This is a repository copy of *The bishop in the Latin West 600–1100*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/94465/

Version: Accepted Version

Proceedings Paper:
Barrow, J (2018) The bishop in the Latin West 600–1100. In: Höfert, A, Mesley, M and Tolino, S, (eds.) Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Eunuchs and Bishops in the Pre-Modern World. The Gender of Authority. Celibate and Childless Men in Power: Ruling Bishops and Ruling Eunuchs, 400-1800, 28-30 Aug 2013, Zurich, Switzerland. Routledge , pp. 43-64. ISBN 9781472453402

Julia Barrow

The Bishop in the Latin West 600-1100[1]

At first sight there might seem little in common between medieval bishops and the eunuchs who played such prominent roles in Arab, Indian, Chinese and Ottoman courts. Church law was cautious about admitting castrated men to ordination: from the Council of Nicaea (325) onwards those who had had themselves castrated in order to live lives of greater asceticism were rejected for ordination, and while those who had been castrated against their will were not prevented from being ordained, in practice it was relatively unusual for castrated men to be ordained in either the Western or the Eastern church.[2] Furthermore, unlike many of the court eunuchs featuring in other chapters in this volume, very few bishops spent any time as slaves. Instead, they were almost always freeborn, and indeed were often of noble birth;[3] furthermore, they were usually not exiles, though some had left their homelands as a form of voluntary asceticism (peregrinatio).[4]

These important differences apart, however, there were ways in which bishops in the medieval west did resemble court eunuchs further to the east in the Eurasian land-mass. First of all, from the end of the fourth century onwards, bishops were supposed to renounce sexual relations within marriage on being elevated to the episcopate, and by the end of the sixth century it was becoming usual for the clergy (including future bishops) to be recruited in boyhood, making it easier for their superiors to discourage them from marriage.[5] There were exceptions to this: in Ireland and England, for example, clerical dynasties were a common feature of society down to the twelfth century. However, in most of western

---

[1] Many of the quoted sources have been edited in various series of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica (abbreviated as MGH). In this chapter, the full (but sometimes confusing) titles of the MGH-editions are quoted for non-specialists while the abbreviated version is added. These abbreviations are the best way in order to identify a quoted volume. They can be found online at www.dmgh.de, together with the digitalised editions (open access).

[2] Robert Muth, "Kastration," in Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, ed. Franz-Joseph Dölger, Theodor Klauser et al. (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2004) 20: 285-342, esp. 325-6.

[3] From early on, canon law was opposed to the ordination of slaves, but ordaining slaves freed by their masters was permitted: Robert Godding, Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne (Brussels: Société des. Bollandistes, 2001), 85-90. On the noble origins of many bishops, see footnote 22 below.

[4] Cf. James T. Palmer, Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World, 690-900 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 59-76, and Rachel Stone, "Spiritual heirs and families: episcopal relatives in early medieval Francia," in this volume.

[5] Godding, Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne, 110-54; see also Stone, this volume.

Europe for most of the period 600-1100 (and beyond) it was relatively unusual for bishops to have legitimate offspring. Episcopal celibacy was also a requirement in the Eastern Church, which unlike the Western Church did not reject marriage for priests. Like eunuchs, bishops often drew on their family relationships to create surrogate father-son bonds, and the relatives most likely to be drawn into these surrogate bonds were their nephews.

The Role of the Bishop in the Medieval West

Before embarking on an examination of how medieval bishops built up uncle-nephew relationships, it would be useful to supply some background information about the activities, functions and the raison *d'être* of bishops in the medieval west.[6] Their roles were varied, spanning politics, law, cultural patronage and the supervision of education as well as their principal role, the spiritual oversight of the Christian faithful in the territories (dioceses) for which they were responsible.[7] Bishops in the Western Church in the middle ages were part of a much longer tradition. Much of their role is only explicable in terms of the history of the Church over the longue durée, though some of it was conditioned by the political and social circumstances of their time and place: we can start with the longer-term characteristics and then turn to the features specific to the 600-1100 period.

---

[6] For modern re-examination of these roles, see especially Timothy Reuter, "Ein Europa der Bischöfe: Das Zeitalter Burchards von Worms," in Bischof Burchard von Worms 1000-1025, ed. Wilfried Hartmann, Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelrheinische Geschichte 100 (Mainz: Gesellschaft für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte, 2000), 1–28. This article has been translated into English as "A Europe of bishops: the age of Wulfstan of York and Burchard of Worms," in Patterns of Episcopal Power: Bishops in Tenth and Eleventh Century Western Europe, ed. Ludger Körntgen and Dominik Waßenhoven, Prinz-Albert-Forschungen 6 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 17-38. See also Stephan Patzold, Episcopus: Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts, Mittelalter-Forschungen 25 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2008); John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones, eds., The Bishop Reformed: Studies in Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages, (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Maureen C. Miller, Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).

[7] On dioceses as territorial spaces in the Middle Ages, see Florian Mazel, *L'espace du diocèse: Genèse d'un territoire dans l'Occident médiéval (Ve-*XIIIe siècle) (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2008).

Bishops trace their origins to the apostles, Christ's disciples after the Crucifixion.[8] As the spiritual successors to the apostles, chosen by members of the church, at least in theory, and consecrated by the laying on of hands, they have overall responsibility for the spiritual health of Christian believers; the term "bishop", which derives from the Greek episkopos or overseer, conveys a sense of this duty. From early on, bishops were based in individual cities, each responsible for a single community;[9] since each city within the Roman Empire (where most though not all of the early church was situated) exercised political authority over a fixed territory, this pattern came to be replicated in ecclesiastical organisation, and by the later fourth century the term dioikesis, which originated as a term in civil administration, had begun to be used to mean an ecclesiastical territory, a diocese.[10] Bishops were supposed to respect each other's territories and not intervene unless invited by the local diocesan or unless commanded to do so by a group of bishops acting as a council. Certain cities, notably Rome, had a particular seniority as patriarchates and their bishops had especial authority; since Rome was the only patriarchate in the western church the pattern of ecclesiastical authority in the west became more monarchical than in the east, though this took some time to evolve fully.[11]

Bishops had disciplinary authority over all the clergy of their diocese, who were theoretically supposed to remain within the diocese in which they had been ordained unless they received written permission to travel from their diocesan.[12] Their authority over laypeople was more limited, since with respect to the laity the law of the church (canon law) chiefly concerned sexual behaviour and questions

---

[8] The emergence of the episkopos as the leading figure in each local church largely occurred in the second century: Wayne A. Meeks, "Social and ecclesial life of the earliest Christians," in Origins to Constantine, vol. 1 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, ed. Margaret M. Mitchell and Frances M. Young (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 145-73, and particularly 153-4; Stuart George Hall, "Institutions in the pre-Constantinian ecclesia," ibid., 415-33, especially 417-21. In general see Claudia Rapp, Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: the Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

[9] Raymond van Dam, "Bishops and society," in Constantine to c. 600, vol. 2 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, ed. Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 343-66, especially 344-57.

[10] Pierre Fourneret, "Diocèse," in Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, ed. Alfred Vacant, Joseph-Eugène Mangenot, Émile Amann (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1930-50), 4: 1362-1363.

[11] Judith Herrin, The Formation of Christendom (Oxford: Princeton University Press, 1987), 103-106.

[12] Carine van Rhijn, Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 175-6, 179-80; Richard Fletcher, "An epistola formata from León," Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research 45 (1972): 122-8.

of religious belief.[13] By the middle of the third century bishops had begun to meet in councils to decide disciplinary and theological problems, and councils, some held within single provinces and some with a much wider geographical base, continued to provide a forum for debate for centuries to come.[14] Bishops thus often had chances to travel widely and even if they did not necessarily get as far as Rome (many did) they would be in frequent contact with their neighbours.[15] On a more local level, diocesan synods, which emerged early in the middle ages but which were much developed in the Carolingian church in the ninth century, gave bishops the opportunity to exercise jurisdiction within their sees more effectively.[16]

In the second and third centuries bishops were the only clerics able to celebrate the Eucharist, and the term sacerdotes (priests) was reserved for them. The early expansion of Christian communities within and beyond the cities in which they were originally established necessitated the foundation of many churches and by the fourth century meant that the ability to celebrate the Eucharist and baptism had to be devolved to a wider group of clergy. Hence presbyteroi or elders were allowed to share this duty with bishops and acquired sacerdotal functions too.[17] Some rites came to be reserved for bishops alone: these were the ordination of clergy, the confirmation of baptized members of the Christian community and the consecration of churches.[18] These remained episcopal monopolies, and medieval

---

[13] Janet L. Nelson, "Law and its applications," in Early Medieval Christianities c .600-c.1100, vol. 3 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, ed. Thomas F.X. Noble and Julia M.H. Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008): 299-326.

