

Chapter 3

Contemplating Money and Wealth in Monastic Writing c. 1060–c. 1160

Giles E. M. Gasper

It is possible to spend money in such a way that it increases; it is an investment which grows, and pouring it out only brings in more. The very sight of sumptuous and exquisite baubles is sufficient to inspire men to make offerings, though not to say their prayers. In this way, riches attract riches, and money produces more money. For some unknown reasons, the richer a place appears, the more freely do offerings pour in. Gold-cased relics catch the gaze and open the purses. If you show someone a beautiful picture of a saint, he comes to the conclusion that the saint is as holy as the picture is brightly coloured. When people rush up to kiss them, they are asked to donate. Beauty they admire, but they do no reverence to holiness. ... Oh, vanity of vanities, whose vanity is rivalled only by its insanity! The walls of the church are aglow, but the poor of the church go hungry. The stones of the church are covered with gold, while its children are left naked.¹

The famous *Apologia* of Bernard of Clairvaux to Abbot William of St Thierry on the alleged decadence of the Cluniac monastic observance is well known. While Bernard does not make an unequivocal condemnation of wealth, adornment and money, but rather a series of qualified, if biting, remarks on the subject directed particularly to monastic communities, material prosperity and its

¹ Bernard of Clairvaux, *An Apologia to Abbot William*, M. Casey (trans.) (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1970), p. 65; *Apologia ad Guillelmum*, in *Bernardi opera*, J. Leclercq and H.M. Rochais (eds) (Rome, 1963), vol. 3, pp. 81–108 'Et ut aperte loquar, an hoc totum facit avaritia, quae est idolorum servitus, et non requirimus fructum, sed datum? Si quaeris: 'Quomodo?' 'Miro', inquam, 'modo'. Tali quadam arte spargitur aes, ut multiplicetur. Expenditur ut augeatur, et effusio copiam parit. Ipso quippe visu sumptuosarum, sed mirandarum vanitatum, accenduntur homines magis ad offerendum quam ad orandum. Sic opes opibus hauriuntur, sic pecunia pecuniam trahit, quia nescio quo pacto, ubi amplius divitiarum cernitur, ibi offertur libentius. Auro tectis reliquiis signantur oculi, et loculi aperiuntur Ostenditur pulcherrima forma Sancti vel Sanctae alicuius, et eo creditur sanctor, quo coloratior Currunt homines ad osculandum, invitantur ad donandum, et magis mirantur pulchra, quam venerantur sacra. O vanitas vanitatum, sed non vanior quam insanior! Fulget ecclesia parietibus et in pauperibus eget. Suos lapides induit auro, et suos filios nudos deserit.'

relation to spiritual health are at the heart of his criticisms. These criticisms were themselves part of a wider polemical landscape within which the newer orders of the twelfth century identified themselves against traditional Benedictine monasticism.² While arguments about a ‘crisis’ in cenobitic monastic life have emphasised the health of these older communities in the period under question, there is little doubt that the fulcrum on which contemporary criticism balanced was the emergence of changing attitudes towards wealth.³ All of this occurred, as is well established, during a period in which western Christendom experienced major economic expansion and the beginnings of a more integrated process of monetising the local, regional and international economies through which these societies operated.⁴ How this expansion occurred in detail and what contemporaries thought about the process, collectively and individually, are less easy to explain or explore.⁵

To a considerable extent these processes involve an evolving understanding of money, in its conceptual role as a means of account and exchange, and in its physical form as coin. Evidence for such evolution is wide-ranging, including

² As John Van Engen expressed it, critical contemporaries in the period 1050–1150, ‘knew very well that Benedictine monasticism was a powerful, wealthy, and influential establishment. But the evidence accrued here for “prosperity” or “vitality” largely spelled “bankruptcy” for them ... the strong implication was that material prosperity meant spiritual decadence,’ ‘The “Crisis of Cenobitism” Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150,’ *Speculum*, 61 (1986): 269–304, at 284–5.

³ On the so-called ‘Crisis of Cenobitism’ see n. 2 above, with J. Leclercq, ‘La crise du monachisme’ notable amongst older literature. It is still a term which enjoys invocation, for example, S. Vanderputten, ‘Crises of Cenobitism: Abbatial Leadership and Monastic Competition in late Eleventh-Century Flanders,’ *The English Historical Review*, 127 (2012): 259–84.

⁴ See Richard H. Britnell, *The Commercialisation of English Society 1000–1500* (Cambridge, 2009). For a more general discussion of economic change see N. J. G. Pound, *An Economic History of Medieval Europe*, 2nd edition (London, 1994), and references within.

⁵ Studies on the structural changes within the western medieval economy and society from the eleventh century through to the early thirteenth are widespread, and indeed are foundational themes for medieval studies since the emergence of professional historical studies in the late nineteenth century. Peter Spufford’s *Money and its Use in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1988) remains seminal on the subject. That said, there are few studies devoted to consideration of the conception of money in a period of monetisation, a notable exception being A. Murray, *Reason and Society in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1978). Within case studies, such as Georges Duby’s now classic investigation of twelfth-century Cluny ‘Économie domaniale et économie monétaire: Le budget de l’abbaye de Cluny entre 1080 et 1155,’ *Annales*, 7 (1952): 155–71, the focus has tended to be towards the practical responses to economic situations experienced, rather than the mental frameworks in which these experiences were processed.

in an Anglo-Norman context, that of Domesday Book.⁶ In terms of how these changes were articulated, evidence from monastic authors plays an extremely important role, although one which requires sensitive use. The dominance of written material from monastic environments in this period cannot be underestimated. As John Van Engen noted, ‘Benedictines wrote virtually all the great chronicles and lives extant from the years 850–1150 ... Without the cartularies, chronicles, and lives written by monks historians would know precious little about the European world between 850 and 1100.’⁷ The preservation of such documentation is related in great part to the interest these institutions developed in their economic situations, and their mechanisms for navigating market fluctuation and conceptual change. How monastic authors, whether leaders of their communities or the voices of record, write about money and its use can be used as an interpretative thread to illuminate wider responses to systemic economic and cultural change.

As Bernard’s remarks above indicate, comments on wealth from within and about monastic houses are common. A particular focus on attitudes to money, however, allows older questions to be re-posed, and re-considered. Central to this re-consideration is money’s possession of a dual quality, as both a physical entity, used to practical ends, and as a literary device, used to allusive and metaphorical purpose. The majority of modern scholarship on the subject focuses on the first aspect, the practical production of money and the manner in which it was variously employed within the high medieval period. The prevalence of money as a tool of satire or reforming invective has also been noted.⁸ To put the two aspects together, however, is to open different perspectives on the nature of monetisation in the period, and reflects better the ways in which, especially in monastic hands, the literary and the actual become so tightly woven together that they become difficult to separate. Both aspects speak to a sector of society in which money was becoming ubiquitous (although the partial nature of this process should be stressed), more carefully defined, and patient of multiple interpretations, negative as well as positive.

How monks wrote about money allows a sharper focus on how different monastic communities contemplated worldly wealth. The description of money as it relates to economic practices, within the institution and without, in circumstances quotidian and extraordinary, can be used to explore not

⁶ A vast literature exists on the Domesday Book and Inquest, see D. Roffe, *Decoding Domesday* (Woodbridge, 2007), and recently, S. Baxter, ‘The Making of Domesday Book and the Languages of Lordship’ in *Conceptualizing Multilingualism in England, c. 800–c. 1250* (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 271–308; for the wider source base, Domesday and beyond, relevant to the expansion and change of English economy in this period see Britnell, *Commercialisation*, pp. 5–75.

⁷ Van Engen, ‘The “Crisis of Cenobitism” Reconsidered’: 297–8.

⁸ Murray, *Reason and Society*, pp. 71–7.

only the articulation of power within religious houses, but also particularities of relationships with their benefactors. However, while the role of monastic communities in the later eleventh and early-twelfth centuries as generators of currency is well known, if still inconsistently explored, what and how they thought about this role is not.⁹

That monks thought about money, in different ways and in different modes, can be established straightforwardly. Money as a subject for monastic authors is found in more than charter or chronicle literature; it takes its place within memorial literature, within letter collections, and within meditative, and, on occasion, theological reflection. The place of money within monastic image-making, in the expression of spiritual value, and as part of a growing articulation of spiritual economy speaks to something of a shift in the underpinnings of the metaphorical language employed. Monastic writing on the subject highlights not only monetisation of the economy, but also of contemporary conceptual frameworks, and as a result can be used to inform interpretation of a society on the cusp or in the first stage of a monetary revolution.¹⁰

Care must be taken in the interpretation of this language: money, as value and as coin, is a common source of biblical, and especially New Testament, metaphor, from the injunction to ‘render unto Caesar’ to the parable of the talents.¹¹ This is an area too where the in-dwelling of high medieval monastic communities with Patristic writing needs to be taken into account, since these authorities wrote also in a society and economy significantly, if far from wholly, monetised.¹² Monastic authors of the later period contribute, for example, to a longer tradition of using the coin, its quality, production and appearance, as an

⁹ See M. Allen, *Mints and Money in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2012) and *The Durham Mint*, British Numismatic Society Special Publication 4 (London, 2003); Sebastian Steinbach, *Das Geld der Nonnen und Mönche. Münzrecht, Münzprägung und Geldumlauf der ostfränkisch-deutschen Klöster in ottonisch-salischer Zeit (ca. 911–1125)* (Berlin, 2007). See also the contributions of Sebastian Steinbach and Jens Christian Moesgaard to this volume. Giles E. M. Gasper and Svein H. Gullbekk, ‘Money and its Use in the Thought and Experience of Anselm of Canterbury’, *Journal of Medieval History*, 38 (2012): 155–82 attempts an interpretation of Anselm’s experiences in this regard.

¹⁰ The most convenient treatment remains P. Spufford, *Money and its Use in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1988).

¹¹ Matthew 22:19–21; Matthew 25:14–30.

¹² As a general introduction to the classical background see S. Von Reden, *Money in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 18–64, and the comments in M. Finlay, *The Ancient Economy*, 2nd edition (London, 1985), esp. 196–8. For the later Roman world and that of late antiquity see the contrasting studies of K. Hopkins, ‘Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire (200 B.C.–A.D. 400)’, *Journal of Roman Studies*, 70 (1980): 101–24 and Peter Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD* (Princeton, New Jersey, 2012).

analogy for religious life well and badly lived.¹³ Interpretation of how monastic authors use money must, therefore, be sensitive to the echoing chamber of the past, especially those texts that informed to a high degree the re-imagining of monastic life in an era of reform.

Taking a conspectus of attitudes towards money across the differing forms of monastic life that emerged in this period allows the range of responses to be considered, and the common themes and conceptual underpinnings to be identified. The period from the later eleventh to the middle of the twelfth century is well known in the medieval west for a remarkable proliferation of monastic orders in the context of wider reform of the church. The vogue for variety in monastic life carried with it those who wished to adopt it themselves, and amongst those who wished to offer support. Different houses, different orders and different communities offered different registers of monastic life and identity, and, presumably, different registers of lay association and engagement.¹⁴ The monastic landscape was one in the process of rapid change in the period 1060–1160; the fact of that change alone speaks to the importance of these communities in society at large.

In seeking a conspectus of monastic opinion attention will be placed on writers who provide an indicative sense of the range of responses to money to be found in monastic communities as well as a guide to the ways in which attitudes changed over the period. The case studies reflect different types of monastic community across the period. Anselm of Canterbury (1033–1109), Guibert of Nogent (c. 1060–1125) and Orderic Vitalis (1075–c. 1142) represent regular Benedictine houses, Ailred of Rievaulx (1110–67) the Cistercians, Guigo I (1083–1132) the Carthusians with the additional testimony on their way of life from William of St Thierry (1085–1148), and finally Stephen of Muret (c. 1047–1124), as founder of the Grandmontines. These individuals and their

¹³ See G. Dinkova-Bruun in this volume.

