

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Christopher A. Jones, 'The Irregular Life in Ælfric Bata's Colloquies', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 37 (2006), 241-60

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=123825&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

The Irregular Life in Ælfric Bata's *Colloquies*

Christopher A. Jones

Our scant knowledge of life inside Anglo-Saxon monasteries makes the *Colloquies* of Ælfric Bata (fl. s. xi¹) at once important and frustrating. The chatty, tipsy monks who populate these dialogues may have enlivened Latin conversation-drills for Anglo-Saxon oblates.¹ Today, however, determining where the jokes end and trustworthy details begin is embarrassingly hard. If Bata's context was the 'reformed monasticism' of Benedict's *Rule* as codified in the emergent genre of customaries, then either the jokes of the *Colloquies* went far indeed – much farther than often acknowledged – or the prescriptive sources themselves are hopelessly misleading. To review these severe alternatives and ponder a course between them seem appropriate goals for an essay honouring Joyce Hill, author of inspiring articles about colloquies and monastic custom.

For all the celebrity of reformed monasticism in Anglo-Saxon England, its internal organization is poorly documented. Like other pre-eleventh-century customaries, the *Regularis concordia* drafted c. 973 by Æthelwold of Winchester deals mainly with liturgy and may reflect ideals more than actualities.² Its goal has been compared to Carolingian aspirations for 'one rule, one custom', though evidence for promulgation of the *Concordia* is slight.³ Both surviving copies come from one place (Christ Church, Canterbury) two generations after Æthelwold, and probably neither manuscript served as the text of reference for any house.⁴ Others who knew the work treated it as a source to mine: Ælfric of Eynsham, Æthelwold's student, adapted the *Concordia* freely, as did a Winchester translator whose Old English version accommodated a house of nuns.⁵ It pays to recall, moreover, that reformed monasteries were always far fewer than unreformed minsters or other types of foundation, and that boundaries between monastic and secular clergy remained permeable.⁶

The disputable impact of the *Concordia* and ambiguity of its manuscript tradition are problems familiar to historians of monastic custom, who have long debated the evidentiary value of written *consuetudines*.⁷ Typologies of 'descriptive' versus 'prescriptive' have increasingly yielded to approaches more flexible and less eager to infer reformist alliances from sample *Punktvergleiche* of customs or from the mere presence of one house's customary at another.⁸ These lessons bear on the reception of the *Concordia* and equally on its indebtedness to continental sources. Æthelwold's proem acknowledges influences from Ghent and Fleury specifically, and modern research has regarded the *Concordia* as, variously, Lotharingian, Fleuriac, or distantly Cluniac.⁹ The discovery of Thierry of Amorbach's customary describing uses at Fleury c. 1000 has recently affirmed Æthelwold's debts to that house, but much about the continental affiliations of Anglo-Saxon customs remains unclear.¹⁰

The 'Bata problem' therefore involves not only patent misbehaviours shown in the *Colloquies* but our own uncertainty about actual (as opposed to ideal) English standards of 'monastic' and 'reformed' at the time. To contextualize Bata's witness, I begin with a survey of moments in the *Colloquies* that appear to defy trends of tenth- and eleventh-century regulation, whether English or continental. Thereafter I consider how representations of 'irregularity' were used by other monastic authors in the period, and how these analogues may render Bata somewhat less puzzling.

The Colloquies and reformed customs

In England, as on the Continent, 'reform' was a protean concept. But to emphasize only its variety does injustice to the impressive continuities dating back, in important respects, to Benedict of Aniane.¹¹ Two such areas of wide consensus happen to be ones where the *Colloquies* frequently transgress, namely the observance of silence and the nurture of oblates. The value attached to silence is easily forgotten, but in reformed circles 'by the tenth century there was scarcely a time or a place for monks to speak'.¹² The trend registers directly in Anglo-Saxon customaries and indirectly in the Old English monastic sign-language list *Monasteriales [sic] indicia*.¹³ Some allowances for speech must have been made in the 'school' but need not have gone so far as free conversation.¹⁴ Ælfric of Eynsham's *Colloquy* is instructive in this regard: the framing remarks of its *magister* represent that entire exchange as a controlled give-and-take within the

scola. Though several of Bata's pieces suggest a comparable setting (e.g., *Colloquies* 3-6 and probably 14-18), others blithely portray talk during the *horae incompetentes* of night (e.g., *Colloquies* 1-2 and 10-12) and while eating or drinking in the refectory (*Colloquies* 8-9 and 24).

Yet the more serious irregularities dramatized by Bata concern the supervision of younger *scolastici*.¹⁵ These are presumably oblates – boys offered to the monastery by their parents and immersed in a system of intellectual and spiritual formation. The categories and terminology for 'boys' versus 'youths' or 'adolescents' were not entirely stable. In theory the *scola* included *pueri* aged seven to fifteen; thereafter as *iuvenes* they might join the regular community but remain under close watch for several more years. A balance of punishment (*disciplina*) and constant policing (*custodia*) was supposed to transform oblates into elite monk-priests whose purity guaranteed the efficacy of a community's prayers and, hence, its ability to attract patronage.¹⁶ The fact that an entire institutional identity was at stake in keeping the oblates pure explains why customaries and related sources, especially the ninth-century *Rule*-commentary by Hildemar of Corbie, recommend that persons *sub custodia* never be left by themselves or alone in the private company of anyone else.¹⁷ Other than *magistri*, only a few high-ranking monks were allowed to address or even gesture to the *pueri*.¹⁸ Children themselves internalized these and other measures from an early age, learning (for example) to sit at a prescribed distance from one another, curbing impulses to touch or speak and keeping their bodies always covered.¹⁹

It comes as no surprise that some late-Anglo-Saxon sources reflect these trends: the proem to the *Concordia* forbids senior monks, including abbots, to embrace the *pueri* and *iuvenes*: 'Nec ad obsequium priuatum quempiam illorum [*scil.* puerorum uel adolescentium] nec saltim sub spiritualis rei obtentu solum deducere praesumant [*scil.* seniores], sed uti regula praecipit sub sui custodis uigilantia iugiter maneat. Nec ipse custos cum singulo aliquo puerulo sine tertio qui testis assistat migrandi licentiam habeat.'²⁰ Æthelwold here bows to the most rigorous continental observance, possibly to Fleury in particular,²¹ though the impact of the *Concordia* here as elsewhere can only be guessed. The oblate in Ælfric of Eynsham's *Colloquy* calls himself a 'puer sub virga'²², suggesting that conventions of *custodia* are familiar enough for the periphrasis to need no further explanation.²³ More than a half-century later, Osbern of Canterbury links the memory of Dunstan to the same emblem: when, for fear of their abusive *magistri*, oblates at Christ Church seek refuge at his tomb, the sainted archbishop appears holding not a bishop's staff but a master's *virga*.²⁴