[14] On church councils, see Hall, "Institutions in the pre-Constantinian ecclesia," 428-33; Mark Edwards, "Synods and councils", in Origins to Constantine, vol. 1 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, 367-85; Herrin, Formation of Christendom, 98-101; Wilfried Hartmann, Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und Italien (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1989); Catherine Cubitt, Anglo-Saxon Church Councils c. 650-c. 850 (London: Leicester University Press, 1995).

[15] Rosamond McKitterick, Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 299-301; Veronica Ortenberg, "Archbishop Sigeric's journey to Rome in 990," in Anglo-Saxon England 11 (1990): 197-246.

[16] Wilfried Hartmann, Kirche und Kirchenrecht um 900: Die Bedeutung der spätkarolingischen Zeit für Tradition und Innovation im kirchlichen Recht (Hanover: MGH, 2008), 78-80; Martina Stratmann, Hinkmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kirchenprovinz, Quellen und Forschungen zum Recht im Mittelalter 6 (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1991), 35-38; Rhijn, Shepherds of the Lord, 24-33.

[17] Franz Pototschnig, "Priester," in Lexikon des Mittelalters (Munich: Artemis, 1995), 7: 204.

[18] On pre-Constantinian ordination see Pierre van Beneden, *Aux origines d'une terminologie sacramentelle: Ordo*, ordinare, ordinatio dans la littérature chrétienne avant 313, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniens, Études et Documents 38 (Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1974), 93-139, and Bruno Kleinheyer, Die Priesterweihe im römischen Ritus: Eine liturgiehistorische Studie, Trierer Theologische Studien 12 (Trier: Paulinus, 1962), 12-25, 63-74; see also William Hugh Clifford Frend, The Rise of Christianity (London: Fortress Press, 1984), 404-406;

bishops derived considerable authority from them: the right to bestow ordination and to consecrate churches gave them some control over the recruitment of the clergy and the positioning of new churches. Some further rites also came to be reserved to bishops. The most important of these in the medieval west was the anointing of kings: when in 751 the Carolingian dynasty usurped the Frankish throne, removing the original ruling dynasty, the Merovingians, from office, the new ruler, Pippin, adopted anointing as a royal inauguration ritual, in imitation of the Jewish kings. Pippin's anointing was carried out by bishops (and was repeated soon afterwards by the pope) and royal unction remained an episcopal monopoly from the start, not only for Carolingian rulers but also among their successors and more widely among Christian rulers across Western Europe.[19]

So far we have concentrated on the sacramental and disciplinary aspects of the bishop's office, but the pastoral role of the bishop, that is the bishop acting as teacher and preacher, was also vital. By the fourth century bishops found that they had to devolve much of this role on to other clergy in the diocese, especially priests, but they retained the right to license (and thus choose) preachers and were supposed to assess the learning and general suitability of clerical candidates for ordination by a short examination.[20] Bishops were supposed to ensure that education was available to clergy within their dioceses and many went further, acting as patrons of literary works, theological and historical writings, art and music.[21]

From the fourth century, when Christianity became the official religion of the Roman empire, bishops began to have significant political roles, both in the service of rulers and also locally in their dioceses, in which, for example, they often acted as civic leaders and organisers of defences in the fifth

---

Rapp, Holy Bishops, 98; for consecration of churches see Susan Wood, The Proprietary Church in the Medieval West (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 12-14; for confirmation see L. Hödl and J. Neumann, "Firmung," in Lexikon des Mittelalters (Munich: Artemis, 1989), 4: 490-493.

[19] Janet L. Nelson, "Carolingian royal ritual," in Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 137-80.

[20] Ernest Vykoukal, "Les examens du clergé paroissial à l'époque carolingienne," Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 14 (1913): 81-96.

[21] See for example Godefroid Kurth, Notger de Liège et la civilisation au Xe siècle (Paris: Picard, 1905), 1: 130-169; 251-331; Bernward von Hildesheim und das Zeitalter der Ottonen: Katalog der Ausstellung, 2 vols., ed. Michael Brandt and Arne Eggebrecht (Hildesheim: Bernward, 1993); Michel Sot, Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 22-23.

and sixth centuries.[22] By c. 600, bishops were powerful figures in royal assemblies in the Frankish

kingdoms. Within their cities and dioceses, they rivalled local royal officials (counts) in influence.[23]

This power was partly based on the landed endowments of bishoprics, which grew steadily throughout

the earlier middle ages.[24] By the eighth century many bishops were, thanks to their office, very wealthy

landowners, and as a result of this were lords over large numbers of unfree and semi-free peasants; the

freeborn were also increasingly drawn into their clientages. As a result, kings expected bishops to help

organise defence, for although they were not expected to fight themselves (a few did, in breach of canon

law),[25] they had to ensure that their tenants did. As members of the political élite, they were also

expected to attend royal courts and advise on legislation; several of them helped to draft royal laws and

many supervised the copying of such texts.[26] In the Carolingian empire, bishops were among those

chosen to act as missi, royal commissioners who had the task of ensuring that locally-based royal

officials acted as they were supposed to.[27] Although bishops in the Carolingian empire and its successor

states were not supposed to act as judges in secular courts, their counterparts in Anglo-Saxon England

(where public and ecclesiastical courts were not separated) helped to preside in locally-based courts

---

[22] The position of bishops was "considerable" by c. 450: Chris Wickham, Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean, 400-800 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 159.

[23] Raymond van Dam, "Merovingian Gaul and the Frankish conquests," in The New Cambridge Medieval History 1: c.500-c.700, ed. Paul Fouracre (Cambridge: Cambridge of University Press, 2005): 214-22; Paul Fouracre, "Francia in the seventh century," ibid., 383-384; Georg Scheibelreiter, Der Bischof in merowingischer Zeit (Vienna: Böhlau, 1983), 172-80; Martin Heinzelmann, "Bischof und Herrschaft vom spätantiken Gallien bis zu den karolingischen Hausmeiern. Die institutionellen Grundlagen," in Herrschaft und Kirche: Beiträge zur Entstehung und Wirkungsweise episkopaler und monastischer Organisationsformen, ed. Friedrich Prinz (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1988): 23-82, esp. 37-54, 68-73.

[24] Cf. Edward Roberts, "Flodoard, the will of St Remigius and the see of Reims in the tenth century," in Early Medieval Europe 22 (2014): 204; Nicholas Brooks, The Early History of the Church of Canterbury (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1984), 100-107, 114-17, 129-49, 175-206.

[25] E.g. Bishop Arn of Würzburg, The Annals of Fulda, trans. and ed. Timothy Reuter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 95 (s. a. 884); Reginonis abbatis Prumiensis chronicon cum continuatione Treverensi, ed. Friedrich Kurze, MGH SS rer. Germ 50 (Hanover: Hahn, 1890), 140 (s.a. 892); for a translation of Regino, see History and Politics in Late Carolingian and Ottonian Europe: the Chronicle of Regino of Prüm and Adalbert of Magdeburg, tr. Simon MacLean (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009), 215.

[26] Janet L. Nelson, "Literacy in Carolingian government," in The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 286-289; on the copying of Carolingian capitularies see Rosamond McKitterick, Charlemagne, 232, and literature cited. On Wulfstan the Homilist, archbishop of York, who drafted laws for Æthelred the Unready and Cnut in early eleventh-century England, see Patrick Wormald, "Archbishop Wulfstan: eleventh-century state-builder," in Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, ed. Matthew Townend (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 9-27.