¹⁴ A remarkable example of patronage to a diverse range of religious communities are the foundations made by David I of Scotland in the Border region: Tironensians at Kelso in 1126 (moved from their original foundation of 1113 at Selkirk), Cistercians at Melrose in 1136, Augustinians at Jedburgh in 1138 and Premonstratensians at Dyrburgh in 1150. These foundations are all within 20 miles of each other. Nor was this series of foundations the fulfilment of David's monastic vision, Melrose founded daughter-houses at Newbattle (1140), Dundrennan (1142), Kinloss (1150) within his lifetime, the Tironensians of Kelso established Priors at Lesmahagow, and David settled more Augustinians at Holyrood (1128), Camuskenneth (1147), and was involved in their arrival at Glasgow Cathedral. David also enlarged the Benedictine house at Dunfermline, founded Urquhart Priory (1124) and introduced Cluniac monks to the Isle of May (1153). See R. Oram, *The King who made Scotland* (Stroud, 2004), and G. W. S. Barrow, 'David I (c. 1085–1153)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edition, Jan 2006, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7208> (accessed 10 Sept 2012).

communities are also, with the exception of the Carthusians, geographically linked in northern and western France and England, within territories dominated by Norman, Anglo-Norman and Angevin rulers of England, from William the Conqueror to Henry II.

Attitudes towards money will be explored in three thematic areas: I) material and spiritual gain: property and patronage, II) simony and payment: sin and charity, III) ascetic values: debt, poverty and usury. These represent major concerns for the monastic communities represented, and the different opinions expressed are responsive to the prevailing attitudes across the spectrum of monastic experience. From communities whose relationship to money was intricate and nuanced, to those whose existence valorised a more complete rejection of the world, what emerges is a complex articulation of the problems and benefits of monetisation, moving between the intimate circumstances of individual houses, to questions of wider concern. These questions include the notion of change over time in references to money in monastic sources, dealt with, for the most part, in section one, whether and why this change occurs over the eleventh and twelfth centuries, addressed in section two, and the distinction and overlap between metaphorical treatment of money and discussion of the reality of monetary transaction, the focus of section three.

I) Material and Spiritual Gain: Property and Patronage

One of the paramount needs of Benedictine houses of the period from the tenth to the mid-twelfth centuries was the accumulation of sufficient resources to support and sustain their communities, and to do so at more than subsistence levels.¹⁵ Monastic houses needed property, income, and money to function, making interaction with the world and secular society necessary. Explicitly and implicitly money forms part of this wider monastic economy, and in what follows both money and its wider hinterland of monastic wealth will be considered. Attitudes within the cloister towards this necessity provide a touchstone for deeper divisions in attitudes towards wealth and the world.

The importance of patronage was underlined to the community of Bec, in lower Normandy, in 1093 by their recently departed Abbot Anselm, shortly after his promotion to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Anselm's parting injunction to his successor as Abbot, William Bona-Anima, was that he should:

¹⁵ See Van Engen 'Crisis of Cenobitism': 278–82 for a summary of the complexities of the economic position of Benedictine houses in the period, and the expansion and contraction of landed wealth in particular.

Remember too how I always used to gain friends for the church of Bec: follow this example, hasten to gain friends for yourselves from all sides by exercising the good deed of hospitality, dispensing generosity to all men, and when you do not have the opportunity of doing good works, by according at least the gift of a kind word. Never consider that you have enough friends, but whether rich or poor, let all be bound to you by brotherly love. This will be to the advantage of your church and promote the welfare of those who you love.¹⁶

Anselm presided over a considerable expansion at Bec in terms of personnel and building, triumphantly brought together in the dedication of the new church in 1077. The network of patrons can be drawn together, as a case study of Benedictine survival and then expansion. Herluin, a Norman knight, who would become its first abbot, had founded Bec in the mid-1030s, and its initial properties derived from the lesser aristocracy.¹⁷ Gifts of this order continued to be given, an example being the 120 shillings brought by ‘a certain knight’ in about 1076.¹⁸ Anselm played a decisive role in attracting this patronage with increased donations after the consecration of the new church and his election as Abbot in 1078. Two diplomas of 1077, one from William the Conqueror, and the other from Philip I of France, confirm the possessions held by Bec.¹⁹ Significant French properties acquired after 1078 include three priories in the

¹⁶ Anselm of Canterbury, *Letter* 165, F. S. Schmitt (ed.) *Opera omnia S. Anselmi Cantuariensis archiepiscopi*, 6 vols. [vol. 1 printed at Seckau 1938; vol. 2 at Rome 1940, all reset for the Nelson edition] (Edinburgh, 1946–61), vol. IV, *Ep.* 165: ‘Memores etiam estote qua ratione semper ecclesiae Beccensi amicos acquirere consuevi; et hoc exemplo amicos vobis undecumque acquirere festinate, hospitalitatis bonum sectando, benignitatem omnibus impendendo, et, ubi facultas operis defuerit, affabilis sermonis gratiam porrigendo. Nec unquam satis vos habere amicos credatis, sed sive divites sive pauperes, omnes vobis in amore fraternitatis conglutinate, quatenus hoc et ad vestrae ecclesiae utilitatem proficere et ad eorum quos diligitis salute valeat pertingere.’ The translation is based, with emendation, on that of W. Fröhlich, *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, 3 vols. (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1990–94), vol. 2, *Letter* 165.

¹⁷ On Herluin, see Gilbert Crispin, *Vita Herluini*, in *The Works of Gilbert Crispin*, A. S. Abulafia and G. R. Evans (eds) (Oxford, 1986); C. Harper-Bill, ‘Herluin, Abbot of Bec and His Biographer’ in D. Baker (ed.) *Studies in Church History*, 15 (1978): 15–25.

¹⁸ Anselm *Ep.* 66.

¹⁹ For William’s confirmation, M. Fauroux, *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie de 911 à 1066 complété d’un index rerum par Lucien Musset* (Paris, 1961), no. 98; For Philip I’s M. Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier roi de France* (Paris, 1908), no. 90. Véronique Gazeau has pointed out that although the list of possessions can give the impression of wealth, the property was widely dispersed, and concludes that it was insufficient to support properly the community: ‘The Effect of the Conquest of 1066 on Monasticism in Normandy: The Abbeys of the Risle Valley’ in *England and Normandy in the Middle Ages*, D. Bates and A. Curry (eds) (London, 1994), pp. 131–42, at p. 135.

Île-de-France, and a church.²⁰ In this context it may be significant that Anselm was the only Norman prelate present at the signing of agreements at the end of the First Vexin War of 1087.²¹ However, in economic terms, less revenue from French properties was paid directly to Bec than to the French priories after 1077.²² Economic security and expansion relied to a greater extent upon the income from post-conquest English holdings.

The first stages of the accumulation of English endowments for Bec took place under Abbot Anselm.²³ A variety of families made donations, including those of Ralph of Tosny, and Hugh, Earl of Chester, but Bec's principal English patrons were the descendants of Herluin's original overlord Count Gilbert of Brionne, namely Richard fitzGilbert and his son Gilbert fitzRichard whose English lands centred on the honour of Clare, and Baldwin fitzGilbert, and his sons William and Richard.²⁴ Two priories of the eventual four were established in England before 1093, one at St Neots in about 1079 by Richard fitzGilbert, and one at St John the Baptist, Clare, by Gilbert fitzRichard in about 1090, although this community eventually moved to Stoke-by-Clare in 1124.²⁵ Alongside these priories came gifts of land and tithes, which directly supported the abbey at Bec. Already in the Domesday assessment Bec held property in England valued at 23 pounds. Of the 21 Norman monasteries recorded as English property holders in the Domesday survey, Bec received the tenth-largest revenue. Only a few houses held property of considerably more value, and in these cases Fécamp, and possibly Mont-St-Michel, had pre-conquest holdings, whilst La Trinité and St Étienne, Caen, and Grestain, had close connexions to the ducal house and were rewarded accordingly.²⁶

²⁰ V. Gazeau, 'Le domaine continental du Bec; aristocratie et monachisme au temps d'anselme' in *Les mutations socio-culturelles au tournant des Xe–XIIe siècles*, Spicilegium Beccense II, Raymonde Foreville (ed.) (Paris, 1984), pp. 259–71, at p. 262.

²¹ Prou, *Receuil* 94; J. F. Lemarignier, E. Lamon and V. Gazeau, 'Monachisme et aristocratie autour de St Taurin d'Evreux et du Bec' in L. Musset (ed.), *Aspects du monachisme* (Paris, 1982), pp. 100–107.

²² Gazeau, 'The Effect of the Conquest of 1066', p. 135.

²³ M. Chibnall, 'The English Possessions of Bec in the Time of Anselm' in *Les Mutations*, pp. 273–82, at p. 276. See too her 'The Relations of Saint Anselm with the English Dependencies of the Abbey of Bec, 1079–93' *Spicilegium Beccense* I (Paris, 1959), pp. 521–30. Both of these articles are reprinted in M. Chibnall, *Piety, Power and History in Medieval England and Normandy* (Farnham, 2000). M. Morgan (Chibnall), *The English Lands of the Abbey of Bec* (Oxford, 1968).

²⁴ Morgan (Chibnall), *The English Lands*, p. 278.

²⁵ For this and what follows: Morgan (Chibnall), *The English Lands*.

²⁶ Figures from D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, 2nd edition (Cambridge, 1963), Appendix VI. La Trinité and St Étienne, Caen, were ducal foundations while Grestain was the burial place of William the Conqueror's mother.

Anselm made three trips to England during his abbacy, in about 1080, about 1086, and 1093, each concerning Bec land and priories. His ability to attract and encourage benefactions and gifts to Bec, and his general skill in running his abbey, emerge from these dealings, although they are not qualities which his chief remembrancer Eadmer, monk of Canterbury, chose to emphasise. Eadmer states quite bluntly that he will pass over the letters Anselm wrote for business reasons [*consilium de negotio*] and although he did describe the first trip to England, which led in all probability to the founding of the priory at St Neots, he places the main focus onto Anselm's visit to Canterbury.²⁷ Meetings Anselm had with noble families are indicated, but not explored. The good relations Anselm enjoyed with King William do receive attention: the king who 'seemed stiff and terrifying to everyone ... nevertheless unbent and was amiable with Anselm, so that to everyone's surprise he seemed an altogether different man when Anselm was present', but the implications of this and other contacts for Bec's material gain legitimately may be extrapolated.²⁸

Eadmer did not record Anselm's second trip to England at all, although since it was probably connected to the Domesday inquiry it held significance for the economic position of Bec.²⁹ Anselm did, writing from England to the monks at Bec, reporting that:

Since the king was willing to confirm our charter for the property we have in England, but only in the donors' presence, who were not all in attendance at the Easter Court, he ordered me to wait at court until Pentecost, when everyone would once again convene at the same time.³⁰

A generation later, Guibert of Nogent, in his *Monodiae* or memoirs composed in about 1115, was moved to compare the successful support of new orders and houses, such as Bec, in the second half of the eleventh century, with a more negative comparison to his present day. It is possible that Guibert had in mind

²⁷ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, R. W. Southern (ed. and trans.) (London, 1962), i.29. Chibnall questions the date of the first English trip, preferring 1080/1 to 1079/80 which might be imagined from Eadmer's account, 'English dependencies of the Abbey of Bec'. Regarding the foundation of St Neots, Anselm *Epp.* 91, 92 and 93 sought the support of Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, Baldwin, Abbot of Bury-St-Edmunds and Henry, Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, and *Ep.* 94 thanked Richard fitzGilbert and his wife, the Lady Rohais, for their sponsorship and gifts.

²⁸ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, i.31. See W. Fröhlich, 'St Anselm's Special Relationship with William the Conqueror', *Anglo Norman Studies*, X (1987): 101–10.

²⁹ Eadmer, *Vita Anselmi*, R. W. Southern (ed. and trans.) (London, 1962), i.20.

³⁰ Anselm *Ep.* 118. H. E. Salter, 'Two Deeds about the Abbey of Bec', *English Historical Review*, XL (1925): 74–6 includes a charter of William I confirming Bec property in England, probably dating from 1087.

the circumstances of Bec; he had become acquainted with Anselm during the latter's visits to France, and had studied with him.³¹ Guibert praises precisely the acts of patronage that made and secured Benedictine life at Bec:

The numerous examples all around them aroused a desire in the nobility to accept voluntary poverty. They supported the monasteries they entered with the wealth they now repudiated, and forever exerted themselves in pious pursuits to bring others to this end. ... Men or women who could not completely renounce their possessions supported those who did with frequent offerings from their own wealth. They bestowed gifts of the most welcome sort upon many churches and altars and were eager to match, to the extent they could, those who led a life of prayer and piety; it was a life they could not imitate, but they used their own wealth to help others follow it.³²

Monastic life flourished, but now, Guibert bewails, the conditions on which that flourishing was based have changed:

And still today – it pains me to say – sons take back from these holy sites everything their parents had once donated because of their religious desires, or else they never cease in their demands to buy these possessions back, so far have they lapsed from the intentions of their parent.³³

Guibert voices an anxiety which would be common to established monastic houses of the twelfth century.

