

‘Decline’ and ‘New Management’ in Medieval Historiography during the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries (And Beyond)¹

John O. Ward

No one who seeks to compare the historiographical output of William of Malmesbury or Otto of Freising with that of Matthew Paris – to pick at random three historians from the period under discussion – could think in terms of the ‘decline’ of historiography in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Europe. Even if we leave aside all the other indications of growth in semi-national monastic chronicling in the thirteenth and fourteenth-centuries, Matthew’s record is enough to dazzle, in comparison with twelfth-century and earlier efforts. His *Chronica*

¹ This article is a much extended version of a paper delivered initially at a conference entitled ‘History, Text, Culture: Medieval and Early Modern studies’, University of Melbourne 4-6 February, 1999, and more elaborately at the second conference on ‘The Medieval Chronicle / La Chronique Médiévale / Die mittelalterliche Chronik’, held at Utrecht / Driebergen, 16-21 July, 1999. Selected papers from the first conference have been published as *The Medieval Chronicle: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the Medieval Chronicle*, Driebergen / Utrecht, 13-16 July, 1996, ed. Erik Kooper (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999). This volume will be referred to below as ‘Kooper’. I should like to take the opportunity here of thanking Professor Kooper and his assistants for arranging so expertly two such productive occasions on which scholars interested in the medieval historiographical impulse could exchange their ideas and air their specialties.

Majora – with the ‘book of documents’ known as the *Liber Additamentorum* – occupy six large Rolls Series volumes, and date from the sixth decade of the thirteenth century. His other historical works – the *Historia Anglorum*, the *Flores Historiarum*, his *Life of St Edmund of Abingdon* (canonised 1244-46), lives of Saints Alban and Amphibalus (in Anglo-Norman verse), St Thomas Becket of Canterbury, of Edward the Confessor (an Anglo-Norman metrical translation of the Latin Life composed by Aelred of Rievaulx), and Stephen Langton (in Latin), his *Gesta Abbatum* (included in the *Liber Additamentorum*), his *Vitae Offarum* (Lives of the two Offas, of Angel and of Mercia), and his celebrated historical artistic efforts – all add up to a picture of a man obsessed with the historical record, and in a good position to dwell upon it: his abbey, as has often been pointed out, was but a day’s ride ‘on the great road north from London and the palace of Westminster’ and had stabling for 300 horses!²

How then can one speak of ‘decline’? In three ways, perhaps: first, the place that historiography, and monastic historiography in particular, occupied in the prevailing intellectual and cultural atmosphere changed in the later and post-twelfth-century world. Second, during the same time-span history came under what R. W. Southern has called ‘new management’. Third, monastic literary interests in general were increasingly compromised, as the twelfth century wore on, by a concern for the legal defence of property and privilege, and by the general shift of broad-based intellectual culture to cathedral-schools and university *studia*.³

² Richard Vaughan *The Illustrated Chronicles of Matthew Paris: Observations of Thirteenth-Century Life, translated and edited and with an introduction* (Cambridge: Sutton, 1993); Richard Vaughan *Matthew Paris* (1958, Cambridge: University Press, 1979) p. 11; W. N. Bryant, ‘Matthew Paris, chronicler of St. Albans’, *History Today* 19:12 (1969) [772-782] p. 776. Matthew’s conversations with King Henry III are recorded in Bryant pp. 772-74. For a recent comment on Matthew’s working procedures, see Björn Weiler ‘Matthew Paris, Richard of Cornwall’s candidacy for the German throne, and the Sicilian business’, *Journal of Medieval History* 26:1 (2000) 71-92.

³ I have used here in particular the (unpublished) study of Christ Church by John Scott ‘Intellectual life in the monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury: 1075-1205 (University of Sydney History IV Thesis, 1972). For historiography down to the twelfth century as primarily ‘monastic’, see my ‘The monastic historiographical impulse c.1000-1260 A.D.: a re-assessment’, delivered at the 1998 Leeds International Medieval Congress and published in *Historia: The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mehtonen and Lehtonen pp. 71-100.

Let us elaborate this paradigm a little. Bernard Guenée has called the transformation that historiography underwent towards c.1200 a shift from 'eloquent to erudite historiography', from 'rhetoric' to 'scholarship'.⁴ R. W. Southern as long ago as 1970 advanced the same suggestion. At the end of his *Aspects of The European Tradition of Historical Writing, 1. The Classical Tradition from Einhard to Geoffrey of Monmouth* he proposed that with Geoffrey of Monmouth, the notion of history as a source for 'facts about the past' 'had shrunk to vanishing point, and it was time for history to come under new management'. At this point, he argued, 'the end was in sight for history as an art conceived in terms borrowed from the ancient world: Romance became separated from History'.⁵

What did Southern mean by these phrases? In one sense at least, as he explained it, the 'new management' he spoke of meant an abandonment of *historia* as 'verisimilar probable *narratio* or *argumentum*' — in the manner recommended by the ancient rhetoricians — in favour of what we until very recently would have recognised as 'historical fact'. Others have been unimpressed by this: Ruth Morse, surveying the influence of rhetorical *narratio* and *progymnasmata* on the proliferation of twelfth and thirteenth-century historiography, argues that 'Rhetorical historians assumed a great latitude of invention, and went on doing so at least into the sixteenth century'. Similarly Joachim Knape believes that

History is an invention of the eighteenth century ... The medieval word *historia* must strictly be distinguished from the modern notion. It was used to describe historiography in general, as well as individual historical narratives, which were first and foremost written in prose. Among all scientific disciplines, rhetoric was the one responsible for these works. This did not change until, the middle of the eighteenth century when the new class of historians was institutionalised.⁶

⁴ A. Gransden 'Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England' in Daniel Williams, ed., *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990) [55-81] pp. 60-61.

⁵ *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Series 5, Vol. 20 (1970), pp. 195-96.

⁶ See Ruth Morse *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation, and Reality* (Cambridge: University Press, 1991) p. 96; Joachim Knape 'Historia, textuality and *episteme* in the middle ages' in *Historia: The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages* edited by Päivi Mehtonen and Tuomas Lehtonen (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica (Commentationes Humanum Litterarum 116) 2000) p. 12. For the 'ancient' manner of handling history, see [*Cicero*] *Ad C. Herennium De ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)* with an English translation by Harry Caplan (London: Heinemann, Loeb Classical Library, 1964) I.8.12-9.16, pp. 22-28.

Nevertheless, the notion of the twelfth century in European history as a kind of climax in history-writing is widespread.⁷ In view of this, it is worth asking what the major features of this ‘great renaissance of historiography’ actually were. The following remarks, summary though they must be, are an attempt to supply a characterisation. In the first place, we may stress an evident link between the historiography of the period and major aspects of the so-called ‘Renaissance of the twelfth century’ in general: an emphasis upon classicism, classical stylistic and historiographical paradigms or models, upon rhetorical presentation and the

⁷ J. O. Ward ‘Some principles of rhetorical historiography in the twelfth century’ in E. Breisach (ed.) *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography* (Studies in Medieval Culture XIX, Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University Medieval Institute Publications 1985) [103-166] p. 103: ‘In general the twelfth century was the great age of medieval historiography ...’; A. Gransden ‘Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England’ in Daniel Williams (ed.) *England in the Twelfth Century: Proceedings of the 1988 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1990) p. 60: ‘The twelfth century was, indeed, a golden age of historiography in England, as elsewhere in Europe’; Bernard Guenée, too, speaks of ‘la grande renaissance de l’historiographie occidentale’ at the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century: ‘L’historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle’, *Journal des Savants* 1985 p. 134 ; cf. also p. 133: ‘La Renaissance de l’histoire, au XIIIe siècle, s’était appuyée sur les grands fondateurs de l’historiographie chrétienne, d’Eusèbe de Césarée à Bede’, etc. See also Roger Ray in F. A. C. Mantello and A. C. Rigg (eds) *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996) pp. 645; R. N. Swanson *The Twelfth-Century Renaissance* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999) pp. 54ff and p. 64: ‘The first real signs of these new forms [of historiography] had appeared during the long twelfth century; some would achieve enduring importance’.

'message' rather than 'truth' as such.⁸ As an illustration, we may take William of Malmesbury's account of Baldwin's succession to Godfrey of Bouillon in the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem, and the tales of necromancy and witchcraft that he sews into his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*.⁹ The former uses classical periodic style to suggest 'realities' of strategy and motivation, whilst the latter substitutes moral and religious *suasio* for verifiable 'fact'.