The *Colloquies*' disregard of custody is extreme. Whatever relief Æthelwold might have felt when Bata has one boy say 'non audeo osculari te, frater' to an overly affectionate elder, little else would have pleased.²⁵ The boys of the *scola* are left unsupervised at least twice, first while their master strolls in the cemetery to chat with a layman, then again as oblates go to and from the refectory.²⁶ Individual boys head off on errands without *custodes*.²⁷ One monk upon rising sends a lone youngster out in the dead of night to fetch water; another boy is left behind by his master and peers to sleep through Nocturns.²⁸ Bata even has boys called upon to assist others with their *cura corporis*. Most irregular is a repeated request in Bata's *Colloquies* 9 and 10 that a lone boy accompany an elder to the latrine. In the first instance the boy answers that he must ask his master's permission. The master, instead of refusing or demanding (as at Cluny or Fleury) that an additional witness accompany the pair, enthusiastically encourages the boy to guide the monk to the latrine, then to bed, and there help him remove his shoes.²⁹

In the latter detail, neglect of custody extends even to the sleeping quarters, a zone of particular anxiety in monastic regulation. Chapter 22 of Benedict's *Rule* had required that the beds of youths (*adolescentiores*) be arranged among those of their elders for easier supervision; Hildemar names outright the targets of vigilance as homosexual contact (*sodomiticum scelus*) and masturbation (*immunditia*).³⁰ By the eleventh century, some reformers had come to see the dangers as arising less among the oblates than from older monks preying on them. The realization led to revised sleeping arrangements, described most revealingly at Fleury by Bata's contemporary, Thierry: 'lectuli infantum nequaquam fratrum lectis intermiscetur, sed potius in medio dormitorii fiunt ubi lucerne pendent, ut ex omni parte circumspici possunt. Lubricum quippe est valde et periculosum inter spiritalis viros conversari puerulos, quia nonnumquam scandalum permaximum atque destructio locorum inde procedit'.³¹ A similar arrangement pertains in Cluniac and other sources, corroborating the reformers' particular worries about the dormitory.³² Bata describes nothing overtly scandalous as his speakers retire to bed in *Colloquies* 9-11. But the boys' duty in making up elders' beds (*Colloquies* 9-10) is hard to square with typical arrangements that those under custody entered and exited the dormitory silently, as a group, having no reason or permission to touch the beds of older monks.³³ Other of Bata's remarks about the dormitory are also surprising, as in *Colloquy* 12 where the chief sacristan responsible for waking the whole community must himself be woken by an errand-boy.³⁴

The *cura corporis* occasions some of Bata's other major challenges to reformist custody. His Colloquy 23 seems realistic on the preparation and infrequency of baths, and in the detail that bathing rotations were not interrupted even for liturgical duties. On the other hand, Bata's description of an *adolescens* helping one monk to get undressed, bathe, then get dressed again defies the letter and spirit of most prescription.³⁵ In principle, bathing was possibly the only time when a monk was entirely naked and allowed to touch his unclothed body. For *magistri* charged with upholding custody even here, the conflicting demands of supervision and modesty must have been as tricky as during latrine-visits.³⁶ The washing of faces and hands at intervals throughout each day involved fewer pitfalls, but oblates remained segregated and scrutinized at these moments too.³⁷ Though Bata describes younger monks' participation in mutual shaving or hair-trimming, customaries tend to forbid those under custody to perform these tasks for one another (although they might, if supervised, so tend their *custodes*).³⁸

Like his depiction of bathing, Bata's remarks about clothes are also, when held up to reformist sources, a mix of the credible and incredible. In *Colloquy 26* a boy complains of neglect by the officer who distributes clothes (Bata's *vestiarius*, typically the *camerarius* in other sources); given the value that reformed communities placed on their oblates, the charge has a whiff of the implausible about it. But Bata's inventory of *cappa*, *cuculla*, *toral*, *femoralia*, *perizomata*, and other garments agrees fairly well with a clothing list in the nearly contemporary Old English monastic sign-language text.³⁹ Unfortunately neither these nor other Anglo-Saxon documentary sources reveal much specific about the look of monastic habits.⁴⁰ The terms Bata uses may, moreover, have been lifted from class glossaries and so not reflect his own house's customs.⁴¹

One final detail in Bata's talk of clothing raises questions concerning real practices in a different, important sphere: corporal punishment. About his need for new clothes a *puer* gripes, 'femoralia quoque non habeo, nisi cruentata cum uirgis nuper uapulata.'⁴² In a later episode, Bata scripts the punishment of an allegedly kleptomaniacal oblate: the master deputizes two of the wretch's peers (possibly his accusers) to bring switches, then he orders: 'stet unus in dextera parte culi illius et alter in sinistra, et sic inuicem percutite super culum eius et dorsum, et flagellate eum bene prius, et ego uolo postea'. The master chides one punisher for not hitting hard enough and even jokes 'Non es mortuus adhuc' when the miscreant cries that he feels as if he is dying. In a verbose lament, the boy continues: 'modo sanguis meus in terra manat, cum lacrimis cruor stillat, non est cruor lacrimarum sed uulnerum.'⁴³ The lash was one of many forms of monastic

punishment, and the *Colloquies* convey its unique terror for the young. Customaries recognize a preventative as well as punitive benefit to corporal punishment; applied with discretion, it was part of a larger ascetic program for forming the stainless monk-priest.⁴⁴ Generally children were protected from delation and whipping in daily conventual Chapter; but in their own separate Chapter overseen by *magistri*, oblates were expected to accuse themselves or one another of faults and to receive punishment. Bowing to realism, some customaries limit their expectations of boys in so potentially sensitive a situation. Certain kinds of accusation were effectively disallowed, and in no customary known to me is any boy or adolescent still under custody ever deputized to whip a peer, as happens in Bata's *Colloquy* 28.⁴⁵