³¹ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua sive monodiae, Autobiographe*, E-R Labande (ed.) (Paris, 1981), 1.17. See also J. Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002).

³² Guibert de Nogent, *De vita sua sive monodiae, Autobiographe*, E-R Labande (ed.) (Paris, 1981), 1.11: 'Affectabat itaque spontaneam subire pauperim tot exemplis circumcincta nobilitas, et coenobia, quae subibatm rebus a se conemptis inferciens, aliis etiam ad haec ipsa trahendis pia semper venatione tendebat. ... Qui vero, vel quae non poterant rebus ad integrum abrenunciare possessis, eos qui abrenunciaverant crebis substantiarum suarum largitionibus sustentabant, ecclesias et altaria multa jucundissimorum munerum oblatione circumdabant, et orationes ac pie vivendi modum, quem tales imitando exequi non poterant, talia facientes propriis ad id faciendum juvando substantiis, inquantum licuerat, exaequare studebant.' Translation from Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies and On the Relics of Saints*, J. Rubenstein and J. McAlhane (trans.) (London, 2011), p. 30.

³³ Guibert de Nogent, *De vita sua*, 1.11: 'Jam nunc enim, pro dolor! quae hujusmodi affectione permoti, locis sacris contulere parentes, aut penitus subtrahunt, aut crebras redemptiones exigere non desinunt filii, a patrum voluntatibus usquequaque degeneres.' Translation from Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 30.

These sentiments are echoed, one generation on from Guibert, by Orderic Vitalis. Tradition lay close to his heart. Moving praise is given to the establishment of Benedictine houses in all cases by Orderic, but high amongst them is Shrewsbury, and the encouraging words he puts into the mouth of his own father, Ordelerius of Orléans, to the main patron, Roger of Montgomery. Noting that Roger had found it difficult to find support for the gifts necessary for such an undertaking, Ordelerius stresses the gain assured by foundation:

Countless benefits are obtained there every day and Christ's garrisons struggle manfully against the devil ... True cenobites are enclosed in royal cloisters as if they were king's daughters ... where the cowed champions may engage in ceaseless combat against Behemoth for your soul.³⁴

To this endeavour Orderlerius dedicated the church of St Peter, and, Orderic recounts, 15 pounds sterling for the first stage of the work, half of all his property to demesne, with the remaining half to remain for his son, but under monastic lordship.

In recounting this story Orderic connects himself personally to what he conceives as proper mores regarding monastic property. His own orthodoxy in this respect having been established, Orderic painstakingly records in his *Ecclesiastical History* gifts and donations to St Evroult, his home monastery, in the spirit of a cartulary-chronicle.³⁵ These include not only the amounts of money given by particular benefactors, but also the mechanisms by which donations were garnered. Amongst these were medical practitioners within the community, whose attendance on lay families often resulted in bequests. One particularly productive practitioner was the doctor Goisbert, who, having joined St Evroult in 1076, was given charge of the Priory of Maule:

After the renowned physician Goisbert had begun to build the church at Maule, as I have related, he talked seriously with some of his friends and acquaintances about the welfare of his monastery. And since they were all of one mind with him, he urged his abbot to entrust the priory of Maule to another, so that he himself might be freed to set procuring other endowments. His request was granted ... Goisbert the physician then approached a number of French knights, and importuned them for the profit of his brethren. Some he won over with his medical skill and help, others with gifts, all with his eloquent entreaties.³⁶

³⁴ Orderic Vitalis, *The Ecclesiastical History*, M. Chibnall (ed. and trans.), 6 vols (Oxford, 1969–80), Book V, vol. III, pp. 142–7.

³⁵ This is especially the case for Book V.

³⁶ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book V, vol. III, pp. 206–9: '... Quosdam quidem illexit medicinali cura et subuentu, aliosque muneribus utrosque uero facundis hortatibus.'

None of these behaviours does Orderic condemn; wealth, land, accoutrements and money were all of central importance. Such resources had to be guarded and preserved, an activity described in terms where practical and moral arguments are intertwined institutionally and personally. The contract between donors and monasteries is explored in a deathbed speech of Ansold of Maule, the original benefactor of Maule, in 1118, in a series of admonitions to his son. Orderic puts into Ansold's mouth the clear statement, that his son should honour the monks of his foundation:

Grant freely that they may enjoy in peace and quiet the goods that my father and I have given them for our salvation. Never try to deprive them of any possessions or revenues, nor allow any of your men to do them wrong. For if you take care to be a true patron to them, they will never cease to pray to God for you.³⁷

Numerous examples of the travails of monastic communities beset by offspring unsympathetic to patrons' donations pervade Orderic's text, and stories of their eventual just desserts.³⁸ How lay patrons behaved towards family endowment forms an important measure of morality for monastic authors.

These values and their betrayal are exemplified, for Orderic, in the character and action of William Rufus, whose multiple offences against monastic property are treated with particular ire, in terms which Guibert would have echoed. Orderic saw as sacrilegious the king's administration of lands originally given to the church:

³⁷ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book V, vol. III, pp. 194–5: 'Res quas pater meus et ego dedimus eis pro nostra salute ut in pace et quiete habeant libenter concede. De rebus et redditibus suis nunquam uelis eos diminuere nec aliquam eis uiolentiam per subditos tuos patiaris inferre. Ipsi nimirum si fidus eorum fautor studeris esse indesinenter Deum exorabunt pro te'.

³⁸ Mabel of Bellême is perhaps the best example, Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book III, vol. II, pp. 54–5. Mabel, having attempted to literally eat the monks of St Évrout out of their home, is punished with divine illness. See Lanfranc's letter to Peter, bishop of Chester for his use of similar tactics with respect to the abbey of Coventry, Lanfranc, *Letters*, H. Clover and M. Gibson (eds and trans) (Oxford, 1979), *Letter 27* (1072–85), pp. 112–13: 'Both the abbot and his monks have lodged a complaint with me that you forced an entry into their dormitory and broke into their strongboxes, and that you have robbed them of their horses and all their goods. Furthermore that you pulled down their houses and ordered the materials of which these were built to be taken to your own residences; finally you remained in that monastery with your retinue for eight days eating up the monks' provisions [Clamorem enim fecerunt ad me tam abbas quam monachi eius quod dormitorium eorum per uim introisti, archas eorum fregisti, et equos et omnes proprietates quas habebant rapuisti; insuper domos eorum destruxisti et materias earum ad tuas uillas asportari precepisti, in ipso quoque coenobio cum familia tua consumens bona monachorum octo dierum moram fecisti]':

It is manifestly unjust and contrary to all reason that the things given to God by the generosity of Christian princes, or honourably increased by the care of stewards of the Church's goods, should revert to lay hands and be applied to unholy secular uses. We must believe unquestioningly that just as those who dutifully gave of their wealth to God have received a reward according to their deserts by God's grace, so sacrilegious men who appropriate holy things will be punished by God's vengeance and stripped of their wealth they have unjustly acquired, to their perpetual disgrace.³⁹

Both Orderic and Guibert single out concerns for their own monastic houses and, more generally, with the security of income, and the particular problems of benefaction across generations. The novel approach taken to these issues by one of the new orders of the period, mentioned by neither Guibert, nor Orderic, the Grandmontines, illustrates the extent of the concern they engendered.

The Grandmontines were perhaps the strictest and most rigorous of the new orders in the medieval West.⁴⁰ The origins of the order are obscure, but the founder, Stephen of Muret, established, probably in the 1070s, a hermitage in the forest of Muret, near Limoges, where others joined him in his solitary life. After his death came the move to Grandmont and by the middle years of the twelfth-century the order was well known (with 39 houses in France in 1167), enjoyed the patronage of Henry II Count of Anjou and King of England, and the approbation of some of the sternest critics of contemporary monasticism. For John of Salisbury, they, and the Carthusians, were remarkable for their resistance to avarice:

The Carthusians and the new order of Grandmont, firmly planted on the summit of ancient virtues under the guidance of our Saviour, display the greatest caution and conscientiousness in avoiding the name and stigma of hypocrites;

³⁹ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VIII, vol. IV, pp. 174–7: 'Iniustum quippe uidetur omnique rationi contrarium, ut quod Deo datum est fidelium liberalitate principium uel sollertia dispensatorum aecclesiasticae rei laudabiliter est auctum, denuo sub laicali manu retrahatur et in nefarios seculi usus distrahatur. Indubitanter credendum est quod sicut illi qui Deo de suis opibus pie dederunt, iam retributionem meritorum donante Deo receperunt sic sacrilegi sacrorum inuasores ultore Deo punientur, opibusque quas iniuste possident cum iugi dedecore spoliabantur.'

⁴⁰ C. Hutchison, *The Hermit Monks of Grandmont* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1989). The work of Jean Bequet remains central, *Recherches sur les institutions religieuses de l'Ordre de Grandmont au Moyen Age*, École pratiques des hautes études (Paris, 1951), and a series of articles in *Revue Mabillon* and the *Bulletin Archæologique et Historique du Limousin*. See also, E. Hallam, 'Henry II, Richard I and the Order of Grandmont', *Journal of Medieval History*, 1 (1975): 165–86, which is given broader context in her 'Henry II as a Founder of Monasteries', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 28 (1977): 113–32.

for they have indeed fixed limits to their desires, nay even to their necessities, hold in check avarice with the reins of moderation, and at times even deprive themselves of necessities for fear that avarice under cover of necessity may plot against them ... They are undoubtedly great men and to be counted among the exceptional since not only few orders but even few individuals in our now aging world with its many passing centuries have been conspicuous for having set limits to their own desires.⁴¹

The fervour of the Grandmontines found itself expressed in their *Rule*, finally approved in 1156. On the question of property strict limits were imposed: no land to be held except a smallholding around the individual house and no possession of other churches.⁴² More specifically the Grandmontines were strictly enjoined to return gifts to the heirs of donors were they to require them.⁴³ Title deeds and charters were not to be kept, and there was to be no recourse to law.⁴⁴ A position more diametrically opposed to the traditional monastic point of view expressed by Anselm, Guibert and Orderic, would be difficult to find.

While the extreme reaction of the Grandmontines to the issue fits with a wider-ranging critique of Benedictine material prosperity, it is arguable that this was part of a broader response to the questions posed by wealth and money. The differences in ethos aside, both types of community evince a shared sense of how seriously the questions raised by possession of money and wealth had to be taken, and the proper and fitting use of these resources. Outright rejection of both found contemporary approval, but within those communities who did not do so, a serious and complex web of moral positions were adopted to safeguard those who did receive and administer the fiscal support of the secular world.

⁴¹ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, C. C. J. Webb (ed.) (Oxford, 1909), ch. 23. Translation from John of Salisbury, *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers*, J. B. Pike (trans.) (New York, 1972, orig. publ. 1938), pp. 281–6, 281: 'Quod Cartuarienses, dum moderationis habenis avaritiam cohibent, et Magni Montis noua religio, dum omnia mundana contempnens et de crastino non cogitans repellit omnia, avaritiam excludit, ab ypocritarum nota et nomine longius absunt; et qui sint seculares aut religiosi; et quae regula actiuorum et quae otiosorum; et quis sit finis ypocriseos ... Ypocritarum autem nomen et notam cautiissime et fidelissime declinant Cartuarienses et Magni Montis noua professio in antiquae uirtutis culmine, Salvatore praeuio, solidata.'

⁴² *Regula Venerabilis Viri Stephani Muretensis*, in *Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis*, J. Becquet (ed.), *Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis*, 8 (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 61–99.

⁴³ *Regula Stephani Muretensis*, no. 23, pp. 81–2.

⁴⁴ *Regula Stephani Muretensis*, no. 24, p. 82; no. 31, p. 84.

II) Simony and Payment: Sin and Charity

The question how money and gifts were obtained and to what purpose they might be put by monastic communities formed part of a wider debate over simony. This debate touched the core of traditional Benedictine life, not least how monks joined their abbeys. The practice of childhood oblation, giving boys to a particular abbey, has its origins in the early history of monasticism. It features within the *Rule of St Benedict*, where prospective gifts to the monastery, to accompany oblates, are addressed: gifts are allowed for, but are identified as not necessary.⁴⁵ The practice of oblation, and of associated gift-giving, became widespread, enduring through the eleventh and earlier twelfth centuries.⁴⁶ Orderic Vitalis gives the details of his own oblation, in the course of his father's supposed oration on the foundation of St Mary's Shrewsbury, and the arrangements made for his son:

I have procured for him a safe place of refuge among the faithful servants of God at Saint-Évroult in Normandy, and have given as my free-will offering for his blessing thirty marks of silver out of my own substance to his future masters and companions.⁴⁷

The benefits to monastic houses of such arrangements in terms of patronage are obvious. However, the practice had all but died out by the end of the twelfth century.⁴⁸

Reform communities did not take forward the practice, using its rejection as a means to distinguish themselves from the older communities for whom it was normative.⁴⁹ Furthermore, concerns grew throughout the twelfth century about

⁴⁵ *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary*, c. 59, T. Kardong (ed. and trans.) (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1996), pp. 485–6.