Secondly, in the twelfth century 'history' sought to establish and was established by boundaries of confidence: a provisional 'truth' was often worked up from the texts and situations themselves. History-writing flourished because stability and certainty for those engaged in its practice was often fragile.¹⁰ Thus,

⁸ Sallust and Suetonius are the principal models here, and the notion of 'truth' is no stronger than that elaborated in Cicero's celebrated letter to L. Lucceius (*Ad Fam.* 5.12). For discussion see A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London: Croom Helm, 1988) chs 2 and 3. Note William of Malmesbury's tendency to go 'easily and naturally to Roman models' and his notion of his historiographical work as 'chronicle' seasoned 'with Roman art': Joan Haahr 'William of Malmesbury's Roman models: Suetonius and Lucan' in Aldo S. Bernardo and Saul Levin (eds) *The Classics in the Middle Ages: Papers of the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies* (Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 69, Binghamton, New York: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies [165-173]) pp. 165 and 172. Max Manitius devotes some 300 pages of his monumental *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* III (München: Beck'sche, 1931) to history-writing (pp. 320-640), some 20% of J. de Ghellinck's *L'Essor de la Littérature Latine au XIIIe siècle* (2nd ed. Brussels: Brouwer, 1955) ch.V, pp. 313-422 is devoted to historiography (though one should note the much narrower definition of innovation, indicated by the subtitle, in G. Paré, A. Brunet and P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XIIIe Siècle: les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris-Ottawa: Institut d'Études Médiévales d'Ottawa no.3, 1933).

⁹ See Ward, 'Some principles', and Ward, 'Classical rhetoric and the writing of history in medieval and Renaissance culture' in Frank McGregor and Nicholas Wright, eds, *European History and its Historians* (Adelaide: Adelaide University Union Press, 1977) pp. 1-10 (the omitted reference at n.45 *De Legibus* being 1.2.6); R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom (ed. and trans.) *William of Malmesbury 'Gesta Regum Anglorum'* vol.1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) pp. 282ff, 377ff; Joachim Knappe 'Historiography as Rhetoric' (circulated paper at the second Utrecht Chronicles Conference, July, 1999 and see now his '*Historia*, textuality and *episteme* in the middle ages' in *Historia: The Concept and Genres in the Middle Ages* ed. Mehtonen and Lehtonen, pp. 11-27).

¹⁰ 'In short, historiography was a mechanism for cultural interaction, repositioning and rapprochement in the brave new post-Conquest world': E. Freeman 'The many functions of Cistercian histories, using Aelred's of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo* as a case study', in Kooper [124- 132] p. 125.

for example, in this period our ‘canonical’ view of the ‘first crusade’ was created, in which the movement was initiated by a ringing summons from Urban II at Clermont, a summons that fitted the rhetorical motivations of the chroniclers more than it did the historical circumstances themselves.¹¹ William of Malmesbury’s very devotion to history is a mark not only of his own marginality, need for patronage and psychological tensions,¹² and the marginality of his abbey¹³, but also of the growing isolation of the monastic enterprise in general.¹⁴ Historiography functioned, in fact, as a mode of identity-construction on both a small scale¹⁵ and on a large-scale: Otto of Freising alternates between massive chronicling as part of an attempt to reconstruct the lost trajectory of world salvationist history, and rhetorical biography as triumphant reaffirmation of the

¹¹ I have a monograph in draft form on this topic, but see in the meantime Ward, ‘Some Principles’ and ‘The first crusade as disaster: apocalypticism and the genesis of the crusading movement’ in Bat-Sheva Albert, Yvonne Friedman and Simon Schwarzfuchs (eds) *Medieval Studies in Honour of Avrom Saltman* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1995) pp. 253-292.

¹² Something of the conflicting tensions and values that made up the character and attitudes of William as an historian and man of letters are touched upon in R. M. Thomson’s *William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1987) pt. 1, ch. 2.

¹³ Compare also here Guibert of Nogent: R. I. Moore ‘Guibert of Nogent and his world’ in Henry Mayr-Harting and R. I. Moore eds., *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis* (London: Hambledon, 1985) [107-117] pp. 113-16.

¹⁴ Compare the critique of contemporary monasticism in the first *distinctio* of Walter Map *De nugis curialium, Courtiers’ Trifles*, edited and translated by M. R. James, revised by C. N. L. Brooke and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983). Also D. Knowles *The Monastic Order in England* (Cambridge: University Press, 1949) ch. 39, ‘The critics of the monks’. For the ‘fragility’ of William’s position, see also R. W. Southern ‘The sense of the past’ (Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing 4) in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5:23 (1973) 243-63.

¹⁵ See for example the *Historia calamitatum* of Abelard, translated Betty Radice *The Letters of Abelard and Heloise* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974) pp. 57-106. Recent attention to what may well be a surviving record of the original wax-tablet exchanges between Abelard and Heloise during their initial love-affair 1116-17 A.D. reveals how ‘constructed’ the image of Abelard and his motives in the *Historia calamitatum* actually is. See Constant Mews (with Neville Chiavaroli) *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1999). A cautionary note must be entered here. Franciscan historiography in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has also recently been linked with the order’s need to create and maintain its own identity. See below at note 111.

primacy of the present.¹⁶ At a humbler level, a notary-historian such as Galbert of Bruges is driven to historiography as a means of establishing 'pattern' amidst the social chaos that surrounded the murder of Count Charles of Flanders at Bruges in 1127 A.D. In short, as Elizabeth Freeman has reminded us, 'historiography was used to forge group identity'.¹⁷

In the third place, 'history' assumed increasing importance in the twelfth century as the foundational level of meaning in biblical exegesis. 'History' as 'littera' meant that even those who were not — in our modern sense — practising historians, were nevertheless committed to the foundational study of history.¹⁸ Fourthly, as we have in part already seen, history was written in this period, contrary to the general pattern emphasised by Guenée,¹⁹ by important people as well as by the unimportant. Otto of Freising, William of Tyre and Suger of St. Denis come easily to mind here.²⁰ Fifthly, history was written during the 'long'

¹⁶ For Otto see Sverre Bagge, 'Ideas and narrative in Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici*', *Journal of Medieval History* 22:4 (1996) 345-77 and Elisabeth Mégier, '*Tamquam lux post tenebras*, oder: Ottos von Freising Weg von der *Chronik* zu den *Gesta Friderici*' *Mediaevistik* 3 (1990) 131-267. One could also adduce here the historiographical efforts of William of Tyre.

¹⁷ I cite here Freeman's doctoral dissertation 'Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150-1220', University of Melbourne, March 1999, p. 9. This dissertation, which only came into my hands as I was finishing the present article, may be recommended as an exceptionally mature and reliable treatment of its subject. For Galbert, see Ross J. B. ed. and trans., *The Murder of Charles the Good, Count of Flanders, by Galbert of Bruges* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960).

¹⁸ See *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor, translated from the Latin with an introduction and notes* by Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961) VI.3 pp. 135-39; Kooper, pp. 212-25; E. Randolph Daniel, 'Joachim of Fiore: patterns of history in the *Apocalypse*' in R.K. Emmerson and B. McGinn (eds) *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) pp. 72-88.

¹⁹ B. Guenée, 'Histoire, mémoire, écriture. Contribution à une étude des lieux communs' *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris: Boccard, July-Oct. 1983) p. 451. Benoît Lacroix (*L'Historien Au Moyen Âge*) sees it more as a matter of an audience made up not 'of specialists making professional use of the records of the past, but of less educated, more generally interested auditors and readers', the most 'cohesive audience' for history being the monastic communities (see R. W. Hanning in *History and Theory* 12 [1973] p. 422).

²⁰ See Gabrielle Spiegel, 'History as Enlightenment: Suger and the *Mos Anagogicus*' in her *The Past as Text: the Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997) pp. 163-77.

²¹ *The Song of Aspremont (La Chanson d'Aspremont)* translated by Michael Newth (Garland Library of Medieval Literature vol. 61, New York: Garland, 1989).

twelfth century in modes that we would nowadays classify as ‘fiction’: the learned authors of the *Chanson d’Aspremont*,²¹ for example, doubtless wished to pass their creation off as ‘factual’, just as the (Cistercian?) author(s?) of *La Queste del Saint Graal*²² went to particular efforts to make their recital sound like verifiable fact. Even the author of the *Nibelungenlied*²³ might perhaps have expected his audience to believe he was dealing in ‘the truth’ rather than ‘the fabulous’.²⁴ In the same way Geoffrey of Monmouth took history out of the realm of uncertain truth and established it firmly in the brilliantly clear realm of fiction, for which he was criticised, not only by his contemporaries, but also by the more factually minded chroniclers of a later age.²⁵ Geoffrey’s work pushed *inventio* to extremes in the service of the plausible fiction, stretching the conventions of one period (the ‘classical / rhetorical’, from Sallust’s day to Geoffrey’s own day to the limit, and arousing resentment both from within that world and from later worlds.²⁶

²² *Roman du XIIIe siècle*, ed. Albert Pauphilet (Paris: Champion, 1984) pp. 279-80, trans. P. M. Matarasso *The Quest of the Holy Grail* (Penguin Books, 1982) pp. 283-84.