Bata's specific references to bloodshed are difficult to judge, as are his hints that culprits had to bare their backs or posteriors. For reasons of safety and collective modesty, the typical procedure appears to have been for offenders to remove the cowl but keep on the undershirt (*staminea*) during whippings. Bata's references to undressing for punishment are vague, mentioning only the cowl explicitly.⁴⁶ The thief's testimony that his 'blood drips with tears' cannot be taken too seriously: the words come verbatim from Isidore's *Synonyma*, and some eleventh-century authors coloured their descriptions of boys' being whipped to evoke the Holy Innocents.⁴⁷ Before dismissing Bata's gorier details as embellishment, however, it should be noted that oblates do seem to have faced unusually harsh discipline at Fleury. There, in children's Chapter, boys up to age fifteen stripped bare to the waist for lashings by a master whose job Thierry of Amorbach grimly describes: 'terribilibus solet verberibus latera eorum cruentare'.⁴⁸ Most unusually, Thierry requires older boys (*adolescentiores*) whipped in regular conventual Chapter to strip in the same fashion, even though this requires some exquisite choreography since 'verecundie est permaxime monacum nudum videri'.⁴⁹

So far I have considered mainly patterns in the *Colloquies* difficult to reconcile with a wide array of reformist customs (some of which, admittedly, may have had no correlates in Anglo-Saxon England). Yet among these irregularities also occur, as noted, plausible details about clothing, punishment, and bathing. Likewise, Bata's descriptions of eating and drinking may be less outrageous than they are reputed to be (Pierre Riché regarded the quantities of alcohol guzzled in the *Colloquies* as 'unworthy even of English monasticism').⁵⁰ Normative sources show considerable latitude about oblates' diets, and Hildemar allows younger boys to eat meat, provided they are weaned from the custom as adolescents. Customaries typically reserve meat-eating for the sick, but monastic diets

normally included fish and animal products such as cheese and eggs, and supplementary rounds of drink including beer, mead, and sweetened wine proliferated even at reformed centres.⁵¹ Bata's mentions of flesh-meat and frequent drinking are therefore not uniformly scandalous in themselves. The problems lie rather in uncensored portrayals of excessive consumption and chatter in the refectory, a space where, as in the dormitory, interactions were strictly curtailed.⁵²

Any catalogue of the believably irregular in the *Colloquies* will also include their references to private property, work-for-pay, recreations for the boys, and social excursions outside the monastery.⁵³ While regulation variously forbade all these, they were, like meat-eating and excess drinking, mentioned often enough in monastic literature to amount to commonplaces about unideal monkhood. As such topoi were rarely disengaged from polemic, Bata must have known that they would stir his audience's expectations for some kind of morally redeeming point. Such a point, if he had one, is hard to identify. Had he wished to illustrate vice in order to reinforce good conduct, he might have done so more clearly with only minor adjustments: his scenarios about latrine-visits, for example, could have launched exchanges upholding custody ('May I accompany this brother to the latrine?' 'Not unless he is a *magister* and a third goes with you!'). In the absence of such gestures, it is nevertheless still possible to consider the transgressiveness of the *Colloquies* anew by viewing them first within the wider range of contemporary motives for describing monastic misbehaviour, then within the problematic history of reform at Bata's probable home, Canterbury.

Reading monastic undiscipline

The *Colloquies* are hardly unique in representing lapses of discipline as part of monastic life. Histories and hagiography do so too, and, from the twelfth century, criticism of bad monks would become a veritable genre. Late-Anglo-Saxon communities received famous critiques from Eadmer and William of Malmesbury, both invoking already ancient clichés about monastic worldliness. Some attributes of Bata's monks echo the same stereotypes, yet without the plain motives of an Eadmer or William out to justify Norman domination, or even of a Gerald of Wales avenging perceived 'Cluniac' obstructions to his own career.⁵⁴ Did Bata have comparable agendas that we simply cannot see? Some wider antagonism seems all the more necessary to explain how such a man could have been appointed *magister* at Canterbury, either St Augustine's or Christ Church

Cathedral Priory (I view the latter as more likely).⁵⁵ Insofar as either was reformed to even approximately Æthelwoldian standards, the job of its *magistri* should have been to uphold custody as well as teach Latin. Yet the *Colloquies* nearly invert the emphases that the customaries or Hildemar assign to *disciplina* and *custodia*. Excess of the former and deficiency of the latter make Bata's picture of oblation a grotesque of the reformed ideal.

Critical responses to contradictions so extreme have tended two ways. One is *ad hominem*, making Bata a rogue who stayed a monk by inertia or compulsion. The practice of oblation probably meant that monasteries housed more such persons than the rare known examples betray (such as Gottschalk at Fulda). Osbern and Eadmer knew of Bata by reputation as a would-be despoiler of Christ Church, so he may in fact have been a bad seed.⁵⁶ If so, however, what that means for the *Colloquies* is none the clearer: a vindictive monk might seek to embarrass his community by documenting actual misbehaviours, inventing them outright, or mixing truth and slander.

A more provocative response to Bata's curious amorality is to question how deeply reform actually implicated him and his peers. Suspicions on this count may begin with the generic backgrounds of the *Colloquies* themselves. Bata drew on the straight-laced *Colloquy* by his reformist teacher Ælfric of Eynsham, but his other sources lay farther afield. Porter has shown that Bata modeled some of his scenarios on ones in an earlier text, the *Colloquia e libro De raris fabulis retractata* (or *Retractata*, for short), which in turn drew on the earlier collection *De raris fabulis*.⁵⁷ The latter was composed before c. 900 in Wales or Cornwall, hence remote in time and place from the Anglo-Saxon monastic reform.⁵⁸ Unsurprisingly, the *De raris fabulis* reflects institutions and terminology that are 'monastic' only in a broad pre-reformed sense.⁵⁹ It is surely striking, then, that some of Bata's episodes flouting silence and *custodia* in zones of particular anxiety to the reformers – the refectory, dormitory, bathing-house, and latrines – ultimately bear, via the *Retractata*, the impress of the pre-reformed *De raris fabulis*.⁶⁰

The debts of the *Colloquies* to these models still do not explain why Bata risked setting inadequately adapted scenarios before his students, or why his superiors would tolerate him as master if they took more seriously than he the objectives of Æthelwoldian-style reform. Beneath the latter 'if' of course lies the real question: in reading the *Colloquies* against normative texts of tenth- and eleventh-century reformed pedigree, are we using a standard to which Bata and his house truly aspired? The possibility that houses directly or indirectly joined to Æthelwold's legacy could flout his progressive customs may be remote. But the

