this way from the disputed election does not do justice to the fluidity and uncertainty of the situation in Italy, or extent to which Frederick's won actions and inactions added fuel to the fire." Duggan posits that the schism of 1159 was not inevitable and that in the context of Italian history, this is of particular importance to remember.

(Victor IV), as the main conspirator in the schism.[117] Rather, Barbarossa comes off strikingly well.

This is best reflected in Boso's account of Adrian's meeting with Barbarossa at Sutri. Three weeks before Barbarossa's imperial coronation he met with Adrian. During their meeting, Barbarossa was supposed to act as Adrian's *strator* (horse-holder) as was customary, but he neglected to do so because of the symbolism. Boso recounted, "When, however, the king did not perform the office of *strator* for the pope in a customary manner, the cardinals who had come with him, disturbed and greatly terrified, turned their backs and took refuge… having left the pontiff outside the king's pavilion."[118] This account is most likely embellished. Barbarossa had already sworn loyalty to Adrian and signed the Treaty of Constance. Barbarossa seemed to have genuinely misinterpreted the symbolism. Boso suggested this also.[119] Two other perspectives of Sutri come from Barbarossa and Bishop Otto. In a letter to Bishop Otto, Barbarossa states, "There the lord pope, with the entire Roman Church, met us joyfully, paternally offered us holy consecration, and complained to us of the injuries which he had suffered at the hands of the Roman populace."[120] This letter, dated 1157, makes no mention of a problem. Although reasons for this may vary, it may simply be that Barbarossa did not think much of it. According to Otto's account, "after the

---

[117] According to Boso, Adrian and Barbarossa both sent envoys regarding the latter's coronation. Barbarossa's party was particularly insistent that he meant full cooperation with the papacy. It was Adrian who was stiff with Barbarossa, as he would not give his envoys a reply, until he first heard from his own. Boso goes on to detail a vivid scene of Barbarossa and his supporters swearing an oath to Adrian (Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV", 217-221).

[118] Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV", 221.

[119] "Finally, having question the older princes and especially those who had come with King Lothar to Pope Innocent, and having diligently investigated early custom, from their replies and from the old documents, by the judgement of the princes it was decreed and confirmed by the common approval of the whole royal court that the said king should perform the office of *strator* for the said Pope Adrian," (Boso, "*Vita Adriani* IV", 223).

[120] Frederick Barbarossa, "Here begins a letter of the august Emperor, Frederick, to Otto, Bishop of Freising" (1157); quoted in Otto, 17.

supreme rulers of the world had been united amid their retinue, they advanced together for several days, and pleasant converse was exchanged as between a spiritual father and his son. Both ecclesiastical and secular matters were discussed, as though a single state had been created from two princely courts."[121] Otto also does not seem to mention a problem. Although no doubt a bit of propaganda, his imagery of the functioning relationship between church and state is significant. It shows that Barbarossa was capable of cooperating. These perspectives are collectively important because historians, such as Logan, Baldwin, and Partner, do seem to find problems with Sutri. For them, it becomes the start of the conflict between Barbarossa and Adrian. Three different primary accounts do not stress the issue, showing cordiality between Barbarossa and Adrian, rather than a crisis between church and state. It is possible that scholars have emphasized the matter beyond its importance.[122]

Following his coronation, Barbarossa attempted to assert imperial authority in Rome. Hostile, the Romans retaliated against the Germans and the papacy in rebellion.[123] Barbarossa's forces sought to suppress the rebellion but withdrew when disease ran rampant through their camps.[124] In the meantime, the Normans invaded and plundered the Papal States. Barbarossa's efforts had effectively solved nothing from the papacy's perspective.[125] He had failed to take Rome and was no help against the Normans. Before long, the papacy was forced to make concessions to the Normans. The Treaty of Benevento (1156) formally ceded papal territory and recognized the Kingdom of Sicily. In return, the Normans gave the

---

[121] Otto, 144.

[122] Traditional historiography often refers to this as the catalyst in the papal schism of 1159. Historians have variously interpreted Barbarossa's motives as nefarious and sinister, but rarely confused and misunderstood. Both Logan and Baldwin present Barbarossa in a negative light in this situation.

[123] Otto, 144-149.

[124] Otto, 152-153; Baldwin, 31.

[125] Partner, 189. This is an interesting interpretation as according to Barbarossa; "we withdrew, taking with us the pope and the cardinals and rejoicing in triumph over our victory." ("Here begins a letter of the august Emperor, Frederick, to Otto, Bishop of Freising" (1157); quoted in Otto, 17.)

papacy military support against the Romans. The Treaty of Benevento broke the Treaty of Constance and thus signaled a change in papal policy.[126]

Another event in this series occurred at Besançon. Two years before the schism, an imperial diet was held at Besançon. Barbarossa's purpose was to consolidate his authority.[127] Two papal legates were also supposed to judge him for his role in covering up the treatment of Eskil.[128] One of these legates was Roland Bandinelli (the future Alexander III). Some historians described Cardinal Bandinelli as the leader of an anti-imperial faction in the papal curia, but to send a diplomat already hostile to Barbarossa would have put unnecessary strain on the relationship between Barbarossa and the papacy. This does not seem to give Adrian much credit. [129]

A letter to Barbarossa from Adrian, delivered by Cardinal Bandinelli, created another problem between the two. The trouble hinged on a translation of the word *beneficium*. As Adrian meant it, the word meant 'favors,' 'benefits,' or 'gifts.' The imperial chancellor, however, translated it to mean 'fiefs' granted by the pope.[130]Adrian was referring to the special relationship between the papacy and the empire, but Barbarossa understood it to imply that his authority was dependent on the papacy. The meaning of the word was lost in

---

[126] Partner, 191; Baldwin, 33; Both John of Salisbury and Arnulf of Lisieux were with the papal curia during this time.

[127] Logan, 125.

[128] Allegedly, the Archbishop of Lund, Eskil, had been ambushed on his way through Barbarossa's territories. Rather than punish the accused, Barbarossa attempted to cover it up. Pope Adrian IV, "to Frederick Barbarossa, Sept. 20th, 1157", ed. and trans. Ernest F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, (London: George Bell and Sons, 1910), 410-419, accessed October 1, 2015, http://classes.maxwell.syr.edu/his311/Lecture%20Four/besancon.html

Eskil, a Cistercian, was friends with Bernard (Bergquist "The Papal Legate", *Adrian IV, the English Pope*, 42) and Cardinal Roland's, Eskil would later play a role in Alexander's involvement in Scandinavian affairs as pope.

[129] Pennington, 114.

[130] Otto, 180-187. Books Three and Four of Otto's work were completed by his continuator Rahewin; Pennington; 115-116; Baldwin implicates the imperial chancellor in the schism

translation. The situation was further complicated when Adrian died unexpectedly in 1159.[131]

For our purposes, it is significant to note the continued attempts at compromise over the course of this declining relationship. Even after the Treaty of Constance and the confusion at Sutri, Barbarossa tried to work with the papacy. Similarly, after Barbarossa was forced to flee Rome and the confusion at Besançon, Adrian did not break with the Empire. It was Adrian's alliance with the Normans that set the schism into motion. The problems of communication and conflict ultimately caused the collapse of relationships between the papacy and the empire. Barbarossa was not responsible for his difficulties with the papacy, but Adrian needed a more efficient alliance. After Benevento, Barbarossa made peace with the Romans on his own terms, without conferring with the papacy. When Adrian died, the papal curia was split between continuing with Benevento or reviving Constance. It was a clash between the traditional and the pragmatic.

The Papal Schism of 1159

When Adrian IV died in late 1159, the papal curia was fiercely divided into two factions: The Imperialists and the Normanists. The Imperialists, headed by Octaviano de Monticelli, a Roman magnate, advocated for repairing relations with the Holy Roman Empire and preserving the traditional relationship between the papacy and the empire.[132] The other faction, led by Roland Bandinelli, were more rational and preferred to continue

[131] Logan, 125.
[132] Otto, 149.

the papacy's alliance with the Kingdom of Sicily.[133] Unable to reconcile their differences the papacy ruptured in schism in 1159.

Violence broke out on all sides when the two parties met to crown their popes, Monticelli as Victor IV and Bandinelli as Alexander III. Boso recounts the events in exquisite detail, "But Octavian, who had long aspired to the Chair of the Apostle, on seeing himself disappointed in his hope, was moved to such a peak of madness and rashness that he snatched the mantle like a robber, tore it with his own hands from Alexander's shoulders, and attempted among cries and confusion to carry it off."[134] At nearly the same time, Roman citizens stormed the church, forcing Alexander and his supporters to flee the city.[135] Both sides appealed to Barbarossa to resolve the dispute, but this proved to be detrimental to Alexander's cause as Barbarossa's biases revealed themselves almost immediately.[136] This sequence of events, although dramatic, captures the calamity surrounding the schism.

Barbarossa convened a council to restore order.[137] In the invitation, Barbarossa referred to Victor as Pope and Alexander as the Papal Chancellor.[138] Slighted, Alexander refused to attend, and the Council of Pavia became a meeting of German and Italian bishops. Alexander was excommunicated. Barbarossa understood the importance of working with the

---

[133] Baldwin, 44-45.

[134] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 44.

[135] Baldwin, 46-47.

[136] Boso *Life of Alexander III*, 48; Baldwin, 49-50; John of Salisbury, "Concerning the Council of Pavia. June 1160" *in Medieval Sourcebook: The Struggle Between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III 1160-1177* (New York: Fordham University, 1997) accessed on Sept. 24, 2015, http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/source/barbarossa1.asp.

[137] The sincerity of Barbarossa's council deserves attention. He argued that in times of papal schism, the Emperor held the right to choose the pope. He was not without precedent. In the eleventh century, when there were three claimants to the papal throne, the Salian Emperor Henry III, resolved the conflict. From Alexander's perspective, this could not be acknowledged, as his role at Besançon and in the Treaty of Constance, would surely have lost him the contest.

[138] Boso *Life of Alexander III*, 48

papacy even amid schism, so long as it first espoused his views. The following is attributed to him at the council,

> Although I know that through the office and dignity of the empire the power to convoke councils is mine, especially in (time of) such great dangers to the Church – for this is known to have been done by the emperors Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, and more recently Charlemagne and Otto – nevertheless, I commit to you and to your power the authority to define this supremely important business.[139]

Barbarossa saw the emperor as necessary to the papacy's functioning, thus evoking a relationship between church and state. Barbarossa's appeals to precedent also suggest the Twelfth Century Renaissance.

In response to Pavia, bishops from England, France, and Spain swore allegiance to Alexander at the Council at Beauvais held that same year. Their council excommunicated Victor and Barbarossa.[140] At Beauvais, Henry II and Louis VII agreed to support Alexander conjointly.[141] A year later, Alexander tried to return to Rome but was again forced to flee. With the aid of the King of Sicily, he headed for exile in France, echoing the same exile taken by Innocent II during the Double Election in 1130's schism.[142] Alexander first settled in Montpellier where he held a synod. After a meeting with Louis, he moved on to Auvergne. [143] When Barbarossa tried to persuade Louis to his cause, Alexander moved on to a monastery in Aquitaine. After a small skirmish at Dijon, Henry met with Alexander at that

---

[139] Quoted in Somerville, 7.

[140] Boso *Life of Alexander III*, 51; Pennington 116

[141] Boso *Life of Alexander III*, 52. In addition to Henry and Louis, the Kings of Sicily, Spain, Jerusalem, Hungary, and the Byzantine Emperor also supported Alexander. This is the beginning of new problems pertaining to the Vexin, a piece of territory on the border of Normandy and the French Royal Domain. As part of his agreement at Beauvais papal envoys granted the marriage between Henry's son and Louis' daughter, although much too young, and the Vexin, her dowry, transferred to Henry's control (Somerville, 78).

[142] Somerville, 2; Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 52.

[143] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 52-54.

monastery. Following this, Alexander, and Henry each independently went to Tours to hold a conference with Louis.[144]

Somerville has described the meeting between Alexander and the English and French monarchs as a "tripartite conference."[145] He argues, "The pope needed them badly, and was in no position to create difficulties. Henry had little to fear from Frederick Barbarossa, and his promise of military support would calm Louis."[146] Alexander's success thus depended on his cooperation between the Kings of England and France. Henry and Louis had to come to a truce before they both agreed to support Alexander.[147] The best symbol of their cooperation to support Alexander is reflected in their support of the Council of Tours (1163), an effective rallying point for the Alexandrine cause, especially because by that point Victor had convened four synods and councils to rouse his support. Among those in attendance was the recently consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Becket.

After Tours, Alexander moved onto Sens, where he stayed until Easter 1165. In the meantime, Victor IV died, and the schism waned to such a degree that Alexander was able to return to Rome with aid from Sicily. In May 1166 Barbarossa marched on Rome, forcing Alexander into his second exile, again by the aid of Sicily. He went to Benevento. With Alexander removed, Barbarossa and his wife were crowned for a second time by Victor's successor Paschal III. Barbarossa's hold on Rome did not last long however, as disease

[144] Somerville, 4.
[145] Somerville, 3. Somerville argues that this meeting was intentionally removed from Boso's account of events due to the secrecy of the meeting, as Boso himself was there.
[146] Somerville, 4.
[147] Baldwin, 53.

again forced him out of the city. A year and a half later, Victor's successor Paschal died and was replaced by Calixtus III.[148]

After this, the schism enters its last phase. Barbarossa's attention was consumed by his conflicts with the Lombard League, and which defeated him at the Battle of Legnano (1177). Meanwhile, Alexander continued to move around Italy, staying in Tusculum for some time. Here, he received news of Becket's murder.[149] For the duration of the schism, Alexander was also engaged in Italian conflicts. Barbarossa's messengers found Alexander in Anagni in 1176. The Peace at Venice a year later, had come to include Alexander, Barbarossa, the Lombard League, and the King of Sicily. This turned out to be rather complicated, as the Lombard League and Imperial envoys gave the papacy a list of cities. To make sure that his did offend anyone, Alexander not only took a roundabout way to Venice (via the King of Sicily), but also went to Ferrara, before returning back to Venice. This process took nearly a year, and is significant for our purposes, as it shows Alexander's shrewd diplomacy and calculated strategy.

In addition to reconciling with the papacy, Barbarossa also agreed to a six year truce with the Lombard League and a fifteen-year peace with the King of Sicily, effectively bringing a close to the very problems that had caused the schism.[150]

---

[148] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 77-78. As part of the mounting chaos in these events, Rome decided to attack its rival, Tusculum. Tusculum called to Barbarossa for aid. Barbarossa's forces outnumbered Rome's and he captured the city.

[149] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 85-88. In the English sources, Alexander's reaction is quite dramatic. Apparently, he shut himself up, wept, and refused to see an English person for a week. In Boso's account, envoys approach Alexander on his way to Mass, the Thursday of Holy Week, and afterwards he presumably went about his business. Boso is also more interested in the outcome pertaining to Henry than he is with Becket, excepting his canonization.

[150] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 106.

Henry and Louis

Barbarossa's diplomatic policy during the schism echoes the alliances caused by the Double Election of 1130. In that schism, when the papacy had split from internal tension, France, England, and the empire had supported Innocent II. Rome, Southern Italy, and the Normans had supported the antipope.[151] Then, as in 1159, England and France were critical to success. Barbarossa courted both Louis and Henry. If he could sway one, he would break the Alexandrine coalition.

Simultaneous to the schism, Barbarossa began reestablishing imperial control in Burgundy, much to Louis' concern.[152] Twice, Louis agreed to meet with Barbarossa to discuss the Burgundian situation and Louis' stance in the schism. Alexander, in exile in France, was perturbed. As a precautionary move, he encouraged Henry to ready Normandy, should Louis join with Barbarossa, to which Henry agreed. In a message for Louis, Barbarossa urged, "Imploring you, therefore, with deep and abundant affection, we warn that you should in no way receive the aforesaid schismatic, a hideous enemy to us and our entire empire, nor should you permit him to be received by anyone."[153] Barbarossa's first attempt to meet Louis was at Dijon. The plan was that Louis would bring Alexander and his supporters to treat with Barbarossa, who would bring Victor and his followers to treat with Louis. Barbarossa also brought armed-forces. Alexander, who suspected a plot, did not attend. Louis however did and was threatened with arrest by Barbarossa's men if Alexander

[151] Donald F. Logan. *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages.* Second Edition. London: Routledge, 2013. 124

[152] Mierow, 4.

[153] Cited in Somerville, 2.

did not appear. Before anything could be done however, Henry appeared and scattered Barbarossa's forces.[154]

While clearly embellished with dramatics, this anecdote is significant for our purposes. First is the international nature of this intended meeting. Second, is the political character of these events. Although Barbarossa claimed the purpose was to mend the medieval church, it is evident that the only details Boso was interested in recounting were political, pertaining to secular rulers. To Barbarossa's chagrin, Louis balked at the situation when Barbarossa did not meet with him. Louis was even further distanced from the imperial cause when Barbarossa was soundly defeated twice militarily in Burgundy. Barbarossa did not give up.

Barbarossa's efforts to sway Henry were ongoing. They became much more significant into the Becket controversy. Peter Munz suggested that Henry saw strong similarities in his dispute with Becket and the situation between Barbarossa and Alexander.[155] Henry sent two envoys when an imperial diet was held to appoint Victor's successor. The fact that Henry might support the emperor helped sustain the schism.[156]

In a letter to a friend, John of Salisbury seemed particularly wary of Henry's decision. John draws a strong distinction between "a Balaamitic pontiff through whom he might curse the people of God; the son of malediction" and "a prince who is thought of with joy and benediction," the latter being Louis VII. Meanwhile, as for his own lord, "We, however, fear beyond measure lest the German emperor circumvent and subvert with his wiles the serenity of our prince."[157] John alludes to the influence of Barbarossa and the fear that Henry might

---

[154] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 55-58.

[155] Munz, *Boso's Life of Alexander III*, 34.