²³ John M. Clifton-Everest ‘The *Nibelungenlied*: Epic vs. Romance’ in L. S. Davidson ed., *The Epic in History* (Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, 1994) pp. 162-75.

²⁴ See further on the relationship between the ‘fictional’ and the ‘historical’ in the period Sophie Marnette’s paper ‘Narrateur et point de vue dans les chroniques médiévales: une approche linguistique’ ed. Kooper, pp. 174-90. A recent publication usefully assembles a great mass of fictional / fabulous ‘truth’ for the medieval period. See W. P. Gerritsen and Anthony van Melle eds, *A Dictionary of Medieval Heroes* (1993), trans from the Dutch by Tanis Guest (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1998).

²⁵ Antonia Gransden *Historical Writing in England c.550 to c.1307* (London: Routledge, 1974) pp. 263-65 and ‘Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England’ p. 80; V. H. Galbraith, *Historical Research in Medieval England* (London: The Athlone Press, 1951) p. 27; Bernard Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l’occident médiéval* (Paris: Aubier, 1980) p. 63. William of Newburgh, 1136-1198 was an Augustinian canon and author of a *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*.

²⁶ For the parallel popularity of Dares Phrygius’ *De excidio Trojae historiae*, see n. 91 below. The mixed-genre nature of rhetorical historiography down to the twelfth century, its ability to adapt to different audiences and to eschew allegory when necessary, its use of novelistic techniques in description, are noted in Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn, *Writing Faith: Text, Sign and History in the Miracles of Sainte Foy* (Chicago: University Press, 1999) pp. 1, 27, 28 etc. I have dealt with these aspects more fully elsewhere: “‘Chronicle’ and ‘History’: the medieval origins of postmodern historiographical practice?” *Parergon* n.s. 14:2 (1997) 101-28. On Geoffrey see the remarks of R. W. Southern with which the present article opens.

To sum up, then, history flourished in the liminal, conflict-filled 'pre-structural' age that began to pass with the death of the charismatic figure Bernard of Clairvaux (1153), and progressively lost out as new lines of authority and new hegemonic structures became clearer, from the time of Pope Alexander III onwards. The observation of Sverre Bagge is relevant: 'as often, crisis and tragedy had a stimulating effect on historiography', and the period from the investitures contest to the crusades of Louis IX was filled with 'crisis and tragedy': the investitures controversy itself, the rise of monarchy and the 'demise' of the aristocracy (both in *chanson-de-geste* 'fiction' and 'reality'), the conflict between church and state (for example the murder of Becket), the rise of the Inquisition and the blood-thirsty hounding out of witches and heretics in the period, internal warfare and its consequences, and the like. Such a recital, however, prompts a fundamental question for this essay: what happened to historiography when the 'liminality' of the twelfth century was replaced by a deeper and firmer sense of structure and purpose in the thirteenth century and subsequently? What were the dimensions, in other words, of R. W. Southern's 'new management'?²⁷

By the thirteenth century, according to a current paradigm of interpretation, 'history-writing' had indeed been made over. Guenée as we have seen speaks of the 'shift from eloquent to erudite historiography', from 'rhetoric' to

²⁷ The sense of tragedy about the investitures controversy is nowhere better captured than in the anonymous 'planctus' or life of Henry IV: R. M. Stein, 'Signs and things: the *vita Heinrici IV Imperatoris* and the crisis of interpretation in twelfth-century historiography' *Traditio* 43 (1987) 105-119. See too the very relevant paper by Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen, 'History, tragedy and fortune in twelfth-century historiography, with special reference to Otto of Freising's *Chronica*' in Lehtonen and Lehtonen (eds) *Historia* pp. 29-49. For the thirteenth century as the 'great' century of the Middle Ages see James J. Walsh, *The Thirteenth: Greatest of Centuries* (N.Y.: Fordham University Press, 1907) and Léopold Genicot in *Le XIIIe Siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires [Nouvelle Clio], 1968). On the 'liminality' of the twelfth century see J. O. Ward, 'Rhetoric, Truth, and Literacy in the Renaissance of the Twelfth Century' in R. L. Enos ed., *Oral and Written Communication: Historical Approaches* (Written Communication Annual: An International Survey of Research and Theory vol. 4, Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1990) pp. 126-57. For the comment of Sverre Bagge see 'Medieval and Renaissance Historiography: break or continuity?' *The European Legacy* 2:8 (1997) [1336-71] p. 1367.

‘scholarship’²⁸ or from ‘authorship’ to ‘compilation’:²⁹ In his 1985 study Guenée points to a new pride that thirteenth-century historians took in being compilers rather than authors. This pride, significantly, Guenée dates back to the prologue that Henry of Huntingdon attached to his *Historia Anglorum*:

Tuo quidem concilio Bede venerabilis ecclesiasticam qua potui secutus historiam, nonnulla etiam ex aliis excerpens auctoribus, inde cronica in antiquis reservata librariis compilans, usque nostrum ad auditum et visum preterita representavi.³⁰

For the first time, says Guenée, historians in the thirteenth century set up a critique of their sources and discussed how they could nevertheless make use of apocryphal texts, a far cry from Geoffrey of Monmouth, who constructed such

²⁸ A.Grandsden, ‘Prologues in the historiography of twelfth-century England’ p. 60, citing Guenée, ‘L’histoire entre l’éloquence et la science. Quelques remarques sur le prologue de Guillaume de Malmesbury à ses *Gesta Regum Anglorum*’, *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris: Boccard, 1982) and ‘Les premiers pas de l’histoire de l’historiographie en occident au XIIIe siècle’ *ibid.* (1983); also Guenée, *Histoire et culture historique dans l’occident médiéval*, p. 68: ‘C’est dans les scriptoria monastiques ... que l’érudition moderne a forgé ses exigences’. With Guenée’s view ‘that in the course of the twelfth century the dominance of rhetoric over historiography declined [in favour of] scholarship’ (Grandsden 1990 pp. 80-81), we may compare the exactly similar phenomenon noted for the period c.1500 A.D. by Robert Black ‘The new laws of history’ *Renaissance Studies* 1:1 (1987) 126-56, on which see below. For this latter development see now Peter Godman’s stirring *From Poliziano to Machiavelli: Florentine Humanism in the High Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998) p. 200.

²⁹ See Bernard Guenée, ‘L’Historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle’ *Journal des Savants* Janvier-Septembre (Paris: Boccard 1985) pp. 119-135. See Knape’s reference to the thirteenth-century *Saxon World Chronicle* author’s ‘Having compiled and collected information’ in Knape, ‘*Historia*, textuality and *episteme* in the Middle Ages’ p. 14.

³⁰ Guenée, ‘L’Historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle’, p. 121. In the translation of ‘cronica’ (neuter plural) in Diana Greenway ed. and trans., *Henry, Archdeacon of Huntingdon, ‘Historia Anglorum’: The History of the English People* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) p. 6, ‘borrowing from’ is a little misleading. The idea is: ‘putting together the chronicles kept in old bookcases’. On p. lxxxv of her edition, Greenway says 25% of Henry of Huntingdon’s material comes from Bede, 40% from the Anglo-Saxon chronicle, 10% from other sources, leaving 25% his own work!

apocryphal texts and passed them off as real *without* comment!³¹ This new preference for compilation absolutely explains and justifies the method used by Vincent of Beauvais in his *Speculum Historiale*. Guenée points out that whereas historians in the twelfth century claimed that their work was founded on early Christian historiography, from Eusebius of Cesarea to Bede, the historians of the thirteenth century tended to take as their models and to follow late eleventh-century historians whom they were happy to call historians of their own times, 'modern' historians:³²

History distances itself little by little from rhetoric. It becomes more and more a science. This evolution, at first slow, then more rapid as the eleventh century becomes the twelfth, at the moment of the great western historiographical renaissance, is discernible at least in outline [*à bien des traits*], but it is especially marked in regard to what the historian says of his sources: in classical antiquity they were never mentioned; early Christian historiography at least noted an abundance of sources; early twelfth-century historians noted that their sources were good, and, at the end of the twelfth century, in accordance with university practice, the historian advances a distinction between himself as compiler and the authors he selects from. *Compilatores non inventores*: thirteenth-century historians are worthy pupils of their

³¹ It is significant in this regard that Henry of Huntingdon's expansion of Bede for early British history, although it contains some additional material, is conservative (ed. Greenway pp. 32ff, for example). Henry's 'Book of English Miracles' (IX, Greenway, pp. 622ff) is also 'historical' rather than 'fictitious', being grounded in the first instance upon Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the great acknowledged precursor also of William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*. In regard to Henry's late adaptation of materials from Geoffrey of Monmouth himself, Henry's attitude represents what we could probably call a medieval 'research-oriented approach', in that he abstains from substituting Geoffrey's contents and methodology for his own account, and confines himself to selectively adding in as a 'research addition' 'a separate compilation based on the HRB' (the 'Letter to Warin', added into Bk VIII, Greenway p. ci) and to abridging, rhetoricising and glossing selected other materials from Geoffrey (Greenway pp. ci-cii).