[27] McKitterick, Charlemagne, 259-60.

(shire courts).[28] In France and Germany bishops often developed considerable jurisdictional rights over the inhabitants of their landed estates and (especially in Germany) of their see-cities, even though jurisdiction itself might be exercised by lay deputies.[29] Some of these powers can be seen in the lawcode drawn up by Bishop Burchard of Worms (1000-25) for his ministerials (unfree tenants performing administrative roles).[30] As Tim Reuter remarked, "bishoprics c. 1000 were small states, with almost everything which corresponds to our conception of a state: rulers, governments, central places, citizenship, legislation, taxation".[31]

Because of these responsibilities and also because of their resources, bishops were powerful and wealthy. Unsurprisingly, kings and also the aristocratic elite were interested in their appointment. For rulers, it was most desirable to appoint clerics of ability who had spent time in royal service, for example as court chaplains.[32] From the mid-fifth century onwards in Gaul, though slowly to start with, aristocratic families began to ensure that bishops were drawn from their ranks.[33] From the seventh

---

[28] R. Sharpe, "The use of writs in the eleventh century," Anglo-Saxon England 32 (2003), 251-252; Julia Barrow, "Wulfstan and Worcester: bishop and clergy in the early eleventh century," in Townend, ed., Wulfstan, Archbishop of York, 143-144.

[29] Reinhold Kaiser, Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht: Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfränkisch-französischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter, Pariser Historische Studien 17 (Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1981); Olivier Guyotjeannin, Episcopus et comes: Affirmation et déclin de la seigneurie épiscopale au nord du royaume de France (Beauvais-Noyon, Xe – début XIIIe siècle) (Geneva and Paris: Librairie Droz, 1987), esp. 3-66; Geneviève Bührer-Thierry, Évêques et pouvoir dans le royaume de Germanie: Les Églises de Bavière et de Souabe, 876-973 (Paris: Picard, 1997), 206-24.

[30] For Burchard of Worms' Hofrecht, see Quellen zur deutschen Verfassungs-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bis 1250, ed. Lorenz Weinrich (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977), 88-105, and for discussion see Knut Schulz, "Das Wormser Hofrecht Bischof Burchards", in Hartmann, ed., Bischof Burchard von Worms, 251-78.

[31] Reuter, "A Europe of bishops", 23 (this model works best for Germany, somewhat less well for France and less well again for England).

[32] For royal control over the appointment of bishops in the Île de France and northern Burgundy see Marcel Pacaut, Louis VII et les elections épiscopales dans le royaume de France (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1957), 63-82; W. M. Newman, Le domaine royal sous les premiers Capétiens (987-1180) (Paris: Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1937), 67-69, 216-224; Jörg Peltzer, Canon Law, Careers and Conquest: Episcopal Elections in Normandy and Greater Anjou, c. 1140-c. 1230 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 238-52. For the appointment of bishops in England see Catherine Cubitt, "Bishops and succession crises in tenth- and eleventh-century England," in Körntgen and Waßenhoven, eds., Patterns of Episcopal Power, 124-125; Everett U. Crosby, The King's Bishops: the Politics of Patronage in England and Normandy 1066-1216 (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013). For Germany see n. 34.

[33] Aristocrats in Gaul (but not Italy) began to be interested in becoming bishops from the mid-fifth century: S. Barnish, "Transformation and survival in the western senatorial aristocracy, c. A.D. 400-700," Papers of the British School at Rome 66 (1988): 138. However, even in Gaul many bishops came from lower social ranks: Steffen Patzold, "Zur Sozialstruktur des Episkopats und zur Ausbildung bischöflicher Herrschaft in Gallien zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter," in Völker, Reiche und Namen im frühen Mittelalter, ed. Matthias Becher and Stefanie Dick (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2010): 121-40, esp. 138. On Frankish aristocratic families in

century, aristocratic backgrounds for bishops in Francia were normal, and this continued to be the case in the Frankish successor-states.[34] Quite often, as in Ottonian Germany, it was possible to keep both sets of demands satisfied: the Ottonians (919-1024) and the early Salians (1024-1125), while keeping control of most episcopal appointments, nonetheless paid heed to the views of their magnates.[35] In England, where connections between bishops and the higher aristocracy were rare from the tenth century to beyond the end of the Middle Ages, kings had more power over patronage.[36] In all areas, bishops were aware of what they owed to their patrons and to their families, and when they themselves exercised patronage they would try to repay their debts to their lords and to their relatives. The remainder of this paper examines an important duty of bishops towards their kin: support for their nephews.

Bishops and the Uncle-Nephew Relationship: a Case Study

When, in 869, Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims fell out with his nephew and namesake Bishop Hincmar of Laon, who had been disobedient to him and also to their ruler, Charles the Bald (born 823; reigned

---

general from the seventh century onwards, see Régine Le Jan, Famille et pouvoir dans le monde franc (VIIe-Xe siècle) (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1995); Julia M.H. Smith, Europe after Rome: a New Cultural History 500-1000 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 115-47; Rachel Stone, Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 247-310.

[34] Patzold, Episcopus, 27-30 and literature cited; Steffen Patzold, "L'épiscopat du haute Moyen Âge du point de vue de la médiévistique allemande," Cahiers de civilisation médiévale Xe-XIIe siècles 48 (2005): 341-358; Herbert Zielinski, Der Reichspiskopat in spätottonischer und salischer Zeit (1002-1125) (Stuttgart: Steiner Franz, 1984), 1: 19-66; Constance B. Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198 (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 65-86 (noting that episcopal recruitment in Burgundy shifted from the higher to the lower nobility after c.1100); Bernard Guillemain, "Les origines des évêques en France aux XIe et XIIe siècles," in Le istituzioni ecclesia*stiche della "Societas Christiana" dei secoli XI*-XII: Papato, cardinalato ed episcopato, Miscellanea del Centro di studi medioevali 7 (Milano: Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1974): 374-402.

[35] Zielinski, Der Reichspiskopat, esp. 187-98; note also Joseph Fleckenstein, Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige, Schriften der MGH 16, 1/2 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1959-66), 2: 175-6; for comment on historiography, see Patzold, Épiscopat du haut Moyen Âge, 344-348.

[36] Julia Barrow, The Clergy in the Medieval World: Secular Clerics, their Families and Careers in North-Western Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), chap. 4, nn. 141-142.

840-877), what particularly upset him was the memory of all that he had accomplished for his young kinsman:

> For you know well, if you discern reason, that you offer no sacrifice of a good work to God for just as long as you quarrel with the love of your neighbours, and much less indeed [do you offer sacrifice] if you quarrel with my affection, I who received you kindly to be fostered, I who with sweet affection fostered you as an orphan, I who tonsured you as a clerk, I who taught you in your letters myself and by whomsoever I could [afford], I who promoted you through each grade of ordination to the rank of the episcopate, I who obtained for you the intimate acquaintance [familiaritatem] and the sweetness of the affection of the lord our king.[37]

Hincmar the elder had done everything for his nephew that an episcopal uncle could do: fostering, tonsure, education, ordination and obtaining familiarity with the ruler, through whom patronage could be secured. His task had begun very early in his nephew's life: elsewhere he says that the church of Rheims had taken in the young Hincmar "as I might say" from his cradle and had changed and washed young Hincmar's "cloths of infancy" (which presumably means nappies).[38] This is probably hyperbole, but not necessarily by very much; ecclesiastical careers in the middle ages began in childhood, with first tonsure often, as here, preceding the start of education in letters.

Hincmar was not alone. Historians have noticed many examples of bishops, and other members of the clergy, advancing the careers of their young nephews, especially those destined for the church: but there has until recently been curiously little attempt to put the examples together and look for patterns.[39] Examination of charter material, especially post-obit grants, makes it possible to see that in many churches there was an elaborate uncle-nephew dynastic succession system.[40] Uncles were

---

[37] Rudolf Schieffer, ed., Die Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon 869-871, MGH Concilia 4, Suppl. 2 (Hanover: Hahn, 2003), 303, lines 12-18. Hincmar the elder was archbishop of Rheims from 845 until 882 (for further details see Stone, this volume); Hincmar the younger was bishop of Laon from 858 until his deposition in 871.