[156] Peter Munz, 34; Anne Duggan, *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury 1162-1170: Vol. I: Letters 1-175.* Edited and translated by Anne J. Duggan. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

[157] John of Salisbury, "Concerning the Council of Pavia. June 1160" *in Medieval Sourcebook: The Struggle Between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III 1160-1177* (New York: Fordham University, 1997) accessed on Sept. 24, 2015, http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/source/barbarossa1.asp.

fall in line with him. It should here be noticed that Henry ultimately declined Barbarossa's offers, preferring to use Alexander in the struggle with Becket, as Alexander was using Henry in his struggle with Barbarossa. Barbarossa had lost the necessary urgency to give support to his cause because he could not break the Franco-Angevin coalition and Victor's successors were increasingly unpopular.

Alexander Victorious

Three aspects were instrumental in Alexander's success in the schism. First, was his maintenance of the papal apparatus, second, was retaining the support of Henry and Louis, and third was his alliance with the Lombard League. The best evidence for Alexander's influence in the schism was his ability to operate the papal apparatus. From minute bureaucratic details, such as issues of canon law and papal correspondence, to the convocation of a council of the medieval church.[158] In this regard, Alexander's policies should be seen as a continuation of his predecessors'. His diplomatic abilities allowed him to balance a papal political schism and everyday business. They were instrumental in his alliances with Henry and Louis who were crucial to his success.

Louis' role in the schism is often overshadowed by his contemporaries both of which attract more drama. Louis had his own political influence, which played an important part in the outcome of events. Over the course of the schism, he welcomed both Alexander and Becket as exiles to France. Alexander's situation was precarious when Barbarossa was trying to influence Louis to the imperialist faction. Becket also complicated Alexander's situation, as he threatened Louis' alliance with Henry. Within a year of Becket's arrival,

[158] Baldwin, 43-44.

Alexander returned to Rome following the death of Victor IV, thus easing the relationship between Henry and Louis.

Henry was particularly important to Alexander's cause. With his marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine, Henry had become one of the largest landholders in Western Europe.[159] When schism erupted in 1159 Henry, in the tradition of Henry I, forbade the English church to recognize a pope until he first decided. Recognizing the critical role of Henry's support, Alexander was open to compromising with him.

One of Alexander's first papal acts was to canonize Edward the Confessor, the last Anglo-Saxon king. This was an explicitly religious action with strong political undertones that gave England a patron saint and thus Henry's kingship itself a certain degree of sanctity.[160] Barbarossa attempted the same thing four years later when he had antipope Paschal III, Victor's successor, canonize Charlemagne to legitimate Barbarossa. Alexander would repeal this canonization at the Third Lateran Council in 1179. Alexander's efforts were a blatant effort to compromise with Henry. The official bull for canonization was announced in February 1161. At the time, Henry was busy waging war in Touraine and Blois in an attempt to take the Vexin back from Louis. This conflict was settled in a peace treaty arbitrated by Alexander.[161] Alexander's involvement clearly was to his own benefit as he needed them both on his side. Henry and Louis were prominent members of an Alexandrine coalition with the Lombard League which Barbarossa would try and influence as well.

---

[159] Brooke, 12. This warrants further explanation. The Aquitaine was fiercely loyal to Eleanor and it was she who held the rights to these lands. Henry's claim to these lands was thus through her.

[160] Roger Mortimer, *Angevin England: 1154-1258* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1994), 34; Robert. Bartlett, *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings: 1075-1225* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 130.

[161] Warren, 235.

The Towns

In 1154 Barbarossa launched the first of several Italian campaigns which were not as successful as he hoped.[162] Historians have argued that Barbarossa was an able administrator and that if it were not for his interventions in Italy, he would have been much more successful.[163] Barbarossa's interest in Italy has been the subject of much debate. Italy offered glory, pride, and wealth, to whoever controlled it. Economics, politics, and civil war disorganized the Italian towns, making them a seemingly easy target for shrewd calculation.[164] It turned out that Barbarossa's involvement brought more trouble than it was worth. His campaigns rallied the Italian towns into one of the era's most formidable military entities.

Following more military skirmishes, Barbarossa held an imperial diet at Roncaglia (1158) with representatives from the Lombard towns.[165] His advances provoked an alliance of several towns, including Vicenza, Padua, Verona, and Venice, who formed an entity known as the Lombard League.[166] Barbarossa sought to reestablish a relationship between the empire and the towns at the meeting,, like that which had existed under his predecessors. The region would be under his nominal suzerainty. The towns rejected this idea and denied the Emperor's proposals. They had become autonomous because of the twelfth century's economic growth. Here again we the intersection of the old – represented by Barbarossa's efforts to reestablish a traditional relationship – and the new, symbolized by the towns'

[162] Mierow, 142; Otto provides much detail about this campaign in "The Second Book" in *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, (112-155)

[163] Strayer and Munro, 219.

[164] Strayer and Munro, 219.

[165] Lombardy is a region in Northern Italy. It sits at the foot of the Alps.

[166] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 64. According to Boso, their aim was to restore a relationship with empire akin to Charlemagne's time.

autonomy and rise during the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Barbarossa and the Lombard League were unable to reach an agreement and war soon followed.

At first, things went badly for the towns. After Roncaglia, Barbarossa conquered Tortona and Crema, and eventually took Milan in 1162. After some success, the Lombard League attracted more cities.[167] Boso describes the league as, "The cities of Lombardy, therefore, which had for long experienced in their own streets his atrocities and cruelties, on seeing that his mind and intent burned against them more fiercely even than they were wont, in common deliberation declared that they out to drive entirely from Lombardy that person who had striven to reduce the whole of Italy to shameful slavery."[168] Barbarossa's gains were quickly reversed. After brief success in Tuscany, he launched a siege on Ancona. Simultaneous to this, the Lombard League recaptured Milan. They appealed to Alexander to support their fight against Barbarossa. Alexander's support of the towns was instrumental to his success in the schism.

Rome continued to play a significant role in these events. It was its aggression against Tusculum that led to Alexander's second expulsion. The alliance of Tusculum, Tivoli, Alba Longa, and Campagna with Barbarossa, resulted in Rome's capture.[169] Barbarossa was forced from Rome by disease, and the Lombard League attacked him again, forcing him north of the Alps.[170] In 1168 the Lombard League commissioned the city of Alessandria, named after the pope, as a defensive stronghold in response to this success.[171] Barbarossa sent a messenger to Alexander to begin peace talks. As the messenger was not

---

[167] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 65.
[168] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 75
[169] *Ibid*, 71.
[170] *Ibid*, 75.
[171] *Ibid*, 75-76. Pavia and Monferrato dissenting.

welcome in Benevento, Alexander agreed to meet in Veroli, part of the papal territories. Because the Lombard League feared an alliance between Pope and Emperor, nothing came of it.[172] Thus as early as 1168, it was clear to all sides that the Lombard League was Alexander's best hope for success.

A decade later Barbarossa invaded Lombardy for the fifth time.[173] This campaign was initially successful; he wasted Susa and destroyed Asti, but was unable to take Alessandria.[174] After a four-month siege, the rest of the Lombard League came to Alessandria's aid and defeated Barbarossa.[175] Pushed back, Barbarossa recovered in Pavia and made overtures of peace talks again, but these failed.[176] There, he bided his time. First, he appealed to his cousin Henry "the Lion," the Duke of Bavaria for aid, but he would not come. In the spring of the next year, reinforcements arrived from Germany, and Barbarossa launched a surprise attack on Milan.[177] The Milanese however, had word of this plan beforehand, and pushed the imperial forces back, where the rest of the Lombard League met them. This defeat at Legnano (1177) forced Barbarossa to end the schism. [178]

The struggle between Alexander and Barbarossa over alliances with the towns speaks to this conflict's connection to the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Both belligerents understood that the towns were key to success. Moreover, it also shows that they understood the value of compromise. The towns had their own agency in choosing whether to back

---

[172] *Ibid*, 78-79.

[173]*Ibid*, 88. At the same time, Alexander was orchestrating a peace between Henry and Henry the Young King and Louis.

[174] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 87-89.

[175] *Ibid*, 88-90

[176] Boso blames the city of Pavia itself. He appeals to its history as a threat to the papacy, referring to Lombard Kings who had needed the aid of Pepin and Charlemagne (96). The argument itself is odd, but it is significant because Boso anchors the papal schism as a continuation of past problems. Fittingly enough, Barbarossa speaks highly of Pavia in a letter to his uncle. (Quoted in Mierow, 19).

[177] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*¸ 96

[178] Spruyt, 141.

Barbarossa or Alexander, a choice which was undoubtedly shaped by the party that could make them the better deal. Understanding how this fits into a healthy church and state relationship is more complicated.

At first, towns appear to be the spoiler in this relationship. For example, in the conflict between Alexander and Barbarossa, towns might merely to be the better tool by which to attack your enemy, and to this end; Alexander was the better strategist. However, this view overgeneralizes the nuances in working with the towns themselves and shows that the cooperation between church and state was more beneficial to all. The Lombard League chose to back Alexander because of what he could offer. Rome's enemies chose Barbarossa for the same reason. Thus, from the institutions' perspective, this could be a dangerous situation, as the other institution might have a stronger influence. For the towns, a similar risk was present. The Lombard League was fortunate in the case of Alexander. He brought the League's concerns to peace talks as early as 1168 and he did not switch in alliance to Barbarossa. If he had, the joint forces of church and state might have suppressed them. Another alternative, however; and a more likely one at that, is that the Lombard League would have helped Barbarossa defeat Alexander if Barbarossa could compromise his goals. Thus, the complexities and nuances of this triangular relationship between church, state, and towns, shows that dramatic battles like Legnano were the exception to the rule.

Barbarossa's Cooperation

After the defeat at Legnano, Barbarossa's only recourse was settlement. According to Boso, "Indeed all the Princes of the Kingdom, both ecclesiastical and secular, who until that time had followed Frederick in his errors, told him that unless he made peace with the

Church they would follow him no longer, nor give him any aid."[179] Barbarossa was forced to compromise with the papacy. Cooperation worked on multiple levels, some more explicit than others. For example, when he met with Alexander he publicly kissed the pope's feet. When the antipope Calixtus III fled Viterbo, Barbarossa placed the ban of the empire on him. The symbolism of this spoke broadly enough, as did when he acted as Alexander's *strator*.[180] However, Barbarossa's implicit signs of cooperation are more significant.

First, his agreement to the Peace at Venice's terms effectively resolved the problems that had caused the schism in the first place. In addition to agreeing to peace with the Lombard League, he also agreed to a fifteen-year peace with the King of Sicily. It was the differences between the Empire and the Sicilians that had caused the papal curia's rupture in 1159. Second, following the Peace at Venice, the terms had to be ratified. Boso describes the meeting, "in the Church of St. Mark at Venice Pope Alexander with his Archbishops, Bishops, and other prelates of the churches of Italy and Germany held a Synod, in which the Emperor himself had his throne at the side of the Pope."[181] This synod, convened to ratify peace between the papacy, Empire, Lombard League, and Sicily, places Barbarossa second in importance to Alexander. The image of their thrones next to each reflects a harmony between the two and thus the cooperation between church and state. Finally, there is the matter of Bertinoro.

At the same time as the Peace at Venice, the papacy was gifted a castle in Bertinoro. [182] After leaving Venice, Barbarossa took the castle and refused to give it back to Alexander. According to Boso, Alexander thought the peace between papacy and empire was too

[179] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 98.
[180] *Ibid*, 108, 114.
[181] *Ibid*, 110.
[182] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 110, 114.

important to risk over such a matter. Rather, he seemed to think that the castle would return to the papacy in time. This is particularly interesting, as Bertinoro is located squarely between Bologna and Ancona. Alexander realized that Barbarossa was best left in check with the Byzantines to the east, the Lombard League to the North, and the papacy in the South. [183] Thus, this problem reflects the sincerity of Barbarossa's peace with the papacy. For one reason it shows that Barbarossa was only so willing to comply with what he wanted, rather than submit to the papacy. It also shows he understood that after nearly two decades of schism, he knew the value of compromise for the papacy.

The political nature of this schism is perhaps best evoked by its aftermath. As with its cause, the afterward did not pertain to matters of theoretical or theological importance, but in the last events of Barbarossa's reign. Barbarossa did not break with the papacy following the Peace of Venice and had no more major confrontations with Alexander during the pope's lifetime. He did, however, continue to squabble with the papacy, notably over the rights to Matilda of Tuscany's lands, which had been contested by both factions in 1177, but the dispute remained unresolved. Finally, the problem was resolved nearly a decade later when Barbarossa made a new peace with the papacy. Barbarossa also conflicted with the papacy over the marriage of his successor to the heiress of Sicily. He ignored the papacy's protestations, and this arrangement gave his dynasty claims to Sicily which they would rule by the end of the century.[184]

For twenty-two years, Alexander and Barbarossa were locked in a power struggle. The catalyst was the result of rising tensions between the papacy and empire and were predicated on contemporary political events. When the papal curia split, Alexander and

---

[183] *Ibid*, 114.
[184] Mierow, 4.

Barbarossa each sought to steer the political course. Their contest engulfed Latin Christendom as both struck alliances to best the other. The medieval church, the nascent states, and towns were divided over the issue. Ultimately, Alexander proved victorious. Barbarossa, defeated militarily and needed to turn his attention to imperial affairs, conceded. Alexander's successes were predicated on his diplomatic abilities and skills of compromise. One significant event, the Becket controversy, posed a pivotal key in his course of action.

Chapter III: Becket

In late May 1538, one of the greatest celebrities of the Middle Ages disappeared. When Henry VIII formed the Anglican Church of England, he severed all ties with the medieval church. As part of this movement, he ordered St. Thomas Becket's shrine at Canterbury Cathedral destroyed. Royal officals looted the shrine and burned the saint's bones. The state transformed the reputation of the famous Archbishop of Canterbury overnight. Rebranded a traitor to his king, the medieval church's most famous martyr became a symbol of treason. This peculiar episode is emblematic of the enmity between church and state, the very cause of Becket's death in 1170—or so runs the popular misconception.

Reinterpreting the Becket controversy from Alexander's perspective offers an alternative view. The Becket controversy takes on an international aspect, which thus weakens its significance. Additionally, from the English viewpoint, Alexander's involvement in the controversy was the continuation of papal interference that had been increasing since the Norman Conquest. Because of the Becket controversy's complexities and its popularity among English historians, I will take both of these perspectives in turn in order to argue that there was no crisis during this period. To do this, I first present the history of the see of Canterbury to argue the significance of Alexander's involvement in the controversy. Then, I examine the controversy's chronology, and the roles of Alexander, Becket, and Henry. Finally, I analyze correspondence between Alexander and Becket to argue that the Becket case was not a crisis of church and state.

A History of the Office

The circumstances of the Becket controversy were not unusual. They should be seen as the continuation of several larger ongoing problems affecting archbishops as far back as the Norman Conquest. In England, a peculiar Anglo-Norman policy towards reform resulted from the Twelfth Century Renaissance, the Gregorian Reforms, and traditional customs. Intellectualism, the personal and political relationship between the archbishops and monarchs, and the York-Canterbury dispute all played significant roles in the office's historical developments. Analyzing these archiepiscopates elucidates the relationship between church and state in England. When analyzed through this historical context, the Becket controversy's gravity diminishes.

Archbishops of Canterbury were noted for their education. Each functioned as a conduit of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Lanfranc and Anselm were towering intellectuals. Theobald's household was one of the most notable of the age. All but Ralph d'Escures were monks. D'Escures was a clerk emblematic of those trained at universities. Each of these archbishops were members of the transnational *intelligentsia*.

The archbishop's office was as much political as it was ecclesiastical. The Archbishops held a significant amount of land, and because they occupied the highest position of authority in the English medieval church, were traditionally the monarch's chief counselor. [185] The relationships between archbishops and kings, both personal and professional, could allow them to mutually reinforce each other's authority or produce obstacles to smooth governance, often depending on the personalities of each.

[185] The Archbishop of York, as we will see, often contested this issue, known as primacy. This conflict between the sees of Canterbury and York is historically known as the York-Canterbury dispute. There were exceptions to this during some archiepiscopates, during which monarchs preferred the counsel of other figures.

The York-Canterbury dispute transformed from a local issue into an international problem for the medieval church. The struggle for Canterbury's primacy involved the English church, the monarchy, and the papacy. Over the course of the twelfth century appeals to Rome by both sides gave the papacy a developing presence in England. Consequently, Alexander's involvement in the Becket controversy highlights the reciprocal relationship between the controversy and schism, as Alexander's role in English affairs was a continuation established by his predecessors.

Henry was King of England, but also Lord of much of modern France. The pope was the international figure par excellence. The archbishops of both sees were drawn from an international pool of twelfth century intellectuals. Thus the quarrel between Henry and Becket must be seen through an international lens. This international scope was largely predicated on the burgeoning relationship between England and the papacy.

Together these three elements, the Twelfth Century Renaissance, political events, and the York-Canterbury dispute, shaped a cooperative relationship between church and state. The triangular relationship between the archiepiscopacy, the monarchy, and the papacy, was a field by which conflict and compromise were navigated. [186] Through this survey of Archbishops of Canterbury a dialogue between these elements and this triangular relationship help establish the context of the Becket controversy. By looking at the Becket controversy as a continuation of the past, not only does it diminish its gravity, but we can further understand the roles of Henry, Becket, and Alexander over the course of those events.

[186] As we will see, this is a highly contentious claim. From the archbishops' perspective, it was an undisputed fact. The evidence for this argument was based off the founding of the see, dating back to the time of Augustine of Canterbury and his correspondence with Pope Gregory I and the writings of Bede.

Lanfranc: [b. 1005-10 – d. 1089: Office 1070 – 1089]

The Twelfth Century Renaissance

Any study of the twelfth century English Church needs to begin with Lanfranc. Although he lived in the eleventh century, he exemplified the coming renaissance.[187] Lanfranc studied law at Pavia and Bologna becoming an acclaimed jurist and lecturer. He established schools at Pavia and Avranches, before becoming a monk at Bec Abbey in Normandy.[188] He continued to lecture, turning Bec's monastic school into one Europe's finest.[189] His lectures on the *trivium* were exceedingly popular, drawing students from throughout Latin Christendom making Bec's monastic school a preeminent intellectual center of the renaissance.[190]

Political Events, Relationship with the Kings, and Efforts at Reform

Lanfranc's archiepiscopate was divided into two parts: the reigns of William I and of William II, called Rufus. Both William I and Alexander II recognized Lanfranc's position as the head of the medieval church in England. In a letter to William, Alexander writes

> To achieve these ends and to gain increase of other virtues we exhort your highness to follow the advice and counsel of our brother Lanfranc, archbishop[sic] of Canterbury; as our most cherished member, one of the leading sons of the Roman

[187] For more detailed information on Lanfranc, see also Allan MacDonald, *Lanfranc: A Study of His Work & Writing* (London: Oxford University Press, 1926); David Douglas, *William the Conqueror* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964), H. R. Loyn, *The English Church, 940-1154* (New York: Longman Publishing Group, 2000) among others.

