# Robert of Jumièges, archbishop in exile (1052–5)[1]

TOM LICENCE

ABSTRACT

Archbishop Robert of Jumièges interests historians of Anglo-Saxon England chiefly for his role in offering the crown to William of Normandy and in the conflict between King Edward and Earl Godwin in 1051–2. Before now, very little was known of his movements after his flight from England that September, but the discovery of an early source placing him in Paris casts new light on his activities. Part 1 examines the source and proposes a date for the event Robert attended. Part 2 challenges current perceptions of his career and offers a new interpretation of its significance in view of his movements in exile.

Robert of Jumièges has commanded attention for his role as King Edward's chief advisor and leader of a French/ Norman faction at court, whose influence fuelled conflict between the king and his powerful in-laws, Earl Godwin's family.[2] In 1051, this conflict would break into crisis, but not before Robert attained the very highest office. Formerly prior of Saint-Ouen, in Rouen, and abbot of the ducal monastery of Jumièges from 1037, he was promoted to the see of London in 1044 or 1045, and elevated to Canterbury probably in March 1051. This would seem to have been a fateful year, for the defence proposed by two Norman ducal biographers, William of Jumièges and William of Poitiers, against the charge that, in 1066, Duke William slew an anointed king and usurped his throne, involved the detail that King Edward had sent Archbishop Robert to appoint the duke his heir.[3] Although it derives from

[1] The dates in the title apply to Robert's career in exile. If they cause confusion because scholars in the past have dated his death to 1052, I hope, by the end of this article, the reader will deem them defensible.

[2] Neither E. A. Freeman nor anyone since has found much reason to discuss Robert's career. Biographical notes and commentary can be found in H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Robert of Jumièges (d. 1052/1055)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford, 2004), and V. Gazeau, *Normannia Monastica*, 2 vols (Caen, 2007) II, pp. 150–1.

[3] *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, ed. and trans. E. M. C. van Houts, 2 vols., OMT (Oxford, 1992–5) II, p. 158; *The Gesta Guillelmi of William of Poitiers*, ed. and trans. R. H. C. Davis and M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1998), p. 20.

William's earliest apologist, the claim still carries some weight, not least for the casual nature of its appearance in a work by a monk (William) of Jumièges, who would have consulted Robert at that abbey in the 1050s. Most historians appear now to accept the claim and use it in their discussion of Edward's policy for the succession.[4] The consensus holds that Robert probably conveyed the offer on his way to or from Rome to obtain the pallium between mid-Lent and 27 June 1051; for although we cannot be sure that he travelled via Normandy, he was at least abroad at that time and could easily have done so.[5] It has also been suggested that King Edward must have obtained the consent of his magnates (as Norman sources claim he did, although they do not state when he did so) at the council in London in 1051, before Robert's departure.[6] Whether or not this speculation is correct, it is certain that Robert went to Rome to collect the pallium from Pope Leo IX (1049–54), arriving back in Kent on 27 June, papally authorized in office.

During the summer months that followed, tensions erupted. A number of men of Count Eustace of Boulogne, who came to visit Edward, were killed in a fight in Dover, along with numerous townsmen, who had opposed them. And when Godwin refused to obey the king's command to punish that port (which was part of his earldom), Edward summoned the other magnates, Earls Leofric and Siward, against him; and Godwin was obliged to flee the realm with his sons. Soon, the exiles were building their forces in Bruges, under the protection of Edward's intermittent enemy, Count Baldwin V of Flanders (1035–67), and challenging the king's authority by recruiting along England's southern coast, where their support was, and raiding the ports of their enemies. About that time, in the closing months of 1051, a certain Count William (probably William of Normandy) came to England, where Edward received him with his sizeable troop of followers.[7] Scholars are inclined to assume that his visit was prompted by the offer of the crown, which Robert may previously have communicated. Yet his arrival was also timely in that his marriage to Baldwin V's daughter, Matilda, celebrated in 1050–1, gave him influence over her father; perhaps he

[4] See, most recently, S. Baxter, 'Edward the Confessor and the Succession Question', *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*, ed. R. Mortimer (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 77–118, at pp. 90–5.

[5] D. C. Douglas advanced this view in 'Edward the Confessor, Duke William of Normandy, and the English Succession', *EHR* 68 (1953), 526–45, and again in 'Robert de Jumièges, archevêque de Cantorbéry, et la conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands', *Jumièges: congrès scientifique du XIII^e centenaire, Rouen, 10–12 Juin 1954*, ed. R.-J. Hesbert, 2 vols. (Rouen, 1955), pp. 283–6.

[6] E.g., F. Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, 2nd ed. (London, 1979), p. 48.

[7] *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, with reference to the collaborative edition, gen. eds. D. Dumville and S. Keynes (Cambridge, 1983–), hereafter ASC [+ A/B/C/D/E/F], D, against the year 1052 (for 1051). On William's visit, see now Baxter, 'Edward the Confessor', pp. 90–5.

could use it to dislodge the rebels.[8] William also had a lever on King Edward, knowing, as both men surely did, that the spectre of a hostile alliance between the naval powers of Normandy and Flanders might be haunting the king, at a time when civil war loomed on the horizon too.[9] This was narrowly avoided in September 1052, when Godwin and his forces returned in such strength that the king, whose armies were slower to arrive on this occasion, had to reinstate the rebels and outlaw some of his French counsellors of the anti-Godwin faction. Archbishop Robert swiftly fled the realm. Partisans of the victors soon depicted him as an evil counsellor who had poisoned the king's mind against his magnates.[10] Stigand, bishop of Winchester, filling the vacant archbishopric, confounded proponents of propriety by usurping the archbishop's crozier without presuming to perform the attendant sacramental duties, such as the consecration of bishops.[11] From this point, historians tend to write Robert out of the story with a footnote penned in the 1120s by William of Malmesbury, who concluded that Robert had fled to Rome, secured papal letters asserting his innocence and seeking his restoration, but died at Jumièges on his way back.[12]

It is now necessary to re-examine his career in light of evidence that has not been noted or taken into account, which should alter our understanding of his last few years and change our view of ecclesiastical politics at a pivotal point in Edward's reign. Specifically, we need to attend to the only occasion when Robert was noticed in France as a titled archbishop. The first part of this article will determine whether we can accept evidence indicating that Robert visited Saint-Denis, the French royal abbey, shrine of France's patron saint, and burial place of kings, north of Paris; and to identify the year in which he might have done so. If we delay awhile initially to affirm the credentials of the evidence, it is because no scholar has given it the scrutiny a new discovery now demands, and any new interpretation requires a solid base.

Among the historical texts printed by the eighteenth-century Benedictines of St-Maur in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* is an account by a

[8] On the date of their union, see D. Bates, *Normandy Before 1066* (London, 1982), p. 76.