⁴⁶ See the discussion in J. Clark, *The Benedictines in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 64–6.

⁴⁷ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book V, vol. III, pp. 146–7: 'eique locum tutae mansionis inter uernulas Dei apud Vticum in Neustria procurauit pro quo eulogias benedictionis xxx scilicet marcos argenti futuris eius magistris et consodalibus de porismate meo libenter erogauit'. Whether Orderic intended any particular New Testament valence in the reference to the 30 marks of silver (Matthew 26:15) is open to question. His feelings of anguish about his exile to St Évroult as an infant come to the fore at the end of his history, Book XIII, vol. VI, pp. 552–5, abandoned, weeping and renounced.

⁴⁸ Clark, *Benedictines*, p. 65.

⁴⁹ The subject was not one of intensive debate amongst the newer orders, although Bernard of Clairvaux was characteristically direct in his condemnation of the alleged oblation of his nephew Robert to Cluny, in a letter to the same, c. 1119, Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistolae*, in *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, vii–viii, J. Leclercq and H.-M. Rochais (eds), Editiones

the possible implications of simony connected to the practice. The vexatious nature of the issue is indicated by its appearance in canon law collections, especially in Gratian's *Decretum*, composed by the 1150s.⁵⁰

The prologue to *Causa 1* of the *Decretum* sets up the story of an oblate given to a monastery by his father, who paid the sum of 10 pounds demanded by the abbot (see Plate 2). Although the story continues with an outline of the boy's subsequent career as a simoniac, the substance of the first and second questions of the *Causa* was whether the original entry, over which the boy had no control, constituted an act of simony.⁵¹ Gratian decided that the gift should be freely offered; any perceived demand for money rendering the transaction simoniacal.⁵² This conclusion brought to an end a debate begun in the 1120s with the defence of oblate gifts by Rudolph of St Trond, and was probably a significant factor in the decline of oblate recruitment.⁵³ That anxiety about simony and entry was expressed in this way in the period c. 1120–c. 1155 speaks to issues of church reform, but bound up within that indicates tensions about the right and proper use of monetary gifts within monastic communities. The harmful or harmonious effects of money are used, by the authors under consideration here, to explore the dynamics of monastic identity, the relation of individuals and the communities they served, and questions of the boundaries of moral behaviour.

Concern over simony emerges as a strong theme for Guibert, who, throughout his *Monodiae*, treats the subject and its practitioners severely, especially, but not exclusively, in a monastic context. Closely connected to this is his evident concern for the sinful consequences of money used in the wrong way, for malign purposes, or with intentions defined as morally dubious. A genuine and growing moral issue with money can be detected within Guibert's text.

Cisterciones (Rome, 1974 and 1977), *Ep. 1*; B. S. James (trans.), *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux* (Stroud, 1998, orig. publ. 1953).

⁵⁰ Joseph H. Lynch, *Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260: A Social, Economic and Legal Study* (Columbus, Ohio, 1976). See also Lynch's, 'Monastic Recruitment in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Some Social and Economic Considerations', *American Benedictine Review*, 26 (1975): 425–47.

⁵¹ For the text of Gratian, while the standard edition remains Emil Friedberg, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, 2 vols (Leipzig, [repr. Graz], 1879 [repr. 1959]), see *Decretum Gratiani*, A. Winroth (ed.): <https://sites.google.com/a/yale.edu/decretumgratiani/> (accessed 22/12/13).

⁵² Gratian, *Decretum*, c. 1 q. 2 d.p.c. 10: 'It is clearer than light by the authority of many, that it is not permitted to demand money from those about to enter a monastery, lest he who demands and he who pays, commit the crime of simony. [Multorum auctoritatibus luce clarius constat, quod ab ingressuris monasterium non licet pecuniam exigere, ne et ille, qui exigit, et ille, qui soluit symoniae crimen incurrat].'

⁵³ Lynch, *Simoniacal Entry*, p. 95.

By far the most detailed of Guibert's descriptions of money come in his narrative and analysis of the rising of the commune at Laon in 1115. The commune Guibert regarded as an unnatural and evil phenomenon, a lamentable state of affairs brought about by the unhappy leadership of its bishops. The uprising provoked a number of violent episodes, including the murder of bishop Gaudry, and Guibert pays attention to the disruption such events caused within the urban community. He offers particular insight into the dislocation to the systems of coinage which occurred within the city, the consequent effects of bribery and corruption on mintmasters, and the confusion caused by the appearance of different coinages and their impact within not only the city but also its hinterland. As Guibert explains:

... the minters, knowing that if they sinned in their duties, they could find salvation through pecuniary redemption, debased the currency with so many counterfeits that a great many people were brought to extreme poverty. They minted coins of the cheapest bronze, and by some crooked technique used a tiny amount of silver to make them shinier.⁵⁴

To combat this, bishop Gaudry decreed that the small coins of Amiens (also heavily debased, according to Guibert) would be legal tender within the city.⁵⁵ When that failed to have any effect, he started to mint his own coin:

... and had the coins stamped with a bishop's crozier to serve as his symbol. Everyone in private rejected these with such loud guffaws that they had less value than any of the debased currency. In the meantime, to promote every issue of these new coins, decrees were circulated that no one mock the worthless impressions of him, providing numerous opportunities to prosecute the people on the grounds they had insulted the office of the bishop. Enormous revenues could thus be extorted from every possible direction.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua*, III.7: '... monetae percussores, scientes, si peccarent in suo officio, quod pecuniaria possent redemptione salvari, tanta eandem falsitate corruperunt, ut per hoc ad extremam plurimi indigentiam ducerentur. Nam cum denarios ex aere vilissimo conficerent, quos in momentum pravis quibusdam artibus, argento micantiores facerent ...'; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 128.

⁵⁵ On the coinage of Amiens and Laon see Faustin Poey-d'Avant, *Les monnaies féodales de France* (Paris, 1858–62) and A. Dieudonné, *Les monnaies féodales*, Manuel de la numismatique française, tome IV (Paris, 1936). C. Vellet has complete summaries on the coinages of the French provinces (Amiens under Picardy and Laon under Île-de-France) in Michel Amandry *et al.*, *Dictionnaire de Numismatique* (Paris, 2006). I am indebted to Jens Christian Moesgaard for these references.

⁵⁶ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua*, III.7: '... cui pariter ad suae personae signum ferulam pastorem imprimi fecit. Quae clam ab omnibus cum tanto cachinno spernebatur,

Gaudry's actions, Guibert contends, were the essential cause of the uprising and, to that extent his misfortunes were a form of divine punishment. Money plays an important role in his articulation of the diabolical nature of the commune and the violence it unleashed. It is important to note, however, that money, as concept and as the reification in coin, is still in itself a bad, but rather something that could, perhaps all too easily, be turned to evil purpose.

The accounts of the Laon commune form part of a larger concern within Guibert's writing on immoral use of money. Two stories told early in his memoirs introduce the theme. The first concerns a simoniac monk: an elderly monk sent to a cell in the Vexin decided to restore a damaged public road. He asked for public contributions, and mended the road, but kept some of the money to himself. Struck down by sickness, he refused to confess, but gave the money to a servant. The monk died but had confessed to his crime and mentioned the servant, who had hidden the money in the straw of his infant daughter's cradle. The baby was tormented by demons whose importuning stopped only when the money was returned. The evil identified by Guibert here is wrongful use of money and the vice of avarice: 'more ruinous to monks, as it is less natural to them, and thus it is difficult to find any other crime where the devil waits in ambush with greater stealth'.⁵⁷

A second story takes a similar subject; a monk received two sous from a noble lady. Soon afterwards he developed dysentery, and died in agonising pain, accompanied by diabolic torments. The monk died unconfessed on account of this cursed money, which was found in a small purse, strapped around his body, and hidden in an armpit. A question arose about where and how the body should be buried most appropriately:

The abbot took counsel with some wise men and ordered that he be buried in a field, deprived of prayer and psalms, with the money placed on his chest. Yet in their private prayers for him his brothers did not falter, but instead, when they learned that he was in even more need for their support, they pressed on with all the more urgency. As a result of his sudden death, the rest of the monks had more scruples about money.⁵⁸

ut impuriore moneta omnino minus appreciaretur. Interea, cum ad singulas quasque horum novorum nomismatum promotiones ferebantur edicta, ne quis pessimis ipsius caraxaturas cavillaretur, inde creberrimae populum impetendi occasiones, quasi qui calumniam intulissent instituto pontificis: inde largissimorum quocumque fieri poterant census extortiones'; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, pp. 128–9.

⁵⁷ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua*, 1.21: '... apud monachos perniciosum, utpote minus naturale, ut vix aliquod crimen reperiatur, cui tantopere diabolus surripiendo insidiatur'; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 70.

⁵⁸ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua* 1.22: 'Communicatio itaque abbatis cum viris prudentibus consilio, praecepit agrariam ei fieri sepulturam, et ab oration et psalmis exortem,

This is a less equivocal statement on the evils of money per se, although the private possession of money, which led to the problems in the first place, should be noted. Archaeological evidence confirms the burial of corpses with purses of coin throughout the Middle Ages, within graveyards and without.⁵⁹

The details in Guibert's description provide further evidence for tensions over the improper use of money, tensions which are contextualised around the relationship of the individual monk to his community. To take first the insistence that the monk died unconfessed. Unlike the case for the laity, monastic confession was not uncommon in the early twelfth century.⁶⁰ Admonition to confession is included in the Benedictine Rule, where it features as the fifth step of humility.⁶¹ The extent to which such confession was conceptualised as private is a more difficult question, but it did form part of the Benedictine liturgy of death carried out by the community on behalf of their companion in extremis, from which Guibert's unfortunate subject had rendered himself excluded.⁶²

Despite the prohibition of prayer and psalms, by which should be understood the death liturgy, Guibert notes that his brethren still offered to their unfortunate companion efficacious private prayers. Private devotion formed an important element in later eleventh-century religiosity among religious communities and the laity, drawing on Carolingian traditions with a strongly liturgical aspect, and incorporating a stronger emphasis on the intercession of the particular saint,

et pectori ejus supponi pecuniam. Privata tamen pro eo fratrum non defecit oratio, immo multo amplius institerunt, quo magis noverant eum egere subsidio. Ex hujus igitur morte repentina, caeteri peculium castigatiores redditi?; Guibert, *Monodies*, p. 71.

⁵⁹ On this general subject see Lucia Travaini, 'Saints and Sinners: Coins in Medieval Italian Graves', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 164 (2004): 159–81, and her contribution to this volume, including discussion of a quite different example, the deposit of 12 coins in the tomb of St Francis, which appear to have been placed on the chest of the corpse, F. Guadagni, *De invento corpore Divi Francisci Ordinis Minorum Parentis* (Rome, 1819). A striking discovery of a corpse, from about 1190, with a purse of coins, which may or may not have been buried in a graveyard, was recorded from Skänninge, Monica Golabiewski Lannby, 'Unikt gravfynd med 1100-talsmynt i Skänninge', *Svensk numismatisk tidskrift*, 5 (2009): 110. I am grateful to Professor Kenneth Jonsson for bringing this example to my attention.

⁶⁰ A. Murray, 'Confession before 1215', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, sixth series, 3 (1993): 51–81, esp. 70–71.

⁶¹ *Benedict's Rule*, c. 7, Kardong (ed. and trans.), pp. 131 and 134.