[188] Acclaimed for his jurisprudence, he was also among the first generation to teach the *trivium*. (Frank Barlow, *William Rufus* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 19; Douglas, 318; Loyn, 72; C. Warren Hollister, Robert C. Stacey, and Robin Chapman Stacey, *The Making of England to 1399* in *History of England*, 8th ed. 1:136.).

[189] Douglas, 116.

[190] C. Warren Hollister, *Henry I* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 16. For more on the influence of Bec Abbey, see Hollister, *Henry I*.

> Church, we are grieved that he is so rarely at our side, but we are consoled for his absence by the increment which he renders to the Church in your realm[191]

William followed Alexander's advice and church and state had an amicable relationship during his reign.[192] In the age of the Investiture Controversy, this is particularly significant. The cooperation between archbishop and monarch gave the broader church reforms a distinctly Norman character. Historians have argued that this Norman reform reflects respect for Rome, rather than obedience to it. [193] A writ issued by William in 1072 captures that *zeitgeist*. It states, "I ordain and, by my royal authority, command that henceforth, when ecclesiastical law is involved, no bishop or archdeacon shall hold pleas in the hundred [court], nor shall he bring to judgment before laymen any cause that pertains to the cure of souls."[194] Although it did not officially separate ecclesiastical and secular courts, the ordinance was an important first step in the process that would culminate with the Becket controversy.[195]

William's writ led to subsequent debates about the problem of overlapping jurisdictions. One example from Rufus' reign captures this in detail. Following a rebellion led by Odo of Bayeux to place Rufus' brother Robert on the throne, William of Calais, a

---

[191] Pope Alexander II, "to King William I, Oct. 1071" in *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*. eds. and trans. Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 61-63. For more on the relationship between Lanfranc and William see: Hollister, Stacey, and Stacey; and Loyn.

[192]According to Douglas, Leo IX had prohibited William's marriage due to consanguinity. The marriage took place and did not receive a papal sanction until 1059. It was then, during attempting to reconcile with the papacy, that William established a personal relationship with Lanfranc.

For more about William I's relationship with the church, see Chapter 13, "The King in the Church" of Douglas' *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact Upon England*; Chapter 4 in Loyn.

[193] Two letters, one written by William and another by Lanfranc, both addressed to Gregory VII, this idea is best captured. William's letter is a response to Gregory's demands of fealty and Peter's Pence. He is particularly appalled by the suggestion of the former, and his suggestion to collect the latter. Similarly, Lanfranc's letter is also a response. Gregory argues that Lanfranc is responsible for William's behavior. These letters can be found in *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*. (38) for Lanfranc and (39) for William.

[194] William I "Ordinance on Church Courts" in *Sources of English Constitutional History*. eds. And trans. Carl Stephenson and Frederick George Marcham. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), 35-36.

[195] Hollister, Stacey, and Stacey, 137.

conspirator, was arrested and tried for treason.[196] At his trial, Calais argued that because he was an abbot, he had the benefit of clergy – meaning that he reserved the right to be tried in an ecclesiastical court, and could thus appeal for a proper trial in Rome.[197] Calais cited a book of canon law compiled by Lanfranc.[198] Lanfranc, who was prosecuting the case, argued that Calais was on trial in his role as a feudal noble rather than in his capacity as a bishop.[199] Calais was found guilty and this case established an important precedent for future problems of a similar nature.[200]

Lanfranc reorganized the English Church to make it more analogous to the Norman Church in structure. His reforms included redistricting bishoprics, reforming monasteries, and reshaping cathedral communities.[201] Two different types of cathedral communities, monastic and secular, emerged under his guidance.[202] This restructuring was significant because it allowed the development of intellectual centers. By urbanizing bishoprics and attaching cathedral communities, Lanfranc played a critical role in preparing England for the Twelfth Century Renaissance. The monarchy retained several customs during these reforms,: the investiture of church officials, organization of bishoprics, and monitoring of communication between England and Rome. This kept England focused on local issues

[196] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 85.
[197] *Ibid*, 86.
[198] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 86..
[199] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 176-177. Precedence for this procedure was established in an earlier trial concerning the same Odo of Bayeux in 1082.
[200] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 86-87.
[201] Douglas, 322-332.
[202] Douglas, 329 (he is citing Knowles). Monastic constitutions (6)- Canterbury, Rochester, Norwich, Winchester, Worcester, Salisbury. Secular constitutions (9) - Chichester, Exeter, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, London, Salisbury, Wells, York.

rather than universal problems of the medieval church.[203] This policy worked for Lanfranc and William and the pope approved.[204]

The relationship between church and state is intertwined with political events throughout the rest of Lanfranc's life. Lanfranc played a critical role in the succession following William's death in 1087. As was the custom, the Archbishop of Canterbury crowned the King of England.[205] Barlow argued that in the interregnum Lanfranc ran England.[206] This is a compelling image of the relationship between church and state. The Archbishop of Canterbury ultimately controlled the destiny of the state. Three of William's sons survived him, and in an expression of agency Lanfranc decided to abide by William I's wishes.[207] Events could have unfolded much differently.

The cordiality between church and state did not transfer to Rufus' administration. The *Anglo Saxon Chronicle* gives a vivid description of his relationship with the medieval church,

> He was very powerful, and stern over his lands and subjects, and towards all his neighbours… in the sight of God and the world. He trampled on the church of God, and as to the bishoprics and abbacies, the incumbents of which died in his reign, he either sold them outright, or kept them in his own hands, and set them out to renters; for he desired to be the heir of everyone, churchman or layman.[208]

This excerpt captures the association between Rufus and the medieval church, which Frank Barlow has called "sinister."[209] Lanfranc's relationship with Rufus was much more complicated than that between Lanfranc and William. It was not without issues, but it was in

---

[203] Hollister, Stacey, and Stacey, 138; Barlow, *William Rufus*, 344

[204] Lanfranc, "to Pope Alexander II", *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, 35.

[205] In the dispute over primacy this was often given as argument for Canterbury's superiority.

[206] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 55.

[207] The eldest, Robert, was to inherit Normandy, the patrimony. William was given England. The third son, Henry, was given money with which he was to buy land. Hollister, *Henry I*.

[208] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, ann. and trans., J. A. Giles, (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1912), 476.

[209] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 22.

no crisis. Lanfranc's death led to an imbalance in this relationship.[210] The see remained vacant for nearly four years after Lanfranc died, during which Rufus plundered the revenues of Canterbury as if they were his own.[211]

The York-Canterbury Dispute

Just months after his consecration in 1070, Lanfranc became embroiled in a feud with Thomas of Bayeux, the newly elected Archbishop of York.[212] Lanfranc demanded an oath of loyalty and a written statement of obedience from the archbishop-elect before he would consecrate him. Bayeux refused. The matter was temporarily resolved by William I when the King arranged a compromise. Bayeux swore loyalty to Lanfranc, in return for a guarantee that the obedience would not transfer to Lanfranc's successors. [213]

Bayeux reopened the issue the following year before Pope Alexander II. Alexander II deferred the issue back to the English at the Council of Winchester in 1072. The council decided that the Archbishop of York would sign a written oath of obedience and the Archbishop of Canterbury was proclaimed primate of England.[214] In the long term, this did

---

[210] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 97. Although it was Barlow who termed this relationship 'sinister' (see above), Barlow also argues that it is nuanced. Rufus was intimately involved in Church affairs, to such a point that the relationship benefitted from his involvement.

[211] A. Gordon Smith, *A Short History of Medieval England* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1925), 92; Barlow, *William Rufus*, 181. Episcopal sees were vast tracts of land. The bishop, as a feudal lord, collected the see's revenue. If the see were vacant, those revenues would instead go to the monarch. As such it was a feudal custom for monarchies to sustain vacancies in abbacies and bishoprics for financial reasons.

[212] Loyn 71; Douglas 321. Historians have traditionally noted this as the beginning of the Canterbury-York dispute in the Norman era.

[213] "Memorandum on the primacy of Canterbury, 21 Apr. 1073-28 Aug. 1075" in *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, 41. Struggles between high-ranking members of the church were common for Lanfranc. His competitions with Odo of Bayeux (not related to Thomas) and Geoffrey of Countances reflect this contention, although it is not entirely relevant to our focus here. For more information, see the first chapter of Barlow's *William Rufus*. Conflict between the archbishops and their suffragans is something of a *leitmotif* of the office as we will see.

[214] "Memorandum" in *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury*, 43-49. The author of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* recounts these same details more obliquely.

not resolve the dispute. It did, however, establish precedence for its renewal. The York-Canterbury dispute set in motion a series of problems for successive archbishops of both sees. According to Hollister, "On the successful defense of the Canterbury primacy… depended the proper, divinely sanctioned ordering of the English Church."[215] The conclusion of this phase, predicated on personal relationships, left the situation for future generations. Lanfranc's zealous defense of his primacy further complicated the matter, as his successors assumed many of the same positions.[216]

The influence of Lanfranc's archiepiscopate set powerful precedence for future archbishops. An Italian, famous for his school in Normandy, he had a significant impact on the international relationship between the medieval church and the developing nascent state in England. His personal relationship with William showed the impact that the *ecclesia* and the *mundus* could have when they were in full cooperation.

ANSELM: [b.1033 – d.1109: Office 1093 – 1109]

The Twelfth Century Renaissance

Like Lanfranc, Anselm of Bec came from the monastic school at Bec and was considered the preeminent intellectual figure of his generation.[217] Anselm was amongst the

[215] C. Warren Hollister, *Henry I*. ed., continuator, Amanda Clark Frost (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 13.

[216] In addition to the conflict between Lanfranc and Thomas, Lanfranc also procured an oath from the Bishop of Dublin, implying that Lanfranc saw himself not only as the primate of England but of the British Isles. Lanfranc also struggled with the monks at Canterbury. When Lanfranc appointed an abbot to the St. Augustine's monastery at Canterbury, the monks protested. Through an exercise of near-absolute authority, Lanfranc subdued them into accepting his choice. Although the conflict was solved through compromise, this anecdote captures the struggle for primacy in a unique perspective. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 447-9.

[217] Smith 92; Loyn 103, 104. Lanfranc had served as prior. When he was moved by William I to Caen, it was Anselm whom replaced him as prior. In 1079 Anselm was consecrated as Abbot of Bec. The distinction is evident where Anselm was been commemorated as a "Doctor" of the Roman Catholic Church and Lanfranc has not. Moreover, Anselm is canonized in Roman Catholic, Anglican, and some Lutheran Christian denominations. Lanfranc is not celebrated beyond local cults.

first to combine traditional theology with Aristotelian ideas and reasoning.[218] There is a vast body of work attributed to him. Thomas Becket presented him for canonization in 1163, which although Alexander delayed, speaks to Anselm's popularity and prominence.

Politics and Relationships with Rufus: Exile the First

Lanfranc died in 1089, but Anselm was not installed as his successor until 1093. The monarchy's policies towards the medieval church grew antithetical to Lanfranc's Norman reforms during the vacancy. Anselm's rule successfully promoted greater papal participation and church reform in the English medieval church.[219] Anselm's relationship with the monarchy was much more turbulent than Lanfranc's had been.[220] Like his predecessor, Anselm's tenure can be seen in two parts: the first under Rufus, which culminated in Anselm's exile; and the second under Henry I, which lasted until Anselm's death. These rocky relationships do not reflect a crisis of church and state, but rather one of personalities.

Anselm's acceptance to the archiepiscopal see was contingent on three points: First, that Canterbury's lands were returned by the monarchy, Anselm would be the chief counselor to the king, and Anselm's personal recognition of Urban II would not interfere with his professional relationship.[221] Rufus begrudgingly agreed to these terms. Matters

---

[218] Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A Short History* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1982). Barlow called him an intellectual genius (*William Rufus*, 301) and Hollister a polymath (*Henry I*, 121).

[219] The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* reports, "In Lent, king William was very sick at Gloucester, insomuch that he was universally reported to be dead: and he made good promises in his illness; that he would lead his future life in righteousness – that the churches of God he would guard and free – and never sell them for money – and that he would have all just laws in his kingdom" (Chronicle 468). For more on this see; Smith; Loyn; Barlow.

[220] The relationship between Rufus and Anselm was plagued by several conflicts of personality. The historiography of this has already been covered in exquisite detail. For more see; Barlow, *William Rufus*, Smith, etc.

[221] Urban II was elected amid schism. Not long after Gregory VII and Henry V reconciled the first phase of the Investiture Controversy, the relationship between papacy and empire broke down into schism. Henry installed his own pope in Rome, forcing Gregory into exile. There, Gregory died. His successor, Urban

were further complicated by additional hostilities between Anselm and Rufus. Intentionally or otherwise Anselm had failed at certain feudal duties, putting him in ill favor of the king.[222] Their antagonistic relationship was exacerbated when Anselm pressed Rufus for certain rights of the church: the archbishop's pallium from Rome, the ability to hold councils, and to fill the vacant abbacies. The nature of their personal relationship is best reflected in a quote attributed to Rufus: "Yesterday I hated him. Today I hate him even more. Tell him that from now on I will hate him more and more day by day. No longer will I recognize him as my father and archbishop; and for his prayers and benedictions, I will spit them back in his face."[223] This vivid excerpt captures the vitriol in the personal relationship between the two.

Their professional relationship was better. Anselm perceived the relationship as, "The king is the church's protector and I am its custodian."[224] As custodian, Anselm felt that he was charged with maintaining the rights of the medieval church in the face of the Investiture Controversy. England's neutrality in the ongoing papal schism made this difficult. Anselm and Rufus' difference over the issue was initially brought before the *curia regis* to resolve but to no avail.[225] They reached a compromise on their own terms. The outcome detailed that England would recognize Urban in return for his guarantee that

---

II, had to contend with the ongoing situation. Rufus hesitated to back a pope and chose instead to play politics. Anselm had chosen to support Urban II before he was Archbishop (Barlow, *William Rufus*, 339.)

[222] When, in need of feudal aid for an invasion of Normandy, Anselm initially gave Rufus a sum of £500. When, Rufus asked for double this, as per a reward for the promotion to the office of archbishop, Anselm balked at the idea, and donated the original £500 to charity (Barlow, *William Rufus*, 327).

[223] Quoted by Barlow, *William Rufus*, 330-331.

[224] Quoted by Barlow, *William Rufus*, 330.

[225] Anselm argued that he was evenly divided between two loyalties – the first sworn to Urban II when he recognized him as pope, which preceded Anselm's ascension to the archbishopric and his sworn fealty to his lord (Barlow, *William Rufus*, 340).

customs would be safeguarded.[226] Here then, is evidence of a functional relationship between the *sacerdotium* and the *regnum*.

Anselm's first exile resulted from similar tensions.[227] Anselm's wished to hold a reform council, something that had not happened in several years. Rufus continually rebuffed the suggestion. By 1097, Anselm was still unable to enforce Gregorian Reforms and he appealed to the papacy. This violated English custom as he did not obtain Rufus' permission to do so.[228] Rufus gave Anselm an ultimatum: submission or exile. Choosing the second course, Anselm left England for Normandy.[229] It is written in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* that he did this "because it seemed to him that in this nation little was done according to right, or after his desires."[230] From Normandy, Anselm set out for the papal curia while Rufus looted Canterbury.[231]

Urban arbitrated the argument between the King of the English and the Archbishop of Canterbury. With Anselm at his side, Urban sent letters encouraging Rufus to return Canterbury's estates and reinvest Anselm.[232] Rufus responded with letters that defended his position.[233] Although threats of excommunication were in the air, none were formally made, Urban chose calcuated action over rash reaction.[234] There was no interdict or excommunication involved.[235] Urban clearly needed Rufus' support against the antipope,

---

[226] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 344. This scene is captured in Barlow in brilliant detail.

[227] The events concerning Anselm's first exile are part of a broad historiography. In *William Rufus* by Barlow, Anselm's motives are fringed by a penchant to be relieved of his office.

[228] Loyn, 104-105.

[229] Smith, 94.

[230] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 474.

[231] Smith, 94.

[232] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 397-398.

[233] *Ibid*.

[234] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 399. Barlow also includes the details of a letter sent from Anselm to the future Paschal II, in which Anselm himself says that he could never place an excommunication on Rufus, as that would make him both judge and jury. That, and to add injury to insult, Rufus would ignore it anyway.

[235] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 436. Barlow notes that Philip I of France and the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV were both excommunicated during this period.

which Anselm was willing to provide.[236] From this nexus of relationships we can clearly see a cooperative relationship between church and state. The situation was never resolved, however, as Rufus died suddenly in 1100, before acknowledging a pope.[237] Following this, Rufus' brother Henry swiftly assumed the throne and invited Anselm back to Canterbury. [238] Anselm played a crucial role in legitimating the next administration. [239] The relationship between Anselm and Henry was more nuanced than under the previous monarch.

Politics and Relationship with Henry: Second Exile

Henry I was intimately connected with several figures associated with the Twelfth Century Renaissance. In addition to his connection with Anselm, he was also acquainted with both Abbot Suger and Abelard.[240] Later in his reign, Bernard visited Henry's court while the King was in Rouen.[241] This network reflects the monarch's place as part of the transnational *intelligentsia.* Hollister notes that "In its early months [Henry's regime], young barons were inclined to ridicule Henry, perhaps for his literacy and bookishness. He may have been too intelligent to consort easily with his unreflective aristocratic

[236] Barlow, *William Rufus*, 397-8

[237] The Antipope Clement III stayed a choice, as did Urban's successor, Paschal II.