[9] A similar spectre encouraged Edward's father, Æthelred, to forge a Norman alliance by marrying Emma in 1002. (Stephen Church kindly drew my attention to this parallel.)

[10] E.g. ASC, E, against the year 1052; and *Vita Ædwardi regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit: The Life of King Edward who Rests at Westminster*, ed. and trans. F. Barlow, 2nd ed., OMT (Oxford, 1992), pp. 28–36, 44. E. A. Freeman perpetuated this view, calling Robert 'a foreign favourite' and worse: E. A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results*, 5 vols., 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1877) II, p. 122.

[11] Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, pp. 302–7.

[12] William of Malmesbury: *Gesta regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and trans. R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, OMT (Oxford, 1998), p. 360; and *Gesta pontificum anglorum: The History of the English Bishops*, ed. M. Winterbottom, with the assistance of R. M. Thomson, 2 vols., OMT (Oxford, 2007) I, p. 46.

monk named Haymo, of the abbey of Saint-Denis, in Paris, of what he calls the *detectio* – we might say 'certification' – of the relics of St Denis, 'the apostle of all France', whose remains were put on show there on 9 June in a year left unspecified.[13] Bizarre as it would have seemed to the monks that this martyred, third-century bishop of Paris might be thought to rest somewhere else, the purpose of the *detectio* was to quash the claim that his relics, anciently, had been moved to the abbey of St Emmeram at Regensburg in Bavaria and, lately, unearthed during building works.[14] In Haymo's account, the bishop of Regensburg had written to various dignitaries, inviting them to a celebration in which he planned to translate these putative relics; and the emperor Henry III – in what was perhaps a calculated snub to France and its monarch (for he must have been aware of the cult at the royal abbey in Paris, where French kings lay buried) – attended, with his reforming pope Leo IX, formerly Bishop Bruno of Toul.[15] Haymo recounts the dismay of some French ambassadors, who arrived at the celebration while seeking the emperor and had to take him to one side. Henry referred the matter to Leo and to his own nobles. The seething ambassadors returned to France and reported it to King Henry I (1031–60), probably with the desired effect: for Henry was greatly aggrieved and summoned his counsellors, who resolved that the saint's authentic relics should be displayed at Saint-Denis, on the appointed day, and that invitations should be sent to certain dignitaries while letters were sent to the perpetrators in Regensburg to stop them compounding their error. So the relics were displayed, on 9 June, and exhibited for fifteen days, as signs and wonders certified their authenticity to the crowds in attendance and to numerous great men, whose names Haymo sets out as though they were witnesses to a charter. Given that the relics were displayed for fifteen days, one should allow that the following individuals might have arrived severally to inspect them at any point

[13] This text is printed as 'De detectione corporum sanctorum Dionysii, Rustici et Eleutherii', in M. Bouquet *et al.*, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* (hereafter *RHF*), ed. L. Delisle, 24 vols (Paris, 1869–1904) XI, 467–74. The Maurists originally printed it in (Les religiéux bénédictins de S. Maur), *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XI (Paris, 1767), 467–74, from a manuscript at Saint-Denis, which may be lost, and which they did not describe. It may have been one of the four copies now in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France: i.e. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 2447, fols. 136–50 (Saint-Denis, s. xiii); BN, lat. nouv. acq. lat. 1509, fols. 271–4 (copied from the former: Saint-Denis, s. xiii); BN, lat. 2873 B, fols. 121–33 (s. xv), and BN, lat. 2445 B, fols. 41–3 (s. xvi).

[14] According to a monk of St Emmeram, who wrote within a few months of the *inventio* of pseudo-St Denis, the body came to light on 23 October 1049. See 'Translationis et inventionis sancti Dionysii Ratisponensis historia antiquior', ed. A. Hofmeister, MGH, SS 30. ii (Leipzig, 1934), 823–37.

[15] 'De detectione', p. 470: 'domni etiam papae Leonis non absente praesentia'. On the motives for stealing relics or pretending to find them in this period, see, generally, P. J. Geary, *Furta sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1990).

from 9 June to 23 June, when the relics must have been put away in preparation for the feast of St John the Baptist. These individuals are listed below, with their dates (where known). Robert of Jumièges appears near the top of the list.

Archbishops: Guy (Wido) of Reims (1033–55); Robert of Canterbury (1051–?). Bishops: Humbert (Imbert) of Paris (1030–60), Élinand of Laon (14 June 1052–98), Baldwin of Noyon (1044/5–68), Gaultier of Meaux (1045–82), Froiland I of Senlis (attested 1048, 1049). Abbots: Hugh of Saint-Denis (one or two abbots of this name presided from October 1049 to *c.* 1060), Albert of Marmoutier (1032–63), John of Fécamp (1028–78; and Dijon, 1052–4),[16] Landri of Saint-Père-en-Vallée, Chartres (1033–67), Geoffrey of Coulombs (1047–63), Robert of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, Rodulf of Lagny-sur-Marne; there was also a monk named Adalbert of the abbey of Saint-Remi, who had attended the event in Regensburg. Nobles: Odo, brother of the king, and the following counts: Walter III of the Vexin (d. *c.* 1064, identified here as count of Pontoise), William of Corbeil, Ivo of Beaumont-sur-Oise, and Waleran I of Meulan (*c.* 1023–68). King Henry, who did not attend, may not have thought as much of this matter as Haymo makes out, though (as in this instance) he often deputed his brother to take care of his affairs. Besides, Walter of the Vexin appears to have been the monastery's advocate at that date, and this might have caused King Henry to involve himself less in its affairs than his predecessors. It is known from a contemporary account written by a monk of St Emmeram that the dubious remains of St Denis came to light on 23 October 1049 (prompting a flurry of interest). And it follows from this that the ceremony at Saint-Denis occurred in a later year. The details given in this list should assist our inquiry, not least because they seem to advertise a date no earlier than 1053, when Élinand held his episcopal office. Still, as ever, things are not simple, and it still has to be determined whether Haymo's list is credible, given that the manuscript it came from has vanished and doubts envelop its credentials.

Here, we should note at the outset the survival of three printed witnesses, at least two of them independent, attesting the contents of the list as it was given in the lost manuscript that was kept at the abbey of Saint-Denis. Michel Félibien reports the names in his history of the monastery, published in 1706, which summarizes parts and cites other parts of Haymo's text in recounting this curious episode.[17] Jean Mabillon prints the list, in the fourth volume of his *Annales ordinis sancti Benedicti*, published in Paris in 1707; and certainly he or Félibien, his fellow Maurist, consulted the manuscript.[18]

[16] For the years 1052–4, the abbot of Fécamp was also acting abbot of Dijon in plurality.

[17] M. Félibien, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale de Saint-Denys en France* (Paris, 1706), esp. pp. 120–2.