Winchester ambit did not include the Canterbury communities, historically exceptional in any case. If Christ Church was Bata's home, the uncertain progress of reform there further complicates the problem. The claims of spurious charters notwithstanding, little evidence supports that the cathedral chapter was purged of clerks and monasticized at one stroke; the change rather appears to have proceeded gradually well into the eleventh century. However far it had gone by 1011, Danish attacks on the city in that year were later remembered as having claimed the lives of so many monks that the next monastic archbishop, Lyfing, was forced to replenish his chapter from the ranks of secular clergy.⁶¹

Accurate or not, the memory of a disciplinary slump at Canterbury recalls other narratives of monastic misfortune, some surprisingly helpful for imagining how a character such as Bata might have risen to important rank, or what his seeming indifference to new reforms could betoken. Perhaps the most instructive analogies lie at St Gall in the work of Bata's younger contemporary, Ekkehard IV, whose anecdotes of monastic undiscipline have also seemed enigmatically motivated. Writing perhaps c. 1050, Ekkehard relates how his abbey's destruction by fire in 937 forced the otherwise strict abbot, Craloh, to relax discipline. Compounding these hardships, Craloh had to accept as schoolmaster the arrogant monk Victor, whose hatred of the abbot divided the community and later ended in violence. Most arresting is the detail that 'cuius [*scil.* odii] scintillas, quaquapotuit, Victor inflammavit, propter quod et ipsi in scolis, quas ei commiserat, plura incommodasset severius inconsulto eo cum pueris agendo'.⁶² The moment resonates with Bata's whipping-scenes and with the aforementioned anecdote by Osbern about the Christ Church oblates' flight from bullying *magistri*.⁶³ The plausible lesson is that abused or neglected youths were sometimes pawns in the sort of intracommunal struggle that Ekkehard exceptionally details. Victor's career attests that even under a strict abbot, circumstances could land the oblates under the power of someone willing not just to abuse his position but to do so calculatedly.⁶⁴

St Gall provides other lessons potentially relevant to Bata, especially concerning the resistance to reform typical of old, proud monastic houses. Ekkehard's narrative has been interpreted as a defense of St Gall's adherence to the *Rule* against Lotharingian reformers' perennial charges of laxness. (In 1034 reformers actually imposed their own abbatial candidate, Norpert, on Ekkehard's community.) Faults that reformers long decried at St Gall, such as permissiveness about meat-eating and personal property, recall attributes of Bata's monks, as does a tolerance at St Gall for relatively frequent holidays by the *scola*. Granted, at its most topsy-turvy Ekkehard's St Gall is still a more sober, orderly place than

Bata's. The point, simply, is that Ekkehard in effect pleads no contest to what lapses he does acknowledge, chiefly because he and his brothers consider themselves upholders of an ancient, more authentically Benedictine observance than reformers brought. His community's failings, such as they were, Ekkehard attributes mainly to vicissitudes natural and man-made.⁶⁵

Of the two Canterbury communities, St Augustine's is perhaps the one that we would expect to mimic such venerable holdouts against reform as St Gall or, for that matter, Fulda or Fleury.⁶⁶ For its part, early-eleventh-century Christ Church could regard itself as an old 'Benedictine' house only through a trick of historical imagination, albeit one now recognized as characteristic of Anglo-Saxon reformers. On their view, Bede appeared to confirm that, from its Gregorian plantation, the English church had been not only monastic but monastic *stricto sensu*, with its first archbishop a monk served by a *familia* of the same.⁶⁷ Thus inspired, more than one Christ Church monk in the decades to either side of 1000 may have wondered why his community should adopt any customs imposed from outside. Belief in a 'Benedictine' pre-Viking-Age church, with Canterbury's Cathedral Priory as its head, made more logical a flow of custom in the opposite direction, from Christ Church as a type of *Musterkloster*. Naturally, such logic availed little against political realities that had already assigned Æthelwold's Abingdon or Winchester something like the role accorded Benedict of Aniane's Kornelimünster. But against intruded novelties of custom, Christ Church may have nurtured a sense of historic independence much as it did in the liturgy, where its Office remained loyal to the Roman Psalter over the recently fashionable Gallican.⁶⁸

Such conservatism joins other attributes to make the monastery of Bata's *Colloquies* resemble more and more the bustling, open complex that recent studies have seen in the great, late-Carolingian houses, 'Benedictine' and perhaps grudgingly Anianian but not yet reformed in tenth-century moulds.⁶⁹ That this was to some extent the case at urban Christ Church is plausible, notwithstanding any local effects of the Danish onslaught in 1011. There a turn to customs 'reformed' along actually current continental lines may have had to wait for the reign of the Confessor, if not the arrival of Lanfranc.⁷⁰ This does not mean that other cultural achievements associated with monastic reform in Anglo-Saxon England did not flourish at Christ Church from Dunstan through Stigand. Undoubtedly some did, especially the copying and decoration of books or the composition of new liturgical forms.⁷¹ Nevertheless, well into the eleventh century even the 'monastic' books copied at Christ Church can send mixed

signals. The volume famously inscribed with Bata's name, Cotton Tiberius A. iii, is emblematic of this ambivalence, being an archive for pointedly old-fashioned texts (the *Rule* and its Carolingian supplements), alongside products of recent reform (the *Regularis concordia*, the *Monasteriales indicia*) but also much else not monastic in any particular sense.⁷² Given the manuscript's Old English glosses that make the *Rule*, its supplements, and the *Concordia* vehicles for learning Latin language as much as custom, these parts of Tiberius A. iii approach the look of something monumental demoted to workaday service, like temple statuary used for garden planters.

The arrival of more current European custom at Christ Church is just one measure of monastic reform and one that, the suspicion grows, can be considered independently from others. Bata's assumed witness either to a decline of Anglo-Saxon reformed monasticism or to the unrealism of its prescriptions deserves qualification accordingly. Beyond allowing for his humour and debts to older textual models, we should consider that some aspects of the *Colloquies* outrageous by reformed standards of the day appear less so if Bata's context was one of transition, even surly or spiteful resistance, to new strictures being imposed from above or without. The implications of such antagonism reach beyond Bata, placing in a new light, for example, the notorious absence of any non-spurious Christ Church voice celebrating the chapter's monasticization. Tensions between what Joyce Hill has called 'reform and resistance' make the lone contemporary voice that may survive from this transition – Bata's – less unaccountable. When the monks of tenth-century Fulda encountered reformist pressure, Widukind of Corvey grumbled at the arrogance of the Lotharingian zealots: 'Gravisque persecutio monachis oritur in diebus illis, affirmantibus quibusdam pontificibus, melius arbitrati paucos vita claros quam plures negligentes inesse monasteriis oportere'. Like Widukind, who contradicted such fervour with Christ's parable of the wheat and tares (Matthew 13. 24-30), Bata probably would have sympathized with the Fulda monks – and realized that their days were numbered.⁷³

NOTES

¹ See *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Ælfric Bata*, ed. and trans. by Scott Gwara and David W. Porter (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997), pp. 12-15 and 56, this book hereafter cited as *Conversations* (for Porter's introduction) or by text- and page-numbers of the *Colloquy*-items and translations.