[238] Smith, 95; Loyn, 105. The historiography of this sequence of events is complicated. Reason and motive have been contended over the centuries. Our purposes need only concern that a change in power occurred. For more information concerning details see; Hollister's *Henry I*, Barlow's *William Rufus*, and other works.

[239] The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records the events of, and following Anselm's return to England, "The before Michaelmas Anselm archbishop of Canterbury [sic] came to this land; king Henry having sent for him by the advice of his witan, because he had left the country on account of the injustice done him by king William. And soon afterwards the king took for his wife Maud the daughter of Malcolm king of Scotland and of the good queen Margaret king Edward's kinswoman, of the true royal line of England; and on Martinmas day she was given to him with great pomp at Westminster, and archbishop Anselm wedded her to Henry, and afterwards consecrated her as queen." 477.

[240] Hollister, *Henry I*, 2. Hollister supposes the connection to Abelard, suggesting he may have worked in Henry's service.

[241] *Ibid*, 3.

contemporaries."[242] William of Malmesbury wrote, "His eloquence was rather unpremeditated than laboured; not rabid, but deliberate."[243] From this evidence, we see that the King of the English may well have had more in common with monks from France and popes from Italy than with those spatially closest to him.

Henry's inclusion in this group is perhaps best captured in his coronation charter.[244] Traditionally an oral oath, for the first time it appeared in writing.[245] In addition to reflecting the renaissance's growing understanding of the importance of writing, it rectified some of Rufus' most blatant abuses. Foremost among these was the treatment of the medieval church. At first, Henry strove to strengthen the relationship between the monarchy and the medieval church. Anselm convened councils, was able to instill church reforms, and even had Henry's support, however new tensions soon followed.

Henry demanded Anselm perform him homage, but Anselm refused. [246] Additionally, the problems of lay investiture manifested in England. To assert his authority, Henry translated bishops without first conferring with Rome. [247] In response, Pope Paschal II, Urban's successor, excommunicated these bishops. Enraged, Henry sent Anselm, who openly supported the pope, into exile. Henry invested more bishops whom Paschal

---

[242] Hollister, *Henry I*, 132.

[243] William of Malmesbury, *William of Malmesbury's Chronicle of the Kings of England*, ed., and trans. J.A. Giles (London: Bell & Daldy, 6 York Street, Covent Garden, and 186 Fleet Street. 1866), 447.

[244] The ramifications of this document were certainly unintentional. In its own time, it attempted to correct the foreseeable abuses from Rufus' reign. The precedence it established however, echoed in similar promulgations of future monarchs like Stephen, and Henry II, and used to support the Magna Carta, had a profound effect on English constitutional history.

[245] Hollister, *Henry I*, 109.

[246] Smith, 95, Loyn, 106. One of the customs of feudal society had been for religious figures who held lands to perform homage and fealty to the lay individuals who held those lands.[246] This ritual appeared to show the subservience of the medieval church. For the monarchy, however; it guaranteed an important source of income

[247] Translation in this sense refers to the moving of bishops from one see to another.

excommunicated.[248] By 1105, the situation had developed to the point that Anselm himself was threatening to excommunicate Henry, forcing a compromise.[249] In a letter to Henry, Paschal wrote, "recall your pastor, recall your father; and if, what we do not imagine, he hath in anything conducted himself harshly towards you, and hath opposed the investitures, we will mediate according to your pleasure, as far as God permits."[250] Paschal's willingness to work with Henry shows that he also needed Henry's political support in ongoing papal schism. This cooperation demonstrates that compromise and not confrontation was key. Eventually, Anselm returned to England on the condition that lay investiture would stop. As a result, the excommunications were lifted and clerics continued to perform homage.[251]

In Sum

The relationship between the nascent state and the medieval church in Anselm's archiepiscopate is complicated. Although at times dramatic, each of his conflicts was resolved by reconciliation during his lifetime. According to Hollister, "his preference was for teamwork between king and primate"[252] and "he was all ready to compromise."[253] Hollister framed the dispute between Anselm and Henry as conflicting concerns of stewardship with each most interested in protecting the rights of his institution. The personalities of the monarchs and Anselm show that cooperation was certainly possible and that it was only when tempers flew that exile occurred. A quote attributed to Rufus captures

[248] Smith, 95-96. Curiously the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* glosses over this event entirely. Rather, Anselm's trip to Rome is done in full support of the king (479). Something happened to Anselm however, as he disappears form the *Chronicle* for some time. In 1109, he reappears in mention of his death (482).
[249] Smith, 96.
[250] Malmesbury, 449.
[251] *Ibid*, 451.
[252] Hollister, *Henry I*, 122.
[253] *Ibid*, 123.

this "Your predecessor would never have dared to talk in this to my father; and I will do nothing for you."[254] Whether authentic or not, this quote, spat in the heat of an argument over Anselm's trip to Rome, is not hard to imagine. Although captivating, it is important to remember the distinction between the man and his office in instances such as these.

RALPH d'ESCURES [b. mid-eleventh century – d. 1122: Office from 1114 – 1122]

The Twelfth Century Renaissance

The see remained vacant for nearly five years following Anselm's death.[255] An election was held to fill the post. This resulted in a compromise between Henry, the bishops, and the Canterbury chapter. England had ended the problem of lay investiture by holding an election because Henry did not fill the vacancy himself. Henry's candidate, Faritius, was a physician and administrator.[256] He was celebrated for his education and a staunch supporter of church reform.[257] Although a close friend of Henry's, Faritius' nomination also speaks to a degree about Henry himself and evokes his connection to the renaissance's *intelligentsia*. Those opposed to Faritius argued that he was Italian and advocated instead for a Norman.[258] It seems that they were more concerned about Faritius' support of reform. The Norman was appointed. The fact that both the Norman and Italian were essentially foreigners speaks to the transnational character of the office by this period.

The Norman, Ralph D'Escures was an acquaintance of Anselm's; he studied at Bec's monastic school, Anselm attended his consecration as the Abbot of St. Martin's, and upon

---

[254] Quoted in Barlow, *William Rufus*. 329.

[255] Hollister, *Henry I*, 235.

[256] Jean Truax, *Archbishops Ralph D'Escures, William of Corbeil, and Theobald of Bec: Heirs of Anselm and Ancestors of Becket*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012. 35.

[257] *Ibid.*

[258] Truax 35; Hollister, *Henry I*, 235; Edward J Kealey, *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972), 127-128.

Anselm's ascension as Archbishop, joined his household. At the time of his appointment to Canterbury, d'Escures was the Bishop of Rochester.[259] D'Escures' archiepiscopate was considerably shorter than either Lanfranc's or Anselm's, lasting for only eight years. Much of this was spent in conflict with the medieval church rather than with the monarch, by whom he was seen at worst as a nuisance, because he kept getting Henry in trouble with the papacy.

York-Canterbury Affects Relationships between the King and Popes

D'Escures problems started as soon as he was elected. Paschal II was hesitant to approve him because d'Escures was already the Bishop of Rochester at the time and thus, from the papal perspective, the appointment appeared to be another lay translation. When Paschal deployed a legate to send d'Escures pallium, the Pope used the opportunity to slap Henry with several charges. Henry was accused of blocking papal primacy, translating his bishops, and not allowing communication or appeals to Rome.[260] Henry forestalled the issue rather than confront it, and the matter proved inconclusive with the death of Paschal II.[261]

In addition to these problems, d'Escures archiepiscopate became consumed by the York-Canterbury dispute. Henry I supported the election of Thurstan of Bayeux for the Archbishop of York. D'Escures demanded an oath of obedience, which Bayeux resisted. Although Henry would not allow D'Escures to appeal to Rome, Paschal II interfered anyway, ruling for Bayeux. Anselm won the issue of primacy due to his celebrity.[262] By this

[259] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 484.
[260] Hollister, *Henry I*, 240. None of this is mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In 1115, Paschal sent the pallium to D'Escures at Canterbury (485).
[261] Hollister, *Henry I*, 242.
[262] Hollister, *Henry I*¸ 242.

phase of the church's reforms, there was a concerted effort to centralize papal supremacy. It was more effective from the papacy's perspective if Canterbury and York both answered to the papacy directly, rather than depending on Canterbury's mediation.

When Paschal died in 1118, the matter had not been resolved. Nor had it been by the next pontificate. In late 1119, in a twist, Bayeux went to be consecrated by Pope Calixtus II at the Council of Reims without gaining Henry's permission.[263] Furious, Henry banished Bayeux from England.[264] Like Anselm, Bayeux had appealed to papacy without the monarch's permission. The international character of the dispute during d'Escures's tenure is significant. Nominally a local dispute in England, the level of papal interference made it an issue for the medieval church. When Calixtus consecrated Bayeux at Rheims, the papacy was still in the midst of schism from the Investiture Controversy.[265]

A curious event occurred because of Bayeux's consecration – Henry met Calixtus face-to-face. Hollister uses several primary sources to show that the meeting was cordial. Although the resolution of the primacy issue was inconclusive, the efforts demonstrate a principal factor in the relationship between the pope and king. The pope needed Henry's support in the schism against the German Emperor, Henry's nephew. To ensure his support, Calixtus issued two papal bulls and he threatened England with an interdict if they were not followed. The first formally ended the York-Canterbury dispute, as it granted York's autonomy. The other allowed Bayeux to return to England.[266]

---

[263] Hollister, *Henry I*, 266-273.

[264] Much of this is recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, including the succession of popes (*Chronicle*, 487-488). Specific details, such as the Council of Rheims, have been drawn from broader sources, notably Hollister's *Henry I*.

[265] Hollister, *Henry I*, 267. It was also at Rheims where a council was held to resolve the ongoing war between Henry and his barons and the French and claimants to the English throne. Henry did not attend, but Louis VI did.

[266] The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* speaks broadly of reconciliation. It does mention that D'Escures was displeased with the outcome (488).

In 1119, d'Escures suffered a stroke that left him partially paralyzed.[267] He remained active in politics, including several key monarchical events surrounding the *White Ship* catastrophe.[268] Because Henry's only legitimate son died in the incident, he needed to remarry.[269] D'Escures, unable to perform the marriage himself, needed to appoint a surrogate. Among the contenders was Bishop Roger of Salisbury. Salisbury held considerable influence with Henry. In an expression of agency, however, D'Escures chose a different bishop and effectively checked Salisbury. D'Escures died in late 1122.[270]

Besieged by conflicts, D'Escures's archiepiscopate was different than either Lanfranc's or Anselm's. D'Escures's efforts at reform were at best minimal and he convened no councils.[271] His tenure is most notable for the level of papal interference he brought on Henry evoking the triangular relationship between the archiepiscopacy, monarchy, and papacy. The earlier qualities of the office are evident during d'Escures's administration. His connection to Bec and Anselm certainly played a role in his nomination and he was also noted for his education.[272] The York-Canterbury dispute had reached the height of its pettiness, evoking a paradox of a local English issue attracting universal attention.

---

[267] Hollister, *Henry I*, 378.

[268] The *White Ship* incident is a significant event in English history. In 1120, following a decisive battle against the French, Henry and his men needed to return to England. While crossing the Channel, disaster struck. Off the coast of Normandy, the *White Ship* crashed. Over a hundred people died including Henry's male heir. Henry's only other legitimate child, Matilda, was now next in line for the throne.

[269] Hollister, *Henry I*, 281.

[270] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 489.

[271] Hollister, *Henry I*, 378.

[272] Truax, 34.

WILLIAM DE CORBEIL [c. 1070 – d. 1136: Office from 1123 – 1136]

The Twelfth Century Renaissance

The First Lateran Council (1123) was convoked a high council of the medieval church to ratify the Concordat of Worms from a year earlier. According to Hollister, this put pressure on Henry to fill the see of Canterbury.[273] Henry held another election. The electors – England's bishops, abbots, Canterbury's cathedral chapter, and the barons, were split into two groups: those who supported a monk, and those who did not. These competing factions reflect a general shift in the entire medieval church. Those against choosing a monk, led by Salisbury, won Henry's support. They appointed William De Corbeil. He was the first canon to hold the office. [274]

De Corbeil had been d'Escures' clerk and was associated with him since at least 1104.[275] He also had ties to Anselm.[276] Before becoming a canon, he studied at the famous cathedral school of Laon, where the schoolmaster was infamous for his conflicts with Abelard.[277] Therefore, from his education, to his succeeding a monk, De Corbeil reflects the broader trend experienced throughout the medieval church during the Twelfth Century Renaissance.

Politics and Relationships: Roger of Salisbury, Henry, and the Papacy

Historians have argued that Henry's relationship with the Bishop Roger of Salisbury overshadowed the traditional connection between King and Canterbury during De Corbeil's

[273] Hollister, *Henry I*, 287.
[274] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 490; Hollister, *Henry I*, 287-288, 333.
[275] Loyn, 108; Truax, 77.
[276] Truax,77; Kealey, 132
[277] Truax, 77.

tenure. Salisbury's role has been described as "omnipresent"[278] dwarfing De Corbeil. Hollister describes Salisbury as "the foremost figure in Henry's English government."[279] A contemporary historian, William of Malmesbury wrote, "Having experienced his ability after Henry became king he made Roger first his chancellor and then a bishop. The able discharge of his episcopal functions gave rise to hope that he might be deserving of a higher office."[280] Such a position put him in both the *sacerdotium* and the *regnum*. While this certainly speaks to his credibility as a politician, it also evokes the intermingling of church and state during this period. Evidence for this can be seen by Salisbury's reputation as a bishop, and his skill as a civil servant – serving as the Justiciar of England and being credited for founding the Exchequer.[281] Salisbury would act as a model for future monarchs attempting to manage both spheres.

In spite of Salisbury's prominence, Henry maintained a functional relationship with De Corbeil. When the papacy ruptured in schism following the Double Election of 1130, Henry, by Bernard's influence and to the dismay of England's bishops, recognized Innocent II within months.[282] This is significant because in previous papal schisms the English monarchs had been more reluctant to acknowledge a pope preferring to play politics instead. Like d'Escures, the York-Canterbury dispute consumed De Corbeil and traditional conflicts between reform and custom were set aside. Despite this functional relationship, one problem was to pitch England into a political instability for nearly twenty years.

---

[278] David Crouch, *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154* (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000), 93.

[279] Hollister, *Henry I*, 23.

[280] William of Malmesbury, *G.R.*, 2:483-484, quoted in Kealey.

[281] Richard Fitz Nigel, *The Dialogue of the Exchequer*, quoted in Crouch, 36.

[282] Kealey, 171.

Unable to secure a male heir, Henry ensured his daughter Matilda's succession to the throne by making England's lords swear an oath, including De Corbeil. Henry's advisors, however, Salisbury and the Bishop Henry of Winchester amongst them, chose Henry's nephew, Stephen of Boulogne, instead. [283] The advisors persuaded De Corbeil to break his oath and throw the church's support behind Stephen. In exchange, Stephen continued to support Innocent II and made several concessions to the church, which were in line with the First Lateran Council. One, continued the autonomy of ecclesiastical courts and their law. Significantly, this kept England in line with universal church policy. Stephen retained his customary rights as king. De Corbeil did not live to see the full transition of this power as he died a year later.[284]

The York-Canterbury Dispute Becomes Transnational

Resistance to De Corbeil's election stretched from the English feudal nobles to the papal legate, as all agreed that a canon should not rule monks.[285] The matter was further complicated when the Archbishop of York offered to consecrate Canterbury, upon which the latter demanded an oath of obedience, but the former refused.[286] Canterbury's suffragan bishops consecrated De Corbeil at the *curia regis*, drawing suspicion from the papacy.[287] Salisbury supported De Corbeil however and persuaded Henry to stay the election. It took a combined effort from Henry I and the Holy Roman Emperor Henry V to convince Calixtus

[283] Kealey, 156-157; Smith, 102. Opposition to Henry's daughter Matilda concerned her marriages rather than her gender. Her first spouse was the Holy Roman Emperor Henry V, earning her the title 'Empress.' Her second marriage was to Geoffrey of Anjou, her husband at the time of Henry's death. The Angevins were a formidable enemy of the Normans, making Stephen the more attractive option.

[284] Crouch, 37, 46, 63, 299.

[285] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 491.

[286] Hollister, *Henry I*, 288-289.

[287] *Ibid*.

of the election's validity, bringing the papacy and empire into contention less than a year after the Concordat of Worms (1122). The York-Canterbury had become an international concern.[288]

De Corbeil's archiepiscopate presents a skewed perspective of the traditional primacy dispute. Salisbury held the real power and the ongoing church reforms sought to implement papal authority. Legatine councils were held to bring England more strongly under papal jurisdiction, but to little effect. Because of these factors, when problems arose between the Archbishops of York and Canterbury, they reached their own compromise.[289] A humorous anecdote involving Henry I speaks to other resistance to the papacy in England during De Corbeil's tenure. In 1129, one of the issues stressed was the banning of concubines from priests' households, something the papacy had been trying to implement since the Gregorian Reforms.[290] Henry I, who was presiding over the council, announced that the practice would be permitted so long as the guilty clergy paid a fine to the royal treasury.[291] These incidents reflect the jockeying relationship between England and the papacy.

THEOBALD OF BEC [c. 1090 – d. 1161: Office from 1138 – 1161]

The Twelfth Century Renaissance

Theobald was not noted for his education, but his household was, and it had a significant connection to the Twelfth Century Renaissance.[292] Barlow argued that it

---

[288] Hollister, *Henry I*, 288-289. The Emperor was Henry's son-in-law at this time.
[289] Kealey, 136.
[290] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* states that William convened this council and that it was ineffective (498-499).
[291] Hollister, *Henry I*, 288-289.
[292] Crouch, 92.

resembled a school, although it was not formally one.[293] The household produced six bishops and three archbishops, Thomas Becket and John of Salisbury among them.[294] Becket was also shaped by the Archbishop's patronage. John, wrote some of his most profound works while Theobald's secretary.[295] John's writings nostalgically capture the household's atmosphere, which Barlow describes as "What with philosophic speculations, legal business, services to one another, literary seminars and useful but jolly arguments, there had never been a dull moment and the days had flashed by."[296] This vignette captures the comradery and bond amongst a group of the transnational *intelligentsia*.