³² Thus, argues Guenée, for Matthew Paris and Robert of Torigny (died 1186, monk and prior of Bec-Hellouin and abbot of Mont St Michel [in 1154], reworked the *Geste des ducs de Normandie* of William of Jumièges, continued the *Chronicle* of Sigebert of Gembloux and kept annals for Mont St. Michel); Marianus Scotus (1028-82, an Irish monk at Cologne who wrote in anchoritic isolation at Fulda a *Universal Chronicle* down to the year 1082) was the first of the 'modern' historians.

twelfth-century predecessors. They have underlined in a new way that history is no longer the literary genre practised by Sallust and Livy. It is closer and closer to law and theology, evincing the seriousness of purpose and the solidity of a science. Thus, in so far as it is a science, good history comes in the form of a compilation.³³

Monasticism has receded in centrality; what R. W. Southern has called ‘scholastic humanism’ has reached its crescendo and history has become nothing but the well laid-out evidence of God’s plan, whether as set out and interpreted in the Bible, or as summarised by Joachim of Fiore. Controversy and novelty lie elsewhere, in the arts, law and theology faculties of the Universities, institutions which, unlike the monasteries, neither had nor needed history.

Historians have thus detected a ‘growing away’ of the intellectual interests of the secular schools from traditional historiography: by the later middle ages Latin historiography, writes Roger Ray,

competed even more poorly for the best writers. The institutional bulwark of Latin historiography, the Benedictine monasteries, lost social prestige and gave ground to the mendicant orders, among which theological treatises not historical narratives were the preferred genre ... the center of Latin culture [became] the university and it was not friendly to historiography ...³⁴

Some observations and illustrations of this pattern only can be offered here. In the first place, we may note the transformation of ‘history’ into a variety of cognate genres. In a recent paper, and following some interesting suggestions to

³³ Guenée, ‘L’Historien et la compilation au XIIIe siècle’ pp. 133-35, translated and paraphrased. The reference to Vincent of Beauvais will be found on p. 128. Note too the introductory ‘apologia’ provided by the anonymous author of a *vita* of the ‘mulier religiosa’ Ida of Louvain: ‘attende ergo, lector, inprimis hujus operis me non auctorem esse, sed potius collectorem ...’. The full text and contest is provided on p. 175 of Jennifer Carpenter’s unpublished doctoral dissertation ‘A new heaven and a new earth: the *vitae* of the *mulieres religiosae* of Liège’ (Toronto, Ph.D 1997). I would like to thank Dr Carpenter here for the gift of a copy of her thesis and for much stimulation on its general topic.

³⁴ Roger Ray (in Mantello-Rigg) pp. 645-46.

be found in a book by Monika Otter,³⁵ I have pressed the idea that one effect of the rise of what might be called 'secular literacy' in the twelfth century, was a much more careful distinction between 'history' and 'fiction'.³⁶ I examined in a preliminary way the consequences of this for the hitherto ubiquitous monastic pattern of history-writing. I concentrated on some of the work of a group of archdeacons – Henry of Huntingdon, Gerald of Wales, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Walter Map, Peter of Blois,³⁷ Ralph Diceto – all of whom can be used to support the paradigm of 'new management' in history-writing, if in different ways. If Henry and Ralph are indications of the new straightened formula for history-writing, with reasonable boundaries between *fabula*, *argumentum* and *historia*, Walter Map, Geoffrey of Monmouth and Gerald of Wales are indicative of a new sense of history that parallels those coming into vogue in our own day. Geoffrey is an example of *historia as argumentum* absolutely made to order, whilst Gerald and Walter have ruthlessly brought history up to date and embedded the present in it – as we are being counselled to do today – at least in Australia.³⁸ Ironically perhaps, their renovation of the art almost abolished it: whilst careful inspection will reveal the (historiographical) genealogy of their *opera*, it will escape no one that their format admits *fabula* and *argumentum* on equal footing.

In regard to Walter Map, we may begin with his claim to the title 'historian':

Walter can be called a historian only in a rather loose sense. *De nugis curialium*, his only surviving work, is a collection of anecdotes, *facetiae*, and short tracts. But Walter... is interested in definitions of

³⁵ See my 'The monastic historiographical impulse c.1000-1260 A.D.: a re-assessment' and Monika Otter, *'Inventiones': Fiction and Referentiality in Twelfth-Century English Historical Writing* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

³⁶ Cf. too the many pertinent parallels in Päivi Mehtonen, *Old Concepts and New Poetics* (Commentationes Humanum Literarum 108, Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1996).

³⁷ R. W. Southern, *Medieval Humanism and other studies* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970) p. 112; for Peter as an 'historian' see R. W. Southern, 'Peter of Blois and the Third Crusade' in Mayr-Harting and R. I. Moore eds, *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, p. 217.

³⁸ See Terry Smith, ed., *Ideas of the University* (Sydney: Sydney University Research Institute for the Humanities and Social Sciences, 1996).

history, and his ambition in *De nugis* is to be a chronicler of sorts, though primarily of *modernitas*, not of the past.³⁹

Perhaps ironically, Walter begins his work with a reference to time: ‘in tempore sum et de tempore loquor’: ‘... Walter, in offering this opening statement, is aiming at no less than a representation of the world, or reality.’⁴⁰ The early sections of *De nugis distinctio* I have the formal appearance of a world chronicle, presenting ancient episodes and mythology. Tales are presented (*contigit autem nuper*⁴¹). Walter’s is, notes Otter,

a potentially limitless assignment; taken seriously, it amounts to depicting all past *dicta* and *facta* as far as one can know them — the task, in other words, that a historian faces. Not surprisingly, Walter ends [the paragraph Otter is discussing] with a historian’s traditional statement of intention: *meum autem inde propositum est nichil novi cudere, nichil falsitatis inferre; sed quecunque scio ex visu vel credo ex auditu pro viribus explicare*.⁴²

The parallel with Henry of Huntingdon’s already cited ‘usque nostrum ad auditum et visum representavi’ is marked. Nevertheless, there is a resolute defiance of history: the topicality of the (present) court is continually stressed, though a hint of the timelessness of the notion of penance / punishment (specifically linked with the court⁴³) undermines the presentness, and dramatic theatre-scenes are interposed⁴⁴ against a backdrop of the ‘two cities’⁴⁵ and the concept of a poet-writer (writing in prose because the proper conditions for writing in poetry do not exist⁴⁶).

³⁹ Otter, p. 112. Elisabeth van Houts in her recent *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe 900-1200* (London: Macmillan, 1999), designed to make the point (perhaps to be assumed anyway) ‘that knowledge of the past in the central Middle Ages was a shared responsibility and the collaborative task of both men and women, as well as a set of links between old and young’ (p. 150), describes Walter as an ‘historian’ (p. 149). See also Freeman, ‘Cistercian Historical Writing in England’ p. 110.

⁴⁰ Otter, p. 117. Walter is quoting Augustine’s *Confessions*; James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 2.

⁴¹ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 14.

⁴² Otter, p. 119.

⁴³ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 8.

⁴⁴ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 16.

⁴⁵ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 25.

⁴⁶ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 25, 35.