² Ed. by Thomas Symons and others in the series *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum* (= CCM), 14 vols in 19 to date (Siegburg: Schmitt, 1963-), VII/3 (1984), 61-147, prolegomena in VII/1 (1984), 155-66 and 371-93.

³ See Patrick Wormald, 'Æthelwold and his Continental Counterparts: Contact, Comparison, Contrast', in *Bishop Æthelwold: His Career and Influence*, ed. by Barbara Yorke (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1988), pp. 13-42 (pp. 30-32 on the *Concordia* specifically).

⁴ See *Die 'Regularis concordia' und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, ed. by Lucia Kornexl, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie*, 17 (Munich: Fink, 1993), pp. xcvi-cxxix. On evidence that both copies preserve an inchoate state of the text, see Kornexl, *Die 'Regularis concordia'*, pp. cxliii-cxlv. On the more important of the manuscripts, see Helmut Gneuss, 'Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A. III', in *Of Making Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. by P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot: Scolar, 1997), pp. 13-48. See also my discussion, below.

⁵ *Ælfric's Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, ed. and trans. by Christopher A. Jones, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 24 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 18-58; Joyce Hill, 'Rending the Garment and Reading by the Rood: *Regularis concordia* Rituals for Men and Women', in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. by Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, *Henry Bradshaw Society, Subsidia* 5 (London: Boydell, 2005), pp. 53-64.

⁶ John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 349-54.

⁷ For the state of research, see references in Isabelle Cochelin, 'Évolution des coutumiers monastiques dessinée à partir de l'étude de Bernard', in *From Dead of Night to End of Day: The Medieval Cluniac Customs*, ed. by Susan Boynton and Isabelle Cochelin, *Disciplina monastica*, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), pp. 29-66. On English customaries, see my 'Monastic Custom in Early Norman England', *Revue bénédictine*, 115 (2003), 135-68 and 302-36 (pp. 135-37 and 143-48).

⁸ These views represent reaction to Kassius Hallinger's *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, *Studia Anselmiana*, 22-25, 2

vols (Rome: Herder, 1950-51); helpful on the controversies is Pius Engelbert, 'Kassius Hallinger (1911-1991) und die Erforschung des hochmittelalterlichen Mönchtums', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung*, 79 (1993), 278-94.

⁹ See *Regularis concordia* 5 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 71-73 and commentary) and incisive remarks by Wormald, 'Æthelwold', pp. 30-31.

¹⁰ The Fleuriac customs (*Floriacenses antiquiores*) are edited by Anselme Davril and others, CCM VII/3 (1984), 2-60, prolegomena in CCM VII/1 (1984), 147-52 and 331-70 (see pp. 351-59 on Fleury and the *Concordia*). For context, see John Nightingale, 'Oswald, Fleury, and Continental Reform', in *St Oswald of Worcester: Life and Influence*, ed. by Nicholas Brooks and Catherine Cubitt (London: Leicester University Press, 1996), pp. 23-45.

¹¹ In addition to Wormald, 'Æthelwold', good overviews are essays in *Monastische Reformen im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Raymund Kottje and Helmut Maurer, Vorträge und Forschungen, 38 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1989); also Joachim Wollasch, 'Monasticism: The First Wave of Reform', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, III: c. 900-c. 1024*, ed. by Timothy Reuter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 163-85.

¹² Scott G. Bruce, 'Uttering No Human Sound: Silence and Sign Language in Western Medieval Monasticism' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Princeton University, 2000), p. 7.

¹³ *Regularis concordia* 84 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 131); cf. *Regularis concordia* 28, 31, and 40 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 88, 90, and 95); Ælfric's *Letter* 60 (ed. by Jones, p. 60); Bruce, 'Uttering No Human Sound', pp. 132-33. *Monasteriales indicia: The Anglo-Saxon Monastic Sign Language*, ed. and trans. by Debby Banham (Pinner: Anglo-Saxon Books, 1991); cf. Bruce, 'Uttering No Human Sound', p. 136.

¹⁴ See, e.g., the Carolingian *Memoriale qualiter* 8 (ed. by C. Morgand, CCM I (1963; 2nd edn 1989), 239, commentary to line 5). Possibly the eleventh-century Cluniac *Liber tramitis* 154 (ed. by Peter Dinter, CCM X (1980), 220) allows some free but still monitored talk in the *scola*.

¹⁵ For the scholastic component, see *Colloquies* 3, 4, 6, 14-15, 24-25, 27-28, *Colloquia difficiliora* 2 and 4, and comment at *Conversations*, pp. 8-15 and 56; Pierre Riché, 'La vie quotidienne dans les écoles monastiques d'après les colloques scolaires', in *Sous la règle de saint Benoît: Structures monastiques et sociétés en France du moyen âge à l'époque moderne*, Hautes études médiévales et modernes, 47 (Geneva: Droz, 1982), pp. 417-26; idem, 'Les moines bénédictins: maîtres d'école VIIIe-XIe siècles', in *Benedictine Culture: 750-1050*, ed. by W. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1983), pp. 96-113; Susan Boynton, 'Training for the Liturgy as a Form of Monastic Education', in *Medieval Monastic Education*, ed. by George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 2000), pp. 7-20 (pp. 15-16).

¹⁶ See Maria Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer der Kinder: Ein Beitrag zur Liturgie- und Sozialgeschichte des Mönchtums im hohen Mittelalter*, Münsteraner theologische

Abhandlungen, 13 (Münster: Oros, 1991), pp. 215-57; Patricia A. Quinn, *Better Than the Sons of Kings: Boys and Monks in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in History and Culture, 2 (New York: Lang, 1989), pp. 76-81; Mayke de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West*, Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 228-45; and eadem, 'Growing Up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and His Oblates', *Journal of Medieval History*, 9 (1983), 99-128. On monastic ranks of age and maturity as fluid, see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 95-131; Isabelle Cochelin, 'Étude sur les hiérarchies monastiques: Le Prestige de l'ancienneté et son éclipse à Cluny au XIe siècle', *Revue Mabillon*, n.s. 11 (2000), 5-37.