Theobald's household attracted secular figures as well, such as Roger Vacarius, an Italian jurist trained at Bologna. Frank Barlow writes, "He [Vacarius] and John of Salisbury were exponents of the most up-to-date and modish subjects of the most fashionable schools in the West, men who knew everyone of importance who had passed through Paris or Bologna, enormous fishes in a rather small provincial pool."[297] Such a celebrated presence would have undoubtedly had an effect similar to that of Lanfranc and Anselm concerning education. After his time with the archbishop, Vacarius taught at Oxford and was the first to teach Roman Law in England. At Oxford, he wrote a nine-volume gloss of the *Codex Justinianus*. He attracted throngs of students and was immensely popular for his writings and lectures. Soon, he attracted the hostile attention of King Stephen, who attempted to prevent his teaching and destroy his writing. Stephen also targeted Vacarius' pupils in

---

[293] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 31.

[294] For further discussion of the Archbishop's household see Frank Barlow's *Thomas Becket*.

[295] At Reims, John was introduced by Bernard to Theobald of Bec, and soon after that became his secretary. As Theobald's secretary, John often traveled to Rome and thus established a relationship between him and Adrian. He played an active part in Becket's conflicts with Henry, until 1163 when Henry banished him to France. Following the Becket controversy, he was allowed to return to England, in preparation for Becket's return. When Becket was killed in 1170, John was at Canterbury.

[296] *Ibid.*

[297] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 31.

Theobald's household. After Stephen's death, Vacarius' popularity resumed. These examples reflect Theobald's household as an important conduit of the Twelfth Century Renaissance in England.

Politics and the Relationships between Church and State: Henry, Stephen, and the Angevins

Historian Christopher N.L. Brooke has argued that "Theobald has been strangely underestimated by most historians; yet there can be no doubt of his towering achievement."[298] After De Corbeil's death, political instability kept the see from being filled.[299] Bishop Henry of Winchester and Stephen's brother, had been unable to obtain papal permission for translation.[300] In late 1138 a papal legate was sent to England to convene a council to elect a new archbishop.[301] Whereas the past two elections had been contentious for religious reasons, Theobald's had political dimensions.[302] Winchester was given legatine powers as a compromise.

Winchester convened a council to hear Salisbury's case shortly thereafter. Stephen had deposed Salisbury as a power move, dissociating himself with the previous administration, and tried him in a royal court.[303] Winchester as a bishop, Salisbury held the benefit of clergy and was answerable only to ecclesiastical courts.[304] In the growing problem of overlapping jurisdictions, this is a critical midpoint between William's writ and the

[298] Brooke, "Adrian IV and John of Salisbury" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope*, 8.

[299] The political events surrounding Stephen's reign have traditionally been termed the Anarchy. Only beginning in the 1970s did historians begin to turn away from the term. For more information, see; *The Reign of King Stephen: 1135-1154* (particularly the introduction which includes a historiography of the term) by David Crouch. .

[300] Keaney, 171; Crouch, 63.

[301] Keaney, 170.

[302] Scholars agree that Theobald's election was to appease his patrons and win Stephen political allies. For more on this see Crouch.

[303] Smith, 104.

[304] Smith, 104.

Becket controversy. Furthermore, this event also fractured the united front of the bishops as some supported Winchester while others backed Stephen. Under Theobald, the church had to retain both its unity and its relationship with the state. Theobald looked to the papacy for help.[305]

The medieval church held powerful influence during this period and both Theobald and Winchester wanted to maintain it. A primary source describes Theobald as, "great and praiseworthy in all things, expert in both secular and ecclesiastical matters."[306] His ability was useful during the events of Stephen's reign. Matilda refused to surrender her claim to the throne upon Stephen's coronation. She argued the magnates had sworn to uphold her succession. She, in alliance with the King of Scotland, her spouse, and a half-brother, waged war on Stephen. After 1141, when it looked like Matilda had the upper hand, Stephen's allies began switching sides, including Winchester and Theobald. Shortly after, the English church held a council deposing Stephen and crowning Matilda. Following some military success for Stephen, however, the church switched sides again and Theobald crowned Stephen within the same year. The political situation stagnated over the next decade.[307] Meanwhile, Winchester's legatine powers lapsed with the death of Innocent II in 1143.[308]

---

[305] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 33.

[306] Roger of Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 3-12; Staunton, 45.

[307] Truax, 119-121

[308] Innocent's successor Celestine II would not renew them. Celestine's successor, Lucius II, however, turned the discussion to creating an archiepiscopal see. Although Lucius died before anything could come of this. This idea is intriguing because it shows the extent that the papacy was willing to appease Winchester, who had an influence in English politics. Moreover, it also speaks to further efforts at asserting papal primacy. Lucius' successor, Eugenius, quashed all hope for Winchester. Truax argued that this was because Eugenius was pro-Angevin (Truax, 124).

He was unable to renew them. Instead, at Bernard's prompting, they were granted to Theobald by Eugenius.[309]

By the 1150s the political instability had made England weary. [310] Theobald was at odds with Stephen over the problem of succession because the papacy told Theobald not to acknowledge Stephen's son as the heir. Stephen sent Theobald into exile.[311] It did not last long, however; Matilda's son, Henry of Anjou, successfully invaded England, forcing Stephen to capitulate. Theobald worked out a compromise with the state to solve the problem of succession.[312] Throughout the instability of Stephen's reign, the relationship between the nascent state and the medieval church was key. The church's support of Stephen legitimated his kingship. Theobald and Winchester were crucial to in the succession, echoing the medieval church's role in the Norman Conquest. The medieval English Church was instrumental in the transference of power to the Angevins.[313]

Barlow sums up Theobald's archiepiscopate: "Theobald had recovered from a most unfavorable start which was in no way his own making… through patient diplomacy, perseverance, sometimes dignified resistance to superiors and often overbearing behavior to inferior authorities."[314] This character allowed him to navigate relationships within the English Church and the nascent state. Church issues were secondary to political matters during Theobald's archiepiscopate. They were however, still problematic. In 1154, the

[309] Truax, 124; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 36. Barlow suggests Becket may have also had a role, as he was at the *curia* at this time. While possible, it seems that Bernard would have carried much more weight in the matter.

[310] Truax, 124.

[311] Smith, 106.

[312] Smith, 106; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 41, The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 506-507.

[313] William Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 17-26; Staunton, 48.

[314] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 39.

Archbishop of York was poisoned.[315] The accused, Osbert de Bayeux, one of York's archdeacons, was to be tried before the king in the royal court. However, Stephen's death disrupted this, and the trial was forestalled. Proceedings resumed in 1156, but this time within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, rather than royal. Winchester had posed a unique threat to Canterbury's primacy, forcing Theobald to compromise with him. Theobald survived the political instability of Stephen's reign by using the church's support for political ends. At the same time, Theobald cooperated with the Angevins and was necessary for resolving the problem of succession.

York-Canterbury Dispute Continues to be Transnational

During Theobald's archiepiscopate, the York-Canterbury dispute had become truly transnational. In 1140 Thurstan of York died.[316] Winchester's legatine powers put him in charge of appointments, which had to be approved by Innocent II. Bernard of Clairvaux was critical of Winchester's choice causing Innocent to forestall the consecration.[317] Winchester advocated for William of York, a relative, to hold the see, who did so despite protestations. Bernard wanted a Cistercian, Henry Murdac

The issue was finally resolved at the Council of Rheims convened by Eugenius in 1148. In attendance were Bernard and a retinue of Cistercians, Abbot Suger, and Theobald and his friend Gilbert Foliot, who had ignored Stephen's demand that they not attend.[318] The

[315] William of York, Stephen's choice for Archbishop of York, who had suffered the criticism of Bernard for so long, succeeded Bernard's choice on the latter's death. One primary source, written by a 'Roger of Pontigny' states that William died peaceably. Staunton explicates that poison is an alternative interpretation. Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 3-12; Staunton, 46.

[316] Crouch, 309-310.

[317] *Ibid*.

[318] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 34-35; Theobald's relationship with Stephen affected both the church and state. Because in attending Rheims he had disobeyed the king's command, Stephen exiled Theobald. In

Abbot of Saint-Ruf, the future Adrian IV, was also there.[319] Bernard introduced Theobald to his friend John of Salisbury who became Theobald's clerk.[320] Becket was amongst the archbishop's retinue.[321] At Rheims, William of York was ousted, and Henry Murdac appointed. York was again granted autonomy from Canterbury. Theoretically, the issue was resolved, but there would be no peace in York for some time. Murdac died in 1153 and was succeeded by the same William of York[322] York died the next year.[323] Theobald used the vacancy for a deft political move, and filled the post with Roger de Pont l'Évêque, the archdeacon of Canterbury.[324] This brought an unusual harmony between the two sees. It also brought a full conclusion to Theobald's earlier problems with York. At the same time, it sowed seeds of conflict for Becket who clashed with Pont l'Évêque when they were in Theobald's household.[325]

Theobald's most prominent protégés reflect the success of his archiepiscopate. In addition to planting one archdeacon at the see of York, Theobald planted another, Thomas Becket, in the chancellorship. Using John of Salisbury's letters as evidence, Brooke argues, "Theobald attempted to manage Henry most effectively by planting his archdeacon, Thomas Becket, on him as royal chancellor. John's letters give us a vivid insight into the difficulties and ambiguities of Becket's position. But, there is no doubt that in the main Theobald was successful."[326] Brooke suggests that John played a similar role in England's relationship

---

response, England was placed under interdict. Although this was largely ignored, it established a powerful precedent.

[319] Christoph Egger, "The Canon Regular: Saint-Ruf in Context" in *Adrian IV, the English Pope,* 25.

[320] As per Barlow's *Thomas Becket*, it appears that John was already in Theobald's service. Other sources argue the above.

[321] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 35.

[322] The only archbishop to hold two separate tenures at the see.

[323] Of suspected poisoning.

[324] Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 3-12; Staunton, 47.

[325] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 38.

[326] Brooke, "Adrian IV and John of Salisbury", *Adrian IV, the English Pope,* 9-11.

with the papacy during Adrian's pontificate. John and Becket represent Theobald's successful management of both the church and state. The fact that some perceived John as the pope's man, and Theobald as the king's, speaks to the fluidity in this relationship.[327] John's position also reflects the maturation of England's relationship with the papacy, which was expressly different than it had been under the earlier Norman monarchs.

Conclusion

The relationship between church and state, as expressed by these Norman kings of England and the Archbishops of Canterbury, was clearly not in crisis. Towering figures such as Lanfranc and Anselm established education as a foremost quality of the Archbishop of Canterbury. D'Escures and De Corbeil, although not of the same caliber, were also noted for their studies. Theobald's household had the renown of a school. Because society's structure, Archbishops of Canterbury were heavily involved in political events. Personally, their relationships with monarchs could be explosive, but their professional relationships never became a crisis as conflict was always resolved through compromise. Finally, the York-Canterbury dispute's growth over the period required more and more frequent papal intervention, thus elucidating the triangular relationship between the papacy, the monarchy, and the archiepiscopacy. By Theobald's tenure, the papacy's presence loomed much larger in English affairs than it ever had. When schism broke out in 1159, Theobald waited for Henry's decision before supporting a side. Alexander was involved in English affairs like no pope before him, but it could not have been without his predecessors.

[327] Brooke, "Adrian IV and John of Salisbury", *Adrian IV, the English Pope,* 9-11..

The Becket Controversy

Scholarship focusing on Alexander's role in the Becket controversy fits three broad categories. One, reflected by Pennington, argues Alexander had more important problems.[328] The second, captured by Munz, claims that Alexander took no interest because of Becket's positions.[329] The third, echoed by Baldwin, reasons that schism limited Alexander's course of action.[330] Primary source evidence suggests that the Becket controversy was more important to Alexander than these interpretations let on. Undoubtedly the schism was a significant event in Alexander's pontificate, but the Becket controversy held a reciprocal relationship with the schism in a way that necessitated Alexander's attention.

As we have seen, although the papal schism pitted a pope against an emperor, it was chiefly a political conflict and thus hardly a crisis of church and state. The Becket controversy, although more nuanced, was not one either. Alexander had to manage secular and ecclesiastic rulers. On the one side were Henry, and to a lesser degree Louis, while on the other side, were Becket and the English bishops. The bishops best reflect the nuances in Alexander's action, as some bishops supported Henry and others Becket. Alexander's role in the controversy shows the difficulties of working with Becket. For political reasons, he had

[328] According Kenneth Pennington, "The Becket controversy, a centerpiece of English historiography of the twelfth century, may not have seemed as important from the perspective of Rome." To support this claim, Pennington notes that Boso's biography of Alexander does not mention Becket until his murder. Pennington, 118.

[329] Munz argues, "Alexander simply found Becket's studious attempt to lift the controversy to a high doctrinal level unattractive and uninteresting as well as imprudent. His reluctance to support Becket was partially because he simply considered Becket's high-minded stance unrealistic and was out of sympathy with it" (Munz, *Alexander III*, 22)

[330] Baldwin's offer another position. He argues "It [the schism] seriously limited, for example, the pope's freedom of action in handling the controversy between King Henry II of not disrupt the functioning of the papal government. This interpretation suggests that Alexander would have played a more dramatic role in the controversy than the other two interpretations (Baldwin 43).

to encourage and support Becket, and he also had to keep him from doing anything too rash and unfettered.

Alexander's course is best reflected in his correspondence with the Archbishop. They exchanged nearly seventy letters over the course of Becket's archiepiscopate. The letters cover several topics: day-to-day functions of the church, controversy, and schism, which were dealt with in a matter-of-fact fashion, reflecting the mundane adjustments of integrated institutions. Before discussing these letters we must first turn our attention to the controversy itself as to understand its actors, their motives, and how Alexander fits into this framework.

Thomas Becket and Henry of Anjou

Most biographies and hagiographies about Becket emphasize his formative education. One ties him to the Twelfth Century Renaissance particularly well. It reads,

> When the young Thomas had with humility and true obedience covered all the teaching that he could in his parents' house, he went to school for the purpose of higher study… Because the Holy Book has [sic] so much to teach him, in time he fully and fairly comprehended the seven major liberal arts. Therefore he went to school both in England and in France, particularly to the capital city Paris, which has always had the most famous school as regards both scholars and learning.[331]

Although embellished, the mere association of Becket and the liberal arts is important because it illustrates how he was perceived both in education and legacy. The source itself is an Icelandic saga, originally written in the vernacular. Moreover, it references the liberal arts without explaining what they are, they were therefore well known enough in Iceland. This excerpt is also significant as it evokes the transnational nature of the renaissance.

[331] *Thomas Saga* 1. 28-40. Language: Old Icelandic. trans. Haki Antonson; Staunton, 42.

Becket also attended the school at Merton in 1130, which was run by secular canons.[332] Duggan argues that Becket saw his education as, "an employable commodity", thus distinguishing him from John of Salisbury, who was by definition a scholar.[333] Before entering Theobald's household, Thomas worked as a banker's clerk in London. He joined the Archbishop's service in 1145.[334] There, Becket was often part of the entourage to the papal *curia,* where he was exposed to the workings of international relations.[335] Theobald furthered Becket's development by giving him a year's leave to study at Bologna where he studied Roman and canon law.[336] When the archdeacon of Canterbury, Roger de Pont l'Évêque, became the Archbishop of York, Thomas filled the vacancy. Barlow argues,

> As Theobald's confidential agent he knew Canterbury and the whole English church, its personnel and institutions, inside out; and, through his association with John of Salisbury and Vacarius and his diplomatic missions to the papal curia, he had acquired not only a good knowledge of the Western church at large but also of its mainspring, the papal household.[337]

As the Archdeacon of Canterbury, Becket became a principal agent of the English medieval church because, further exposing him to the workings of chruch and state.

Following Henry's coronation by Theobald in 1154, Becket was installed as Henry's chancellor.[338] Traditionally, scholars argue Theobald's influence led to Becket's

---

[332] Duggan, *Thomas Becket*, 9.

[333] *Ibid*, 12.

[334] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 27. Barlow places him in London during the political drama of the early 1140s.

[335] Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 3-12"; Staunton, 46; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 36, 39

[336] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 37-39. This detail comes from John of Salisbury, of whom Barlow is dubious.

[337] *Ibid.*

[338] The role of chancellor is described by William Fitzstephen as follows, "The chancellor of England is considered second in rank in the realm only to the king. He holds the other part of the king's seal, with which he seals his own orders. He has responsibility and care of the king's chapel, and maintains whatever vacant archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbacies and baronies fall into the king's hands. He attends all the king's councils to which he does not even require a summons. All documents are sealed by his clerks, the royal seal-keepers, and everything is carried out according to his advice. Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 17-26; Staunton, 48.

appointment while others sources suggest Winchester. [339] This difference is significant because it speaks to Theobald's continued cooperation with Henry's administration.[340] Their choice, Becket was effectively a product of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. He attended the finest schools, understood the mechanisms of the *sacerdotium*, and was a member of the *intelligentsia*. As chancellor, Becket was always at Henry's side as he traveled throughout the Angevin Commonwealth. Through his experience, he learned the function of secular government to complement his education. [341] Becket and Henry worked together for nearly eight years. Their friendship has been the subject and influence of drama and the source of debate among historians.[342] When Theobald died in 1161, Henry suggested Becket for the position, who was not even a priest. After securing support, Thomas Becket was elected Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162.[343] For six months, he was both chancellor and archbishop, much to Henry's pleasure. For Henry, here was an opportunity to control both the *sacerdotium* and *regnum* with the help of his friend. Becket easily could have taken a similar course as Bishop Roger of Salisbury. Becket had other plans.

Within six months of his consecration, Becket resigned the chancellorship, dashing Henry's hopes of controlling the church.[344] As archbishop, Becket saw himself as a defender of the church's rights. In contrast, Henry sought to limit the papal interference that had

---

[339] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 42.

[340] Arnulf, the Bishop of Lisieux, was the logical choice for the post. In Normandy, he was one of Henry's chief advisors. He was also a towering intellectual (Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 42). Staunton argues that he lost royal favor due his support of Alexander before Henry had officially decided (Staunton, 85).

[341] The idea of the Angevin Commonwealth comes from W.L. Warren's *Henry II*. As the Dukes of Normandy, the Norman monarchs, held vast lands on the continent as well as England.