Into this confused and in-tension net are placed *fabule* offering a likeness to an historical court (his own),⁴⁷ *fabule* that shade off into past facts about a still-living king.⁴⁸ 'Past-facts' (i.e. presented in the perfect tense) are then alleged about a succession of topics (Cluniac monks, the taking of Jerusalem by Saladin, the origin of the Carthusians, of the Order of Grandmont, of the Templars) and these shade into a series of 'mirabilia' in the imperfect tense, but with a historical relevance to the previous topics. Further historical topics on religious orders end in a directed polemic against them, and this shades into the 'gesta Hebreorum'.⁴⁹ A further reference to himself as polemicist⁵⁰ is followed by more religious / sectarian history and Walter's first *distinctio* ends.⁵¹

The next *distinctio* has the same odd mixture but with the strictly historical buried beneath a string of *fantasmata* or marvellous tales. Buried but not too deeply⁵² is a five-page tale in imitation of Geoffrey of Monmouth, conflating Roman with Dark Age English history. The passage to ethnography (the habits of the Welsh) imitates the flavour of Graeco-Roman historiography, whether Herodotus, Lucan or Ammianus Marcellinus, and the *distinctio* is described at its conclusion⁵³ again as 'non fabularum sed faminum', the latter word (*famen*) being an early medieval world for 'speech, language, report, utterance': with what brash postmodernity does Walter reduce his 'history' to 'words' (discourse)!

Reference in the prologue of *Distinctio* III to his work as 'posteris exempla'⁵⁴ ties Walter in with the modern, directed, use of stories as found in Cistercian and Dominican historiography of the post-1180 period. His first, long 'fatua ... et frivola narracio'⁵⁵ and those that follow would do honour to Geoffrey

⁴⁷ James-Brooke-Mynors. p. 26, 30.

⁴⁸ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 30.

⁴⁹ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 104.

⁵⁰ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 110.

⁵¹ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 131.

⁵² At *dist.* II.17.

⁵³ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 208.

⁵⁴ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 210. See 'ut recitacio placeat et ad mores tendat instructio' *De nugis* ed. James-Brooke-Mynors, pp. 36-37, cited Otter p. 118. On the role and nature of the 'exemplum' see *Two Lives of Mary d'Oignies, the Life by Jacques de Vitry and the Supplement to the Life by Thomas de Cantimpré*, ed. and trans. Margot King, Miriam Marsolais, Hugh Feiss (Toronto: Peregrina, 1998) — henceforth 'King, ed., *Two Lives of Marie d'Oignies*' (pp. 157-58).

⁵⁵ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 244.

of Monmouth. *Distinctio* IV mixes *fabule* with invented ancient proof-texts (*Dissuasio Valerii*), *oraciones*,⁵⁶ and includes a version of the legend of Pope Gerbert, which harks back to the same tales which William of Malmesbury inserted in his *Gesta Regum (historia)*:⁵⁷ they now have a much more appropriate fabulous context (*fabula*). Events from ninth-century Brittany are included but again in such a ‘fabulous’ version that there is no tension between *historia* and *fabula*. *Distinctio* V is announced as history (*gesta*), and the complaint is that the ‘antiquorum gesta’ are too readily used to criticize contemporary *gesta*, with the consequence that these latter *gesta* go unrecorded. There is a high twelfth-century flavour in that Lucan and the *chansons de geste* are treated as valid history,⁵⁸ but the ensuing (recent) Anglo-French *gesta* are presented uncritically as ‘entertainment / improvement’. This *distinctio* deals in the most recognisable fashion with the subject-matter of ‘history’ (recent Anglo-French kings and their doings), but the terminal recurrence to the theme of the court and divine punishment stresses the presentness and the timelessness of it all.

It is quite clear that Walter knows both the traditional genre of history and the recent explosion of it by Geoffrey of Monmouth. He is aware of the purposelessness of traditional historiography, its contextless nature, its privileging of the past over the present, its disarming confusion between *historia*, *argumentum* and *fabula*. Walter’s idea of ‘new management’ is to keep the kernel but throw away the restrictive classification, to invent a new frame (*oracio, sermo curialis*) that will allow the subject matter of history and *fabula* and *argumentum* to play an entertaining, critical and improving role. Doubtless too, Walter feared that the ‘new (secular / compilatory) history’ might have difficulty finding a market among the audience he had in mind — courtiers: ‘Walter Map thus not only exemplifies but also reflects on the detached, ironic, disenchanting intellectual stance that he sees as characteristic of *modernitas* (Otter, p. 125].’ And so may we reflect today, but the last word must be replaced by *postmodernitas!*

⁵⁶ James-Brooke-Mynors, pp. 328 (*fabule*) and 344 (*oraciones*).

⁵⁷ Mynors, Thomson and Winterbottom, *William of Malmesbury ‘Gesta Regum Anglorum’* vol. I pp. 282ff.

⁵⁸ James-Brooke-Mynors, p. 404. *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and his continuator Rahewin, translated and annotated with an introduction by C. C. Miow* (1953, New York: Norton, 1966) p. 28 (I prologue).

Concerning Gerald of Wales, we may argue many of the same points, except that his models are closer to the Graeco-Roman historiographical pattern. His originality lies in applying his Nennius-like *compilatio*-method⁵⁹ stringently to the present, the history of the lead-up to the present and the (present-oriented) topographical. In this way, as in his other works, *Gemma*, *Expugnatio*, *De principis instructione*, *Speculum*, Gerald presented a new framework for what he might have called 'operative' rather than 'buried' history.⁶⁰ Thus Walter Map, who laments the previous era's failure to appreciate modernity and deplores the classicising type of historiography, and Gerald are themselves part of a movement to take the fictional, the morally perplexing, the narratively dramatic out of 'history' as such and to develop new forms – the *sermo*, the *farrago*, the travelogue (Gerald of Wales) – for what they want of history. It is a tendency begun by Henry of Huntingdon whose chronicle *Historia Anglorum* (in contrast with William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum Anglorum*) rigorously excluded the tales of the weird and the supernatural that William of Malmesbury so happily included, and which turn up again in Walter's *De nugis*.

The separation between the 'fictional' and 'history' just noted has attracted interesting corroborative attention from a recent publication by Päivi Mehtonen, who has set out for us the 'clearances' effected in the twelfth century schools between 'fiction' and 'history'.⁶¹ The categories of *fabula*, *historia*, *argumentum* derive originally from the domain of poetics but over time were appropriated by the rhetorical treatises.⁶² In the twelfth century they resumed something like their original status. Mehtonen, indeed, speaks of 'the "rebirth" of the Latin poetics of fiction' in the twelfth century, of 'an increasing tolerance of the overtly fictional modes of narration within the realm of *poesis*', and comments 'that as the twelfth-century interest in *ars poetica* grew, there was more intellectual space for more

⁵⁹ Nennius, *British History and the Welsh Annals*, ed. and trans. John Morris (London: Phillimore, 1980) p. 9; Gerald of Wales *The History and Topography of Ireland*, trans. John J. O'Meara (Penguin Books, 1982) pp. 31-32.

⁶⁰ Gerald of Wales, *The Journey through Wales and the Description of Wales*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978); Otter, ch. 4; Robert Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales, 1146-1223* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

⁶¹ Mehtonen, *Old Concepts and New Poetics*.

⁶² For example, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.8.13. On the link with poetics see Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric*, translated by Matthew T. Bliss *et al.*, ed. D. E. Orton and D. Anderson, (Leiden: Brill 1998) p. 138.

positive views of even the extreme forms of fiction'; she cites Nykrog to the effect that 'The twelfth century is often credited with being a transformative period regarding the divorce of fiction from reality in the literature of the middle ages'.⁶³ It is perhaps no accident, then, that the twelfth-century archdeacons, whose links with the schools were perhaps stronger than those of the monks, should have had a sharper sense of the boundaries between the fictional and the historical, and the appropriate genres for each, than the monks of the day.⁶⁴

My second major comment concerns the change of spirit that is detectable between twelfth- and thirteenth-century historiography. Much of this change of spirit can be detected by comparing the prefaces attached to the *Two Cities Chronicle* of Otto of Freising, and the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris, separated by almost a century. Otto is concerned that history, the *gesta Babylonis*, ending with Antichrist, is a tale of wretched woe, yet, with apparent support and encouragement from no less a personage than the Emperor himself, he writes in

⁶³ Mehtonen pp. 45, 48, 87, 106-07. Per Nykrog, 'The rise of literary fiction' in R. L. Benson and G. Constable, eds, *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982) p. 611 writes that 'Strangeness and unheard-ofness became the focus of interest [among the vernacular successors to the 'writers of the 1170's], more than concise analysis': this is a characteristic that used to inhabit the monastic chronicle in earlier days. It is also worth noting that 'humanism' has always been associated with a tendency to differentiate between 'recent' or 'eye-witness' events ('annals', 'commentaries'), and the remoter past proper ('history'; see Mehtonen pp. 70, 73 (n.19) and Gary Ianziti, 'Humanism's new science: the history of the future' *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 4 [1991] 59-88). The 'historical writings' of Gerald of Wales reflect a tendency amongst the seculars to see a distinction between contemporary description and remoter history, but it is by no means consistent, as the examples of John of Salisbury (*Historia pontificalis*) and Galbert of Bruges indicate.