¹⁷ Good overviews of custody are de Jong, 'Growing Up', distilling the mid-ninth-century commentary on Benedict's *Rule* by Hildemar of Corbie: see *Vita et regula SS. P. Benedicti una cum expositione regulae, III: Expositio regulae ab Hildemaro tradita*, ed. by Rupertus Mittermüller (Regensburg: Pustet, 1880), esp. capp. 22 and 37 (pp. 337 and 418). For degrees of custody, see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 106-14.

¹⁸ Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 350-58.

¹⁹ Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 199-200, 357-58, and 406-07. On physical imitation in the oblates' training, see Isabelle Cochelin, 'Besides the Book: Using the Body to Mould the Mind – Cluny in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *Medieval Monastic Education* (op. cit. in note 15 above), pp. 21-34.

²⁰ *Regularis concordia* 12 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 76-77); I translate: '[The elder monks] shall not presume to take any one [of the boys or youths] aside alone for the purpose of some private request or even under the pretense of some spiritual matter; but rather the youth should remain always under the watchful care of his minder, and not even the minder should be permitted to go about with any individual boy without the presence of a third to stand as witness.' Limiting abbots' discretion here is unusually strict; cf. Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 353-56.

²¹ Cf. *Floriacenses antiquiores* 18 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 30).

²² 'a boy beneath the rod.'

²³ *Ælfric's Colloquy*, rev. edn by G. N. Garmonsway (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1978), p. 46.

²⁴ Osbern, *Miracula sancti Dunstani* 15 (ed. by William Stubbs, *Memorials of St Dunstan*, Rolls Series, 63 (London: Longman, 1874), pp. 140-42); cf. Eadmer, *Miracula sancti Dunstani* 12 (*Memorials of St Dunstan*, ed. by Stubbs, pp. 229-31). Note the Dunstan of this vision counters the bad *magistri* in the anecdote and does so while honouring custom to the letter, using the *virga* rather than his hand to touch the visionary boy.

The Irregular Life in Ælfric Bata's Colloquies

²⁵ *Colloquy* 20 (p. 122, trans. p. 123): 'I don't dare kiss you, brother'. Unless the older monk is a *magister*, custody has already been violated by his addressing the boy and asking him to come sit down next to him for a while. Cf. *Colloquy* 25 (p. 140) and Porter's introduction, p. 14.

²⁶ *Colloquies* 5 and 24 (pp. 88 and 132). Porter, supposing that there is just one senior *magister* (*Conversations*, p. 8), wonders if plural 'masters' mentioned in *Colloquy* 6 (p. 92) were older members of the *ordo infantum*. But other sources often speak of multiple *magistri* (e.g. Hildemar, *Expositio regulae* 22 (ed. by Mittermüller, pp. 331-32); Lanfranc's *Decreta* 109 (ed. by David Knowles, CCM III (1967), 95)) or of mature monks acting as *solatia* to the headmaster (*Floriacenses antiquiores* 18 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 30)). On *magistri* generally, see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 344-50 and 352-53.

²⁷ That boys carried out menial chores, especially in the refectory, is attested by, e.g., Hildemar's *Expositio regulae* 37 (ed. by Mittermüller, p. 418); cf. Bata's *Colloquy* 8 and *Difficiliora* 1 (pp. 94-98 and 178). But refectory- and kitchen-duties were closely supervised; see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 297-300.

²⁸ *Colloquies* 2 and 12, respectively (pp. 80-82 and 110). A boy who sleeps through Nocturns in *Colloquy* 12 pleads that a fellow oblate was supposed to wake him; but cf. Hildemar, *Expositio regulae* 22 (ed. by Mittermüller, pp. 335-36), forbidding boys to perform this function for one another. In Ælfric of Eynsham's *Colloquy*, the master's *virga* rousts an oblate from bed (ed. by Garmonsway, p. 48).

²⁹ *Colloquies* 9 and 10 (pp. 98 and 108); cf. sources surveyed by Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 315-20, and Gerd Zimmermann, *Ordensleben und Lebensstandard: Die Cura Corporis in den Ordensvorschriften des abendländischen Hochmittelalters*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens, 32 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1973), pp. 120-22. But cf. Hildemar's *Expositio regulae* 22 (ed. by Mittermüller, p. 234), not mentioning a third party on nightly latrine-visits. Details in Bata's descriptions are unclear: in *Colloquy* 10 the boy may be carrying a lantern; in 9 the fact that the requester needs guidance and sleeps (apparently) in a room other than the dormitory implies that he is a visiting monk (yet custody around strangers was supposed to be strictest of all; see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 180-81).

³⁰ *Expositio regulae* 22 (ed. by Mittermüller, pp. 332-33). Hildemar refers to these two species of offense together again in cap. 29 (ed. by Mittermüller, pp. 365 and 369).

³¹ *Floriacenses antiquiores* 28 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 41-42); I translate: 'the beds of the small boys should never be placed here and there among the beds of the brethren but rather in the middle of the dormitory where lanterns hang, so that [the boys] can be seen from every angle. Indeed it is a hazard and great danger for boys to live in the midst of spiritual men, since from this often arises greatest scandal and the ruin of places.'

³² Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 261-68, surveys pertinent sources and argues against the inference (e.g., by Quinn, *Better Than the Sons*, p. 63) that children typically slept in a separate dormitory.

³³ Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 134-46; Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 261-74, 348, and 403-06; Quinn, *Better Than the Sons*, pp. 123-24; de Jong, 'Growing Up', pp. 112 and 117. On a related topic, see Bata's description of bedding-supplies in *Colloquy 26* (p. 160).

³⁴ The abbot, however, would not be woken (thus *Colloquy 11*); cf. Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 263-64.

³⁵ *Colloquy 23* (p. 130).

³⁶ Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 124-26. Against monks' being seen naked while bathing, see *Floriacenses antiquiores* 12 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 23). In Lanfranc's *Decreta* 7, the young are barred from assisting older bathers, novices from bathing with oblates (CCM III (1967), 11). Customaries otherwise say little about children's baths; Lahaye-Geusen infers the occurrence was rare owing in part to strains it placed on the custody-system (*Das Opfer*, p. 312; cf. Quinn, *Better Than the Sons*, pp. 132-33).

³⁷ *Colloquies 1* and *2* refer to washing hands and faces daily upon rising: boys wake, put on their stockings and night shoes, visit the latrine, then wash, all before going to church for the first Office (presumably Nocturns). Cf. *Regularis concordia* 23 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 85) and Ælfric's *Letter 2* (ed. by Jones, p. 110) which first describe this daily washing at a later point, i.e. before Terce in Winter (before Prime in Summer). Before Nocturns these latter sources explicitly mention only a visit to the latrine, but other customaries do describe a first washing before Nocturns; see Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 118-19; Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 307-10.