[38] Schieffer, Streitschriften, 195: "Remensis ecclesia … ut ita dicam, cunabulis dulci benignitate nutrivit et pannis infantie eluit atque exuit".

[39] Crosby, The King's Bishops, 51-58 notes but does not analyse the phenomenon.

[40] Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chapt. 4, 9, examines these succession patterns among cathedral canons.

generally important; uncles who remained laymen could be figures of power in the lives of their young nephews and nieces, so clerical uncles were not exceptional, but nonetheless there were services that they alone could provide because of their position in the church, and Hincmar's complaint lists these – fostering or nutritio within an ecclesiastical context; tonsure; education; ordination; assistance with patronage. In what follows I will examine each of them in turn.

The Episcopal Career Path

Biographical and canon law sources suggest that there had been two types of ecclesiastical career path in the fourth and fifth centuries.[41] Following the first path, clergy would start young, as boys, and work their way slowly through the grades of ordination, arriving at the priesthood at thirty, or later. The total number of grades of ordination was not absolutely fixed at this point, but popes were already urging that ordination to them should follow a sequence, with appropriate time spent in each grade.[42] On the second path, adult laymen, often after prominent careers in the world, would become clerics in mid-life; quite often high-ranking laymen might be elected bishop (for example, Sidonius Apollinaris as bishop of Clermont, c. 470-85) and then have to work through all the grades of ordination within a year before their actual consecration as bishop.[43] By 600, the first type of progression had become normal for bishops. In the family of Gregory, bishop of Tours (573-94), we can see that this was how he himself had made his career, whereas in earlier generations we find examples of both sorts of advancement.[44] Examples of adult laymen being elected bishop in mid-life are much rarer after 600: Audoenus of

---

[41] Godding, Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne, 32-49.

[42] John St H. Gibaut, The Cursus Honorum: a Study of the Origins and Evolution of Sequential Ordination (Bern: P. Lang, 2000), 85-91; Julia Barrow, "Grades of ordination and clerical careers, c. 900-c. 1200," in Anglo-Norman Studies XXX, Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2007, ed. Christopher P. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 41-61.

[43] Jill Harries, Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, AD 407-485 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 169-79; see also Godding, Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne, 32-35, 45.

[44] Martin Heinzelmann, Gregor von Tours (538-594): Zehn Bücher Geschichte. Historiographie und Gesellschaftskonzept im 6. Jahrhundert (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994), 12. Translated by Christopher Carroll as Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 10, Fig. 1.

Rouen, and Eligius of Noyon, were both consecrated in 641 after a year of being trained up through the canonical grades, but more often accounts of Merovingian bishops, where they survive, show the gradualist approach.[45] And the main reason for the change was probably to do with schooling: by the sixth century churches were becoming active in providing schooling, even at elementary level (where schools accepted boys irrespective of their future careers). Beyond that level, schools associated with bishops restricted themselves to teaching young clerics, but only a select few, while monastic schools probably concentrated on young monks.[46] In the cases of Audoenus and Eligius we do not know about their early education, since it is not mentioned in their Lives. Audoenus must have received an education, since although he entered the king's military service, he became the king's referendary (the official at the Merovingian court in charge of producing royal charters); Eligius would have had time for elementary schooling in boyhood before his apprenticeship to Abbo the goldsmith and mint-master, but we can only speculate on this.[47] They marked the end of the line, however; later bishops, where we have details, had become clerics or monks in childhood or at least in their teens. Adult entry into a clerical career with no schooling was hard work, and was attempted only by a few: Saint Guthlac (674-714) had to undergo a two-year crash-course at Repton at the age of twenty-four in order to provide himself with the necessary education to become a hermit, and there seems to have been no question of him becoming a bishop.[48]

The gradualist approach also made the question of celibacy more acute. Celibacy seems to have begun to be a real issue in the western church in the later fourth century, as masses began to be celebrated on a daily rather than a weekly basis.[49] Weekly celebration had presumably meant abstaining from sexual intercourse one night in seven; daily celebration necessitated complete abstinence, at least

[45] Godding, Prêtres en Gaule mérovingienne, 41-45.

[46] Ibid., 55-67.

[47] Bruno Krusch, ed., "Vita Eligii," in Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi Merovingici, MGH SS rer. Merov. 4 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1902), 2: 671; Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, eds., "Vita Audoini," in Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi Merovingici, MGH SS rer. Merov. 5 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1910), 3: 555.

[48] Bertram Colgrave, ed. and trans., *Felix's Life of Saint Guthlac* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 82 for Guthlac's entry into Repton, 84-87 for Felix's tonsure and training, 144-147 for his ordination as priest once he had become a hermit, and 193 for the date of his death.

[49] Raymund Kottje, "Das Aufkommen der täglichen Eucharistiefeier in der Westkirche und die Zölibatsforderung," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 82 (1971): 218-28.

in theory. In canon law it was acceptable for married men to seek ordination provided that they agreed to give up sexual intercourse with their wives (in practice they and their wives would be encouraged to live separately, preferably with their wives being encouraged to become nuns), but officially it was not possible to be ordained deacon or priest and then get married.[50] Some authorities insisted that this applied to subdeacons too, but this was not generally agreed upon until the eleventh century.[51] At all events, boys and young men who became clerics early knew that they could get married while still in minor orders, but would find it easier to progress in the clerical grades if they remained single. Probably the chance of becoming a bishop was the principal inducement for encouraging clergy to remain celibate, that is, among those clerics who had a hope of rising that far – those with the right family background, a reasonable level of education and, vitally, the right contacts at court. The number of clerics hoping that they might possibly become bishop would be considerably greater than the number who actually achieved that rank. In addition it might well have appeared a good thing to many aristocratic parents to encourage celibacy among some of their offspring, since this would simplify the problem of dividing up the family inheritance among ever-increasing groups of descendants and would also put members of the family in positions where they could help relatives in the next generation.[52] As Godding notes, the silence of Merovingian church councils from the later sixth century onwards on the subject of clerical continence suggests that celibacy was not disputed.[53] There were, however, areas of Europe where this was not the case: Britain and Ireland, Brittany and, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, also Normandy were much more relaxed; we will consider them later.

At all events, the most powerful groups within the church had accepted celibacy a long time before the Gregorian Reform. This was the movement, spearheaded by the papacy from the middle of the eleventh century, which demanded an end to marriage for priests and to lay involvement in appointments to ecclesiastical offices, and it has been credited with marking a sharp caesura in attitudes

---

[50] Godding, Prêtres, 119.

[51] Roger E. Reynolds, "The subdiaconate as a sacred and superior order," in Reynolds, Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchy and Image, Variorum Collected Studies 669 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999), 9-15.

[52] Similarly, Régine Le Jan notes (Famille et pouvoir, 306-310, 316-318) that Frankish aristocratic families were happy to accept the very stringent rules of the church against incestuous marriage (forbidding marriage between sixth cousins).

[53] Godding, Prêtres, 131-5.

towards clerical marriage, but the picture is slightly more nuanced.[54] Abstinence from marriage for clergy with hopes, however faint, of becoming bishop was the framework within which clerical uncle-nephew relationships flourished.

Ecclesiastical Uncles and Nephews

Terminology for family relationships in medieval Latin can be slippery, so some discussion of vocabulary is necessary before we can identify ecclesiastical uncles and nephews. The term *nepos* is especially tricky; although "nephew" is one of its meanings, it can also mean "grandson", and Thietmar (bishop of Merseburg 1009-18) used it in his Chronicle to mean both "nephew" and "cousin".[55] *Sororius* (sister's son) and *fratruelis* (brother's son), however, are more likely to refer to nephews, but can sometimes be used of cousins. Terms meaning "uncle" refer only to uncles, but here there can be some ambiguity, since *avunculus*, technically the mother's brother, was used promiscuously for either sort of uncle. However, *patruus* is used specifically for the father's brother, and sources quite often go to some pains to specify whether the relationship was maternal or paternal.