⁶² See F. Paxton and I. Cochelein, *The Death Ritual at Cluny in the Central Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2013). An earlier version of Bernard and Ulrich of Cluny's record of the death ritual at their monastery, from the late 1060s, appeared as F. Paxton, *A Medieval Latin Death Ritual: the Monastic Customaries of Bernard and Ulrich of Cluny* (Missoula, Montana, 1993). Confession at the beginning of the death ritual is recorded in Lanfranc of Canterbury, *Monastic Constitutions*, M. D. Knowles (trans.) (Oxford, 1951), p. 121. Lanfranc's *Constitutions* were presumably based around the customs of his home monastery of Bec, but bear close resemblance to Bernard of Cluny as well.

especially Mary, or Christ.⁶³ That such private prayers would be appropriate for the occasion Guibert describes is demonstrated by those of Anselm of Canterbury, contemporary to the situation and full of many themes pertinent to an uncertain eternal judgement on the basis of misusing money. In the third *Prayer to Mary*, Anselm addresses theme of forgiveness in all places:

But, Lady, why do I only speak
of the benefits with which you fill the earth?
They go down to hell, they go up to heaven.
For through the fullness of your grace
those in hell rejoice that they are delivered,
and those in heaven are glad at that restoration.⁶⁴

In the *Prayer to Christ*, in a re-imagination of the moments after the crucifixion and resurrection, Anselm reflects on the ‘... wonder, beyond price and beyond compare’ of Christ’s redeeming work.⁶⁵ The priceless value of salvation is underlined, as are the freedom of Christ’s gift and the dependence of fallen humanity on the operation of grace.

Repentance was too late for the monk Guibert describes, whose actions had exemplified sordid sin. The episode, through its juxtaposition of private and public activities, underlines Guibert’s consciousness of the moral penalties for wrongful use of money. It is, ultimately, the community who take action in response to the misuse, and who meet a disciplinary challenge provoked by the possession of money.

The threat to community stability by the misappropriation of resources, and inappropriate use of money, underlies Guibert’s anxieties about simony, with its stronger implications of sacrilege. These emerge frequently, for example, in an account of a chasuble sought by Guibert’s original abbey of Fly from William Rufus of England. Rather than pay for this himself the king ordered the abbot of Battle Abbey to pay his messenger 15 marks; the abbot refused, and Rufus

⁶³ See B. Ward (trans.), *The Prayers and Meditation of Saint Anselm* (London, 1973), pp. 35–43; for a general survey see J-F Cottier. Private prayer in the later Anglo-Saxon period is the subject of the unpublished PhD thesis from the University of York by Kate Thomas, *The Meaning, Practice and Context of Private Prayer in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, 2011.

⁶⁴ Anselm of Canterbury, *Prayer to St Mary* (3), Ward (trans.), *Prayers and Meditations*, p. 119, ll. 141–6; *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt (ed.), *Oratio ad sanctam Mariam pro impetrando eius et Christi amore*, vol. III, p. 21 ll. 76–9: ‘Sed cur solum loquor, domina, beneficiis tuis plenum esse mundum? Inferna penetrant, caelos superant. Per plenitudinem enim gratiae tuae et quae in inferno erant se laetantur liberata, et quae supra mundum sunt se gaudent restaurata.’

⁶⁵ Anselm of Canterbury, *Prayer to Christ*, Ward (trans.), *Prayers and Meditations*, p. 97, l. 131; *Opera Omnia*, Schmitt (ed.), *Oratio ad Christum*, vol. III, p. 8, l. 66: ‘Admirabilis, inaestimabilis, incomparabilis.’

responded by looting the abbey and forcing the abbot to buy back the abbey's possessions for 15 marks. Fly received its chasuble, but, reflective of the unhappy circumstances, it was soon after destroyed by lightning. William, Guibert notes, was brought to his end soon after by divine agency.⁶⁶ While William Rufus does not provoke the prolonged, fascinated disgust he did for Orderic Vitalis, it is important for Guibert that fraudulent behaviour is highlighted by appropriate punishment.

The tensions provoked by simony on the one hand, and regular, familiar, use of money on the other feature particularly in two contrasting clerics with whom Guibert was connected. The first is his predecessor at Nogent as abbot, Godfrey who: '... believing simony to be in both name and deed as accursed as filthy profiteering [lucre], he forbade anything to do with it, whether buying or selling, from happening in the church, and once the market was shut down, only grace was admitted.'⁶⁷ Nevertheless, this did not prevent Godfrey being a shrewd businessman, which Guibert pointed out deliberately, a quality that led directly to, but did not pay for, his election as bishop of Amiens in 1104.

Episcopal simony attracts negative commentary, however, regarding the appointment of Hélinand as bishop of Laon, in which diocese Nogent lay, 1052–98. Hélinand had been chaplain to King Edward the Confessor of England, and was often sent on missions to Henry, king of France. Guibert remarks, in a passage worth quoting at length, that:

'This king was very greedy, and in the habit of selling bishoprics, so Hélinand would ply him with the most lavish gifts to suggest that upon the death of any of the bishops of France, he ought to take on the episcopal insignia as successor. He had in fact accumulated enormous piles of money, since he had been installed in the chapel of the king and queen at a time when England was brimming with enormous wealth ... Once he was introduced into Laon, he did not think he could obtain influence through respect for his family or his scholarly learning, but had placed his hopes in the riches he held in vast supplies and the acts of generosity he had learned to distribute shrewdly ... By such craftiness, he even attempted to seize the archbishopric of Reims. He did occupy it for two years, after its sizable revenues had fallen into the hands of King Philip, a most venal man in what belonged to God, until he heard from the pope that one who has a wife cannot under any circumstances acquire another. When someone openly asked him why

⁶⁶ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua*, 1. 23; Guibert, *Monodies*, p. 74–5.

⁶⁷ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua* 2.2: 'Simoniacum itaque quippiam in eadem ecclesia aut fieri aut haberi vetuit et, exclusis mercimoniis, solam admisit gratiam, non dissimiliter execrationi ducens lucre turpis et opus et nomen'; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 90.

he made such an attempt, he said that he still would not have acted any differently, even if he had been able to become Pope.⁶⁸

Guibert's judgement on Hélinand is worth pausing over. Striking is the reference to pre-conquest England as wealthy, a theme popular amongst monastic observers south of the channel.⁶⁹ Orderic Vitalis emphasises the lavish gifts showered on Norman monasteries by Duke William once conqueror and king, and the staggeringly exaggerated report that as king William received a daily income 'in sterling money one thousand and sixty-one pounds, ten shillings and three halfpence from the ordinary revenue of England, not counting royal tribute and judicial fines and many other sources of revenue which daily swelled the royal treasures'.⁷⁰

⁶⁸ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua* 3.2: 'Cum quo rego, quia multum erat cupidus et episcopatum venditionibus assuetus, largissimis lenocinantibus exeniis egit, ut, si quispiam episcoporum Franciae decederet, pontificalibus infulis ipse succederet. Is enim in capellania regis ac reginae positus, quoniam Anglia infinitis eo tempore florebat opibus, multos pecuniarum montes aggererat ... Lauduno enim invecus, quia non aestimatione parentum, non scientia literarum se valitulum putabat, in opulentia, quae plurima suppetebat, et quam cautissime, dispensare didicerat, et dapsilitate spes fuerat ... His etiam ipse artibus Rhemensem archiepiscopatum insedit; quem cum dilapidatis penes regem Philippum, hominem in Dei rebus venalissimum, magnis censibus biennio obtinisset, a domino papa audivit, quia uxorem quis habens, altera superinducere nequaquam possit. Consulenti plane cuidam se cur eo tenderet, dixit quia, si etiam papa fieri possit, haudquaquam dissimularet.' Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 108, with emendation.

⁶⁹ The subject of the wealth of England before and after the Norman Conquest has occasioned considerable debate. For a positive portrayal see P. Sawyer, 'The Wealth of England in the Eleventh Century', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, (1965): 145–64, and expanded in his *The Wealth of Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2013). Less positive assessments of the capacity of the later eleventh-century English economy include J. L. Bolton, *Money in the Medieval English Economy: 973–1489* (Manchester, 2012). Interpretation of the numismatic evidence especially as marshalled by N. Mayhew, 'Modelling Medieval Monetisation', in *A Commercialising Economy: England 1086 to c. 1300*, (eds) R. Britnell and B. M. S. Campbell (Manchester, 1995), pp. 65–76, and Martin Allen, *Mints and Money in Medieval England* (Cambridge, 2012), is significant in this context. The contributions of Bolton and Mayhew to this volume express the same perspective, and in Bolton's case the same question: by what standard is wealth to be measured? A useful perspective on the effect of high-status commodities in Normandy after the Conquest is provided by D. N. Dumville, 'Anglo-Saxon Books: Treasure in Norman Hands?', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, XVI (1993): 83–99.

⁷⁰ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book IV, vol. II, pp. 196–9 and 266–7: '... mille et LX librae sterilensis monetae, solidique XXX et tres oboli ex iustis redditibus Angliae per singulos dies redduntur exceptis muneribus regis et reatum redemptionibus aliisque multiplicibus negociis quae regis aerarium cotidie adaugent.' Orderic is following the tradition of his earlier source, William of Poitiers's, *Gesta Guillelmi*.

More striking, however, is the fact that despite having outlined all of Hélinand's simoniac behaviour Guibert is ultimately unwilling to condemn him. In fact, Hélinand, was, for Guibert, a defender of church liberty, who spent his money enriching his and neighbouring churches:

he used his enormous wealth to advance his see as well as the churches attached to it, he also protected in splendour the privileged status of the church, and it was fitting for him to have stores of wealth from the outside world, so that he could use it to advance splendidly the lordship of his churches.⁷¹

In Guibert's opinion this was not only unproblematic, but also, positively creditable, 'it was fitting [ut dignum erat]'. For all of his intensity on the subject of money and the church, Guibert was not fanatical about its intrinsic evil. Money, even unfortunately acquired, could be put to good and praiseworthy use, depending on the circumstances of the individual user and the relation to ecclesiastical lordship.

In this sense, Guibert again represents a view consistent with Benedictine monasticism, which saw material support as necessary, properly defensible and a positive element for spiritual expression. Orderic's description of Ansold of Maule's original bequest to the church of St Mary includes the detail that:

he gave the quarry for millstones on the wood of Beule to St. Mary, so that twopence should be given towards the lights of the church for every millstone. And if anyone tried to defraud the church he should pay five shillings. Formerly, indeed, the fine for this offence had been sixty shilling; but since the law of the church is milder than the secular law fifty-five shillings are pardoned and five taken.⁷²

The moral virtue associated with the fine serves to underline the reasonable monetary gain for the particular church. Respect for the purposes of money, as well as property, directed towards religious use forms the central value Orderic seeks to establish.

⁷¹ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua* 3.2: '... quod et libertatem ecclesiae magnifice tuitus sit, et tam ipsam sedem, quam appendices ejus ecclesias uberrima largitione provexit, et dignum erat, ut externa ei bona suppeterent, quae in dominicarum domuum decore projicerentur'; Guibert of Nogent, *Monodies*, p. 109.

⁷² Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book V, vol. III, pp. 184–5: 'Aream quoque molarum in silua Bolæ dedit sanctae Mariae ita ut ex singulis molis duo denarii dentur ad luminaria aeclesiae. Et quisquis inde fraudem fecerit quinque solidos persoluat. Antea nempe pro reatu huiusmodi sexaginta soluebantur solidi. Sed lex aeclesiastica mitior est quam secularis quinquaginta quinque solidi indulgentur, et quinque accipiuntur'.

Moral disbursement of money features especially strongly in the description offered of Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury by Orderic's Anglo-Norman contemporary, William of Malmesbury, in his *Deeds of the Bishops of England*, written in the 1120s. William notes alms-giving as one of Lanfranc's particular virtues; he gave generously and judiciously, fulfilling the prognostic at his consecration from Luke 11.41, 'Give alms; and behold, all things are clean unto you.' The fulfilment of worldly transactions in the spiritual gain they brought to the giver is made explicit; Lanfranc was a cheerful giver.⁷³ He was not, however, indiscriminate with his money. William describes how Lanfranc differentiated his gifts, and what could almost be seen as Dickensian terms for his support of the poor:

The poor were given bread, shoes, and everything under the head of food and clothing. Cash he did not give, a policy he adopted after mature reflection: ordinary folk of this sort even if they find their pockets full, 'digest hunger dry-mouthed' [Persius, *Satyricon* lxxxii.5]; and he avoided as if it were something sacred the provision of a penny instead of food, for fear of diminishing his pile.⁷⁴

For others, Lanfranc's monetary charity was extended generously, in passages where William reveals a debt to the work which forms the basis for his history of both Lanfranc's and Anselm's archiepiscopates, Eadmer's *Historia novorum in Anglia*. 'On needy clerics and monasteries he lavished large sums of money, frequently encouraging the bashful to make requests.'⁷⁵ Lanfranc's gifts of money to monastic houses include Bec and St Évrault, both of whom preserved that memory in Anselm's letters and Orderic's *History*, respectively,

⁷³ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, M. Winterbottom (ed. and trans.) (Oxford, 2007), i.43.1, pp. 100–101.