[342] The friendship between Henry and Becket has been the subject of works of fiction and nonfiction. It is even present in primary documents. William Fitzstephen notes, "Never in Christian times were there two greater friends, more of one mind" William Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 17-26; Staunton, 53.

[343] Edward Grim, *MTB* 2. 365-6 and "Herbert of Bosham, *MTB* 3. 180-1; Staunton, 59-62; Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, 42-48.

[344] Duggan, *Thomas Becket*, 30-32.

grown over Stephen's reign, restoring it to the time of his grandfather, Henry I.[345] It is at this juncture that Alexander enters the scene. In 1163, envoys were sent to Alexander, who was residing in Montpellier on account of the schism, to receive Becket's pallium. He confirmed Becket's appointment.[346] Shortly after, Becket attended the Council of Tours. There, England and France reaffirmed Alexander's legitimacy and Alexander gave special accolades to Becket.[347] This undoubtedly shaped Becket's growing ideas of reform, and his ongoing a conversion experience, which led to conflict on his return to England.[348]

Henry and Becket's first conflict was over taxes at the Council of Woodstock (1163). Becket openly opposed Henry's idea to use them for his own purposes.[349] Then, the issue changed to the problem of criminous clerks. Henry wanted the right to try clerks in royal courts after ecclesiastical courts had pronounced judgment. Becket, supported by the English bishops, argued that canon law overrode custom, and the church's methods were sufficient.[350] Henry was furious.[351] His persistence split the unity of the bishops, with Theobald's friend Gilbert Foliot championing the monarchy's cause. Both sides appealed to Alexander, but he remained neutral.

Later that year, Henry convened the Council of Westminster (1163) to resolve another dispute between the Archbishops of York and Canterbury. Both sides appealed to Alexander to settle the conflict of Canterbury's primacy and the council's was inconclusive. [352] Henry again to criminous clerks. The following is attributed to him,

---

[345] Warren, 219.
[346] Bosham, *MTB* 3. 185-6, 187-9"; Staunton, 66.
[347] Baldwin, 87.
[348] William of Canterbury, *MTB* 1.10-11"; Staunton, 66-67.
[349] Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 22-5; Staunton, 74.
[350] *Ibid.*
[351] Becket was stripped of royal favor.
[352] *Summa Causae Inter Regem et Thomam, MTB* 4.201-5; Staunton, 79; Thomas Becket (London: British Library, MS Cotton Claudius (MCC)), B.ii i.74; Anne Duggan, ed. and trans., *The Correspondence of*

> I am very concerned with peace, and greatly distressed on its behalf, which in my kingdom is disturbed by the wickedness of clerks who perpetrate rapine and theft and often murder. Therefore I seek and desire that by your consent, lord of Canterbury, and that of your fellow bishops, clerks caught in evil-doing or who confess to it be convicted in the ecclesiastical court, and then be transferred immediately to the magistrates of my court, so that stripped of ecclesiastical protection they receive physical punishment.[353]

Becket saw Henry's attempts as a threat to the church's rights, and replied saying,

> "I incurred the offence of the king, on this account my brothers abandoned me, on this account I offended the whole world. What of it? Whether the world likes it or not, in negotiating with a mortal man I will never, God willing, be forgetful of my God and my order."[354]

Henry argued that the he was not usurping the church's rights but instead asserting English custom. Becket was obstinate. This split between Henry and Becket would last for seven years and steadily grow more embittered. The bishops were still split over the issue. Those that supported Henry argued, "We must make allowances for the evil of these times."[355] This evil, although a biblical allusion,[356] clearly refers to the papal schism. The original intention to resolve the York-Canterbury dispute shows how the York-Canterbury dispute began to meld into the problems of the Becket controversy.

These sentiments appear in a letter to Becket from the Bishop of Poitiers. The letter reads,

> You have not only sustained but surpassed the fame of all previous archbishops. The Church was more powerful in their days, and kings more submissive, and there was no schism to distract our holy Roman mother. God will give you courage to

---

Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury 1162-1170 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 1:41-43, #17; and Pope Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.76; Duggan, *Correspondence,* 1:63-65, #23; and Alexander, *MCC*¸ B.ii i.22; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:85, #27.

[353] *Summa Causae Inter Regem et Thomam, MTB* 4.201-5; Staunton, 80.

[354] *Ibid*; Staunton, 81.

[355] *Ibid*; *Ibid.*

[356] Staunton, 81.

> persevere, and reward your perseverance; but it is vain to look to Rome for support against the king.[357]

The bishop's reference to Becket's predecessors shows awareness and the importance of historical memory by anchoring the controversy as a continuation of the problems of the past. The bishop also explicitly refers to the papal schism, arguing that the papacy is too preoccupied with other problems to help Becket. Finally, it also captures the split in the English Church, as he implicitly refers to it by suggesting the church's weakness and the king's stubbornness. From the Bishop's perspective, even in the midst of a papal schism, the English Church should be robust enough to hold out against the monarch, as it had done in the past.

Not long after Westminster, Alexander sent a Cistercian abbot to try and reconcile Henry and Becket. In a letter from Alexander, which we will discuss later, he urges Becket to be more cooperative with Henry because of the instability of the papal schism.[358] Becket agreed to submit to Henry and another council convened.[359] At the Council of Clarendon (1164) the English customs were codified into several constitutions. They included: Royal consent to communicate or travel to Rome, clarifying overlapping jurisdictions between the state and church, and the benefit of clergy. Henry saw them as a compromise between the nascent state's royal prerogatives and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Becket, along with the bishops, grudgingly accepted these terms.[360] After that, Henry sought papal approval for the

---

[357] John, the Bishop of Poiters, "to the Archbishop of Canterbury" (Sens, 1163); in J. A. Giles, ed. and trans, *The life and letters of Thomas à Becket, now first gathered from the contemporary historians* (London: Whitaker and Co., 1846), 1:208, #16.

[358] *Summa Causae Inter Regem et Thomam, MTB* 4.201-5; Staunton, 86.

[359] *Ibid*; *Ibid.*

[360] Becket felt immediate regret for agreeing to the Constitutions. He punished himself - he stopped saying Mass and sought absolution from Alexander. Alexander granted him this absolution but scolded him for his extreme reaction (Alexander, *MCC*¸ B.ii i.22; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:85, #27; Bosham, *MTB* 3. 289-292; Staunton, Baldwin, 92)

Constitutions but was denied.[361] As a concession to Henry, Alexander granted the Archbishop of York legatine powers.[362] On his own volition, Becket reversed his decision to support the Constitutions, provoking Henry's fury.

The *zeitgeist* of the Twelfth Century Renaissance clearly influenced Henry and Becket. The catalytic issue in the Becket controversy concerned the "benefit of clergy." The clergy had the right to be tried in ecclesiastical courts. [363] Henry saw this as an oversight as criminous clerks could use loopholes to their advantage and thus escape proper sentencing. The *Constitutions of Clarendon* concerned the problem of overlapping jurisdictions. As we have seen, the problem of overlapping jurisdictions had plagued legal process since the William I's ordinance. The English monarchy traditionally had a firm grasp on ecclesiastical affairs.[364] Henry sought to remedy this and strove for a continuation that had been disrupted by Stephen's reign.

Becket's policies also reflected the Twelfth Century Renaissance, but in a much more archaic way. He saw himself as a defender of the church's rights, and was just as unwilling to compromise as those of the earliest phases of the church's reforms had been. A letter written by John to Becket in 1163 offers evidence for this. In the letter, John relays

---

[361] The Constitutions contain sixteen clauses. They pertain to overlapping jurisdictions, communications with the papacy, vacancies, and excommunications (Staunton, 91). Of these sixteen clauses, only numbers: two, six, eleven, thirteen, fourteen, and sixteen were not condemned (Staunton, 92-96).

[362] Baldwin, 92.

[363] Baldwin offers a nice explanation of why this was so important, "First, the medieval concept of the 'clergy' signified in the twelfth century not only bishops, priests, and monks, but also a large number of persons who occupied various administrative posts or performed minor religious functions. Many were only deacons or subdeacons or even of a lower order. Ecclesiastical courts normally did not administer any corporal punishment except flogging in rare cases. Degradation from orders and seclusion in a strict monastery were the maximum sentences at the disposal of Church courts" (Baldwin, 88)

[364] Henry also had a penchant for effective administration and was willing to restructure the developing apparatus. A more practical reason was tightening secular authority after Stephen's reign had conceded much of it to the church. These elements are best reflected in Henry's appeals to the time of his grandfather, Henry I. Henry I had exercised a strong hold on the government that not only brought him respect from secular and ecclesiastical members but security. As we have seen, it was also characteristic of the Twelfth Century Renaissance.

clerical support. He is amazed that people have heard the events of Westminster before he has.[365] He reassures Becket that France will always him even if it appears that the pope will not, "The pope, indeed, has hitherto himself opposed us, and is always complaining of the privileges which his predecessor Adrian granted to the see of Canterbury."[366] Here in John's letter, we can see how out of date Becket's zeal has become. John suggests that Alexander is not interested in Becket's problems, and goes on to talk about bribing him for influence and wild rumors that Alexander will soon come to England himself and depose Becket.[367] W.L. Warren writes, "It is this 'Gregorianism' which most clearly demonstrates Becket's limitations as a theologian and his failings as an archbishop. He was a theological dinosaur."[368] Alexander held a different policy. He advocated compromise and in so doing distanced himself from Becket's cause.

By Becket's time, it was apparent to anyone with authority that compromises ultimately resolved conflicts. Older problems, such as the Investiture Controversy, Anselm's exile, and papal schisms, had all been solved through compromise. The middle of the century saw quicker compromise, such as Henry's succession to the throne, and the papacy's treaties with the Germans and the Normans. Unlike Barbarossa and Adrian leading up to the schism, Henry and Becket were much less willing to compromise. More like the struggle between Rufus and Anselm, tempers flew and personalities clashed. In an age characterized by the compromise between church and state, the Becket controversy is the exception that proves the rule. Over the controversy's course, Henry grew increasingly willing to compromise. Becket, however, remained resolute. At Clarendon, Henry promulgated a

---

[365] John of Salisbury, "to Archbishop Becket" (1163); Giles, *The life and letters,* 1:204-207, #15.
[366] *Ibid.*
[367] *Ibid.*
[368] Warren, 514.

series of decrees that Becket first accepted and rejected, shattering his relationship with Henry. It also deepened the split in the English bishops. The basic fact that bishops were on both sides of the demarcation line shows that interests in the matter went beyond the scope of church and state.

At the Council of Northampton (1164) Becket was put on trial before the *curia regis* for a series of offenses. In August, he tried to go to France, which was forbidden by the Constitutions.[369] He was also tried for complaints from when he was Chancellor.[370] Another charge concerned his refusal to hear a plea from John the Marshal, about claims on the archiepiscopal estate. When Becket ignored the plea, John obtained a royal writ, summoning Becket to the *curia regis*, which Becket also ignored.[371] Becket argued that a secular court could not try him and appealed to Rome. Henry's supporters responded saying, "'King William' they said 'who conquered England knew how to control his clerks. He arrested his brother Odo, bishop of Bayeux, who rebelled against him."[372] This reference to William shows just how long the problem of overlapping jurisdictions had plagued England and the power of historical memory. Henry demanded a sentence against Becket but the bishops excused themselves from judgment.[373] This is significant as clearly they did not want to step in between the Archbishop and King. Thus, their actions are important, because it shows that the conflict between Henry and Becket was a clash of personalities. Becket was found guilty and sentenced by secular officials under Henry's command.[374] To avoid punishment, Becket fled to France.

---

[369] Staunton, 99.
[370] Baldwin, 94.
[371] Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 49-68; Staunton, 101.
[372] Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 49-68; Staunton, 112.
[373] Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 49-68; Staunton, 114
[374] Fitzstephen, *MTB* 3. 49-68; Staunton, 114

Both sides again looked to Alexander to solve their case while the pope was in Sens. Henry sent a delegation, and Becket met with him in person. Alexander placated both sides.[375] Louis also tried to arbitrate the problem, but nothing came of it.[376] Instead, Becket remained in exile and Henry confiscated Canterbury and exiled Becket's family and household. In Becket's absence, Gilbert Foliot, the Bishop of London, took over the duties of the Archbishop. Alexander commanded Becket not to provoke Henry until after Easter 1166.[377]

In 1166, to appease Becket, Alexander granted him legatine powers. While on a pilgrimage he went to Vezelay, the place where Bernard had championed the Second Crusade, and issued a series of excommunications. He targeted royal officials, Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury, and issued two sentences specifically because the guilty had consorted with schismatics.[378] The self-association with Bernard speaks not only to Becket's ideas of aspirations but also the ongoing presence of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. Henry and Foliot fought to repeal the excommunications by sending letters to both Becket and Alexander. Becket would not budge, and Alexander sent a legate to resolve the issue. Henry also threatened to expell the Cistercian monasteries in England because a Cistercian order was helping Becket in Normandy.[379] Henry also considered using his dissatisfaction with how Constitutions had gone over to joining Barbarossa in schism.[380]

That same year, Becket sent three written appeals to Henry to reconsider their situation. For our purposes, these letters are significant because explain Becket's

---

[375] Alan of Tewkesbury, *MTB* 2. 336-45; Staunton, 128-134. Henry's delegation consisted of the archbishop of York and the bishops of Lisieux, Worcester, Exeter, Chichester, and London.

[376] Baldwin, 99.

[377] Baldwin, 103.

[378] Staunton, 144; Baldwin 104-105.

[379] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.129; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:557-559, #115.

[380] Baldwin, 105-106.

unwillingness to compromise and his perception of the relationship between church and state.[381] In the first, he writes,

> In your land, the daughter of Syon, bride of the Great King is being held captive, oppressed by many, ill-used by those who for a long time have hated her; and especially ill-used by you… Listen to me and do good. If you do not, we must fear, which God forbid, that the Most Powerful will gird his sword upon his thigh and come with strong arms and a great army to free his Spouse from the oppression and servitude of the oppressor, nor without great pestilence.[382]

With powerfully violent language, Becket resorts to threats and fear mongering rather than compromise. In the second appeal, Becket expanded on this stance and explained it was the duty of his office. He writes, "Because you are my son, I am bound to reprove and restrain you by reason of my office."[383] In the third appeal, the most violent and authoritative, he brings these ideas together,

> Unless you come to your senses, unless you cease attacking churches and the clergy, unless you keep your hands from causing disorder among men, the Son of the Most High will indeed come in the staff of his fury, in response to the sighs of captives and the voices crying out to him; because it is already time to pass judgement against you in the equity and sternness of his spirit.[384]
> This third letter is also full of references and allusions to Gratian's *Decretum*.[385]

Becket's use of biblical allegory to threaten Henry into submission provides a stark contrast to Alexander's attempts at courting him. Where Becket tried to assert authority over Henry, Alexander sought to placate him: by canonizing Edward the Confessor, granting York legatine powers, and not championing Becket, continuing a papal policy of negotiation.

---

[381] Becket's unwillingness to compromise can also be found in some of the primary source accounts of the controversy. For example, Pontigny, *MTB* 4. 27-37

[382] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.59; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:269, #68.

[383] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.60; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:295, #74.

[384] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.61; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:341, #82

[385] Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:329-339. Becket makes references and allusions to Gratian's *Decretum* in other letters to Henry as well. Notably, Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.62, iv. 63, and v. 55; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1033-1043, #241a, #241b and 2:1333-1335, #320.

After this, the controversy began to stagnate, but international events continued to make it an urgent problem. In 1167, Barbarossa marched on Rome, which Alexander had returned to less than two years prior. Alexander fled to Benevento and Barbarossa was crowned by Victor's successor the antipope Paschal III.[386] Although Barbarossa was once more forced out of Rome, the truce between Henry and Louis was set to expire and the controversy could still complicate this further. [387] Alexander needed to resolve it.

In 1168 Alexander again suspended Becket's legatine powers, hoping to force an early settlement, but to no avail. [388] The next year, through legates, censures, and Louis' mediation, Alexander held a series of meetings to try and reach a peace. Duggan argues that although his process was slow, it was not a delay tactic. According to her, "Every effort seems to have been made to find mediators who were beyond reproach from either side. Neither party could suspect that any of them were in the other's pocket."[389] Although things were already not going well, the situation was complicated when Becket's legatine powers were renewed in the spring. Alexander had two reasons for this. First, it shows his ongoing attempts to work with Becket. In theory, Becket's renewed status might have made him more cooperative. It also would have helped Alexander's perspective, as it showed that he was not overruling Becket.

Becket's immediate actions were not helpful. He excommunicated Foliot along with more royal officials, claiming they had been disobedient.[390] This action provoked a response from Alexander. He wrote to Becket, "We find it extraordinary that you have burdened

---

[386] Staunton, 150.

[387] *Ibid.*

[388] Staunton, 154; Baldwin, 106; Becket, *MCC*, B.ii iv.16; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:777-787, #170 and Becket, *MCC*, B.ii iv.6; Duggan, *Correspondence*¸ 2:827, #186.

[389] Anne Duggan, *Thomas Becket*, 149.

[390]Bosham, *MTB* 3. 408-15"; Staunton, 153; Becket, *MCC*, B.ii iii.75; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:865-869, #200.

certain people in the realm with any kind of sentence, without waiting for the return of your messengers or learning what advice we would give"[391] Despite this setback, Alexander again urged Becket to be patient. The letter continues,

> For it is fitting that we – and you – should wait two or three months to mitigate his [Henry] severity, and we should both suffer his obduracy with kindness and mildness in such a manner that he can have no possible excuse to obstruct the blessing of peace and concord between you and him in any way.[392]

This excerpt reveals more about Alexander's role in the schism than it does Becket. Alexander's was clearly a deliberate response. At this stage in the controversy, Becket followed Alexander's advice and agreed to lift the excommunications.[393] By the end of the year, the peace talks had finally begun to have an effect.[394]

The controversy reached its last stage in 1170 when Henry had his son, Henry, crowned by the Archbishop of York. Because this infringed on Becket's rights as Archbishop of Canterbury to crown the king. Alexander granted Becket the right to place an interdict on England in response and forced Henry to negotiate. [395] Henry and Becket reached an agreement at Fréteval in July 1170.[396] However, Becket waited to make sure the peace's terms were implemented before his return, often complaining to Alexander that Henry was taking far too long.[397] By late October, Becket wrote to Henry "I had intended to return to your presence, my lord, but fate is drawing me, unhappy wretch that I am, to that

---

[391] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii iii. 24; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:909-911, #208.