Among uncles who were laymen, those on the father's side of the family would be more powerful as guardians and would have greater rights. It is noticeable for example that Thietmar's *patrui*, his father's brothers (laymen), figure prominently in his life: even when Thietmar tried to obtain the

---

[54] For some examples of authors seeing the Gregorian reform as marking a sharp caesura, see Dyan Elliott, Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality and Demonology in the Middle Ages (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 81-106; Robert I. Moore, The First European Revolution, c. 970-1215 (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), 10-11, 15-16, 62, 88; Maureen Miller, "Masculinity, reform and clerical culture: narratives of episcopal holiness in the Gregorian era," Church History 72 (2003): 25-52; Henrietta Leyser, "Clerical purity and the re-ordered world," in Christianity in Western Europe c. 1100-c. 1500, vol. 4 of The Cambridge History of Christianity, ed. Miri Rubin and Walter Simons (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 11-21; Megan McLaughlin, Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[55] Robert Holtzmann, ed., Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg, MGH SS rer. Germ. N.S. 9 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1935), 156, 432, 434 (= Book 4, 21; 7, 27, 30) for nepos meaning nephew (lay nephews in each case), and (among several instances of cousins), 321, 356, 362, 370, 406, 410 (= Book 6, 38, 66, 67, 74, 81; VII, 7, 10-11: Thietmar's cousin Dietrich, who became bishop of Münster). Translated and annotated by David A. Warner, Ottonian Germany: the Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001), 50, 341-343, 379.

provostship of Walbeck, on the grounds that it was his inheritance from his mother, it was his paternal

uncle, Liuthar, Count of the Nordmark, who controlled appointment to this office. In 1002 Liuthar made

his nephew pay a large sum to the cleric to whom he had sold the provostship.[56] By contrast, clerical

uncle-nephew relationships seem to have operated with equal force regardless of whether the kinship

was on the sister's side or the brother's. Indeed it is possible that in clerical circles the sister's brother

may have had a special role, perhaps as the provider of extra inheritance, or extra career-advancing pull,

for those sister's sons intended for the church. Since the term avunculus was used fairly loosely, we

have to look out for specific references to sisters, but they certainly occur. In the ninth century Bishop

Liudger of Münster's four clerical nephews, all future bishops, were the sons of his sisters, as Altfrid

(one of the nephews in question, and an eventual successor of Liudger) is careful to point out, though

without naming names.[57] Hincmar of Laon was the son of the older Hincmar's sister.[58] Uodalrich of

Augsburg (923-73) took great care over the upbringing and career of his sister's son (filio sororis suae)

Adalbero, who he hoped would succeed him.[59] Imad (1051-76), eventual successor of Meinwerk (1009-

36) as bishop of Paderborn, is described as the latter's sororius, sister's son, in the twelfth-century Vita

Meinwerci, and although the Vita is too late to be necessarily reliable on this point the fact that it stresses

this relationship suggests that this is what its audience would have expected.[60] Brihtheah, bishop of

Worcester 1033-8, was the sister's son (filius sororis) of Archbishop Wulfstan of York (1002-23), who

had been bishop of Worcester (1002-16).[61] And mother's kin were important from early on: Gregory of

---

[56] Holtzmann, Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar, 328-331 (= Book 6, 44); Warner, Ottonian Germany, 268.

[57] Wilhelm Diekamp, ed., Vita Sancti Liudgeri auctore Altfrido (Münster: Theissing, 1881), 11; see also p. xv.

[58] Jean Devisse, Hincmar, archevêque de Reims 845-882, (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975-6), 2: 1096-1097; Heinrich Schrörs, Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims. Sein Leben und seine Schriften (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1884), 10. On Hincmar the younger (born between 835 and 838; died 879) see Rolf Grosse, "Hinkmar, Bischof von Laon," in Lexikon des Mittelalters (Munich: Artemis, 1991), 5: 29.

[59] Gerhard von Augsburg, Vita Sancti Uodalrici: Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des heiligen Ulrich, trans. and ed. Walter Berschin and Angelika Häse (Heidelberg: Winter, 1993), 246-262 (Book 1, 21-24); for further discussion, see Miller, Masculinity, reform and clerical culture, 28-45.

[60] Franz Tenckhoff, ed., Vita Meinwerci episcopi Patherbrunnensis, MGH SS rer. Germ. 59 (Hanover: Hahn, 1921), 6 (= cap. 2 on Meinwerk's siblings); 84 (= cap. 160 on Imad). Imad may not necessarily have been a son of one of Meinwerk's sisters, but was almost certainly a relative, and was educated at Paderborn: Gabriele Meier, Die Bischöfe von Paderborn und ihr Bistum im Mittelalter, Paderborner theologische Studien 17 (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1987), 10-11.

[61] N.P. Brooks, "Introduction: how do we know about St Wulfstan?," in St Wulfstan and his World, ed. Julia S. Barrow and N.P. Brooks (Aldershot: Asghate, 2005), 20, citing R.R. Darlington and Patrick McGurk, ed. and transl., The Chronicle of John of Worcester (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995-in progress), 2: 518.

Tours' elder brother Peter was entrusted to his maternal uncle Tetricus bishop of Langres (539/40-72), whereas Gregory's clerical training was largely carried out at Clermont, where his father's brother Gallus had been bishop 525-51.[62] But there are plenty of references to bishops caring for brothers' sons too. Onomastic evidence suggests that the Bavarian uncle and nephew who were bishops of Auxerre in the later ninth century, Angelelm (812-29) and Heribald (d. perhaps 857), were probably linked on the father's side, since Heribald's father was Antelm and Angelelm's father was Obtelm.[63] Byrhtferth in his Vita Oswaldi describes Archbishop Oda of Canterbury as the patruus of Oswald (later bishop of Worcester and also archbishop of York).[64] Bishop Thierry (or Dietrich) I of Metz (965-84) educated his young nephew (fratruelis, brother's son) Everard.[65] The family trees constructed by Michel Parisse for various Lotharingian families show how the numerous Adalberos who were bishops of Metz and neighbouring sees in the tenth and eleventh centuries were connected in the paternal line. The two bishops and one bishop-elect of Metz, uncle (929-62), nephew (984-1005) and great-nephew (elected 1005), belonged to the Luxemburger family (the dukes of Lotharingia); Archbishop Adalbero of Rheims (969-89) was a nephew (brother's son) of the first Adalbero bishop of Metz (929-62), and Adalbero bishop of Verdun (984-988/9) was the son of the archbishop's brother Godfrey, count of Verdun.[66]

Parents often began to plan for their children's futures while they were in their cradles. Naming patterns are striking here: although obviously only a minority of bishops' nephews were named after them, the number of clerical nephews who were namesakes of their uncles (and who often became bishops themselves) is noticeable: Hildigrim (d. 827) and Hildigrim (d. 886), brother and nephew of Bishop Liudger of Münster and both bishops themselves, of Châlons and Halberstadt respectively;[67]

---

[62] Martin Heinzelmann, Gregory of Tours, 10-11, 30-31.

[63] Michel Sot, Guy Lobrichon and Monique Goullet, eds., *Les gestes des évêques d'Auxerre*, (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002-2009), 1: 142-143, 148-149 (= capitula 35-6).

[64] Byrhtferth of Ramsey, The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine, ed. and tr. Michael Lapidge (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 8-11, 32-29, 54-57.

[65] Sigebert of Gembloux, Vita Deoderici episcopi Mettensis, in Annales, chronica et historiae aevi Carolini et Saxonici, ed. Georg Heinrich Pertz, MGH SS 4 (Hanover: Hahn, 1841), 461–483, here 480 (= cap. 19). Everard bore the same name as Thierry's father, Eberhard of Hamaland.

[66] Michel Parisse, La noblesse lorraine XIe-XIIIe siècle, (Lille and Paris: Université Nancy-II, 1976), 2: 844-847; see also John Nightingale, Monasteries and their Patrons in the Gorze Reform, c.850-1000 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 71-77, 276.