⁷⁴ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, i.43.3, pp. 102–103: 'Expendebantur ergo pauperibus panes, calcei, et prorsus quae ad uictum pertinent et amictum. Denarii non dabantur, maturiori tractatu, consilio profundiori, quod huiusmodi uulguis, suffarcinato etiam marsupio, sicco concoquat ore famem. Et quasi aliquid sacrosanctum uitat dare pro uictu nummum, ne debilitet numerum.' I have adopted and adapted the translation of David Preest for the last sentence, which stays closer to the literal meaning, and in this case the resonances of the misuse of money in a clerical context, than Winterbottom's 'he avoided like the plague the provision of money ...'. William of Malmesbury, *The Deeds of the Bishops of England* (Woodbridge, 2002), p. 46.

⁷⁵ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, i.43.3, pp. 102–103: 'Clericis egentibus et monasteriis immensum quantum nummorum cumulabat, plerumque uerecundiores ad rogandum inuitans.'

and there were others as Eadmer states, including St Albans and Rochester, as well as Canterbury.⁷⁶

Lanfranc made similar gestures to individuals, as William of Malmesbury noted: 'He would, without being asked, offer money to young men to help them come to the rescue of needy relatives. If what he gave turned out to have gone astray, he would repeat the gift, telling the recipient to keep it quiet.'⁷⁷ Eadmer records in detail Lanfranc's generosity to one of his fellow monks at Canterbury, to whom he gave 30 shillings a year, for the sake of the monk's mother. The monk was astonished that after the accidental loss of one of the instalments, and qualms about the archbishop's response, he simply replaced the five-shilling instalment, and added two more for good measure.⁷⁸ The specificity of the references to coin in both Eadmer and Lanfranc is important; this was a facet of Lanfranc's generosity which is commented on, remembered and recalled some 30 to 40 years after his death.

William of Malmesbury's concentration on Lanfranc's use of money is reliant upon its earlier emphasis by Eadmer. Indeed, writing in the 1110s and 1120s, contemporaneously with Guibert, Eadmer displays a similar concern for monetary payment and the moral choices this entailed. Description of money is used to illustrate moral points, and operates as a basic source for metaphorical statements. Like Orderic and Guibert, Eadmer condemned William Rufus's attitude towards monastic property: '... he put the Church of Christ up for sale, granting the rights of lordship over it in preference to all others to whoever to the Church's detriment outbid his rival in the price that he offered. With miserable regularity the price was renewed year by year.'⁷⁹ When Eadmer came to Henry I money played its part in the rhetorical rehabilitation of the monarch. Critical of Henry's monetary demands fuelled by his, eventually victorious, campaigns in Normandy in 1105, and then 1106, Eadmer used Henry's reform of the coinage in or around 1108 as a counterpoint to his interest in furthering

⁷⁶ Anselm, *Epp*, 89 and 90; Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book III, vol. II, pp. 147–51; Eadmer, *Historia novorum in Anglia*, M. Rule (ed.), Rolls Series (London, 1884), 1, p. 15–18.

⁷⁷ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Pontificum*, i.44.4, pp. 104–105: 'Vltroneus iuuenibus offerre denarios, quibus necessitudinum propriarum inopiae occurrerent. Si datum fortuitu excideret, geminare, idque clam aliis esse precipere'.

⁷⁸ Eadmer, *Historia novorum* 1, pp. 14–15. The episode is discussed in Gasper and Gullbekk, 'Money and Anselm of Canterbury': 162–3.

⁷⁹ Eadmer, *Historia novorum*, Rule (ed.), p. 26: 'Fecit ergo ecclesiam Christi venalem, jus in ea dominandi prae caeteris illi tribuens, qui ad detrimentum ejus in dando pretium alium superabat. Unde misera successione singulis annis pretium renovabatur', G. Bosanquet (trans.), *Eadmer's History of Recent Events in England*, (London, 1964), p. 27.

church reform, and taking Anselm's advice in this matter seriously.⁸⁰ Money and the church are held together tightly by Eadmer: wisely guided by his spiritual leader, Henry I was able to re-make money for the positive good of the Christian community he ruled. Monetisation in this sense reaches to the foreground of concerns expressed by monastic authors about moral well-being and, as they would see it, the intertwined nature of religious and secular society.

III) Ascetic Values: Debt, Poverty and Usury

The intersection between royal and spiritual power drawing on the figure of money is evoked again by the Cistercian abbot Ailred of Rievaulx, writing a generation or so after Guibert, and Eadmer, William and Orderic. Noted for his guide to monastic relations, the *Spiritual Friendship*, written around the 1160s, Ailred was, as abbot of Revesby and then Rievaulx, well acquainted with the practical demands of running a major monastery, even one of the Cistercian order.⁸¹ He had prior experience; before entering the order, Ailred had been an official at the court of David I of Scotland, and, according to the author of his *Life*, Walter Daniel, had been marked as a future bishop.⁸² Ailred's discussion

⁸⁰ Eadmer, *Historian novorum*, Rule (ed.), pp. 171–2 and 192–5, Bosanquet (trans.), pp. 183–184 and 205–8. Another contemporary Benedictine chronicler, John of Worcester, follows Eadmer's identification of the large sums of money collected by Henry, s.a. 1105, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, vol. 3, P. McGurk (ed. and trans.) (Oxford, 1998), pp. 106–7, and then quotes Eadmer directly in a notice of Henry's monetary and ecclesiastical reforms, s.a. 1108, *The Chronicle*, pp. 112–17. On the reform of the coinage see Allen, *Coinage*, p. 370, and Giles E. M. Gasper and Svein H. Gullbekk, 'An Intimate Encounter with English Coinage in the High Middle Ages: The Case of Wulfric of Haselbury' *British Numismatic Journal*, 83 (2013): 112–19. For Henry's campaigns, C. W. Hollister, *Henry I* (New Haven, 2001), pp. 184–91, Tinchebrai, at pp. 198–201.

⁸¹ Walter Daniel, *The Life of Ailred of Rievaulx*, F.M. Powicke (ed. and trans.) (London, 1950). Chapter 30 notes the increase at Rievaulx of resources in personnel, farms, lands, equipment, but makes no specific mention of money.

⁸² In the *Genealogy of English Kings* Ailred records his familiarity with Prince Henry of Scotland (d. 1152), King David's son: '... a man gentle and devout, a person of sweet spirit and cheerful heart and worthy in every way to be born of such a father. I lived with him from the very cradle. I grew up with him, boys together, and even when we were both adolescents I knew him. To serve Christ I left him while he was stamping out the flowers of youth, as I did his father, whom I loved beyond all mortals, at that time illustrious in the flower of old age. I left them bodily, but never in my mind or my heart' (25), Ailred of Rievaulx, *The Historical Works*, M. Dutton (ed.) and J. P. Freeland (trans.) (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2005), p. 121; Aelred of Rievaulx, *Genealogia regum anglorum, Patrologia Latina (PL)*, 195, cols. 736–7: 'virum mansuetum et pium, hominem suavis spiritus et lactei cordis, et dignum per omnia qui de tali patre nasceretur. Cum quo ab ipsis cunabulis vixi et puer cum puero crevi, cujus

of money is limited; the remarks by Bernard of Clairvaux quoted earlier, in the context of his rhetorical dispute with Cluny, emphasise the importance of not acting, in this respect, like the older Benedictine communities. Walter Daniel's *Life* is an epitome of how a Cistercian abbot might be presented: an insistence on the strict adherence to the Benedictine rule, a reminder that the community although expansive remained true to the values of poverty, and the lucent holiness of his subject. Money is not mentioned at all.

The context and purpose of Ailred's use of money within his writings deserves closer examination. A story told in his *Life of St Edward, King and Confessor*, shows his ease in employing money allusively, to emphasise the holiness of Edward's manner of life. He 'scorned money beyond human custom and seemed neither sadder when he lost it, nor more cheerful when he gained it'.⁸³ An extended example follows, and Ailred is explicit that it was a story recorded in English, and well known.⁸⁴

The king was once lying on his couch to take some rest, but, as often happens thought prevented sleep. A dignitary went to the case in which the royal coin was kept and, for a moment, as it seemed to him, either took something or replaced something. Then, forgetting to close the chest, he left to do some other task. A poor little boy who, they say, had the task of collecting the dishes at table, noticed this. Going over to the chest, he drew out no small number of coins and hid them in his breast; then going out, he put them where he thought they would be safe for a while. Coming back again, he repeated his misdeed as the king watched. Then, when he tried it for a third time, the king observed in spirit, as I believe, that the keeper of the treasure was at that very moment at hand. Wanting to save the thief from danger he said, 'You are overdoing it, young fellow; if you listen to me you will take what you have and run, because, by the Mother of God, if Hugelinus' –

etiam adolescentiam adolescens agnovi, quem juventutis flores pulsanter sicut patrem suum quem prae cunctis mortalibus dilexi, jam senili flore fulgentem, ut Christo servirem, corpore quidem, sed nunquam mente vel affectu reliqui'. Ailred would also have been aware of the extent of David's monastic foundations, see n. 14 above.

⁸³ Ailred, *Life of King Edward*, in *The Historical Works*, Dutton (ed.) and Freeland (trans.), I.6; Aelred of Rievaulx, *Vita S. Edwardi regis et confessoris*, PL, 195, col. 746: 'Praeterea supra humanum modum pecuniae contemptor, nec in earum amissione tristior, nec in adeptione videbatur hilarior'.

⁸⁴ The story does not appear in the *Vita Aedwardi regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit*, F. Barlow (ed. and trans.) (London, 1962) written, possibly by Goscelin of St Bertin, in the 1070s, or in the life by Osbert of St Clare on which Ailred based his own work, M. Bloch, 'La Vie de S. Edouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare', *Anelecta Bollandiana*, 41 (1923): 5–131.

that was the name of the royal chamberlain – ‘comes, he will not leave you a single coin.’ The boy fled, neither betrayed by the king nor pursued.⁸⁵

Ailred is keen to point out that he had not inserted this story to no end, but to illustrate the greatness of Edward’s spirit, in not getting angry and in protecting the thief from discovery. The constructed nature of the episode is clear from the threefold temptation. Part of Ailred’s insistence may speak to a consciousness of the risk in using the monetary example within Cistercian quarters; the work seems to have been written for his kinsman Lawrence, Abbot of Westminster, a Benedictine foundation.⁸⁶ The setting, a royal chamber, and the king’s personal monetary arrangements, may be drawn from Ailred’s own experiences at the Scottish royal court.

Ailred did not merely describe money in an hagiographical context, but allowed it to inform some of his most characteristic thinking on friendship. In his celebrated treatise *Spiritual Friendship* he provides a forensic examination of a fundamental concept for monastic community life.⁸⁷ Friendship between individuals, within religious communities, and between man and God form the basis of the three dialogues. An important element in the definition of good and bad qualities in friends, and the difficult process of discerning each, the value of friendship is something to which Ailred pays close attention:

⁸⁵ Ailred, *Life of Edward*, I.7; Aelred, *Vita S. Edwardi*, PL, 195, col. 746: ‘Recumbat aliquando lectulo rex gratia quiescendi; sed aliqua, ut fieri solet, cogitatio somnum suspenderat. Accessit ad thecam aedituus in qua aes regium servabatur, et aliquid pro tempore sicut ei videbatur aut sustulit aut reposuit. Deinde arcam oblitus claudere, quidpiam operis alias facturus egreditur. Animadvertit hoc puer pauperculus qui, ut dicitur, ad mensas scutellis recolligendis operam daret, et ad thecam accedens, haustum non parvum numismatum numerum in sinu recondit, et exiens, quo tutum interim arbitrabatur reposuit. Reversus denuo, rege inspectante facinus, iteravit. Quod cum tertio attentasset, cernens, ut credo, rex in spiritu jamjamque thesaurorum adesse custodem, et furis volens cavere periculum: “Importune, inquit, agis, o puer. Si mihi credis, tolle quod habes et fuge, quoniam, per Matrem Domini, si venerit Hugelinus (hoc enim erat regii cubicularii nomen), nec unum tibi nummum relinquet”. Fugit puer, nec a rege proditus nec fugatus.’

⁸⁶ Walter Daniel, *Life*, c. 41–2. See M. Dutton, ‘Aelred, Historian: Two Portraits in Plantagenet Myth’, *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 28 (1993): 112–44. On Lawrence of Westminster see Emma Mason, ‘Lawrence (d. 1173)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16168> (accessed 29 Dec 2013).