⁶⁴ For the ultimate broadening of audience for history beyond that of the monks and the schools to the courts and towns in the later middle ages, however, see Leah Shopkow *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997) pp. 263-75; G. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), Denys Hay, *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries* (London: Methuen, 1977) ch. 4. Indeed, in the perspective of time, the 'historiographical revolution' of the seculars or archdeacons in the twelfth century was but one eddy amongst many in the ebb and flow of historiography as an untaught and socially ambiguous mode of self-referencing and self-identification. For Franciscan historiographical emphasis upon urban situations, see below at n. 86.

an atmosphere of secular optimism and spiritual hope.⁶⁵ Matthew Paris announces that he – like Otto – will deal with the *temporum summam lineamque descendentem ab exordio mundi* – the succession of kingdoms and kings assembled for the erudition of (future) readers, yet, by contrast,⁶⁶ he immediately advances onto the defence, as if aware that the lonely critical stance he has forged in his study will attract disparagers:

but what can we say against those shameful auditors who impugn the need to entrust to letters the lives and deaths and the different situations of men, to perpetuate heavenly and earthly prodigies or the impress in writings of other elementary things?

After presenting the usual justifications — retelling of former disasters will allow the recognition of the prospect of recurrences today and in the future, which will provide incentives to flee *ad remedium poenitentiae*, all history reinforces morals, what to avoid, what to imitate — he concludes:

so they should not be listened to who say that the *chronicorum libros et maxime a catholicis editos* should be neglected, because they permit the zealous investigator to discover through memory, to know by understanding (*intelligentiam*) and to set forth through eloquence (*per facundiam*) whatever is necessary for human enlightenment (*sapientiae*) and salvation.

Further, as Weiler's recent study has made clear, Matthew, far from presenting a random selection of chronicler's tales, has a strictly tailored agenda which determines what he selects for inclusion in his chronicles and how he presents his material. This agenda fits history to the laying bare of the 'greed, undue patronage or the evil machinations of foreign powers ... [to] a damning critique of Henry III and his government ... a scathing critique of Henry III's own undertakings ... [to a critique of] the avarice and tyranny of the Holy See [and how it] damaged the unity of the Church and made heathen[s] and schismatics fearful of accepting papal authority ... [of] the moral ineptitude of the Pope ...

⁶⁵ C. C. Mierow, trans., A. P. Evans and C. Knapp eds, *The Two Cities: A Chronicle of Universal History to the Year 1146 A.D. by Otto, Bishop of Freising* (1928, New York: Octagon, 1966) pp. 87-97.

⁶⁶ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* ed. H. R. Luard (7 vols, London: Rolls Series, 1872-84) I, pp. 1-2.

[of] the *curia*'s greed, the worldly ambitions at the heart of papal policy ... [of] the Pope's sinister policies [as being] among the reason to blame for the parlous state of Christian affairs in *Outremer*':

His misrepresentations and inventions were not merely emendations and falsifications, but an attempt to show what he perceived to be the true nature of actions and undertakings he recorded. If this meant that he had to add to, amend or change documents and reports, then this was done in the service of a search for truth and proper understanding.

This narrow tailoring of 'history' to 'truth and proper understanding' conceived in terms of a specific critique of specific papal and royal actions in the chronicler's day is an instance of how thirteenth-century historians turned their materials much more sharply⁶⁷ to didactic and doctrinaire goals than their antecedents in former times.

There is more than a little savour of the great ecclesiastical project of the thirteenth century in Matthew's goals: to inculcate catholic doctrine by way of preaching, university *studia*, episcopal visitations, confessional and penitential manuals and practice, indulgences and new conceits such as the doctrine of Purgatory, the eucharist, transubstantiation and Corpus Christi festivals, baptism, catechism, confirmation, marriage as a sacrament, burial and requiem masses, cultivation of an elaborate system of establishment Saints, the Inquisition, the creation of a systematic doctrine and practice of Satanic, diabolical evil and apostasy. Jean-Claude Schmitt has recently traced the fateful path pursued not only by the image of the night-flying 'witch', but also by the 'ghosts', tales of whose activities fill or 'invade' the twelfth century — not least in the *De nugis* of Walter Map.⁶⁸ Thus do the inhabitants of our earlier

⁶⁷ The quotations from Matthew Paris will be found in Luard's edition I, p. 2. The other quotations are from Weiler, 'Matthew Paris, Richard of Cornwall's candidacy for the German throne, and the Sicilian business'.

⁶⁸ Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Ghosts in the Middle Ages* (1994) trans. T. L. Fagan (Chicago: University Press, 1998), reviewed A. Murray, *Times Literary Supplement*, June 4, 1999 p. 4. Nancy Caciola, in her review of the book (*Speculum* 76:2 [2001] p. 518) writes: '... in the core of the book Schmitt presents a compelling analysis of how the banalization of ghosts within particular textual milieux — particularly *mirabilia*, *miracula* and *exempla* genres — rendered them adaptable to various agendas. Ghosts served as "instruments of an ecclesiastical policy of moral and religious indoctrination" (p. 156)'.

chronicles⁶⁹ get sorted out and put in their much larger place, without or beyond the trappings of 'normal history'. If we hark back to Marvin Becker's compelling distinction between gentle and stern *paideia*, this is the latter!⁷⁰ Humanism and uncertainty — Becker, we feel, would argue — are replaced by ideological solidity, the certainty of the path to Salvation (the Inquisition, the Dominican Order, Andrea da Firenze's Spanish Chapel,⁷¹ for example). Uncertainty and exploration become increasingly confined to the vernacular — the *Roman de la Rose*, the *Divine Comedy* — replacing the great Latin cosmological poems of the twelfth century.⁷² It is a great doctrinal and establishment project,⁷³ however, in which history plays but a minor and carefully selected part. Monks like Matthew Paris were working against the tide.

⁶⁹ For example, William of Malmesbury's 'Witch of Berkeley': Mynors, Thomson and Winterbottom *William of Malmesbury 'Gesta Regum Anglorum'* vol. 1, pp. 377ff, and for commentary: E. Peters *The Magician, the Witch and the Law* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978) pp. 28-33.

⁷⁰ *Florence in Transition: Studies in the Rise of the Territorial State*, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1968), I, chs 1, 5 and II, ch. 1; cf also his paper 'Dante and his literary contemporaries as political men' *Speculum* 41 (1966) 665-80.

⁷¹ See Millard Meiss *Painting in Florence and Siena after the Black Death* (New York: Harper, 1951) ch. 4.

⁷² J. O. Ward 'Rhetoric in the Faculty of Arts at the universities of Paris and Oxford in the middle ages: a summary of the evidence', *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (Union Académique Internationale: Bulletin du Cange) 54 (1996) [pp. 159-232] esp. pp. 229-31; W. Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry in the Twelfth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972) chs 6 and 7.

⁷³ Cf. the comment and context of Paul Collins' remark: 'But from about the twelfth century onward the emphasis in theology, canon law, and even historiography had shifted away from the local toward the universal church and to a centralized papal authority' (*Papal Power: A Proposal for Change in Catholicism's Third Millennium* (Blackburn, Victoria: HarperCollins, 1997 p. 153). For the same observation, made more authoritatively, see R. I. Moore, 'The birth of Europe as a Eurasian phenomenon', *Modern Asian Studies* 31:3 (1997) [583-601] pp. 584, 586-97, 601, esp. pp. 590-94. The Papacy clearly shared in the widespread transition 'from charismatic to bureaucratic monarchy'. An unusual aspect of the same phenomenon is the ecclesiastical-patriarchal 'reworking' of the religious experience of females in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries: Amy Hollywood, *The Soul as Virgin Wife: Mechthild of Magdeburg, Marguerite Porete, and Meister Eckhart* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press 1995 p. 38 (The necessary adjustments [the body *must* become the exemplary focus] inherent in any biography / autobiography have to be noted here).