[67] Diekamp, Vita Sancti Liudgeri auctore Altfrido, xi, xv, 38, 265.

Hincmar and Hincmar; the three Salomos (great-uncle, uncle and nephew) who were bishops of Constance in the ninth and early tenth centuries;[68] the three Adalberos (great-uncle, uncle and nephew) who were bishops (the last one only bishop-elect) of Metz in the tenth and early eleventh centuries; Thierry bishop of Verdun 1046-89 and his nephew Thierry the primicerius (head of the cathedral chapter) of Verdun;[69] Adalbert I and Adalbert II, both archbishops of Mainz in the first half of the twelfth century,[70] and, also in the first half of the twelfth century, John of Lisieux and John of Sées.[71] Although information about baptismal sponsorship is lacking in these cases, we know from other instances that parents could choose, as baptismal sponsors, clerics who could promote the futures of their children,[72] and it is possible that some of the namesake nephews were also godsons of their uncles.

Fosterage (nutritio)

When they were quite young, boys intended for a clerical career would be handed over (the verb used is usually tradere) to a senior cleric, often a kinsman and very often an uncle. This event, often termed traditio: "handing over", or commendatio "commendation", is often described in lives of bishops as occurring after weaning. For aristocratic boys, weaning probably often occurred late, but even so

---

[68] Helmut Maurer, Das Bistum Konstanz 2: Die Konstanzer Bischöfe vom Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts bis 1206, Germania Sacra, Neue Folge 42,1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), 67-78, 84-119; Joseph Riegel, "Bischof Salomo I. von Konstanz und seine Zeit," Freiburger Diözesan-Archiv 42 (1914): 111-88, at 128, 188; Bührer-Thierry, Évêques et pouvoir, 122-125, 171-172.

[69] Laurence of Liège, Gesta episcoporum virdunensium, in Annales et chronica aevi Salici. Vitae aevi Carolini et Saxonici, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 10 (Hanover: Hahn, 1852), 489–516, here 503.

[70] Anselm of Havelberg, Vita Adelberti Maguntini Archiepiscopi, in Monumenta Moguntina, ed. Philipp Jaffé, Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1866), 565-603, esp. 569-71 (on p. 571 the elder Adalbert is referred to as patruus and the younger as nepos and patruelis).

[71] David Spear, The Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals during the Ducal Period, 911-1204 (London: Institute of Historical Research, 2006), 170, 273.

[72] E.g. Halinard of Sombernon (Archbishop of Lyon 1046-52, born probably c. 990), committed to his godfather and probable kinsman Bishop Walter of Autun: "Vita venerabilis Halinardi," in Patrologia Latina (Paris: Garnier frères et J .P. Migne, 1880), 142: 1337-1339). For the identification of Halinard's parents (Warner of Sombernon and Istisburgis) see François Grignard, "Conjectures sur la famille d'Halinard, abbé de Saint-Bénigne," Bulletin d'histoire et d'archéologie religieuses du diocèse de Dijon 2 (1884), 202-206.

mentioning weaning may be a poetic way of saying that infancy had ended. The handing-over ceremony marked the beginning of a process of fosterage (nutritio), and the terms nutrire (to nourish, to foster), nutritor (foster-father) and nutritus (foster-son) occur frequently in accounts of the upbringing of boys of good birth, for example in Hincmar's description of his nephew and in the account of how Uodalrich of Augsburg brought up his nephew Adalbero.[73] The foster-fathers might become very fond of their charges; a verse epitaph notes the "paternal affection" with which Bishop Thierry I of Metz had undertaken the education of his young nephew Everard "from his cradle"; on the young Everard's death in 978 the bishop had to organise his funeral.[74] Until about the ninth century in Francia, and the tenth century in England, there was some overlap with royal fosterage, though the latter did not start until a boy's early teens, leaving time earlier in boyhood for some clerical training.[75] From the sixth century to the ninth century, and to some extent beyond, boys of very high birth were normally fostered by kings in their teenage years, irrespective of whether they were heading for a secular or an ecclesiastical career.[76] This was the case with Aldric, later bishop of Le Mans, nourished by Charles the Great and Louis the Pious, and Herifrid, later bishop of Auxerre 887-909, brought up at the court of Charles the Bald; both had previously been supervised by bishops, in Herifrid's case his kinsman Bishop Walter of Orléans.[77] In Anglo-Saxon England, royal fosterage of clerics continued even later, down to the mid-tenth century.[78] But royal fosterage, however useful socially, was disruptive to education, and bishops doubtless preferred their young charges, including their nephews, to remain in a stable environment where they could be sure of getting on with their studies. By the later eleventh century nutritio was

---

[73] On nutritio, see Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 5; for Hincmar see footnote 36 above; for Uodalric see footnote 58.

[74] Sigebert of Gembloux, Vita Deoderici episcopi Mettensis, MGH SS 4, 479-80 (= Book 1, 19).

[75] Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 5.

[76] Le Jan, Famille et pouvoir, 342-3, and Matthew Innes, ""A place of discipline": Carolingian courts and aristocratic youth," in Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages, ed. Catherine Cubitt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 61-66.

[77] Geschichte des Bistums Le Mans von der Spätantike bis zur Karolingerzeit: Actus pontificum cenomannis in urbe degentium und Gesta Aldrici, ed. Margarete Weidemann, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Monographien 56, 1-3 (Mainz and Bonn: Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, 2002), 1: 118-19: Gesta Domni Aldrici, capitula 1-2; Sot, Lobrichon and Goullet, eds., Les gestes des évêques d'Auxerre, 1: 169.

[78] Wulfstan of Winchester, The Life of St Æthelwold, ed. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 10-12 (= cap. 7); Michael Winterbottom and Michael Lapidge, eds. and trans., The Early Lives of St Dunstan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 18-22 (= B, Vita Dunstani, capitula 5-6); see Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 5.

beginning to come to an end, particularly in France (it died more slowly in Germany): educational patterns were becoming looser as young clerics moved in search of different schools. The extent of the mobility can doubtless be exaggerated, but the fact that it could happen was decisive. Even so, the ending of nutritio did not stop episcopal uncles from taking a strong interest in the careers of their nephews: they continued to do this, as far as education and preferment were concerned, but in a more informal way.

Education

Uncles did not necessarily undertake the job of teaching their nephews themselves. In the case of bishops direct involvement would have been difficult, though many of them were keen to ensure the education of their clerics.[79] However, they were well-placed to supervise it, usually in their own cathedral schools, but occasionally in another church in their lordship,[80] or by paying to send their charges to school elsewhere. Gregory of Tours' uncle Gallus bishop of Clermont took charge of him when his father died;[81] in the seventh century Dido bishop of Poitiers (c.628-67) ensured that his nephew Leudegar (bishop of Autun c.662-76) received a good education;[82] in the tenth century Archbishop Oda of Canterbury (942-58) employed a Frankish tutor, Frithegod (Fredegaud) to teach his nephew

---

[79] For examples of bishops encouraging education see Kurth, Notger de Liège, 251-99; Henry Mayr-Harting, Church and Cosmos in Early Ottonian Germany: the View from Cologne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 59-63, 131-144; C. Stephen Jaeger, The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), 44-77. Meinhard, later bishop of Würzburg 1085-8, taught his nephew Erlung while Meinhard was scholasticus and Erlung was a canon at Bamberg; Erlung became bishop of Würzburg 1106-21: Alfred Wendehorst, Das Bistum Würzburg, 1: Die Bischofsreihe bis 1254, Germania Sacra Neue Folge 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), 117-19 and 126-32, esp. 126.

[80] Archbishop Ebo of Rheims had his nephew Ebo educated not in his cathedral but in the abbey of Saint-Rémy in Rheims, and made him abbot there: Flodoard von Reims, Die Geschichte der Reimser Kirche, ed. Martina Stratmann, MGH SS 36 (Hanover: Hahn, 1998), 244.

[81] Heinzelmann, Gregory of Tours, 13. Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi Merovingici, MGH SS rer. Merov. 4 (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1902).