⁸⁷ See B. P. McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2000) and Julian Haseldine, ‘Monastic Friendship in Theory and in Action in the Twelfth Century’, in A. Classen and M. Sandidge (eds), *Friendship in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Explorations of a Fundamental Ethical Discourse* (Berlin, 2010), pp. 349–93.

Far be it from me to concede that those people know love who put a monetary value on friendship, for they proclaim themselves friends only with their lips, only when they smile in the hope of some temporal gain or lure a friend to become an accomplice in some vile action.⁸⁸

More pointedly, and this time drawing on St Ambrose, Ailred goes on to show the moral limitations of the notions of profit and loss, and the acquisition of money, and to place in counterpoint to such empty desires, the true value of friendship:

In human affairs many reckon nothing to be good unless it is materially profitable. They love their friends as they love their cattle, *from which they hope to profit*. ... 'For friendship is not taxation', as Saint Ambrose says, 'but is full of charm and grace. It is a virtue, not commerce, because it gives birth not to money but kindness, is not a negotiation over value but a concert of good will.' So the intention of the one chosen must be subtly tested lest he should wish to be linked to you in friendship in the hope of gain, because he calculates friendship as marketable and not voluntary.⁸⁹

Both here, and in the *Life of St Edward*, money when used as an analogy for spiritual value features with respect to secular society, whether royal or quotidian. As Ailred's discussion moves to the society of the religious, so references to money recede. The desire for monastic friendships firmly founded on the grace of love suffuses Ailred's idealised image of the monastic community. Poverty he does not regard as a good in and of itself, rather it is the intention that gives force to the adoption of a poor life. However, Ailred's reaction against the monetisation and commodification of virtues is worth noting. Other contemporary orders reacted far more vigorously, stressing poverty and simplicity above all else; and

⁸⁸ Ailred, *Spiritual Friendship*, M. Dutton (ed.) and L. C. Braceland (trans.) (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2010), II. 53, p. 82; Aelredus Rieuallensis, *De spiritali amicitia*, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, 1, A. Hoste (ed.) (Turnhout, 1971), Liber II: 'absit enim ut eorum quemquam amare concesserim, qui amicitiam quaestum putant; tunc se solis labiis profitentes amicos, cum spes alicuius commodi temporalis arriserit; uel cum amicum cuiuslibet turpitudinis ministrum facere temptauerit'.

⁸⁹ Ailred, *Spiritual Friendship*, III. 68, 70, pp. 103, 104; Aelredus, *De spiritali amicitia*, Liber III: 'sunt enim plerique qui in rebus humanis nihil bonum norunt, nisi quod temporaliter fructuosum sit. hi sic amicos sicut boues suos diligunt' ... 'non enim, ut ait sanctus ambrosius, uectigalis amicitia est, sed plena decoris, plena gratiae. uirtus est enim, non quaestus; quia pecunia non parturitur, sed gratia; nec licitatione pretiorum, sed concertatione beneuolentiae, eius igitur quem eligisti, subtiliter est probanda intentio, ne secundum spem commodi cuiuslibet tibi uelit in amicitia copulari, mercenariam eam aestimans non gratuitam.' The italicised quotations are from Cicero, *De amicitia*, 21.79 and Ambrose, *De officiis*, 3.134, respectively.

these more extreme ascetic monastic movements offer corresponding judgement on worldly wealth, its mechanisms, tools and modes.

Prominent amongst these movements was the Carthusian Order.⁹⁰ The distinctive architecture of Carthusian cloisters, with individual house-like cells, physically inscribes the eremitic within their communities.⁹¹ One of the most important witnesses for the establishment and early development of the order in the 1080s is Guibert of Nogent, and it is an establishment that he ties quite specifically to attitudes to money. The beginning of the order, the retreat of the founder Bruno from the household of Archbishop Manasses of Reims, was catalysed by his mistreatment of money: Manasses occupied his seat simoniacally and broke up a precious chalice for salary payment for his soldiers.⁹² Guibert draws attention to Carthusian attitudes towards wealth. No riches were to be kept within the church, no silver vessels for their use; their poverty was very jealously guarded.⁹³ This sentiment re-occurs repeatedly in Carthusian literature.

William of St Thierry in *The Golden Epistle*, perhaps the most celebrated monastic text of the high medieval period, written for the monks of the Charterhouse of Mont-Dieu, mentions money only once, but significantly. Discoursing on poverty, William praises the simple fashioning of their monastic cells, and, in a similar fashion to Ailred, places this in a discussion about how men can rise from the animal state, to the rational and spiritual. Those in the animal state can be admitted to the company of those who live an ascetic life, but the danger of indulging the animal to the whole community is stressed. This danger is exemplified in the fabric of the community's dwellings:

For it comes about that with money that does not belong to us the building of costly and, insofar as very shame allows, imposing cells is undertaken ... Banishing from ourselves and from our cells the pattern of poverty and the model of holy simplicity, the true beauty of God's house, bequeathed to us by our Fathers, we build for ourselves by the hands of skilled craftsmen cells which are not so much eremitic as aromatic, each of them costing a hundred *solidi*. They are the delight of our eyes but they come from the alms of the poor ... Take away, Lord, the

⁹⁰ Reference works on the Carthusians are limited, see Gerhard Schlegel and James Hogg (eds.), *Monasticon Cartusiense*, 4 vols in 10, *Analecta Cartusiana* 185, 1–4, (Salzburg, Austria: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, University of Salzburg, 2004–12), and *Etudes et documents pour l'histoire des Chartreux*, Dom Augustin Devaulx (ed.), *Analecta Cartusiana*, 208 (Salzburg, 2003).

⁹¹ For archaeological investigations in Britain see G. Coppack and M. Aston, *Christ's Poor Men: The Carthusians in Britain* (Stroud, 2002) and for wider comparison Ludolphe Jacquemart, Pacome de Falconnet, Bernard-Marie Dubosquet and Gerard Hulsbosch, *Maisons de l'ordre des Chartreux: Vues et notices*, 4 vols (Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1913–19).

⁹² Guibert, *Mon.* 1.11; pp. 26–7.

⁹³ Guibert, *Mon.*, 1.11; pp. 27–8.

reproach of these hundred *solidi* from the cells of your poor men. Why not rather a hundred *denarii*? Why not rather nothing at all? Why do not the sons of grace rather build for themselves free of cost?⁹⁴

William, praises the interior over exterior, and extolls the beauty of holy simplicity and poverty.

The same reticence in mentioning money per se, while dwelling at length on poverty and wealth, is to be found in the *Meditations* of Guigo I (1083–1136), the fifth Prior of the Grande Chartreuse, composed 1109–15, which became one of the foundational texts for the Carthusian communities.⁹⁵ Guigo's meditations do not mention money often, specifically. His admonitions and allusions tend to revolve around images of fornication more than the evils of money. However, his writing is filled with warnings about the world. Worldly goods are harmful distractions from the true struggle of human life, the transitory should not be preferred to the eternal, no matter how superficially attractive and desirable. Wealth, therefore, is a fundamental element to Guigo's thought, but he does not spend a great deal of time exploring its particularities.

Where money is mentioned the context is, therefore, instructive. Money-lending is condemned, by analogy to a full cellar:

If you rely on a full cellar, aren't you behaving like money-lenders? And is that not to worship an idol, even though a cellar has no face or eyes? In any case you do not realise how much you rely on a full cellar until it is empty.⁹⁶

⁹⁴ William of St Thierry, *The Golden Epistle*, XXXVI, 147–9, Theodore Berkley (trans.), pp. 59–60, *Epistola ad Fratres de Monte-Dei*, R. Thomas (ed.), 2 vols (Chambarand, 1968): XXXVI 147. 'Inde enim subintrat iam de aere alieno sumptuosa, et, quantum pudor sinit, ambitiosa cellarum aedificatio ...' 148. 'Dimissam enim nobis a patribus iure hereditario formam paupertatis, et sanctae simplicitatis speciem, uerum decorem domus Dei, alienantes a nobis et a cellis nostris, per manus artificum exquisitorum, cellas non tam eremiticas quam aromaticas aedicamus nobis, singulas in titulo centum solidorum, concupiscentias oculorum nostrorum, de eleemosynis pauperum.' 149. 'Amputa, Domine, opprobrium centum solidorum a cellis pauperum tuorum. Cur non potius centum denariorum? Cur non potius nullorum? Cur non potius filii gratiae gratis ipsi sibi aedificant?'

⁹⁵ D. N. Bell, 'The Carthusian Connection: Guigo I of La Chartreuse and the Origins of Cistercian Spirituality', *Cistercian Studies Quarterly*, 27 (1992): pp. 51–62. See also, Guigues Ier, Prieur de Chartreuse, *Coutumes de Chartreuse. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par un chartreux*, M. Laporte (ed.), Sources chrétiennes, 313 (Paris, 1984).

⁹⁶ Guigo, *Meditationes*, 116, M. Laporte (ed. and trans.), Sources Chrétiennes, 308 (Paris, 1983): 'Si confidis in pleno cellario, an non usurarii hoc faciunt? An non est hoc, ydolum colere? An quia cellarium non habet faciem et oculos? Non autem nostri quantum confidis pleno, nisi cum depletur'. English translation from *The Meditations of Guigo*, A. Gorden Mursell (trans.) (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1995), p. 87.

The theme of money, drink and commodification is continued with reference to love:

Notice how you sell love and the other spiritual affections for half-pennies and smaller coins, like wine in a tavern. And notice too how you buy opinions and loves and other spiritual affections or emotions for half-pennies and smaller coins, like wine in a tavern.⁹⁷

Guigo presents an interesting comment on the fact of small change, presumably half-pennies (probably round given that continental denarii were rarely of a high enough value to cut in two, compared to English coin), which adds to the verisimilitude of the allusion.⁹⁸ He also acknowledges wage labour: 'Not only should you accept no salary for doing your duty: you should not even be deterred by any adversities from doing it.'⁹⁹ The existence of salaried labour is driven into a different point and is negatively compared to the challenges and virtues of religious life. Guigo is no advocate of mendicancy. Money and wealth exist, are necessary for his community, but are given even less prominence than in Ailred's writing. Attention is focused elsewhere and money is ignored rather than problematised. As Guigo expresses it, an image of dung made in gold is better in substance than image. An image of an angel in gold is better in image.¹⁰⁰ Interior wins out for Guigo over the exterior: the goal of human meditation remains the contemplation of God, and not of the world.

⁹⁷ Guigo, *Meditationes*, 438: 'Vide quomodo vendis amorem et caeteros affectus animi tui ad obolatus et nummatas, sicut in taberna vinum. Rursus attende qualiter emas opiniones et amores ac caeteros affectus sive motus humanorum animorum, ad obolatas et nummatas, sicut in taberna vinum'; *Meditations*, p. 176. Mursell translates Guigo's reference to coin denominations as 'for pennies and small change', and the sense is that of a phrase such as the American 'nickels and dimes'. The translation has been emended for a more literal reading of the particular coin denominations he references, since obolus generally refers to half of the main denomination.

⁹⁸ See in this connection, Thomas J. Sargent and François Velde, *The Big Problem of Small Change* (Princeton, 2002), esp. ch. 4. Gasper and Gullbekk, 'Wulfric of Haselbury': 113–15, discuss the issue with respect to Henry I's coinage. I am very grateful for the comments of the anonymous reviewer of the volume on the issue of Guigo's reference to coin denominations.

⁹⁹ Guigo, *Meditationes*, 331: 'Non solum nullum pretium debes suscipere ut facias quod oportet, sed etiam nullis adversis qui facias deterreri'; *Meditations*, p. 139.

¹⁰⁰ Guigo, *Meditationes*, 360: 'Si imago stercoris ex auro fiat, melior est utique substantialiter, quam imaginaliter. Substantialiter namque aurum, imaginaliter vero stercus erit. Si autem angeli imago auro imprimatur, imaginaliter erit melior, quam substantialiter. Imaginaliter enim substantia viva, spiritalis ac rationalis. Substantialiter autem, corpus insensatum et sine vita'; *Meditations*, 149–50.