[18] J. Mabillon, with the assistance and additions of T. Ruinart, R. Massuet, E. Martène and U. Durand, *Annales ordinis sancti Benedicti occidentalium monachorum patriarchae*, 6 vols (Paris,

Finally, the Maurists published a substantial and self-contained block of text comprising Haymo's dedicatory letter to an abbot Hugh of Saint-Denis, his account of the events I have described, and list of witnesses at the end, in 1767.[19] These cross-references are proof enough that Archbishop Robert of Canterbury's name (and title) appeared on Haymo's list. What, then, of Haymo's credentials? Much has been written on this matter because scholars have taken pains to date his work for historical and liturgical inquiries. But Rolf Grosse offers the neatest summary and appraisal of the consensus now in place: that Haymo wrote his work at the end of the twelfth century.[20] The crucial point in his argument is that Haymo refers to the abbot, Hugh, who presided at the time of the ceremony, as 'abbas, qui tunc ipsius loco praeerat' (that is, 'the abbot who was then in charge of his place'), which is taken to imply that the said abbot Hugh was dead and therefore not the abbot Hugh addressed in Haymo's letter.[21] By Grosse's estimation, Abbot Hugh IV (for whom he offers the dates *c.* 1053–*c.* 1060) was abbot at the time of the ceremony, which he assigns to 1053.[22] He was therefore inclined to date Haymo's text to the abbacy of Hugh V (1186–97) or Hugh VI (1197–1204), while accepting that Haymo may have had access to a lost earlier account.[23] Some such line of argument went back over three hundred years to Félibien (commanding a consensus for almost as long); and it would lead any careful scholar, as it has done for three hundred years, to regard Haymo as a late and suspect source.

1703–39) IV, p. 495. Mabillon, who worked in Paris alongside Félibien, had briefly been a monk at Saint-Denis.

[19] Les religiéux bénédictins de S. Maur, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XI (Paris, 1767), 467–74 (following a manuscript from Saint-Denis).

[20] R. Grosse, *Saint-Denis zwischen Adel und König: die Zeit vor Suger (1053–1122)*, Beihefte der Francia: Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris, Band 57 (Stuttgart, 2002), 19n; liturgical studies, whose authors thought that Haymo wrote in the late twelfth century, include L. Levillain, 'Essai sur les origins du Lendit', *Revue historique* 155 (1927), 241–76; and A. W. Robertson, *The Service Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis. Images of Ritual and Music in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1991), p. 69.

[21] 'De detectione', p. 472; Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, p. 19, n. 2.

[22] Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, p. 20, n. 7; cf. Félibien, *Histoire*, pp. 120–8. For the dates of the eleventh-century abbots, see L. Levillain, 'Note sur quelques abbés de Saint-Denis', *Revue Mabillon* 1 (1905–6), 41–54 and *idem*, 'Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis a l'époque mérovingienne', *Bibliotheque de l'École de Chartes* 87 (1926), 20–97, 245–346, at 301n. Abbot Albert died on 29 July 1049. An abbot, or abbots, named Hugh are attested between 5 October 1049 and *c.* 1060, when Abbot Rainier took office. Rainier died on 18 January, probably in 1066. In the late 1060s, an abbot named Vuaszo (Wazo) appears. Abbot William I appears on record in 1071. Grosse has two abbots Hugh in the 1050s (Hugh III and Hugh IV), but it is not clear to me why there must have been two. I accept his statement in this, nevertheless, in order to avoid confusion, and in case I have overlooked something.

[23] Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, p. 19, n. 2.

Although so far this view has prevailed, it is now possible to show that the consensus is wrong. There is in the University Library in Cambridge a two-volume copy of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, copied probably in northern France in the late eleventh century. It came to the abbey of Bury St Edmunds possibly in the era of Abbot Baldwin (1065–97/8), a monk of Saint-Denis, and later passed into the hands of William Smart of Ipswich, who gave it as part of a collection, in 1599, to Pembroke College, Cambridge, where its two volumes were labelled MSS 23 and 24.[24] The item relevant to our research is a sermon the copyist himself added at the end of the homiliary (Cambridge, Pembroke College 24, at 361v–74v), which is nothing less than a longer copy of the text known to the Maurists. It comprises the parts they printed, here incorporated into a sermon, which explains to a monastic audience (presumably at Saint-Denis) why they annually commemorated the feast of the *detectio*. In the past, a few scholars working on the abbey of Bury St Edmunds have noticed this text in passing, but no one has appreciated its significance to the debate about the date of Haymo's work.[25] Grosse and others have been very pleased to learn of its existence.[26]

One anomaly in this early witness is that Robert's name, but not his title, 'Archbishop of Canterbury', has been inserted over an erasure, in a hand datable to s. xiii.[27] The correction is not easily explained, nor the obliterated word decipherable, but it need not overly concern our inquiry, given the evidence showing that Robert's name was in the manuscript at Saint-Denis, which could not have been Pembroke 24, because that manuscript was at Pembroke when the Maurists were consulting the texts in Paris. One possibility is that a historically minded monk altered the name in Pembroke MS 24 (maybe to 'Stigand'), thinking it must be wrong, before being obliged to undo this 'correction'. Hitherto unknown to the historians in this debate, the eleventh-century witness, in Pembroke 24, proves that Haymo addressed his sermon to Abbot Hugh 'IV' (1053?–*c.* 1060), writing at his request to explain to the monks why the feast of the *detectio* was celebrated, perhaps partly for

[24] Cambridge, Pembroke College 24, 361v–74v (BHL 2198). On the homiliary in Pembroke MSS 23 and 24, see J. E. Cross, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS. 25: A Carolingian Sermonary used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, King's College London Med. Stud. 1 (London, 1987); and R. J. Rushforth, 'The Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century Manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds Abbey' (unpubl. PhD dissertation, Cambridge Univ., 2002), pp. 66, 99–104.

[25] See, e.g., A. Gransden, 'Some Manuscripts in Cambridge from Bury St Edmunds Abbey: Exhibition Catalogue', *Bury St Edmunds: Medieval Art, Architecture and Economy*, ed. *eadem*, Brit. Archaeol. Assoc., conference transactions 20 (Leeds, 1998), 228–85, at 254. Gransden noted, at least, that the copy of Haymo in Pembroke 24 pre-dated the later extant manuscripts by over a century (see pp. 281–2, note 221).

[26] Personal communications from Rolf Grosse, Veronika Lukas, and others.