³⁸ *Colloquies 14* and *23* (pp. 114 and 128-30) mention shaving. For the customaries, cf. Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 126-28; Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 313-14.

³⁹ *Colloquy 26*; Porter translates 'cap', 'cowl', 'overcoat', and 'trousers', but *cappa* here probably means 'cape, cloak' (cf. *DOE*, s.v. *cæppe*) and *perizomata* 'loin cloth' (cf. Gale R. Owen-Crocker, *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2004), p. 253). Cf. *Monasteriales indicia* 91-93 and 101-08 (ed. by Banham, pp. 40 and 42-44).

⁴⁰ On monastic garb, see Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny*, II, 681-83, 689-92, 695-96, and 715-30; Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 88-107. Boys used essentially the wardrobe of adult monks; see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 53 n. 31 and 302-06.

⁴¹ See *Conversations*, p. 39, and minor discrepancies between lists in *Colloquy 26* (already discussed) and *Colloquy 1*: 'ficones [. . .] et pedules et ocreas' (p. 80; cf. Porter's translation, p. 81: 'shoes, stockings, and leggings'); *Colloquy 14*: *stropheum* 'belt', *interulum* 'shirt', *tractorium* 'boothook', *ficones* 'shoes', *duae manicae* 'sleeves' [or perhaps 'gloves'], *duae*

ocreae uel pedules 'a pair of leggings or stockings', *duo ficones seu subtulares* 'a pair of shoes or slippers' (p. 114, translation p. 115).

⁴² *Colloquy* 26 (p. 160, translation p. 161): 'I don't have any trousers save for the bloody ones from when I was beaten with rods a while back.'

⁴³ *Colloquy* 28 (pp. 166 and 168, translation pp. 167 and 169): 'One boy stand on the right side of his ass and one on the left. Take turns beating his ass and back. First you two beat him well and I will afterwards' [. . .] 'You're not dead yet' [. . .] 'Now my blood lies on the earth and my blood drips with tears. It is not the blood of tears, but of wounds'.

⁴⁴ The point is often made in studies of the *Colloquies*, both Bata's (see *Conversations*, pp. 8-9, 12, and 14; Riché, 'Les moines bénédictins', pp. 103-04) and Ælfric of Eynsham's (ed. by Garmonsway, pp. 18-19 and 45). On corporal punishment in customaries, see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 380-99.

⁴⁵ On children's Chapter, see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 117-18, 275, and 368-72; Quinn, *Better Than the Sons*, pp. 65 and 116-27.

⁴⁶ *Colloquies* 6 and 18 (pp. 92 and 170) on dressing/undressing for punishment. On the rarity of whipping bare skin, see *Floriacenses antiquiores* 18 and 32 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 31, commentary to line 6; also 51, commentary to ll. 3-4 and 6).

⁴⁷ *Colloquy* 28 (p. 169 n. 345). On whipping as 'martyrdom' see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 384-87 and 394-96; cf. the anecdote by Osbern cited above (in note 24), and the famous episode in Eadmer's *Life of St Anselm* 1.22 (rev. edn and trans. by R. W. Southern (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), pp. 37-40).

⁴⁸ *Floriacenses antiquiores* 18 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 31); I translate: 'he customarily bloodies their flanks with horrific beatings'. Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 394-95, takes the passage for hyperbole but grants that punishments were comparatively harsh at Fleury.

⁴⁹ *Floriacenses antiquiores* 32 (CCM VII/3 (1984), 51): 'it is the ultimate embarrassment for a monk to be seen naked' (my translation, aided by the French of Anselme Davril and others in *L'Abbaye de Fleury en l'an mil*, Sources d'histoire médiévale, 32 (Paris: Éditions CNRS, 2004), p. 234). Problematically, other monastic texts can use *nudus* for 'stripped' only of the outer *cuculla*; see Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, p. 394.

⁵⁰ 'Les moines bénédictins', pp. 106-7. *Colloquy* 8 (p. 98) has an older monk goad a younger to eat and drink excessively.

⁵¹ Zimmermann, *Ordensleben*, pp. 58-64 and 67-71; Quinn, *Better Than the Sons*, pp. 127-28; Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 276-86. Eating and drinking abound in *Colloquies* 8, 9, 21, the opening of 24, and *Difficiliora* 1 and 12; cf. *Monasteriales indicia* 57-78 and 83-86 (ed. by Banham, pp. 32-38).

⁵² Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 288-97.

⁵³ For property see *Colloquies* 14, 20, and 28 (beginning); in *Colloquy* 24 boys negotiate wages for copywork; for playtime, see *Colloquy* 7 and cf. Hildemar, *Expositio regulae* 37 (ed. by Mittermüller, p. 419); Lahaye-Geusen, *Das Opfer*, pp. 274-75. For frivolous trips from the monastery see *Colloquy* 21.

⁵⁴ Eadmer, *Miracula sancti Dunstani* 16 (ed. by Stubbs, pp. 236-38); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum Anglorum* 1.44 (ed. by N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series, 52 (London, 1870), pp. 70-71); Brian Golding, 'Gerald of Wales and the Monks', *Thirteenth-Century England*, 5 (1995), 53-64.

⁵⁵ On Bata's career, see *Conversations*, pp. 1-3 and 208-09. Favouring Christ Church are an inscription in Cotton Tiberius A. iii (see Gneuss, 'Origin', pp. 23-24, and below) and the grudges of Osbern and Eadmer (see following note). Favouring St Augustine's are Bata's references to an 'abbot' over his community and the St Augustine's provenance of the Cambro-Latin *De raris fabulis* (see Scott Gwara, 'Education in Wales and Cornwall in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries: Understanding *De raris fabulis*', Hughes Memorial Lectures, 4 (Cambridge: ASNAC, 2004), pp. 12-13), on which see my discussion below. Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), pp. 277-78, allows that some monks in this period moved between the two Canterbury houses.

⁵⁶ For this view see *Conversations*, pp. 12-15; on Osbern and Eadmer, *Conversations*, pp. 3 and 208-09. On Gottschalk and other rebellious *nutriti*, see de Jong, *In Samuel's Image*, pp. 77-99 and 219.