Excoriation of wealth and money-lending feature powerfully in the writings of Guigo I's Grandmontine contemporary, Stephen of Muret.¹⁰¹ The main written text associated with Stephen of Muret is the *Maxims* transmitted orally amongst those who gathered around him, and eventually compiled by a second Stephen, he of Liciac, fourth Prior of Grandmont, from 1139. As a text the *Maxims* represent the mores and interests of the 1140s and 1150s as much as they do the vision and experience of the 1070s to early 1120s. They do not offer a coherent treatise on monastic life, but rather, in a series of aphorisms and observations, provide a series of reflections on the values necessary to life in a strict community, and one that had an eremitic bent. Discipline looms large within Stephen of Muret's world, as do the temptations to which his community will be subject. The guiding principle is the imitation of Christ and the attempt to follow the apostolic life: '... all such [monastic] Rules are derived from the Common Rule, the Gospel'.¹⁰²

Throughout the *Maxims*, Stephen's pool of imagery, his use of metaphors and similes, as well as his description of real challenges to his lifestyle, draws on the secular world. In particular the market-place and the example and experience of soldiers, including their lust for booty, loom large. The *Maxims* deals with a number of circumstances where money, and wealth, impinge on the life of the community. These include occasions where Stephen's community is distinguished and set apart from other monastic orders, and others where it is the secular world that forms the point of contrast and comparison:

You may move on to any monastery you wish, where you will find impressive buildings, delicate foods served up according to their seasons. There too you will meet with great expanses of land covered with flocks. Here you will find only poverty and the cross.¹⁰³

Simony is condemned also, with an implicit criticism of the *Rule* of Saint Benedict: 'If anyone entered religious life because of some promise of earthly

¹⁰¹ *Vita venerabilis viri Stephani Muretensis*, in *Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis*, pp. 103–37.

¹⁰² Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, D. van Doel (trans.) (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 2002), Prologue, p. 8; *Liber sententiarum uel de doctrina ab Hugone Lacerta et sociis eius collectus*, in *Scriptores Ordinis Grandimontensis*, Initium Libri: 'Attamen, totum sumitur de communi regula, id est de euangelio'.

¹⁰³ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 1.3; *Liber de doctrina*, 1: "Tu uero pergere potes ad quodlibet monasteriorum, ubi magna inuenies aedificia, cibos que delicatos suis temporibus constitutos. Illic bestias reperies terrarum que latitudinem, hic tantum crucem et paupertatem".

goods, Stephen would have considered him a simoniac.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the same theme of the value of love raised by Ailred is addressed, with slightly different force:

In the marketplace of this world, God pits his own love against the attractions of silver and gold and other earthly things; in this way he makes it dearer and more valuable to those who would possess it. For when they want to covet something, some earthly thing, God is there to confront them with a choice, as if to say, ‘Choose now which you would prefer: me your God, or the temporal thing. Should you choose me, I will give you more than you could ever covet: choose the other, and you will lose everything.’¹⁰⁵

Stephen immediately goes to provide a more detailed example of God’s gifts, money and need: as long as no harm is caused to one who amasses wealth, and the expenditure is on the good, the accumulation of money is not to be condemned:

God gives to each according to that person’s needs, so you are not ever going to be condemned for making a lot of money, provided you harm neither yourself nor anyone else in the process. In fact this is how God contrives to spend on many the wealth amassed by one. Whoever has made a fortune by cheating and exploiting others, unwittingly has wasted it; the one who gathers wealth, yet spends it too, on doing good, will have God as a business partner.¹⁰⁶

However, the subject on which Stephen expends most rhetorical effort, the more striking in a genre defined by epigrammatic and gnomic style, is money-lending.

Whoever has recourse to a money-lender is doing wrong and is, in fact, just as wrong as the money-lender. This is why: if you spend what you cannot afford on

¹⁰⁴ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 1.4; *Liber de doctrina*, 1: ‘Simoniacum enim eum aestimaret, si cuiuslibet terrenae rei promissione in religionem ueniret’.

¹⁰⁵ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 42.1; *Liber de doctrina*, 42: ‘Idcirco Deus amorem immisit in auro et argento ceteris que rebus terrenis, ut suus amor esset inde carior meriti que maioris ipsum habituris. Cum enim aliquis uult concupiscere quodlibet huius saeculi, a Deo sibi datur optio, quasi diceret: “Elige quod malueris, aut me qui sum Deus, aut rem temporalem. Si me elegeris, magis tibi dabo quam concupiscere possis; si aliud elegeris, totum amittes”’.

¹⁰⁶ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 42.3; *Liber de doctrina*, 42: ‘Attamen Dominus bene concedit homini quicquid sibi necessarium est, nullus que propter hoc umquam damnabitur, si omnem censum congreget quem acquirere poterit, tali modo ne sibi primum inde faciat iniuriam nec alii. Eo namque modo quo census ab aliquo colligitur Dominus disponit ut expendatur. Quisquis enim peruerse et iniuste congregat, insipienter deuastat; qui uero iuste congerit, Deo cooperante, in bonum expendit’.

expensive luxuries – fancy foods, clothing, etc. – when you already have enough to live comfortably, you will end up needing the services of a money-lender.¹⁰⁷

Both the lender and the creditor incur the same guilt before God, wanting for things that they do not have (as Alan of Lille would later observe also).¹⁰⁸ The money-lender is if anything worse however, as a facilitator of this vice. Stephen reserves his most scathing comments for the usurer, as practising a type of money-lending that transcends death:

The money-lending trade offers many ways to be wicked, but the worst of all its practitioners is the usurer. An end will come to the life of a usurer, and his children will have to inherit the pledges he held. This state of affairs will speak more eloquently than if the man had said, ‘My child I am about to die. While I could I fought hard against God, but that is not enough for me; by leaving you these pledges, I will carry on my fight through you.’¹⁰⁹

In this way even a dead moneyer can go on putting his money out at interest, noting that ‘and whatever is received over and above the amount borrowed is usury’.¹¹⁰ Stephen reminds his community at the end of this disquisition that to claim money or property from borrowers is to inherit a place in Hell. As he puts it:

But beyond any doubt, this you would never actually do: spend but a second in that place, and you would not wish to repeat the visit – not for all the wealth in the world.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 60.1; *Liber de doctrina*, 60: ‘Quisquis usuram accipit, delinquit; et qui eam tribuit, similiter; hoc modo: cum aliquis immoderantia sua fecit expensam quam sua nequit tolerare facultas in cibo uel in uestibus, siue ceteris rebus, posset que uitam suam quoquo modo cum re possessa sustentare, postmodum propter illam superfluitatem pergens ad feneratorum, similiter peccat in censu quem illi tribuit, quemadmodum alter qui accipit’.

¹⁰⁸ See the contribution by Odd Langholm within this volume.

¹⁰⁹ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 60.2; this translation uses ‘pawnbroker’ in place of ‘usurer’, the latter is preferred in this context, given the general range of meaning that ‘usura’ could carry. *Liber de doctrina*, 60: ‘Multis modis in usura delinquitur, sed ab eo penitus, a quo pignora capiuntur. Postquam enim ea susceperit circa finem uitae suae filio suo uel cui uult ea relinquere, dicit; hoc uero dicit operibus ualidius sermone loquentibus: “Fili, ego moriar, et Deum impugnauit, quamdiu uixi, nec mihi sufficit, sed te uicarium pro me relinquam, ut illum cum hac eadem usura impugnes”’.

¹¹⁰ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 60.3: ‘Quidquid enim recipitur praeter id quod commissum est, usura est’. The translation offers for ‘usura es’ ‘counts as such ill-gotten profit’, a literal translation seems more appropriate here.

¹¹¹ Stephen of Muret, *Maxims*, 60.4; *Liber de doctrina*, 60: ‘Sciat autem indubitanter se numquam illic adfuisse; nam si uno tantum momento illic exstisset, numquam pro uniuerso

In this fear of the usurer's hell the Grandmontine is joined by the Benedictine. At about the same time as Stephen's *Maxims* were composed Orderic was composing the eighth book of his *Ecclesiastical History*, in which he recorded the priest Walchelin's experience of a diabolical cavalcade, made up of the recent dead enduring horror and torture for their sins in life.¹¹² William of Glos is singled out, tormented for a gamut of worldly crimes but suffering most for usury, receiving a mill in pledge for a monetary loan which he kept on non-payment, disinheriting the legitimate heirs. As punishment William states 'I carry a burning mill-shaft in my mouth, which, believe me, seems heavier than the castle of Rouen', begging that his wife and son should be contacted to restore the mill to its rightful owners.¹¹³

The vehemence of the warnings against usury, more extreme amongst the more ascetic voices, grow throughout the later eleventh and the first half of the twelfth century. These voices are amongst the most pointed monastic reactions to a gradual monetisation of the economy and of society. Other contemporaries, too, placed, conceptually, the differing expression of monastic values amongst the various orders of the period, alongside and as a moral mirror to contemporary economic and social change. This is the case in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*. In his praise, and criticism, of monastic orders, it is, as discussed earlier, their resistance to hypocrisy which provides his most important category. While he notes that secular priests, operating within the world, find it challenging to establish discipline needed to engender, nurture and sustain the holy life, regular canonical and other monks do include the holy within their ranks, as do the Cluniac and Cistercians. Pre-eminent amongst the religious orders, for John, are the Carthusians, and at the pinnacle, the Grandmontines. What defines John's discussion of hypocrisy, however, is the attitudes shown towards money.

Love of money well-nigh conquers nature herself and brings almost impossible things within the realm of possibility. ... As long as one can make money, no region of the world appears inaccessible, and the greater flame of avarice will conquer even its torrid zone.¹¹⁴

censu mundi illuc redire uellet'.

¹¹² Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VIII, vol. IV, pp. 236–49. On Orderic's story as amongst the earliest versions of what became known as Hellequin's hunt see J-C Schmitt, *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society* (Chicago, 1998), pp. 93–100.

¹¹³ Orderic Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book VIII, vol. IV, pp. 244–5: 'Ecce candens ferrum molendini gesto in ore quod sine dubio michi uidetur ad ferendum grauius Rotomagensi arce'.

¹¹⁴ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Book VII, ch. 16: 'Ipsam fere naturam uincit amor pecuniae et res pene impossibiles ad possibilem redigit facultatem ... Dum itaque quaestum

Money, for John is an integral element in the broader vice of avarice, but one whose role may be superseded by that for which it is exchanged.¹¹⁵

One not falling victim to the love of money is at times conquered by greed for its trappings. Horses, apparel, spurred falcons, hunting dogs, numerous herds of cattle and smaller beasts, and the varied furniture of the world (since it exceeds human capacity to enumerate each) are preferred to money by many, and they exhaust the strength of their whole being in acquiring and keeping these possessions. For the frenzy of avarice in the abstract is based upon two considerations: that it covets to excess the possessions of others or guards its own too tenaciously; and that he who seeks to excess what he lacks, makes demands beyond the law of necessity of utility.¹¹⁶

Monastic lives of observance, discipline and vigilance against the corruption of money are the main defences John offers for individuals and communities so affected. At the extremes of ascetic lifestyle are lodged deeper criticisms of contemporary society.

Conclusions

Monastic witness to money and that to which it gives value is both complex and variable. How far spiritual values are seen to inflect description of the world, and how far the values of the world inscribe themselves within monastic expression, require constant interpretation. Nevertheless, to describe the retreat from the worldly necessitates acknowledging the world and its practices. Beneath the divisions between authors over time, and from order to order, describing the world outside or the world within the cloister, reactions to economic and social transformation can be detected. The acquisition and management of wealth, lordship, especially kingship, and usury emerge as themes common to

faciat, nulla pars mundi uidetur inaccessibilis et ipsius torridae estum maior auaritiae ignis exuperat', Pike (trans.), pp. 275–6.

¹¹⁵ For a discussion of avarice in this period see A. Murray, *Reason and Society*, pp. 59–80.

¹¹⁶ John of Salisbury, *Policraticus*, Book VII, ch. 16: 'et quem non subigit amor pecuniae, internum superat cupiditas specierum. Equos, uestes, aues armatas, uenaticos canes, numerosos greges armentorum et pecorum, et uariam mundi supellectilem (quoniam per singula currere uires humanas excedit) plerique pecuniae praeferrunt et totius hominis uires exhauriunt in acquirendis his aut tenendis. Nam in his duobus articulis furor totius auaritiae constat quod immoderatus appetit aliena aut sua tenacius seruat; et quidem immoderatus appetit quisquis quod deest, legem necessitatis excedens et usus, exposcit', Pike (trans.), p. 277.

the monastic authors considered. The varied discussions underline the protean quality of money, as physical and real, with tangible benefits, and as symbolic both of temptation and of its rejection. The Gospel injunction, illustrated through coin, to render unto Caesar that which was his, and to God that which was his, may lie at the root of the multi-layered monastic response to money. The invocation, description and debate on the possession of money and the consequences of its use indicate the evolution of money as a conceptual category and of its presence within systems and schema of value and economy. Both deliberately and despite themselves, these authors reveal a great deal about how embedded a monetary economy, and a monetary way of thinking, had become within their lifetimes.