[27] Pembroke 24, 369v.

the benefit of future members of the community.[28] He also wrote that the error arose at Regensburg, 'in these times, when King Henry. . .sits on the throne of France and an emperor who shares his name rules over Rome, the capital of the world.'[29] This statement clearly appears to be a reference to the years in which Haymo wrote: that is, before the death of the Emperor Henry III in 1056. For by 1060, when Henry I (and maybe Abbot Hugh) died, the young Henry IV had not acquired his imperial title. There is very good reason indeed, then, to conclude that Haymo wrote within a few years of the *detectio*, perhaps as an eyewitness. It would be hard to suppose that he invented the visit of Archbishop Robert to make his witness list more impressive, because in every other respect the list is convincing, naming various ecclesiastics and counts from the Île-de-France and its sphere of influence. It is easier to accept that Robert went to the *detectio* in Paris, at some point between 9 June and 23 June, in a year in the early 1050s. We should therefore take great care to identify the year.

According to a monk of St Emmeram, who wrote within a few months of the 'discovery' (or *inventio* of St Denis, at St Emmeram), the body came to light on 23 October 1049.[30] His purpose in writing was to explain how the remains of that famous Parisian bishop had ended up in Bavaria, to prepare St Emmeram's brethren for the inevitable controversy, and to stave off any ridicule with plausible historical arguments, which need not concern us here. Haymo reports that, when 'the bones of some unknown dead man had been dug up', the bishop sent out letters, enticing dignitaries to attend their ritual elevation.[31] This bishop must have been Gebhard III of Regensburg (1036–60), who ruled St Emmeram's as a proprietary monastery, with the abbot as his prior. According to Haymo, he attracted both the emperor and the pope. Of course, there was no reason for Haymo to invent a detail that would surely lend authority to his rivals. Henry III and Leo are known to have visited Regensburg in 1052 (and we shall come to that visit presently). However, the fact that no annalist specifically places Leo there on an earlier occasion is by no means conclusive proof that his itinerary of late 1049 (when, after leaving Reichenau in November, he passed through Augsburg and Bavaria to arrive in Verona

[28] The abbot called Hugh who was abbot at the time of the *detectio* was presumably Hugh III (1049?–1053?), if we are still to assume that he was dead by the time of writing.

[29] Pembroke 24, 364r: 'hoc tempore quo Heinricus incliti regis Rocberti filius monarchia sublimatur Gallie, aliusque eiusdem nominis imperator principatur capiti orbis Romae, malum contigit exoriri inopinabile'.

[30] 'Translationis et inventionis sancti Dionysii', ed. A. Hofmeister, 823–37.

[31] Pembroke 24, 364v–5r. The French ambassadors are reported to have remarked (366r): 'pro beato Dyonisio ariopagita nescimus cuius defuncti hominis de fossa eleuuntur ossa'. (At that time, St Denis of Paris was still generally confused with Dionysius the Areopagite.)

for Christmas) bypassed St Emmeram.[32] The same argument applies to his itinerary of 1050–51, when Leo was in Toul on 22 October, then at Augsburg with the emperor (who had celebrated Christmas at Goslar) on 2 February 1051.[33] Regensburg, home to pseudo-St Denis, was the Bavarian locality most consistently visited by the Ottonian and Salian kings, so it is possible that the pope stayed there with Henry on either or both of these occasions.[34] If, for the sake of argument, we suppose that Gebhard staged his event, in their presence, in 1049 or 1050, and if we allow several months between that ceremony and the *detectio* of St Denis in Paris, giving time for the French ambassadors to have reported back, and letters to have been sent, inviting dignitaries to attend and certify the relics, then we need to consider whether the *detectio* might have occurred in 1050 or 1051. The first date presupposes more than a touch of legerdemain from Haymo in naming Robert as one of two archbishops who attended the relics. For, although he had procured the see of Canterbury by the time Haymo wrote (1051 x 1056), Robert was bishop of London in June 1050, and Haymo's subject was still too sensitive for him to have given his opponents an opportunity to query his authority, by back-dating Robert's archiepiscopal status.[35] Moreover, a papal visit late in 1049 would not leave enough time, in our hypothetical scenario, for Gebhard to dispatch his invitations, after the 'discovery' of St Denis that October. So 1050 is very unlikely.

A better case can be built for dating the *detectio* to June 1051, on the basis of Robert's known itinerary. In spring of 1051, Robert journeyed to Rome, and he could have returned via Paris, on 9 June, before landing in Kent, as we know he

[32] Leo must have travelled north after leaving Augsburg, for on 3 December 1049 he was by the Danube. It is possible, therefore, that his itinerary took in Regensburg, on the Danube. See P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum* (with corrections and additions by G. Wattenbach), ed. S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1885–8) I, p. 539; and *Initienverzeichnis und chronologisches Verzeichnis zu den Achivberichten und Vorarbeiten der Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed. R. Hiestand, MGH, Hilfsmittel 7 (Munich, 1983), pp. 119–20 (though it adds nothing in this instance); and S. Weinfurter, *The Salian Century: Main Currents in an Age of Transition*, trans. B. M. Bowlus (Philadelphia, 1999), diagram 27, p. 95.

[33] Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum*, ed. Loewenfeld *et al.*, I, pp. 540–1. On this circuit, however, there is no evidence that Leo went north from Augsburg before heading back down to Rome.

[34] J. W. Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, c. 936–1075* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 69–70.

[35] To allow that Haymo might have back-dated Robert's status in this way is to assume that neither he nor the abbot who authorized his account adhered to the protocol of witness lists and possessed sound judgement. Still, Robert did not hold a French see, so it is not impossible that confusion arose over exactly when he took office. Three charters of 1050, witnessed by Robert in England, are relevant, insofar as they limit the case for placing him in Paris in that year: P. H. Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Charters: an Annotated List and Bibliography* (London, 1968), nos. 1020, 1021, and 1025 (which bears the date 1054 but includes a witness list compatible with a date of 1049–50). (Hereafter S + number.) Two charters benefit Abingdon and the third (S 1021) concerns the establishment of the see of Devon and Cornwall at Exeter.

did, two and a half weeks later, on 27 June. Although Élinand was not elevated to the see of Laon until June 1052, prior to that he was a chaplain to Edward the Confessor, an ambassador to the French court, and so just the dignitary one might expect to find accompanying Robert on diplomatic business in Paris (though the hypothesis must presuppose that Haymo back-dated Élinand's title).[36] In 1051, both 9 June and 23 June were Sundays, which may be a very important detail. For by the time Haymo wrote, within a few years, the *detectio* had been added to the calendar as a feast day (and indeed, Haymo wrote to explain why that day was celebrated). If it had been the abbot's plan to use the relic showing to institute a feast, he would have arranged it for a Sunday, in accordance with liturgical custom; and Haymo's evidence and the advantage of propagating a feast that would undermine St Emmeram's rival claim provide good grounds for positing that the abbot might indeed have planned the feast from the outset. Conversely, instituting the feast may have been an afterthought; it might even have been inspired by the miracle announced by the abbot of Coulombs, who had taken home a contact relic.[37] Either way, no one has raised the possibility that the *detectio* might have taken place before 1053, because no one asked whether Élinand attended in a capacity other than that of a bishop. If the case for 1051 therefore eluded them so did the case for 1052, for they failed to consider that Élinand might have viewed the body about the time of his consecration (14 June 1052), which occurred during the fifteen days when the body was on show. This is not impossible, given that his metropolitan, the archbishop of Reims, attended too, along with two more of his suffragans (Noyon and Senlis). The patron responsible for his promotion as chaplain to King Edward, Count Walter III of the Vexin, also attended the *detectio* ceremony.[38] Seeing the possibility that Archbishop Robert went to Paris in June 1052 to accompany Élinand to the French court and secure his promo-