[82] "Passio Leudegarii episcopi Augustodunensis", cap. 1, in Passiones vitaeque sanctorum aevi merovingici, Krusch and Levison, eds., 3: 283. Translated in English in Paul Fouracre and Richard A. Gerberding, eds. Late Merovingian France (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 217. Dido was Leudegar's avunculus.

Oswald;[83] in the early twelfth century Archbishop Adalbert I of Mainz (1111-37) sent his young nephew (1138-41) to finish his education in Rheims, Paris and Montpellier.[84] Bishops who were their nephews' nutritores would also have the task of supervising their nephews' ordination, which would involve them in conducting examinations of the candidates' knowledge, at least for the higher grades (the archdeacon would examine the lower grades). As bishops, they would also be able to have their nephews installed as cathedral canons, which might happen on entry in childhood, though in these cases the status of the young canons might be confirmed more formally when they were ordained subdeacon, which usually marked the start of full adulthood for clerics. For example, at the age of nineteen Thietmar was still under the authority of the scholasticus of Magdeburg cathedral, meaning that he had not yet become a subdeacon.[85] Most dignities (especially provostships) were also in the episcopal gift, so nephews might also count on getting one or more of those.

Help with Career Advancement

The support bishops gave to their nephews went well beyond education and first preferment. Although they were not supposed to arrange for their own succession, this was of course not unknown. The number of bishops who were succeeded by their nephews (not always immediately – sometimes there was another candidate in between) is striking. In the seventh century, for example, we find Agilbert, driven out of the see of Dorchester in 660, refusing to return but instead persuading the king of Wessex to accept his nephew Leuthere as bishop of Winchester (670-6).[86] Angilramn, successor of Bishop

---

[83] Michael Lapidge, "A Frankish scholar in tenth-century England: Frithegod of Canterbury/ Fredegaud of Brioude," Anglo-Saxon England, 17 (1988): 46-65.

[84] Anselm of Havelberg, Vita Adelberti, 575-86.

[85] Holtzmann, Die Chronik Thietmars von Merseburg, 158-61 (= Book 4, capitula 24-5); Warner, Ottonian Germany, 168-169.

[86] Bede, Ecclesiastical History of the English People, ed. and trans. Bertram Colgrave and R.A.M. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), 236 (Book 3, cap. 7).

Chrodegang of Metz in the eighth century, may have been the latter's nephew;[87] Liudger, the first bishop of Münster, was succeeded by his brother and then by two of his nephews;[88] Angelelm was succeeded by Heribald at Auxerre 828 or 829;[89] Arnold bishop of Toul (872-94) was the nephew of his immediate successor Arnulf (847-72);[90] the successor of Bernard bishop of Verden 870-9 was his sister's son Dado (880-923);[91] the Salomos occupied the see of Constance for most of the period 838-920 (Salomo I was particularly instrumental in helping the career of his great-nephew Salomo III);[92] Poppo I (941-61) was succeeded by Poppo II (961-84) of Würzburg, and later, in the same diocese, we find the uncle and nephew Meinhard (1085-8) and Erlung (1106-21);[93] Lietbert (1051-76) was succeeded by his nephew Gerard II (1076-92) at Cambrai in 1076.[94] This is a scattering of examples only: there are more.[95] The failed succession attempts are also of interest. Uodalric spent time persuading Otto I and his fellow-bishops to promote Adalpero after his death, and had some success;[96] unfortunately for him Adalpero died just ahead of him (24 April 973), apparently as the result of a faulty blood-letting.[97] Otto, vicedominus of Bremen, "gloried in" his uncle Archbishop Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen (937-88) and hoped to succeed him, but Libentius (Liawizo) became archbishop instead (988-1013): on his deathbed, Libentius tried to promote Otto's case, but without success.[98] Royal wishes were almost always stronger

---

[87] M.A. Claussen, The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canonicorum in the Eighth Century (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 22.

[88] Diekamp, Vita Sancti Liudgeri auctore Altfrido, 38, 265.

[89] Sot, Lobrichon and Goullet, *Les gestes des évêques d'Auxerre*, 1: 142-143, 148-149.

[90] Georg Waitz, ed., Gesta episcoporum Tullensium, in Chronica et gesta aevi Salici, MGH SS 8 (Hanover: Hahn, 1848), 631–648, here 637-638 (cap. 27).

[91] Georg Waitz, ed., Gesta episcoporum Virdunensium, Annales, chronica et historiae aevi Carolini et Saxonici, MGH SS 4 (Hanover: Hahn, 1841), 36–51, here 37 (an autobiographical fragment by Bishop Dado).

[92] Maurer, Das Bistum Konstanz 2, 67-78, 84-119: Salomo I was bishop from 838/9 till 71; Salomo II from 875/6 till 89; Salomo III from 890 till 919/20.

[93] Wendehorst, Das Bistum Würzburg 1, 59-67, 117-119 and 126-132.

[94] Gesta Episcoporum Cameracensium Continuatio, ed. Ludwig Konrad Bethmann, in Chronica et gesta aevi Salici, MGH SS 7 (Hanover: Hahn, 1846), 393–525, here 497.

[95] See for example Bouchard, Sword, Miter and Cloister, 296 (Letbald II and Walter, bishops of Mâcon, 993-1016 and 1031-61 respectively), 320-322 (Gibuin and Gibuin, bishops of Châlons-sur-Marne in the late tenth century), 400 (Hugh I and Hugh II, bishops of Nevers 1016-69 and 1074-96, great-uncle and great-nephew). See also Stone, this volume.

[96] Gerhard, Vita Sancti Uodalrici, ed. Berschin, 110-113 (= Book 1, cap. 3), 246-259 (= Book 1, capitula 21-23).

[97] Ibid., 258-261 (= Book 1, cap. 24). For the bloodletting story, see Herimanni Augiensis Chronicon, ed. Georg Pertz, in Annales et chronica aevi Salici, MGH SS 5 (Hanover: Hahn, 1844), 67–133, here 116 (Hermann of Reichenau's Chronicle, s.a. 973).

[98] Magistri Adam Bremensis Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum, ed. Bernhard Schmeidler, MGH SS Rer. Germ. 2, 3rd ed. (Hanover and Leipzig: Hahn, 1917), 89-90 and n.; see also Thietmar VI, cap. 89 (p. 380 in Holtzmann; pp. 296-297 in Warner).

than those of a dying bishop, but the succession of many nephews suggests that rulers, especially in Germany, paid some attention to the ambitions of the families of bishops.

Equally of interest are the instances of uncle and nephew bishops holding different sees. Here we can guess (in some cases we know) that the uncles helped bring their nephews to the notice of rulers and other influential forces: more importantly perhaps, they would have helped provide them with the ecclesiastical training and social polish that made them acceptable. Hincmar introduced his nephew to Charles the Bald. The Salomo family did not only supply bishops for Constance but also bishops of Freising (883-906) and Chur (920-49; both called Waldo, also an uncle-nephew pair);[99] Geoffrey, bishop of Auxerre (1052-76) was nephew of Hugh I bishop of Nevers (1016-69) and uncle of Hugh II, also bishop of Nevers (1074-96);[100] the counts of Saarbrücken supplied bishops for Worms (Winither, bishop-elect 1085-8), Mainz (Adalbert I and Adalbert II) and Speyer (Bruno, 1107-23) in three different generations across the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.[101] Again, this is just a tiny scattering of examples.