A brief content analysis of Matthew Paris's annals for the last four years of his original version (1247-50)⁷⁴, in contrast with those in a previous study⁷⁵ I made on William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon, suggests trends that are relevant to the transformations I am discussing. Certain categories of material (#7, #11 for instance) are not relevant, for chronological reasons, to Matthew Paris' writing, and we must in general bear in mind the differences between annals (Matthew) and a worked up history of past times (William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon).⁷⁶ In this regard, comparisons between the latter historians and the early portions of Matthew's *Chronica Majora* (or Roger of Wendover's *Flowers of History*) might have served our comparison better, although, because of the traditional nature of monastic historiography, there is the risk that such earlier chronicling would be importantly influenced by the prior example of William's and Henry's chronicling. Some of the statistical variations may seem slight, but when they are translated into pages of modern print it can be maintained that a trend is evident:

Combining categories #2 and #4, we find 0% for William, 3% for Henry of Huntingdon and Matthew Paris: the latter here clearly *maintains* the greater interest of the seculars in such matters. Emending category #3 to include material relating to parliaments, fairs, courts and festivities, tournaments and aspects of aristocratic life in general, we find 42% for William, 37% for Henry and 17% for Matthew Paris: a clear *decline* of monastic interest in the affairs of the kingdom and knightly life in general.⁷⁷

⁷⁴ Translated by Richard Vaughan, *The Illustrated Chronicles of Matthew Paris*. I have used this volume because it is recent and accessible. Matthew's own portion of the *Historia Anglorum* / *Chronica Majora*, which include the portions translated by Vaughan, has been described as 'unique among English chronicles because of its bulk and its scope ... an early attempt at universal history. There is nothing quite like it in medieval English historiography' (Bryant, p. 776). For Matthew's 'improvements' to Roger of Wendover's section of the chronicles, see Bryant, pp. 778-79 and Vaughan *Matthew Paris*, ch. II.

⁷⁵ See *Historia: Concept and Genres*, ed. Mehtonen and Lehtonen, pp. 95-96. I include the content analysis performed in that paper as Appendix A to the present paper. The content analysis of Matthew Paris is presented as Appendix B.

⁷⁶ For similar reasons the content analysis of Matthew's annals has excluded category #13 of the William / Henry analysis.

⁷⁷ See Bryant, p. 780, and Weiler, for the suggestion that Matthew saw as one of his purposes to expose the weakness of Henry III as a ruler.

For category #5, expanded to include much material relating to Church/State relations, relics, the Jews, we find the percentages as follows: 26% for William, 20% for Henry and 37% for Matthew Paris: a clear *increase* of interest in the (beleaguered?) status and affairs of the Church and religion.⁷⁸

For category #6, in Matthew Paris's case mostly imperial matters or affairs of the Empire, and adding the figures for category #10 (bearing in mind that Matthew, because of the close focus of his four annal years, makes no reference to 'Biblical, Old Testament, Hellenistic, Roman or Persian history'), we find: 9% for William, 7% for Henry of Huntingdon and 12% for Matthew Paris: another *increase* of interest on the part of Matthew,⁷⁹ perhaps to be explained by his interest in the relationship between Frederick II and the Pope, and his keen admiration of the former ruler.

For category #8, Matthew Paris remains constant with the seculars: 0% for William, 1% for Henry and Matthew Paris. Category #9 (crusading matters, expanded to include references to the Tartars and pilgrimage — usually with the Holy Land in mind) produces the following result: 13% for William, 3% for Henry and 25% for Matthew Paris, a marked *increase* of interest, again to be explained by reference to Matthews much closer focus upon ecclesiastical matters.

Category #12 on the surface produces a slight increase for Matthew Paris over William of Malmesbury: 5% for William, 0% for Henry and just under 6% for Matthew. However, when it is realised that the majority of Matthew Paris's inclusions under this heading have to do with relic-related wonders, or with general phenomena, such as are mentioned in his end-of-an-annal observations about the state of the world, or as result from his keen — and possibly apocalyptic⁸⁰ — interest in floods, fires, eclipses, earthquakes and plagues, one

⁷⁸ Bryant, p. 780, discusses Matthew's dislike of the papacy and papal politics.

⁷⁹ Bryant, p. 781.

⁸⁰ See for instance his 1250 termination, Vaughan, p. 203.

can only conclude that his general interest in the occult, the supernatural, has declined markedly in comparison with that of William of Malmesbury – or Walter Map.⁸¹

If any general conclusions are to be drawn from this relatively informal base, one would have to observe that thirteenth-century monastic historiography has, despite its continued interest in the long past, drawn in its canvas. Independent authorship of the world chronicle has been replaced by abridgement of or annotations to established work; contemporary historical interest is dominated by a concern for local and general ecclesiastical affairs, especially the crusade. A declining interest in secular affairs and a general avoidance of the homiletic and cautionary tales of the supernatural that once appeared in the general chronicle and then shifted either into the specialised sermon-aid chronicle or the new *sermo*-based genre, puts Matthew Paris in line with the developing historiographical trends noted elsewhere in this paper. A ‘first-rate journalist’ R. W. Southern has called Matthew, a ‘laborious reviser of first impressions, a conscientious collector of evidence’.⁸² Such is the pattern of the thirteenth-century monastic historian.

The pattern of historiographical interest and emphasis during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries presented above is clearly one that must engage our attention. However, a few cautions and qualifications seem necessary. In the first place, even within an order such as the Dominicans, the thirteenth-century historical urge was pronounced: histories of St. Dominic himself abounded, and

⁸¹ Category #13, slight for William of Malmesbury, but extensive for Henry of Huntingdon, has not been specifically analysed for Matthew. In Henry’s case it probably represents a shriller critique of contemporary *mores*, perhaps reflecting the secular’s greater knowledge of, and less inhibited attitude towards contemporary moral laxity than the more institutionally protected monk. Thus, while Walter Map and Henry share a considerable interest in critiqueing — if in different ways — the moral fibre of their contemporaries, for the monk the burden of category #13 may well be reflected in other categories, for example #12.

⁸² Robert Grosseteste: *The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) pp. 8, 12.

Jacobus de Voragine completed in the middle of the century [1260-67] one of the great historiographical products of the middle ages, the *Golden Legend*.⁸³ Further, the 'historical' or preacher's *exemplum* collection flourished as never before.⁸⁴ Important changes in production and consumption of historiography from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries have been noted by leading historians: Gabrielle Spiegel's *Romancing the Past*, as we have seen, deals with 'the rise of vernacular prose historiography in thirteenth-century France' and the tensions between consolidating royal power and resistant baronial consciousness that she sees behind it.⁸⁵ The market for chivalric historiography opened up in the fourteenth century – Froissart, Jean le Bel, Monstrelet – as it did for women's history – Christine de Pisan; and for town history northern Europe began in the later middle ages to catch up with the Italian lead.⁸⁶ The plausible fictions of

⁸³ *Early Dominicans: Selected Writings* ed. Simon Tugwell (New York: Paulist Press, 1882); Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*, 2 vols (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). John Cochrane, a student of mine (with my colleague, Max Walkley) is editing and investigating the thirteenth-century French lives of St. Dominic.

⁸⁴ See Joan Young Gregg, *Devils, Women and Jews: Reflections of the Other in Medieval Sermon Stories* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997) and Barbara Newman, 'Possessed by the spirit: devout women, demoniacs and the apostolic life in the thirteenth century' *Speculum* 73:3 (1998) 733-70; *Gesta Romanorum, translated from the Latin* by C. Swan and W. Hooper (1876, New York: Dover, 1959). An annotated translation / edition of the English manuscripts of the *Gesta* is in preparation by Diane Speed and Philippa Bright (University of Sydney).

⁸⁵ G. Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*.

⁸⁶ Denys Hay, 'History and historians in France and England during the fifteenth century', *Bulletin of the [London] Institute of Historical Research* 35 (92) (1962) 111-127; E. D. Kennedy 'Romancing the past: a medieval English perspective' in Kooper pp. 13-39. Papers by Peter Ainsworth ('Heralds, heraldry and the colour blue in the Chronicles of Jean Froissart'), G. Croenen, Uta Goerlitz, Sarah Mitchell and Peter Noble in Kooper enrich the picture of later medieval historiographical patterns. See also Summer Ferris, 'Chronicle, chivalric biography, family tradition in fourteenth-century England', pp. 25-38 of *Chivalric Literature*, ed. L. D. Benson and J. Leyerle (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Studies in Medieval Culture XIV, 1980); William J. Brandt, *The Shape of Medieval History* (N.Y.: Schocken, 1966, 1973) ch. 3. For urban consciousness among [Franciscan] historiographical compilers, see Mikko Piippo, 'Who belongs to history? John of Winterthur O. F. M. (d.1348) and the common people' in Mehtonen and Lehtonen *Historia* [119-35] pp. 124ff. To the usual historical writings by Christine de Pisan may now be added *The Book of Deeds of Arms and of Chivalry*, trans. Summer Willard, ed. C. C. Willard (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

the *chansons de geste* and the Arthurian Romances continue and are transformed, from the *Chanson de Croisade Albigeoise*,⁸⁷ certainly intended as history, through to Tasso and Ariosto, probably no longer intended to be history.⁸⁸ We should note also the great flourishing of the Norse / Icelandic saga in the thirteenth century⁸⁹ and the large-scale Old Norse translating movement of the same period.⁹⁰

If it can be concluded from the above that history-writing seems to have expanded in all directions in the thirteenth and later centuries, a caution seems nevertheless worthy of record: despite its apparent prolificacy, historiography from c.1200 onwards became more specialised, more closely geared to a specific

⁸⁷ William of Tudela and an anonymous successor, *The Song of the Cathar Wars*, trans. Janet Shirley (Aldershot: Scolar, 1996).