[36] Guibert de Nogent, *Autobiographie*, ed. and trans. E.-R. Labande, Les classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen age 34 (Paris, 1981), 270: 'capellanus eius fuit et, quia francicam elegantiam norat, Anglicus ille ad Francorum regem Henricum eum saepius destinabat'. In the eleventh century, royal chaplains were sometimes used for sensitive missions. William II, in 1095, sent his chaplain, William, to fetch the papal legate, Cardinal Walter of Albano: see Eadmer, *Historia Novorum*, ed. M. Rule, RS 81 (1884), p. 68. On the date of Élinand's consecration, see *Actes des évêques de Laon des origines à 1151*, ed. A. Dufour-Malbezin, Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes 65 (Paris, 2001), 15–16; for Élinand's career, S. Martinet, 'Élinand, évêque de Laon méconnu (1052–1098)', *Mémoires de la Fédération des sociétés d'histoire et d'archéologie de l'Aisne* 36 (1991), 58–78.

[37] The account of the miracle can be found in the complete version of Haymo's text in Pembroke 24 (368v–374r). It was not printed by the Maurists and may not have appeared in the text they saw.

[38] Guibert, *Autobiographie*, p. 270: '[Élinand] per notitiam Gualteri comitis senioris Pontisarensis, de cuius comitatu gerebat originem, ad gratiam Eadwardi, Anglorum regis, pertigisset'.

tion, one might use Haymo's list of the dignitaries in attendance to support the suggestion that the *detectio* occurred in that year.

Despite these tempting arguments, the dates 1051 and 1052 are not without difficulties. Since Mabillon, scholars have dated the event to June 1053, and not only on the evidence of Élinand's presence as bishop. Their argument builds on the chronicle of the Bavarian monk Ekkehard of Aura (d. 1126), written *c.* 1100, which notes that Leo IX visited Regensburg in 1052, and proved to Parisian ambassadors that the suspect relics were indeed the remains of St Denis. Ekkehard records that Leo also translated the remains of St Wolfgang, formerly a bishop of the see, into the newly constructed crypt at St Emmeram's abbey, an event safely dated to 6 October 1052 in Wolfgang's hagiography.[39] Other annals from Bavaria dating to the time of Leo's visit uphold Ekkehard's later record, at least in one respect, by confirming Leo's presence in Regensburg with the emperor Henry in early October 1052.[40] Ekkehard's remark, moreover, that the pope verified the relics of St Denis before Parisian ambassadors, seems to describe the very incident Haymo reported – though Haymo, as might be expected, does not report that Leo backed his rivals in the dispute. The problem is that Ekkehard took these details from a false bull, in Leo's name, forged in the 1080s or 1090s precisely for the purpose of bolstering the Bavarian cult with papal authority.[41] In this fake bull, pseudo-Leo notifies Henry of France, through his papal chancellor at Regensburg, that he has translated the body of St Wolfgang and proved by written records and wondrous signs that the body of St Denis lies at St Emmeram.[42] It might be that the forger used the occasion of Leo's known visit in 1052 to insert his false

[39] Frutolf of Michelsberg and Ekkehard of Aura, *Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. F.-J. Schmale and I. Schmale-Ott, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, Bd 15 (Darmstadt, 1972), p. 66 (against the year 1052). Ekkehard wrote, 'Qui papa [i.e. Leo] ueniens Ratisponam [i.e. Regensburg, also called Ratisbon] reliquias beati Dionisii martyris, de quibus diu dubitatum est, an ibi haberentur, presentibus Parisiorum legatis perspexit ibique tueri probauit.' ('The pope came to Ratisbon, inspected the relics of the martyr St Denis, for it had long been in doubt whether they had them there, and proved their authenticity before Parisian ambassadors.') The relics had been 'discovered' in 1049, hence the long period of doubt that is mentioned. Ekkehard's additions built on Frutolf's chronicle.

[40] A. Kraus, *Die Translatio s. Dionysii Areopagitae von St. Emmeram in Regensburg*, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte. Jarhgang 1972, Heft 4 (Munich, 1972), 42–7. The dedication of Wolfgang's crypt occurred on 7 October (see *ibid.* p. 43).

[41] Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum*, ed. Loewenfeld *et al.*, I, p. 543 (no. 4280); *Germania pontificia, sive, Repertorium privilegiorum et litterarum a Romanis pontificibus ante annum MCLXXXXVIII Germaniae ecclesiis monasteriis civitatibus singulisque personis concessorum*, ed. A. Brackmann, 10 vols. (Berlin, 1910–11), I, no. +3, pp. 284–5; cf. Kraus, *Die Translatio*, pp. 46–53.

[42] *Regesta*, ed. Jaffé *et al.*, no. 4280; *Germania pontificia*, ed. Brackmann, I, no. +3, pp. 284–5.

claim that he had verified the relics. For, as Kraus notes, none of the annalists and others who recorded Leo's visit, before Ekkehard, mentions St Denis; so the claim is probably fictitious.[43] Ekkehard's assertion that Leo met the French ambassadors on his visit in October 1052 must be treated seriously, however, as a likely indication that he believed that the *detectio* followed in 1053.

Here, a contemporary parallel sheds light on the practicalities. For the relics of St Bertin, of Saint-Omer in Flanders, were rediscovered in 1050, after a fire, but not translated in front of an assembly of dignitaries until 1052.[44] Even though St Emmeram's was not in ruins, like St Bertin's, when a saint was discovered, the point to be drawn is that preparations took time, and that we should sensibly allow at least a year between the 'discovery' of pseudo-Denis in October 1049 and his later elevation, for all the complex practical and political preparations. Two years might be more realistic, pushing forward to the date given by Ekkehard (of 1052), even without leaving additional time for France's response. This puts the hypothesis that the *detectio* occurred in 1051 under considerable pressure. Conversely, against the possibility of re-dating the event to 1052, we should remember that Leo stayed in Rome between February 1051 and August 1052, and had last passed through Bavaria in late 1049.[45] Although it would have taken a few months to respond, as soon as the French ambassadors heralded news of the elevation, the pressure was on the French court and clergy to quash it as quickly as possible.[46] It is very doubtful that they would have waited a year and a half: that is from December 1049 until June 1052; but their preparations may have occupied the seven months between October 1052 and June 1053. After August 1052, Leo never returned to Bavaria, so the *detectio* could hardly have required twenty-two months of preparation until June 1054. Such considerations favour the date handed down by the Maurists, that is, 1053, which is the only year except for the implausible 1054 that fits all the particulars of the witness list. One final piece of evidence is enough to clinch the argument. In 1053, the fifteen days of 9–23 June coincided exactly with the Lendit fair, an annual Saint-Denis relic showing, which ran from the second Wednesday in June until the feast of John the Baptist. This was exactly the time the monks did put relics on show. The fifteen-day showing must relate to Lendit, and it only corresponds to Lendit in 1053.[47] We

[43] Kraus, *Die Translatio*, p. 46.