[392] *Ibid*.

[393] [Friend] *MCC*, B.ii iii.32; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:989, #228.

[394] Baldwin, 111.

[395] Until Stephen's reign, this process was unknown in England. Rather, it is a custom more familiar to the Capetians in France or the Holy Roman Emperors and German rulers. It is an attempt to ensure succession. The fact that Stephen and Henry both tried it reflects the political instability of their claims to the throne.

[396] King Henry of the English, (Oxford: Bodleian Library, MSS. e Musaeo 249), 182; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1259-1261, #299.

[397] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii v.53 and v. 77; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1321-1329, #318 and 2:1345-1355, #326. Alexander responded explicitly in, Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii v.29; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1315-1317, #315.

afflicted Church; by your license and grace I shall return to her, perhaps to die to prevent her destruction, unless your piety deigns swiftly to offer us some other comfort."[398] Only a few days later, Henry wrote to Becket about his delayed return, "And because many rumours are being carried back to me and my son about the delay you are making, which perhaps are not true, it would be expedient I believe for you not to defer your return to England any longer."[399] In December, Becket finally went back to Canterbury, but before doing so, he excommunicated Foliot and the Archbishop of York for their role in the coronation of Henry's son. It was this last action that led to Becket's murder by four of Henry's knights.[400]

The controversy's aftermath explains Becket's famous legacy and how his struggle became misconstrued as a crisis of church and state. In part, this has to do with Alexander's actions. The four knights eventually appealed to Alexander for judgment, and for their crimes he sent them off to protect Jerusalem.[401] Henry tried to avoid Alexander for nearly two years, suffering interdict as a result, before eventually capitulating to a settlement with Alexander's envoys.[402] Boso writes, "As his notoriety grew, the King not undeservedly feared that the Roman Church would exact dire penalty against his person for so great a crime, unless it were to have clear understanding of his innocence."[403] From Boso's perspective, Henry ultimately submitted to Alexander because it made the most political sense. This also infamously included a public penance at Becket's tomb in 1174.[404] Finally,

---

[398] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii v.55; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:991, #229.

[399] Henry, *MCC*, B.ii v.45; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1339, #322.

[400] There are five primary source accounts about Becket's murder, each to a varying degree of detail. The authors include, John of Salisbury, Benedict of Peterborough, William Fitzstephen, William of Canterbury, and Edward Grim.

[401] The Lansdowne Anonymous, *MTB* 4. 159; Staunton, 215.

[402] Staunton, 215-216.

[403] Boso, *Life of Alexander III*, 85.

[404] Staunton, 217.

Becket was canonized on February 21st, 1173.[405] It was this action more than anything else, that cemented his legacy as a martyr, as his shrine became one of the most popular pilgrimage sites in Latin Christendom. A primary source describes it as,

> Equally a great concourse of pilgrims went there from remote regions overseas, so that they differed little in number from the natives, and – as great men worthy of belief who visited holy places throughout the world witness – neither the seat of the blessed Peter, nor the memorial of James the Greater or any other saint, nor indeed that glorious sepulcher of Christ, were so continuously or more crowded with men, or in offering was veneration more clear to be seen.[406]

Fantastic experiences were reported at the archbishop's tomb, and because of the age's profound faith, turned him into one the medieval period's greatest celebrities. In turn, his legacy became overtly romanticized and the controversy increasingly easy to caricaturize as a crisis of church and state. There is a misconception about this however as the correspondence between Becket and Alexander shows that the controversy was not a crisis.

Correspondence

Alexander's role in the Becket controversy started as a continuation of his predecessors' policies concerning the York and Canterbury dispute. Traditional English customs, such as those issued by Henry in the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164), sought to limit the papacy's interference. As we will see, the York-Canterbury dispute proved to be a serious exception to this. Over the course of the twelfth-century papal involvement in English affairs conversely made England a significant player in international politics. Three subjects, in particular, the Becket controversy, the papal schism, and York-Canterbury

---

[405] *Ibid.*

[406] The Lambeth Anonymous, *MTB* 4. 140-1; Staunton, 210.

dispute elucidate the functioning relationship between the medieval church and nascent state during Alexander's pontificate.

Schism and controversy are the most dramatic aspects of their correspondence. Over half of it concerns the events of the Becket controversy. Becket's letters are full of complaints and concerns and more prone to anxiety and anger. He is at times frustrated with the English Church, Henry, and even Alexander. In contrast, Alexander's letters offer support and advice and often encourage Becket's patience and prudence. He always urges Becket to act pragmatically and with understanding. When approached from this perspective, the controversy takes on a very distinctive character. The schism is the main subject of seven letters. For Becket, the schism is always a point of comparison for him and Alexander, as he writes primarily about schismatics spreading malicious lies in the French Church to impugn both Becket's and Alexander's reputations.[407] On the contrary, Alexander's use of the schism always gives context for the Becket controversy.[408] As late as Spring 1168, Alexander was worried that Henry would give in to Barbarossa's machinations.[409] This letter is significant for several reasons. Not only does it explain why Alexander was so patient with Henry in the Becket controversy, it also reflects that he had reason to be concerned about Henry long after the Council of Würzburg. It also shows that Alexander perceived Henry's allegiance as a severe problem, suggesting that when Henry wavered in 1165, this part of a larger noncommittal policy.

Last, of these issues, the York-Canterbury dispute, is the most significant as it gives the framework for the reciprocal relationship between the Becket controversy and the papal

[407] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.51; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:593-595, #124.
[408] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.175-176; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:769-771, #168a and #168b.
[409] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii iv.21; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:765-767, #166.

schism. The problem of primacy on its own is only a matter of five letters. Significantly, early on, it is strikingly similar to previous issues of the York-Canterbury dispute.[410] Alexander himself was keenly aware of this. In the message that granted Becket legatine powers, Alexander wrote, "… and, following in the footsteps of our predecessors Paschal and Eugenius… we grant to you and your lawful successors in the church of Canterbury the primacy as fully as it is known to have been possessed by Lanfranc and Anselm and their predecessors."[411] Significantly, Becket was not allowed to exercise this power in the archdiocese of York, just as that Archbishop was not authorized to exercise his legatine powers in Canterbury, as Alexander had ordered two years. [412] Alexander tried to assert his papal primacy in the matter. This had negligible effect, however; as towards the end of the Controversy, Becket was accusing the Archbishop of York as the main conspirator against him.[413] The Becket controversy is the exception that proves the rule. Becket saw himself as a great defender of church rights. Alexander's hesitance to defend his cause speaks to the difference in their personalities. Becket echoed ideas of Gregorian Reform whereas Alexander was running a post-reform papacy. Moreover, Alexander's concessions to Henry during the controversy reflect not only the significance of the schism but the fact that Alexander knew he had to win Henry's favor if he was to be successful in it.

Alexander's dealings with Becket reflect his pragmatism. In normal administrative matters. Alexander worked with Becket.[414] In the first few letters, all written by Alexander, the issues are chiefly administrative. For our purposes, they are significant because they

---

[410] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.74; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:41-43, #17 and Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.76; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:63-65, #23 and Alexander, *MCC*¸ B.ii i.22; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:85, #27.

[411] Alexander, (Canterbury: Dean and Chapter Library), Register A, fos. 12v-13r, no. 36; Register I, fos. 121v-122r, no. 14; Register O, fo. 164r-v; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:273-275, #70.

[412] Alexander, *MCC*¸ B.ii i.22; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:85, #27.

[413] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii v. 76; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:1329-1331, #319.

[414] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii ii.86; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:13, #3.

reveal Alexander's policy towards the English Church, which he maintained throughout the controversy. There is a consistent effort to maintain centralized authority. The very first letter to Becket, written in the summer of 1162, concerns a problem of obedience.[415] Specifically, clergy chapters are not obeying their archdeacon.[416] Alexander's stance reflects his ideas about the importance of proper channels and due diligence, which can be seen in disarray throughout the schism.

The controversy is the concern of half of the letters between Alexander and Becket, some of which have been previously discussed. In addition to serving as a record of events, these letters also reflect Alexander's diplomatic skill. An example of this can be seen in one of several similar letters. Alexander wrote,

> Indeed we hope and trust in the Lord that he [Henry] will fall in with our admonitions and exhortations and restore your church to you freely and peacefully. For this reason, we ask, advise, and counsel you as a prudent man, to bear with him patiently until we can see the end and outcome of this affair, and you may not in the meanwhile decree anything against him, or anyone in his kingdom, which appears harsh or offensive to him.[417]

Alexander uses this language in several letters, urging Becket to caution and stay level-headed. The full extent of Alexander's prodding is perhaps best reflected in a similar letter to Henry, in which he urges the same thing.[418]

One letter is infamous for Alexander's strong position. He writes, "Wherefore, since we consider your peace to be in every respect ours and the Church's… we request, instruct, counsel, and command your fraternity by apostolic letter that you very carefully and diligently ponder both the dangers inherent in the present time and how much the Church entrusted to your care needs your presence and counsel, and bend your mind and will to the

---

[415] *Ibid.*
[416] *Ibid.*
[417] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.50; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:573, #119.
[418] Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:572-573.

establishment of peace and concord between yourself and the said king."[419] It becomes evident just how strongly Alexander strove for political peace. Alexander is clearly trying to convince Becket that peace is the best solution for both their perspectives. The letter continues, "Nor should you hold back from the blessing of peace and concord in any way, on account of the statement which we made at your request to our dearest son in Christ, the illustrious king of the French, or turn your mind and will away from these considerations."[420] Knowing that the Kings of England and France are unlikely to agree on much, Alexander wants Becket to stop straining the peace between the two.

In some instances, he uses papal authority to enforce this, Alexander for example repealed Becket's legatine powers two different times.[421] In response Becket became increasingly frustrated with Alexander. By 1168 his letters have become quite open about this. In one written in June, "The Church's persectutor and ours is taking advantage of your patience, either not knowing or concealing your kindness is bearing with him in much gentleness so that he may have time to repent, and if, which God forbid, he should persist in this madness, your justice, by which he will be condemned, will be made manifest in the sight of all the nations."[422] Becket has not given up on Alexander, but he certainly expresses impatience. From this letter, we can see the divergence in Alexander's and Becket's motives.

In another letter, Becket's patience has grown even thinner. In July of that same year, after Alexander suspended his coercive powers a second time, Becket has become

---

[419] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii ii.1; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:613, #127.
[420] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii ii.1; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:613, #127.
[421] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.139; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:225, #54 and Becket, *MCC*, B.ii iv.16; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:777, #170.
[422] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii iv.15; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:771-773, #169.

exasperated. The letter reads, "I wish that my lord would weigh and consider more deeply into what great and irreversible confusion the English Church has just fallen, throughout every rank and order in the realm, as a result of that deplorable and unheard of indulgence, extorted by the persistence of our king."[423] Becket's personality is in conflict with Alexander's course of action. Becket's frustration is further expressed towards the end of the letter, "For I know, and all the more greatly grieve, that a crime is never obliterated with time, never is an evil removed through forgetfulness, but they may become examples which remain in place to be instruments of villainy. May your holiness live and thrive, and may he swiftly, if it please him, deign to relive our misfortune, so that we who are perishing even while we live – as God knows, undeservedly – may at least survive."[424] Therefore, the church and state cannot be in crisis because Becket seems to be in conflict with everyone. Here, his frustration with Alexander conflicts with Alexander's attempts to urge him to remain steady and cautious. Alexander's response is characteristically more level-headed.[425] Despite this, Becket continued to bemoan his situation. This is significant because interpretations that argue that this controversy was a crisis between church and state overlook this strained relationship between Becket and Alexander. His frustration with Alexander leads to problems, as although Becket may be the head of the church in England, Alexander is the head of the medieval church, and he is not fighting with Henry.

The controversy's reciprocal relationship with the papal schism is evoked in this correspondence. One way is by placing where Alexander's letters were written. His letters to

---

[423] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.58; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:807-809, #178.

[424] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.58; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:807-809, #178..

[425] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii iv.22; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 2:811, #179, "For we have it always in our intention and in our heart to maintain and protect the honour, dignity, and rights of yourself and of the church over which by God's authority you preside with diligent care, and we have never changed our concession to you, nor shall we, with God's assistance, change it, and on the appointed day we shall grant you fully authority to exercise your power freely, without the remedy of appeal."

Becket in 1164 show that he was in Sens. The next year he wrote to him from Melgueil. By 1166, Alexander had returned to the Lateran in Rome, where he was until at least May 1167. Part way through 1167, the letters are placed in Benevento, thus implicitly showing that he was forced into a second exile. Alexander stayed in Benevento until mid-1170, when he started to move, as he wrote to Becket from Veroli, Anagni, and Segni.

Alexander and Becket also make explicit references to the schism in their correspondence. Significantly, these references come after the Court of Würzburg in 1165. In early 1167, Becket writes to Alexander, claiming that John of Oxford, who is known to been in contact with schismatics is spreading false lies in France.[426] For Becket, this was significant enough because he wrote to Alexander about Oxford at least twice more that December.[427] As it was because of Bishop Jocelin of Salisbury's promotion of Oxford to that deanery that led to Salisbury's suspension.[428] Becket explicitly mentions the schism at one least more time, regarding Barbarossa's expulsion from Rome following his coronation by the antipope Paschal.[429]

Alexander's references to the schism are quite different. Another letter to Becket that explicitly mentions the schism concerns the reconciliation of schismatics. Alexander wrote to Becket, telling him that he is to welcome back schismatics, provided they swear loyalty to the Alexandrine cause.[430] This is significant as it elucidates a critical difference between Becket and Alexander. Becket perceives John of Oxford as enemy, despite his return to

[426] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.51; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:595, #124.
[427] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.37; *Correspondence*, 1:695-711, #150; and Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.50; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:729-735, #157.
[428] Staunton, 144.
[429] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii ii.37; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:641, #139.
[430] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.175-176; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:769-771, #168a and #168b.

England and France, whereas Alexander welcomes back the schismatics rather than opposing them further.

In a letter written to Becket in May 1168, on the eve of Becket's second suspension, Alexander wrote to Becket, explaining that the circumstances of the schism necessitated his cooperation with Henry. The letter reads,

> But since the Church's persecution has not yet ceased, nor the time of peace yet dawned for us as it should, we attempted to mitigate and temper the fury and thrust of his [Henry's] spirit, even though we did not admit his petitions; we were truly terrified that he might attach himself by some kind of alliance to that tyrant and evil enemy of the Church, as he once did…"[431]

The tyrant is clearly Barbarossa. Alexander explains why he is so cooperative with Henry. The date of this letter is also significant because it shows that Alexander was never quite convinced of Henry's sincerity. It also indicates that he understood the reciprocal relationship between the Becket controversy and the papal schism.

Finally, the relationship between church and state is evoked in this correspondence. Because Becket perceives his position as a universal plight, his use of language often pits the *sacerdotium* against the *regnum*. One letter captures his position vividly, He writes, "secular might is stretching forth its hand to Christ's own inheritance."[432] Becket perceives the church at risk from the state. Moreover, he also perceives the *sacerdotium* and *regnum* as equal institutionally. His second appeal to Henry helps elucidate this thought more clearly. In that letter, he writes,

> For God's Church consists of two orders, the clergy and the people. Among the clergy are apostles, Popes, bishops, and other teachers of the Church… Among the people are kings, princes, dukes, earls, and other men of power, who have the ability to conduct secular affairs, that they may bring the whole to the peace and unity of the

[431] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii iv.21; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:765, #166.
[432] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.14; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:31, #12.

> Church. And since it is certain that kings receive their power from the Church, and the Church receives hers not from them but from Christ.[433]

Becket's understanding of the relationship between church and state explains why he perceives a crisis. From this description, he argues that both the *ecclesia* and *mundus* exist for the betterment of the *ecclesia*. Since the controversy has disrupted this, the two institutions are in crisis. This idea of crisis contradicts Alexander's ideas about the relationship

Alexander's ideas about the relationship between church and state can be found in his correspondence with Becket. In an early letter to Becket, he writes, "Wherefore we direct and order your fraternities by letters apostolic, and enjoin you by the virtue of obedience, that if the illustrious English king has at any time required from you anything hostile to the liberty of the church, you should not attempt to render it to him in any way, or commit yourselves to him in anything, especially anything against the Roman Church."[434] This language echoes that of Anselm, who perceived the rulers of church and state as their respective institution's custodians. Although the language is firm, it is not necessarily evoking of crisis. Another letter explicates Alexander's position further. In his next letter to Becket, he writes,

> Since the desires of princes should be respected and his will accommodated as far as possible, we advise, counsel and exhort you, as a prudent and discreet man, to weigh the danger of the time and truly consider what is necessary to protect yourself and your church from harm, to seek to defer to the king in all things as far as you can, saving the honour of your ecclesiastical status, and strive continually to recover the grace and love he had for you, lest by doing otherwise you incense him against yourself and us, and enable those who do not walk in the same spirit to deride and mock us because of it.[435]

---

[433] Becket, *MCC*, B.ii i.60; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:297, #74.
[434] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.88; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:79, #25.
[435] Alexander, *MCC*, B.ii i.4; Duggan, *Correspondence*, 1:83, #26.

Here, it is clear that Alexander believes that the best relationship between church and state is compromise, not crisis. He uses the ongoing schism as a comparison, suggesting to Becket that compromise is a better alternative. These two letters are critical in understanding that church and state were not in crisis during Alexander's pontificate. Throughout the controversy, he strove to reconcile Becket and Henry, and he would live to reconcile Barbarossa to the papacy.