⁵⁷ David W. Porter, 'Anglo-Saxon Colloquies: Ælfric, Ælfric Bata and *De Raris Fabulis Retractata*', *Neophilologus*, 81 (1997), 467-80. For the *Retractata*, see *Latin Colloquies from Pre-Conquest Britain*, ed. by Scott Gwara, Toronto Medieval Latin Texts, 32 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1996), pp. 29-38. For *De raris fabulis*, see '*De raris fabulis*', '*On Uncommon Tales: A Glossed Latin Colloquy-Text from a Tenth-Century Cornish Manuscript*', ed. and trans. by Scott Gwara, Basic Texts for Brittonic History, 4 (Cambridge: ASNAC, 2004).

⁵⁸ See Gwara as cited above (note 55) and his 'The *Hermeneumata pseudodositheana*, Latin Oral Fluency, and the Social Function of the Cambro-Latin Dialogues Called *De raris fabulis*', in *Latin Grammar and Rhetoric: From Classical Theory to Medieval Practice*, ed. by Carol Dana Lanham (London: Continuum, 2002), pp. 109-38 (pp. 110-11).

⁵⁹ For example, Cambro-Latin *podum* and *princeps* in *De raris fabulis* 6 (ed. by Gwara, p. 7) for 'monastery' and 'abbot' respectively; see Wendy Davies, *An Early Welsh Microcosm: Studies in the Llandaff Charters* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978), pp. 36-38 and 121-28. On diversity in pre-reformed English 'monasticism', see Blair, *The Church*, pp. 80-83.

⁶⁰ E.g., speech during *horae incompetentes* = *Retractata* 1-2 from *De raris fabulis* 1-2 (texts cited from editions by Gwara, as note 57 above); refectory = *Retractata* 6 from *De raris fabulis* 6; dormitory and bed-making = *Retractata* 18 from *De raris fabulis* 18; bathing = *Retractata* 20 from *De raris fabulis* 20; latrine = *Retractata* 12 from *De raris fabulis* 11; kissing = *Retractata* 9 from *De raris fabulis* 11; boy left alone to guard an elder's property = *Retractata* 5 from *De raris fabulis* 5 (cf. *Conversations*, p. 8 n. 19).

⁶¹ Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 255-66. Tardy reform also explains Christ Church's relative uninterest in relic cults; see Alan Thacker, 'Cults at Canterbury: Relics and Reform under Dunstan and His Successors', in *St Dunstan: His Life, Times, and Cult*, ed. by Nigel Ramsay and others (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 221-45.

⁶² Ekkehard IV, *Casus sancti Galli* 70 (ed. and trans. by Hans Haefele, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters*, 10 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980), p. 148). Departing from Haefele's German rendering, I translate: 'Victor, so far as he could, fanned into flame the sparks of hatred [against Craloh]; to that end, even in the school which Craloh had entrusted to him, Victor caused many difficulties for the abbot by acting very harshly towards the boys without his permission.'

⁶³ See note 24, above. Brooks (*Early History*, p. 266) dates the events of the anecdote to 1066.

⁶⁴ Several factors, including aristocratic connections at the Ottonian court, enabled Victor's challenges to Craloh; see Iso Müller, 'Ekkehart IV. und die Rätoromanen', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige*, 82 (1971), 271-88 (pp. 272-75).

⁶⁵ For reformist pressures on St Gall, see Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny*, 1, 187-99. A recent interpretation of the *Casus* as resistance to reform is Ernst Hellgardt, 'Die *Casus Sancti Galli* Ekkeharts IV. und die *Benediktsregel*', in *Literarische Kommunikation und soziale Interaktion: Studien zur Institutionalität mittelalterlicher Literatur*, ed. by Beate Kellner and others, *Mikrokosmos*, 64 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001), pp. 27-50. On recreation see Janet L. Nelson, 'Feasts, Games, and Inversions: Reflections on *The Ups and Downs of St-Gall*', in *The Man of Many Devices, Who Wandered Full Many Ways: Festschrift in Honor of János M. Bak*, ed. by Balázs Nagy and Marcell Sebök (Budapest: CEU Press, 1999), pp. 269-76.

⁶⁶ For Fulda, see Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny*, 1, 217-15; Josef Semmler, 'Instituta sancti Bonifatii: Fulda im Widerstreit der Observanzen', in *Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen*, ed. by Gangolf Schrimpf, *Fuldaer Studien*, 7 (Frankfurt am Main: Knecht, 1996), pp. 79-103; Pius Engelbert, 'Klosterleben in Fulda um das Jahr 1000', in *Kloster Fulda*, pp. 225-45. For Fleury, see most recently Nightingale, 'Oswald, Fleury', pp. 33-41.

⁶⁷ Wormald, 'Æthelwold', pp. 39-41; also Antonia Gransden, 'Traditionalism and Continuity during the Last Century of Anglo-Saxon Monasticism', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 40 (1989), 159-207 (pp. 162-68). The character of regular life at Christ Church in

earlier centuries, especially after reforms by Archbishop Wulfred (805-32), is disputed; see Blair, *The Church*, p. 125 with references.

⁶⁸ Brooks, *Early History*, pp. 261-65.

⁶⁹ Richard E. Sullivan, 'What Was Carolingian Monasticism? The Plan of St Gall and the History of Monasticism', in *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History: Essays Presented to Walter Goffart*, ed. by Alexander Callander Murray (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), pp. 251-87.

⁷⁰ Jones, 'Monastic Custom', pp. 161-68.

⁷¹ See Richard Gameson, 'Books, Culture, and the Church in Canterbury around the Millennium', in *Vikings, Monks, and the Millennium: Canterbury in about 1000 A.D.* (Canterbury: Canterbury Archaeological Society, 2000), pp. 15-39. On liturgical composition, see Christopher A. Jones, 'The Origins of the "Sarum" Chrism Mass at Eleventh-Century Christ Church, Canterbury', *Mediaeval Studies*, 67 (2005), 219-315.

⁷² See Gneuss, 'Origin', pp. 23-24. On the Aachen supplements and other Carolingian monuments important to the Anglo-Saxons, see Mechthild Gretsch, 'Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 57: A Witness to the Early Stages of the Benedictine Reform in England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 32 (2003), 111-46 (pp. 114-25 and 146).

⁷³ *Res gestae saxonicae* 2.37 (ed. by H. E. Lohmann, 5th rev. edn by Paul Hirsch, MGH SSRG in usum scholarum, 60 (Hannover: Hahn, 1935), p. 98); I translate, 'In those days there arose against the monks a hard persecution, to which certain bishops gave their approval as they deemed it more fitting for a few men of outstanding life to inhabit the monasteries than crowds of slack ones'.