[44] Bovo, 'Relatio de inuentione et eleuatione sancti Bertini', ed. O Holder-Egger, MGH SS XV. i (Hanover, 1887), 524–34.

[45] *Eleventh-Century Germany: the Swabian Chronicles*, selected sources translated and annotated with an introduction by I. S. Robinson (Manchester, 2008), p. 86. For a map of Leo's travels outside Italy, see Weinfurter, *Salian Century*, trans. Bowlus, diagram 27, p. 95

[46] This point was first made by Köpke: see 'Anonymi Ratisbonensis translatio s. Dionysii Areopagitae', ed. R. Köpke, MGH SS 11, ed. G. H. Pertz (Hanover, 1854), 343–75, at 344.

[47] R. Grosse, 'Reliques du Christ et foires de Saint-Denis au xi$^{e}$ siècle à propos de la *Descriptio clavi et corone domini*', *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 87 (2001), 357–75, at 369–70. The Baptist's

can conclude that the *detectio* occurred in that year. We should also now reflect on the implication: that Robert of Jumièges was in Paris in June 1053 – where the dignitaries recognised his status as archbishop of Canterbury.

This may come as a surprise. For historians have not represented Robert as a figure who commanded the dignity of his office. Frank Barlow remarked that 'his political sense was so poor, his rancour so marked, and his behaviour so unrestrained, that the activity [of his zeal] might have been dearly bought'; and that he 'used the new weapon [of ecclesiastical reform] in his vendetta against Godwin and badly blunted it'.[48] H. E. J. Cowdrey (following Barlow) asserted that his 'vendetta with the Godwines and his unrestrained ecclesiastical and political behaviour give no indication of religious depth or of political wisdom and discretion'.[49] It is remarkable how much their verdicts were influenced both by the hostility of sources aligned with Godwin's interests (ASC, E and the *Vita Ædwardi*), and by the notion that the struggle of 1051–2 was a vicious disturbance Robert brought to an otherwise harmonious relationship between Edward and his in-laws. From this perspective he was an *agent provocateur*, whose flight into obscurity, on Godwin's glorious return, seemed to mirror the fate of villains from every genre of storytelling. Two very important points must be remembered here. First, it is virtually a truism that when monarchs fell out with their magnates, their favourites (notably foreign favourites) took the blame wherever possible. For it was easier to contemplate, even tactful first to assume, that a seducer had led the king astray than that the king himself, who was the ultimate power and God's representative, might be malign. Favourites scapegoated for conflicts in later centuries include Henry III's foreign relations, Piers Gaveston, and the Woodvilles, to cite the most famous cases. And to note these other cases is not to exculpate Robert but to recognise a recurring pattern. Secondly, bearing in mind how easily the victor heaps accusations on his scapegoat, we must be sceptical towards Godwinist historiography and its derivative assertions: that Robert orchestrated the crisis in 1051; pursued

feast followed on 24 June. Grosse argues that the 1053 event may have been the original Lendit fair. In June 1053, the fifteen days of 9–23 June ran, Wednesday to Wednesday, from the week after Trinity Sunday in Ordinary Time, which was a slot free enough to draw ecclesiastical dignitaries, who might otherwise have been busy on Sundays and festivities. It was also a point in the cycle which the drama of a relic display could well serve to enhance.

[48] Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, pp. 86, 47. Barlow learnt to be hostile towards Robert partly from *Vita Ædwardi*, which he edited, and partly from the attitudes of historians since Freeman, whose xenophobic response to him more closely follows the concerns of Robert's contemporaries than Barlow's opinion that he lacked political judgement. Freeman described Robert as 'the foreign monk who sat on the throne of so many English saints' (including, ironically, the foreign monk St Augustine) and as an 'evil prelate': Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest*, II, pp. 138 and 336.

[49] Cowdrey, 'Robert of Jumièges'.

a vendetta against Godwin; displayed poor political judgement, and acted without discretion. We must also consider how Robert would have interpreted his religious duties (although Barlow was not inclined to see him as a man of principle)[50] and reach a fair opinion on his international standing as an eminent ecclesiastical dignitary.

Apart from *Vita Ædwardi*'s partisan complaints, it is hard to find charges that stick to Robert of Jumièges. After several years provoking no scandal as bishop of London, he ran into no difficulty when he went to Rome to obtain the pallium, entirely in accordance with propriety; and on his return, he proved that he was no sycophant by refusing to consecrate Spearhafoc, the new bishop of London, who came to him with the king's writ and favour.[51] Whatever Robert's motives were in this, he was acting from the very outset of his reign as representative of the reforming pope, Leo IX, who had quashed Spearhafoc's appointment, probably on the charge of simony. That Spearhafoc, the king's goldsmith, soon absconded with a bag of gold intended for making a crown must have vindicated Robert's judgement wherever the goldsmith's scandalous exit was gossiped.[52] It would also have embarrassed King Edward. As the defender of all religion, the archbishop also had a duty to protect the church in Canterbury from predators such as Earl Godwin. Even the *Vita Ædwardi* admits that Robert found a way to claim that right was on his side.[53] (This

[50] Barlow, *English Church 1000–1066*, p. 86, spends nine-and-a-half lines considering whether Robert was an ecclesiastical reformer, before concluding: 'It is probable, therefore, that Robert's background was fairly worldly. And so his vendetta against Earl Godwin can be viewed as more political than ecclesiastical and one more of persons and nations than of principle.' There are all sorts of problems with this argument. First, Barlow assumed that life at Jumièges must have been worldly at that date because Herluin could find no monastery in Normandy that could satisfy him (forgetting that Herluin's hagiographer probably picked up a defensive response as to why that man had presumed to found his own, and that he wrote in hindsight). Second, Robert's 'vendetta against Godwin' is a construction of the *Vita Ædwardi*, not a historical fact. Third, the logic of his argument overlooks the fact that the winds of reform swept along people from all sorts of backgrounds. Robert may have been one of them. Was it he, as Edward's advisor, that was counselling closer relations with the reform papacy in the years 1049–51?