Conclusion

The relationship between Alexander and Becket represents the continuation of a much larger history. Since the Norman Conquest, the relations between popes and archbishops had played a fundamental role in English politics. Becket is an exception from his predecessors. On one level, he was like them because the Twelfth Century Renaissance clearly influenced Becket. His intellectualism echoes that of both Lanfranc and Anselm. The fact he understood the practicality of education is reminiscent of d'Escures, De Corbeil, and Theobald. Similarly, he also grappled with the York-Canterbury dispute, evoking the most bitter conflicts by the end of the controversy. However, Becket did not understand the importance of political compromise. His predecessors had been part of spectacular personality clashes. Theobald had clashed with Stephen and Anselm managed to get sent into exile twice. Becket was aware of these similarities. Neither Anselm nor Theobald had risked splitting the English church over their respective conflicts however. Henry himself was hoping for a relationship like that between Lanfranc and William I or Henry I and De Corbeil for himself and Becket. Becket, however, chose to be uncooperative. Alexander, by contrast, is part of a continuation of papal policy towards England. Like Henry, Alexander

also hoped for a functioning relationship between the King and the Archbishop, evoking popes like Alexander II or Innocent II. He also echoes the efforts of Urban II, who during schism, tried to reconcile Anselm and Henry. Finally, he is also reminiscent of Eugenius, who took a stern approach in reconciling Theobald and Stephen. These comparisons are significant as they show that Becket was an outlier, a radical, and a rogue. Alexander's policies are the continuation of his forerunners'. This historical contextualization of the Becket controversy is significant because it further proves that the relationship between church and state was not in crisis.

Chapter IV: Conclusion

Alexander opened the Third Lateran Council in September 1179. The purpose was to ratify the Peace at Venice's accords with Barbarossa. It also marked Alexander's twentieth anniversary on the papal throne. It was a crowning achievement for his papacy; it was Alexander's *magnum opus*. The Third Lateran Council symbolized Alexander's ability to maintain a functioning relationship between the medieval church and the nascent state. Alexander's pontificate witnessed one of the most dramatic and turbulent periods of the High Middle Ages. The problems he faced were the result of an era of boiling tensions that manifested in two dramatic conflicts.

The first conflict pitted Alexander against Frederick Barbarossa, one of the most capable Holy Roman Emperors of the medieval period. Ongoing complications between the papacy and empire took on new dimensions as they unfolded against the backdrop of political instability in Italy. At the intersection between the old and the new, the papal curia divided over political alliances. Barbarossa used the situation for his own ends, which were chiefly political. Alexander's success against Barbarossa depended on his shrewd diplomacy and ability to compromise. He was able to keep both Henry and Louis favorable to his cause as well to maintain an alliance with the Lombard League. Barbarossa was unable to win either Henry or Louis or the Italian towns. In consequence, Alexander soundly defeated one of the most powerful and influential Holy Roman Emperors. The extent of Alexander's successes appears in his peace with Barbarossa, which was also achieved through compromise. Although the Lombard League soundly defeated Barbarossa by military means, Alexander's subsequent peace talks formally ended the schism. If not for these, Barbarossa likely could have launched another Italian campaign. Ultimately, however, it

was Alexander's alliance with the Lombard League that ensured his success in the schism. In response, Alexander made sure to include the Lombard League in the peace talks to resolve the schism. Even though Barbarossa was defeated militarily, it is these negotiations that show his interests in compromise.

The schism itself represents a transformative moment in the medieval period. Characteristically, the schism was an extension of the Investiture Controversy, pitting the papacy against the empire. It was also representative of the Double Election of 1130's schism, which had also been caused by a divided papal curia torn between the old and the new. Distinctly however, unlike emperors in the past, Barbarossa's ends were political rather than theological, and his stance was less passionate and more pragmatic. Significantly, this would be the last schism for a century, the next series of papal schisms would contest different issues.

The drama of schism, especially when the rivals are members of the church and state, encourages the misconception that these institutions were in crisis. Alexander's compromise and diplomacy during the schism, often for the papacy's very survival, shows that this was not the case. The schism was not the only conflict where Alexander exercised these skills.

The Becket controversy unfolded in the early stages of the schism when alliances were still key. Alexander, Barbarossa, and Louis all took an interest in it. In turn, Henry and Becket tried to use the papal schism to their own advantage in the Becket controversy. It was an integral part of Alexander's pontificate, as he needed to support Becket without alienating Henry. Viewing the Becket controversy from Alexander's perspective serves two functions. First, it can be considered in the context of the papal schism. This understanding

helps explain Alexander's calculated action and his papal policy of negotiation between Henry and Becket. Second, it is important to consider Alexander's role from the English perspective as well. The triangular relationship between the archiepiscopacy, the monarchy, and the papacy had been developing over the course of the Twelfth Century Renaissance. This contextualization shows the importance of Alexander's role in the Becket controversy as a continuation of the actions of his predecessors. It sheds light on Henry and Becket's antecedents as well.

Together, these perspectives demonstrate that the Becket controversy was not a crisis of church and state. Alexander's success in the schism was contingent on his ability to deal with both Henry and Becket. The concessions to Henry show Alexander's ability to compromise. His slow calculation and delay tactics served his ends rather than either Henry's or Becket's. The fact that Alexander was ultimately able to work out a settlement between Henry and Becket shows that this conflict did not become crisis This is because of Alexander's mediation during the conflict. The best evidence for this is in the correspondence between Alexander and Becket. These letters concern both the controversy and the schism. Over the course of seven years, Alexander urges Becket to act patiently and seek reconciliation with Henry. Three broad developments that had shaped the development of the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury can also be found in these letters; the Twelfth Century Renaissance, political tensions with monarch, and the York-Canterbury dispute, can be found throughout these letters. This is by no means to suggest that the Becket controversy was inevitable, but that when the Becket controversy is placed in historical context, its gravity is diminished.

These conflicts were set against one of the most profound era of the Middle Ages. Educational revival coupled with intense church reform transformed the European cultural environment. Monasteries, where these forces first melded together, were the foundation for this revolutionary movement. The intermingling of social classes and an emphasis on learning were key in this as they made monasteries the period's first intellectual centers. When Latin Christendom came into contact with the Islamic World and religiopolitical events stablized a new sereis of intellectual centers emerged out of this foundational network. Cathedrals, towns, and universities were the material symbols of the Twelfth Century Renaissance and they brought cultural cohesion to the European continent. In large part, they depended on the cooperation between church and state. The Tweflth Century Renaissance also fostered an intellectual community that stretched across international boundaries. Members of this community had more in common with each other than they did those spatially closest to them. Alexander, Becket, Barbarossa, and Henry, were all members of this *intelligentsia*. When viewed through the lens of the Twelfth Century Renaissance, the relaitonship between the medieval church and the nascent state could not have been crisis while such a phenomon flourished.

Alexander's pontificate encompassed a vibrant period in the Middle Ages; distinguishing the man from his office is therefore difficult. His management of the Twelfth Century Renaissance, the papal schism and Barbarossa's machinations, and the Becket controversy show that he understood there was no crisis between church and state during this period, because of his continued attempts to resolve conflicts. In a period of volatile personalities, his diplomacy skills and ability to compromise are refeshingly mundane.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Annotated and translated by J. A. Giles. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1912.

Baird, Joseph L., and Radd K. Ehrmann, eds. and trans. *The Letters of Hildegard of Bingen.* Vol. 1-3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Bernard of Clairvaux. *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.* Translated by Bruno Scott James. Chicago: Henry Regency Company, 1953.

Clover, Helen, and Margaret Gibson, eds., and trans. *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Davies, R. Trevor. *Documents Illustrating the History of Civilization in Medieval England (1066-1500).* New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1926.

Duggan, Anne, ed., and trans. *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1162-1170.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Eginhard. *Life of Charlemagne.* Translated by Samuel Epes Turner. New York: American Book Company, 1880.

Ellis, G.M., trans. *Boso's Life of Alexander III.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1973.

Giles, J. A., ed., and trans. *The life and letters of Thomas à Becket, now first gathered from the contemporary historians*. 2 vols. London: Whitaker and Co., 1846.

Henderson, Ernest F., ed., and trans. *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages.* London: George Bell & Sons, 1896.

Hildegard of Bingen. *Selected Writings.* Translated by Mark Atherton. London: Penguin Books, 2001.

Loyn, H.R. and John Percival. *The Reign of Charlemagne: Documents of Carolingian Government and Administration.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Mathews, Shailer. *Select Medieval Documents and Other Material Illustrating the History of Church and Empire, 754 A.D.-1254 A.D.* 2nd ed. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1892.

Matthew Paris. *English History.* Translated by J.A. Giles. 3 vols. London: Henry G. Bonn, 1852.

Otto of Freising. *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa.* Translated and Annotated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

Riley, Henry T., trans. *The Annals of Roger de Hoveden. Comprising the History of England and Other Countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201.* Vol. 1. *A.D. 732 to A.D. 1180.* London: H.G. Bohn, 1853.

Salisbury, John of. "Concerning the Council of Pavia. June, 1160." *Medieval Sourcebook: The Struggle Between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III 1160-117.* New York: Fordham University, 1997. Accessed on Sept. 24, 2015. http://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/halsall/source/barbarossa1.asp.

Staunton, Michael ed. and trans. *The Lives of Thomas Becket: Selected Sources.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Stephenson, Carl, and Frederick George Marcham, eds. and trans. *Sources of English Constitutional History.* Vol 1. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Thorpe, Lewis, trans. *Einhard and Notker the Stammerer: Two Lives of Charlemagne.* London: Penguin Books, 1969.

William of Malmesbury. *Chronicle of the Kings of England from the Earliest Period to the Reign of King Stephen.* London: Bell & Daldy, 1866.

Secondary Sources

Baldwin, Marshall W. *Alexander III and the Twelfth Century*. Vol. 3, *The Popes Through History*, edited by Raymond H. Schmandt. New York: Newman Press, 1968.

Barlow, Frank. *The English Church, 1066-1154.* London: Longman Group Limited, 1979.

--------- *Thomas Becket.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

--------- *William I and the Norman Conquest.* London: The English Universities Press Ltd., 1965.

--------- *William Rufus.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.

Barraclough, Geoffrey. "Introduction." In *Medieval Germany, 911-1250: Essays by German Historians*, translated by Geoffrey Barraclough. Vol I. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings, 1075-1225.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

Bell, Mary I.M. *A Short History of the Papacy*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1921.

Benson, Robert L., and Giles Constable, eds. *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Blockmans, Wim, and Peter Hoppenbrouwers. *Introduction to Medieval Europe, 300-1500.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2014.

Brackmann, Albert. "The Beginnings of the National State in Mediaeval Germany and the Norman Monarchies." In *Medieval Germany, 911-1250: Essays by German Historians*, translated by Geoffrey Barraclough. Vol 2. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Bolton, Brenda and Anne Duggan, eds. *Adrian IV, the English Pope, 1154-1159: Studies and Texts*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.

Brooke, Christopher. *The Twelfth Century Renaissance*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1969.

Bruzelius, Caroline. "The Construction of Notre-Dame in Paris." *The Art Bulletin* 69, no. 4 (1987): 540-69. Accessed on Jan. 24, 2017. doi:10.2307/3050998.

Burton, Janet. *Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 1000-1300.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

--------- *The Monastic Order in Yorkshire, 1069-1215.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Carpenter, S.C. *The Church in England, 579-1688.* London: John Murray, 1954.

Cowdrey, H.E.J. *Lanfranc: Scholar, Monk, and Archbishop.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Crosby, Everett U. *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the Mensa Episcopalis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Crouch, David. *The Reign of King Stephen, 1135-1154.* Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

David, Charles Wendall. "The Claim of King Henry I to be Called Learned." In *Anniversary Essays in Medieval History by students of Charles Homer Haskins,* edited by Charles H. Taylor, 45-56. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929.

Davis, H.W.C. *England Under the Normans and Angevins, 1066-1272.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1905.

Dawson, Christopher. *Medieval Essays.* New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954.

Deanesly, Margaret. *A History of the Medieval Church: 590-1500*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis, 2004

Dreisbach, Daniel. *Thomas Jefferson and the Wall of Separation Between Church and State*. NYU Press, 2002.

Douglas, David C. *Willian the Conqueror: The Norman Impact upon England.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1964.

Duggan, Alfred. *My Life for My Sheep.* New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1955.

Duggan, Anne. *Thomas Becket.* London: Hodder Education, 2004.

----------*Thomas Becket: A Textual History of his Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1980

Eliot, T.S. *Murder in the Cathedral.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1935.

Ferruolo, Stephen C. "The Twelfth-Century Renaissance." In *Renaissances Before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,* edited by Warren Treadgold, 114-143. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.

Fowler, Montague. *Some Notable Archbishops of Canterbury.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1895.

Gasquet, Abbot. *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries.* London, George Bell and Sons, 1906.

Gilson, Etienne. *Heloise and Abelard.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. *Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne.* London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1917.

Harvey, Barbara, ed. *The Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: 1066-c.1280.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Haskins, Charles Homer. *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Hollister, C. Warren, Robert C. Stacey, and Robin Chapman Stacey. *The Making of England to 1399.* 8th ed. Boston: Wadsworth, 2001.

Hollister, C. Warren. *Henry I.* Edited and Completed by Amanda Clark Frost. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

--------- *Medieval Europe: A Short History.* 5th ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Ladner, Gerhart B. "Aspects of Mediaeval Thought on Church and State." *The Review of Politics* 9, no. 04 (1947): 403-422. Accessed on Sept. 23, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1404514.

Jamroziak, Emilia. *The Cistercian Order in Medieval Europe, 1090-1500.* London: Routledge, 2013.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *Frederick the Second, 1194-1250.* Translated by E.O. Lorimer. New York: Rederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1957.

--------- *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Kealey, Edward J. *Roger of Salisbury, Viceroy of England.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972.

Knowles, David. *Thomas Becket.* London: Adam & Charles Black, 1970.

Logan, F. Donald. *A History of the Church in the Middle Ages.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2013.

Love, Thomas T. "The Two Principles of Roman Catholic Church-State Relations." *Ethics* 76, no. 1 (1965): 57-61. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2379371. Accessed on September 20, 2015.

Loyn, H.R. *The English Church, 940-1154.* Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2000.

Lyon, Bryce. *A Constitutional and Legal History of Medieval England.* 2nd ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1980.

MacDonald, A.J. *Lanfranc: A Study of His Life Work & Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926.

MacIver, R. M. *The Modern State.* London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Mayr-Harting, Henry. *Religion, Politics and Society in Britain, 1066-1272.* Harlow, England: Pearson Education, 2011.

McCabe, Joseph. *Crisis in the History of the Papacy: A study of twenty famous popes whose careers and whose influence were important in the development of the church and in the history of the world.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.

--------- *Peter Abelard.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.

Morris, Colin. *The Papal Monarchy: The Western Church from 1050-1250.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Noble, Thomas F.X. and Julia M.H. Smith, eds. *The Cambridge History of Christianity.* Vol. 3, *Early Medieval Christianities, c. 600-c.1100.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Oakley, Francis. *The Western Church in the Later Middle Ages.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979.

Ozment, Steven. *The Age of Reform: 1250-1550.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Packard, Sidney R. *12th Century Europe.* Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1973.

Pennington, Kenneth. "Alexander III (1159-81)". *The Great Popes Through History: An Encyclopedia.* Vol. 1. Edited by Frank J. Coppa. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Partner, Peter. *The Lands of St. Peter*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

Pirenne, Henri. *A History of Europe from the Invasions to the XVI Century.* Translated by Bernard Miall. New York: University Books, Inc., 1936.

Poggi, Gianfranco. *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978.

Poole, Austin Lane. *The Oxford History of England.* Vol. 3, *From Domesday Book to Magna Carta, 1087-1216.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Powicke, F.M. "Presidential Address." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 20 (1937): 1-12. Accessed December 3, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3678590.

Robinson, I.S. *The Papacy 1073-1198: Continuity and Innovation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Rubin, Miri, and Walter Simons, eds. *The Cambridge History of Christianity.* Vol. 4, *Christianity in Western Europe c. 1100-c.1500.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Russell, Josiah C. *Twelfth Century Studies.* New York: Ams Press, 1978.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Becket Conflict and the Schools: A Study of Intellectuals in Politics.* Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield, 1973.

Smith, A. Gordon. *A Short History of Medieval England.* London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd., 1925.

Somerville, Robert. *Pope Alexander III and the Council of Tours (1163): A Study of Ecclesiastical Politics and Institutions in the Twelfth Century.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1977.

Staunton, Michael. *Thomas Becket and His Biographers.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.

Stephenson, Carl. *Medieval Feudalism.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1942.

Strayer, Joseph and Dana C. Munro. *The Middle Ages: 395-1500.* 5th ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Strayer, Joseph, ed. *The Dictionary of the Middle Ages*. Vols. 1, 4, 12. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1983.

--------- *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Stubbs, William. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 476-1250.* Edited by Arthur Hassall. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.

Swanson, R.N. *Church and Society in Late Medieval England.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Tellenbach, Gerd. *Church, State and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest.* Translated by R.F. Bennett. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Treadgold, Warren. "Introduction: Renaissances and Dark Ages." In *Renaissances Before the Renaissance: Cultural Revivals of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages,* edited by Warren Treadgold, 1-22. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.

Truax, Jean. *Archbishops Ralph D'Escures, William of Corbeil, and Theobald of Bec: Heirs of Anselm and Ancestors of Becket*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012.

Ullmann, Walter. *A Short History of the Papacy in the Middle Ages.* London: Methuen & Co., 1972.

--------- *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages; a study in the ideological relation of clerical to lay power.* New York: Barnes and Noble, 1956.

Urry, William. *Thomas Becket: His Last Days.* Phoenix Mill Thrupp, Stroud, Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing, 1999.

Van Engen, John H. “Conclusion: Christendom, c. 1100” *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Early Medieval Christianities, c. 600-c. 1100*. Vol. 3. Edited by Thomas F.X. Noble and Julia M.H. Smith. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Wahl, Rudolph. *Kaiser Friedrich Barbarossa.* Munchen, F. Bruckmann Verlag, 1950.

Warren, W.L. *Henry II.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.

-------- *The Governance of Norman and Angevin England, 1086-1272.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.

White, Graeme J. *Restoration and Reform, 1153-1165: Recovery from Civil War in England,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Witte, John. "Facts and Fictions About the History of Separation of Church and State.” *Journal of Church and State*48, no. 1 (2006): 15-45. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23920692. Accessed on September 20, 2015.

Wilkinson, Bertie. *The High Middle Ages in England 1154-1377.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.