A Contrast: Father-Son Relationships in the Church

To provide a point of comparison for our uncle-nephew pairings, it might be useful to look at a rather different society in which uncle-nephew links were less strong: England in the period before c.1100. It does not provide a complete contrast with the Frankish successor-states because there was some effort to keep the episcopate celibate. This was not wholly successful: Bishop Ælfsige of Winchester (951-9)

---

[99] On Bishop Waldo of Freising, brother of Salomo III, see Josef Fleckenstein, Grundlegung: Die karolingische Hofkapelle, MGH Schriften, 16/1 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1959), 190n, 192-194, 202; for Bishop Waldo of Chur see ibid., 216; Bührer-Thierry, Évêques et pouvoir, 171-172 (and see ibid., 172-173, for another tenth century uncle-nephew pair, Archbishop Frederick of Salzburg and Bishop Pilgrim of Passau).
[100] Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 388, 400.
[101] Peter Acht, "Adalbert I., Erzbischof von Mainz," in Neue Deutsche Biographie (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1953), 1: 44; Hans-Werner Hermann, "Saarbrücken, Grafen v.," in Neue Deutsche Biographie 22: 318.

had a son who became a powerful thegn;[102] Bishop Ealdhun of Durham (990-1018) had a daughter and used her marriages to create political connections for himself in the north of England;[103] Stigand, pluralistically bishop of Winchester (1043-70) and archbishop of Canterbury (1052-70), had a son, and so did his brother Æthelmaer, bishop of Elmham (1047-70).[104] However, on the whole there is little evidence for episcopal marriage; moreover, from the mid-tenth century onwards there were always some bishops who had been monks. Slightly lower down the scale, however, there is extensive evidence for clerical marriage among the wealthier clergy – royal clerics, clerics controlling minster churches, and members of cathedral communities.[105] It is likely that many of these positions were hereditary throughout the final two centuries of Anglo-Saxon England; certainly, when some of them were recorded in sources of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, they were treated as such. Hereditary succession continued for at least one generation following the Norman Conquest, since many incoming Norman clerics were used to a similar system in their homeland. The chapter of St Paul's Cathedral, London, contained numerous Anglo-Saxon and Norman clerical dynasties in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries.[106]

Clerical fathers, therefore, had a big role to play in their sons' training; outside patronage, especially from kings, was vital, but fathers may have helped their sons acquire this too, by introducing them to rulers.[107] In the case of Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury (959-88), it is likely that his father was a clerk with royal connections, based in Winchester, either at the Old Minster (Winchester

---

[102] Dorothy Whitelock, ed. and trans., Anglo-Saxon Wills (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 16-17, no. 4, with notes, pp. 114-16; discussion by Linda Tollerton, Wills and Will-Making in Anglo-Saxon England (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2011), 117-18, and Barrow, The Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 4, n. 148.
[103] Thomas Arnold, ed., Symeonis Monachi Opera Omnia, Rolls Series 75 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1882-5), 1: 216-217; for discussion see Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 4, n. 140.
[104] The evidence for Stigand's son Robert is discussed by Alexander R. Rumble, "From Winchester to Canterbury: Ælfheah and Stigand – bishops, archbishops and victims," in Leaders of the Anglo-Saxon Church from Bede to Stigand, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer 2012), 175; for Æthelmær and his son Sæman see ibid., and for his wife see Domesday Book 33, Norfolk, ed. Philippa Brown, 2 parts (Chichester: Phillimore, 1984), 1, 10.28, and comment by Frank Barlow, The English Church 1000-1066, 2nd ed. (London and New York: Longman, 1979), 78, n. 1.
[105] For discussion, see Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 4; Julia Barrow, Who served the Altar at Brixworth? Clergy in English Minsters c.800-c.1200, 28th Brixworth Lecture (Leicester, 2013), 5-7.
[106] Christopher Brooke, The Medieval Idea of Marriage (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 84-89; Barrow, Who served the Altar?, 6, n. 17.
[107] Julia Barrow, "The clergy in English dioceses c.900-c.1066," in Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England, ed. Francesca Tinti (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005), 20-21; Barrow, Who served the Altar, 5-7.

Cathedral) or the New Minster, a royal collegiate church until 964, when it was converted into a monastery.[108] Dunstan's contemporary, Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester (963-84), who was responsible for converting Old Minster and New Minster into Benedictine communities, was born in Winchester, possibly also into a clerical family.[109] Clerical uncles might also be important, as Archbishop Oda was in the case of his nephew Oswald; other clerical kinsmen were also useful (Cynesige, bishop of Lichfield 949-963/4, was a kinsman (consanguineus) of Dunstan) but less vital.[110] It is noteworthy that whereas the earliest Life of Dunstan says that his parents helped him to enter Glastonbury in his adolescence,[111] Adalard of Ghent says that Dunstan entered the household of his uncle Athelm (Æthelhelm, archbishop of Canterbury 923/5-926) and was helped by him. Adalard was probably trying to fit Dunstan into what he saw as the uncle-nephew succession he would have been more familiar with, and probably created the relationship between Dunstan and Athelm (not attested earlier) to link Dunstan with his future see.[112] Family relationships were as important in Anglo-Saxon England as they were in the Frankish successor states, but they operated in a different way: clerics married each other's daughters or sisters, creating a more tightly-meshed clerical community, which, although forming an elite, was not closely linked with the high aristocracy. Very few bishops can be shown to be the sons of ealdormen.[113]

---

[108] Barrow, Clergy in the Medieval World, chap. 4, n. 144.

[109] Wulfstan of Winchester, Life of St Æthelwold, ed. and trans. Michael Lapidge and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford, 1991), 3 (Vita Æthelwoldi, cap. 1).

[110] For Oda, see n. 58 above; for Cynesige, see Winterbottom and Lapidge, The Early Lives of St Dunstan, 68-69.

[111] Winterbottom and Lapidge, The Early Lives of St Dunstan, 17-21 (= cap. 5).

[112] Ibid., 118.

[113] Æthelnoth of Canterbury (archbishop 1020-38) was the son of Æthelmær the Stout, probably identifiable with ealdorman Æthelmær (John of Worcester, Chronicle, 2: 506-7) says Æthelnoth was the son of the nobilis viri Æthelmær; Simon Keynes, "Cnut's Earls", in The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway, ed. Alexander R. Rumble (London, 1994), 43-88, at 67-68 argues for Æthelmaer the stout being ealdorman; Byrhthelm, bishop of Winchester, was a royal kinsman and may also have been related to the ealdorman Byrhtnoth: Shashi Jayakumar, "Eadwig and Edgar: politics, propaganda, faction", in Edgar, King of the English 959-975: New Interpretations, ed. Donald Scragg (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2008), 86-87, and see also Patrick Wormald, "The strange affair of the Selsey bishopric, 953-963," in Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting, ed. Richard Gameson and Henrietta Leyser (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 128-41.

Conclusion

Although in canon law it was always theoretically possible for married men to seek ordination in western Europe in the middle ages, provided that they and their wives agreed to separate and to lead celibate lives, this practice had in much of western Christendom been sidelined by recruiting boys into the clergy and then discouraging them from marriage. Although the observance of clerical celibacy in western Europe in the earlier middle ages was uneven, to say the least, it was usually observed by bishops. In Francia and its successor states those clerics who had any hope of becoming bishops were encouraged to remain celibate not only by the churches to which they belonged but also by their relatives. Families benefited enormously from having kinsmen who were bishops, because of the patronage the latter could exercise as major landholders, as powerful political figures and within the church itself.[114] Clerical kinsmen who failed to become bishops (the vast majority) also had their uses, though on a much smaller scale. Among the useful actions bishops could perform perhaps the one most appreciated by their kinsmen was the upbringing of selected members of the next generation, those of their nephews who were handed over by their parents to become clerics. Although all members of the clergy could undertake this duty, bishops were best-placed to do it well, since they had authority over cathedral schools and could insist on their nephews being accepted into them, and furthermore had the best opportunities to introduce their nephews to kings. Child-entry into the clergy and the need for celibate bishops encouraged clerical uncles to act as foster-fathers, and was one of the factors encouraging cathedrals and other major churches to develop good schools. It could often lead to nephews succeeding their uncles in office, though more often pressure from rival families or a wish on the part of rulers to favour close supporters would prevent this. Weaker support from rulers for clerical celibacy (as in Anglo-Saxon England, for example) could allow father-son clerical dynasties to flourish; this could co-exist with a largely celibate episcopate since the clergy who produced sons would not necessarily seek further advancement, and probably often remained in minor orders. Although bishops

---

[114] For the wider political and social implications of this phenomenon, see Stone, this volume.

continued to support clerical nephews throughout the middle ages, the end of the eleventh century marks a turning point, since the fosterage system faded away and more informal patterns of support became the norm.