[51] ASC, E 1048 (for 1052)

[52] *Historia ecclesiae Abbendonensis: the History of the Church of Abingdon*, ed. J. Hudson, OMT (Oxford, 2007), p. 196. Spearhafoc was not fondly remembered at his old monastery. He had stuffed his bags with gold and jewels, stripped the assets of his bishopric, left England in secret, and vanished.

[53] *The Life of King Edward who rests at Westminster*, ed. Barlow, pp. 32/33 'Accedebat autem ad exercendos odiorum motus pro episcopo in causam iustam, quod terre quedam ducis contigue erant quibusdam terris que ad Christi attinebant ecclesiam' ('However, that certain lands of the earl ran with some that belonged to Christ Church served to direct the hostile movements into a cause in which right was on the bishop's side.') The author then remarks: 'There were also frequent disputes between them, because he said that Godwin had invaded the lands of his archbishopric and injured him by keeping them to his own use.' Ann Williams, while

is not what one should expect from a man with poor political judgement.) Another duty of the archbishop, which Anselm took very seriously forty years later, in pressing Rufus for a council to reform the vices of his barons, was to punish evildoers. Godwin, who surely had a hand in murdering Alfred, the king's brother, had not as much as performed penance for guilt by association. Any principled archbishop should at least have brought pressure to bear on such a man, to rescue his soul from perdition. Faced with unanswerable charges of predation and murder, Godwin's apologists had little choice but to defame Archbishop Robert as the arch-villain. That they never smeared his moral authority might suggest that his lifestyle was blameless and his integrity beyond reproach, which could explain why he was a dangerous opponent. Even if animosity did drive his attacks, he carefully picked battles that could be fought on moral premises of legitimate interest to his office. In this he was rather like his friend, the king, who was better at putting his opponent on the defensive, in his opening moves, than finishing him off in the endgame. This is not to imply that he played the game ineptly. In 1051, Godwin's party crumbled, and although its triumphant return in 1052 was a setback, Robert could buy time and support by complaining to the pope about his unjust expulsion.

The Anglo-Saxon chroniclers offer diverging accounts of what happened after Robert departed the realm. ASC, E, associated at that point with St Augustine's, Canterbury, and favourable to Godwin, states that Robert abandoned his pallium and all Christendom; was outlawed with his accomplices, and that Stigand succeeded to his archbishopric. However, ASC, C states, for the year 1053, 'in this year there was no archbishop in this land', while adding that Stigand held the bishopric in Canterbury.[54] Strictly, C was right. For although Stigand occupied the see, there could be no new archbishop until Robert was dead, or had been deposed, and there was no procedure for deposing him without Leo's assent. Robert, now, was in a strong position: for his opponents' claim that he had abandoned his pallium could be countered by the defence that the murderer and predator Godwin had driven him into exile and that Stigand had usurped his see. Apart from any charges levelled at him by Godwin's party, there was no stain on his reputation and moral authority; and he certainly could have taken those assets to Rome as William of Malmesbury claims, although with a four-month delay before he saw the pope. For Leo was

noting the criticism of Godwin, is disinclined to perceive him as an active predator of Christ Church's estates, arguing instead that Edward had granted him the earl's 'third penny' in the shire, which had previously belonged to the archbishop: see 'The Piety of Earl Godwine', *ANS* 34 (2012), 237–56, at 238–42.

[54] Abingdon, where ASC, C was compiled, may have been more inclined to side with Robert of Jumièges. He had signed two charters that benefited the abbey: S 1020 and S 1025 (dated 1054 but its witness list is compatible with a date of 1049–50).

still in Germany when Robert fled, and he stayed there until February 1053. We should also give credence to William's claim that Robert obtained letters from Leo that cleared his name and sought his restoration (for indeed, this is the response one might expect). King Edward was at liberty to ignore them, given that royal compliance with papal requests was still a matter of courtesy, but there is reason to think he might not have done. Not only had papal relations with England grown closer since Leo's accession, there were signs that Edward was responsive to papal policy when he joined the dioceses of Devon and Cornwall and moved the joint seat to Exeter in 1050 (S 1021), and when he let Robert assert papal power to quash Spearhafoc's election. Politically, Robert's restoration would be much more difficult than those transactions, but although the peace brokered in 1052 would have limited Edward's options, Robert would have departed from Rome hopeful of negotiating his return, and using papal letters to win allies who could lobby on his behalf. Outside observers, and many in England, must have judged Stigand's position untenable beyond the short-term and regarded it as a temporary provision at best. Godwin's death on 15 April 1053 would have seemed like an answer to Robert's prayers, presumably after an audience with Leo had buoyed his campaign.

We can now be assured that Archbishop Robert was in Paris that June, bolstering the beleaguered cult of France's patron saint by certifying the relics displayed at Saint-Denis. Another part of his activity, no doubt, was to seek friends among the clergy of the French court, perhaps in the hope of exploiting its diplomatic networks. Robert must have known Élinand, an experienced ambassador, and John of Fécamp, the ascetic abbot and diplomat who enjoyed King Edward's trust. Potential allies among the nobles would have included Edward's nephew, Walter of the Vexin. Robert's presence in Paris in 1053, with Odo, the French king's brother, raises the question whether he might have been staying in that area, given that France and Normandy had been at war since late 1052. If Robert had any plans involving allies at the French court, he might have thought twice before leaving Rome for sanctuary at the ducal abbey of Jumièges. The only other nobleman from Normandy who went to the *detectio* was the abbot of Fécamp, another ducal monastery, but John was the abbot of Dijon at that time (1052–4), so he may not have gone from Normandy anyway.[55] Haymo, whom we now know to have been a contemporary witness,

[55] On Fécamp's significance in ducal affairs, see A. Renoux, *Fécamp: Du palais ducal au palais de Dieu* (Paris, 1991), pp. 475–7, 482. We must also consider the presence of Count Walter III of the Vexin and Count Waleran I of Meulan. Neither was hostile to the duke of Normandy, but, ultimately, both were men of the king of France. Waleran subscribed a ducal charter in 1046–7 or 1048; and Duke William, Waleran, and Walter all subscribed a charter of King Henry at Senlis, 1048: *Recueil des actes des ducs de Normandie de 911 a 1066*, ed. M. Fauroux, with an index by L. Musset, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie xxxvi, 4[e] série,

had no quibbles with Robert's title, so we can dispel any suggestion that he was anything less than a venerable archbishop in exile. Acknowledging this much may help to resolve a relevant mystery. In 1053, according to the C chronicle, two newly appointed bishops went 'across the sea' to seek ordination because 'there was no archbishop in the land'.[56] Wulfstan of Worcester's profession to Lanfranc (1070) noted that bishops elected during Stigand's administration were obliged to go to Rome, France, and neighbouring bishops to be consecrated. Of five prelates concerned, the movements of three are known – two went to Rome; one sought a consecrator in England. The other two, Leofwine of Lichfield and Wulfwig of Dorchester, were those who crossed the sea in 1053, presumably to France (on Wulfstan's evidence).[57] Given that Robert was still archbishop, they should properly have gone to him. Historians have missed this point after letting William of Malmesbury conjure up an idea that Robert died in 1052, and falling into the habits of calling Stigand archbishop and dating his reign from that year.[58] In fact, William of Malmesbury was uncertain whether Stigand occupied Canterbury in Robert's lifetime, for although he claims that he did so in his *History of the Kings*, his later *History of the Bishops* revises his opinion to indicate that Stigand usurped Canterbury after Robert died.[59] Obits mention his death against 26 May, and the annals of Jumièges, his *alma mater* and burial place, date it to 1055, though they survive only in late twelfth- and thirteenth-century manuscripts.[60]

6[e] Volume (Caen, 1961), nos. 107 and 114. On ducal relations with the counts of the Vexin (and with Waleran), see Bates, *Normandy*, pp. 71–2.

[56] ASC, C 1053. They were Leofwine of Lichfield and Wulfwig of Dorchester.

[57] Barlow, *The English Church 1000–1066*, p. 303 and 303n. Wulfstan's profession is printed in *Canterbury Professions*, ed. M. Richter, Canterbury and York Soc. 67 (Torquay, 1973), no. 31.

[58] Freeman was cautious about the date of Robert's death. He even suggested, cryptically, that Robert 'did not die till he had made Europe ring with the tale of his wrongs': Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest*, II, p. 347 (citing only William of Malmesbury). Cowdrey kills Robert in 1052 (see below). Baxter, 'Edward the Confessor', p. 88, states that Stigand became archbishop in September 1052. Even Stigand's supporters might not have been so bold as to make that claim, at least not before they concocted the story about Robert leaving his pallium behind; and ASC, C (for 1053) shows that influential voices in England (including that chronicler) did not regard Stigand as the archbishop.

[59] William of Malmesbury, *Gesta regum*, p. 360; *Gesta pontificum*, p. 46. No one previously, as far as I know, has observed that William was confused or changed his mind on this matter.

[60] For the day of his death (identified by obits), see B. Schamper, *S. Benigne de Dijon: Untersuchungen zum Necrolog der Handschrift Bibl. mun. de Dijon, ms. 634*, Münsterche Mittelalter-Schriften 63 (Munich, 1989), 72, 177. Schamper is wrong to suppose that he might have died in May 1052, for he was still in England; Cowdrey, 'Robert of Jumièges', repeats the peculiar mistake. The historian of the abbey of Jumièges, J. Loth, writing in the late nineteenth century, may have consulted a source now lost – or one unknown to me at least. For he claims that Robert, while stopping at Jumièges on his way to Rome, passed through Fécamp, where he consecrated two churches and ordained many monks to the priesthood. At Rome, he waited until Epiphany

How should this new information change our understanding, apart from resolving doubt over the date of Robert's death? For a start, it dispenses with the image of Robert as a player no longer relevant after his flight in 1052, and replaces this caricature with a new image of a player still active on the European stage; an archbishop forced into active exile; a forerunner to Anselm, who at that time was still a secular youth, just turning twenty. Robert established the precedent, for the eleventh century at least, that a bishop who could find no justice in the land might take his complaint to Rome and win allies overseas. The second point to observe, though the details are obscure, is that Robert's case was almost certainly the first of this sort in England where the conventions of canon law collided with the precepts of royal justice in an unwanted setback to papal-royal relations. Leo's policy was to win the compliance of lay rulers in a programme of reform, at most challenging their episcopal nominations, but trying to harness their authority, not to contest it. So far, Edward had proved responsive to such an approach. A glaring conflict had arisen, however. According to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the witan had outlawed Robert after he fled, and the king was bound by its decision.[61] Even so, Robert had been driven from his see, and Leo IX must have known the rescript *exceptio spolii*, recurrent in pseudo-Isidore, which decreed that no bishop who had been deprived of office or property could be tried until he was restored to his former state.[62] Edward's clergy were probably not too familiar with pseudo-Isidore. If Leo had cited that canon, they might have scratched their heads. Nevertheless it is interesting that ASC, E mounts the accusation that Robert had wilfully abandoned his pallium and Christendom. For this would be a good defence against it. In short, it was an unwanted conflict that was heading towards stalemate. The curious thing is that both Edward and Leo presumably sought Robert's restoration, but Robert was never restored. This might affect our view of the settlement of 1052, if taken as evidence that there were interests even after Godwin's demise,

(6 January) for his accusers to arrive or send letters detailing their accusations. Then Leo IX gave him a bull, re-establishing him in his see. Nevertheless, the peace-loving Robert retired to Jumièges where he died a month and eight days after his return, on 26 May 1052 (according to Loth, whose chronology for all of these events languishes a year behind; 1053 would be the correct date by this reckoning). Robert could not have waited at Rome in Leo's company, of course. See Loth, *Histoire de l'abbaye royale de Saint-Pierre de Jumièges*, 3 vols (Rouen, 1882–5) I, pp. 175–6, and for Robert's epitaph, III, p. 210. The date of Robert's death is given in *Les annales de l'Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Jumièges: chronique universelle des origines au XIIIe siècle*, ed. and trans. J. Laporte, (Rouen, 1954), p. 57. I am grateful to Nicholas Vincent for consulting this edition in Paris, at a time when no copy was available to me. Given that Robert seems to have died at Jumièges – and was buried there – we should treat the date 1055 as reliable.

[61] ASC, E, 1052; F, 1051 (for 1052).

[62] *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. P. Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 165, 201, 205, 694 and 730. The underlying canonical principle was that no bishop should be evicted from his see by a layman.

powerful enough to prevent Edward from reversing the witan's decree – and it is hard to draw other inferences from the evidence, given that Robert was presumably willing to return, during 1053. Either Edward had decided to be rid of his turbulent prelate, or his magnates continued to tie his hands. In the event, therefore, Edward not only had to restore the Godwines after essaying to destroy them, he also had to abandon his aspirations as a reformer, resolve tension with the papacy, and suffer the embarrassment of an exiled archbishop, while Stigand settled on Canterbury. For our part, we might think very seriously about restoring Archbishop Robert's reputation and, for the first time, acknowledging him as a precursor to Anselm and Becket.[63]

[63] I would like to express my thanks to David Bates, Stephen Church, Liam Draycott, Lindy Grant, Rolf Grosse, Veronika Lukas, Simon Keynes, Richard Sharpe and Nicholas Vincent for reading drafts of this article and for offering advice.