⁸⁸ I realise this is a contentious statement. Much depends upon one's view of the investment in history that one sees as characteristic of the continuous epic tradition from Homer's time onwards. See Zdenko Zlatar, *The Epic Circle* (Sydney: Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture, 1993) pp. 123ff; C. S. Lewis, *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (1966), ed. W. Hooper (Cambridge: University Press, Canto, 1998) pp. 111ff; L. S. Davidson ed., *The Epic in History*. See also W. Calin, 'Texts médiévaux et tradition: la chanson de geste est-elle une épopée?' [11-19] p. 112: 'c'est un poème narratif, basé sur les événements "réels"' (in *Romance Epic*, ed. H-E Keller (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1987). According to E. D. Kennedy's paper at the second Utrecht Chronicles conference (July 17th, 1999 'The Arthurian story: fact or fiction?'), by the fifteenth century many readers disbelieved Geoffrey of Monmouth.

⁸⁹ Cf. Sverre Bagge, *Society and Politics in Snorri Sturluson's 'Heimskringla'* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), and his papers: 'Kingship in Medieval Norway: ideal and reality' in *European Monarchy*, ed. H. Duchhardt, R. A. Jackson and D. Sturdy (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1992) pp. 41-52; 'Nature and society in the *King's Mirror*' *Särtyck ur Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi* 109 (1994) 5-42; 'Oratory and politics in the sagas' in *L'Histoire et les Nouveaux Publics dans L'Europe Médiévale (XIIIe-XVe Siècles)* ed. J-Phil. Genet (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1996) pp. 215-28; 'The individual in medieval historiography' in Janet Coleman ed., *The Individual in Political Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) ch.2 [35-57] pp. 45ff.

⁹⁰ Constance B. Hieatt, *Karlamagnús Saga: The Saga of Charlemagne* (Toronto: PIMS, 1975), I pp. 13ff. See also Gabriele Röder's paper 'Die *Chansons de geste* in der altnordischen *Karlamagnus saga*: Übersetzungen oder Adaptationen?' in *The Medieval Translator / Traduire au Moyen Âge*, 6 eds. Roger Ellis, René Tixier and Bernd Weitemeier, [Proceedings of the International Conference of Göttingen (22-25 July 1996)] (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1998); Jacqueline de Ruyter, '*Karl Magnus' Kronike, Karlamagnús Saga and Karel Ende Elegast*: genre, form, function' in Kooper 96-102.

communication or polemical task.⁹¹ The Dominicans and Cistercians are cases in point here. Specialised (mediocre) chronicling was brought into being by such enterprises as the Inquisition.⁹² Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay's *Historia Albigensis* is a perhaps typical example of a highly focussed piece of Cistercian historiography, carefully oriented towards the preaching and crusading activities

⁹¹ After writing the above, I found the discussion of changes in Cistercian historiography in Freeman 'Cistercian Historical Writing in England' most pertinent: see pp. 5 and 53 for the 'narrowing' of audiences for Cistercian historiography as the twelfth century wore on (from general audiences to specifically Cistercian ones); pp. 107ff on changes undergone by Cistercian history-writing after Aelred, c.1167-1200. Paralleling the popularity of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Freeman notes the rising importance of Dares Phrygius' *De excidio Trojae historiae* (p. 147); Cistercian interest in copying other histories rather than in composing their own during the second half of the twelfth century, 'linked to the Cistercians' increasing establishment and security in England' (p. 150), gives way in the period 1200-1220 to a turning inward, and the writing of highly localised histories (pp. 152, 154ff, 158, 207, and 215: 'in around 1200 the continental Cistercians were preoccupied with writing *exempla* collections and foundation histories, both of which looked inwards to concentrate on local affairs'). Freeman notes, p. 247, the growth of a more critical historiography from the 1180s onwards. One may suppose a time-lag in regard to the 'advent of a more critical historiographical mode': Saxo Grammaticus, for example, a Lund cathedral cleric, between 1208-18 wrote his *Gesta Danorum* to showcase Danish history for the rest of Latin Europe, but his first nine books, at least, seem to follow the pattern of twelfth-century secular, rhetorical historiography: they are often seen 'as no more than a hotch-potch of ancient legends, speeches from heroic poems, selections from Icelandic sagas, rationalised myths, bits of Danish folklore, references to genealogies, echoes from Latin chroniclers, and snippets from Virgil, Valerius Maximus, Martianus Capella and other approved authors who featured in university syllabuses of the early Middle Ages' (Hilda Davidson and Peter Fisher, trans. and ed., *Saxo Grammaticus The History of the Danes Books I-LX*, vol. II, Commentary [Woodbridge: Brewer, 1980] p. 1) — a kind of cross between Nennius, and Geoffrey of Monmouth. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* 9th ed. (Edinburgh: Black, 1886) XXI.350, Saxo 'neither understands nor is interested in scientific research, in general history, or even in chronology'. Cf. also comparable trends in Benedictine and Augustinian historiography: pp. 230, 232 of A. J. Bijsterveld, 'The commemoration of patrons and gifts in chronicles from the diocese of Liège, eleventh-twelfth centuries' *Revue Bénédictine* 109:1-2 (1999).

⁹² Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay (see immediately below); Guillaume de Puylaurens (*Chronique: chronica magistri Guillelmi de Podio Laurentii*, ed. J. Duvernoy (Paris: CNRS, 1976), Bernard Gui (W. Buchwald, A. Hohlweg and O. Prinz, *Dictionnaire des auteurs Grecs et Latins de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Âge*, trans. and ed. J. D. Berger and J. Billen [Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1991] p. 120; W. L. Wakefield and A. P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1969] pp. 371-75).

of the Order in the matter of the Cathar heresy.⁹³ Recent work on the Cistercian chronicler Hélinand of Froidmont (1160-1230), for instance, notes that he ‘used, and probably conceived, his *Chronicon* as a tool to adorn and enrich his sermons’:⁹⁴ its ‘many *exempla* and short stories’, its ‘searchable aspect’⁹⁵ is evident. Hélinand is particularly concerned with ‘contemporary problems, such as the organisation of the Church as appears from his severe criticism of Rome, the life of the clergy, the decay of his own order, and the imminent threat of heresies’.⁹⁶

Hélinand’s work is paralleled by others with Cistercian connections. Ghost stories, marvels and edificatory diabolical tales are a staple in the work

⁹³ See the excellent recent translation of W. A and M. D. Sibly, *The History of the Albigensian Crusade: Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay’s Historia Albigensis* (Woodbridge: Boydell 1998). Freeman, ‘Cistercian Historical Writing’ p. 215.

⁹⁴ W. J. Aerts, E. R. Smits and J. B. Voorbij, eds, *Vincent of Beauvais and Alexander the Great* (Groningen: Forsten, 1986) p. 6. Freeman ‘Cistercian Historical Writing’, p. 215.

⁹⁵ Aerts, Smits and Voorbij, p. 3.

⁹⁶ Aerts, Smits and Voorbij p. 3. After writing these paragraphs I was pleased to read Freeman, ‘Cistercian Historical Writing’ pp. 215, 254-55, 259, 264, esp. pp. 254-55: ‘The Cistercian fight against heresy was ... both internal and external, directed at both Cistercian community members themselves and at wider Christendom. This combination of motives was expressed in historical writings. Hélinand of Froidmont, for example, began writing his world history in 1211, a period when fear of Cathar infestation was high. As mentioned in Chapter Five, his *Chronicon* included many *exempla* tales. These anecdotes, which seemed to be digressions from the historical narrative, were in fact highly charged arguments against the errors of the Cathars. This work was therefore more than just a wide-ranging universal history with fascinating stories; it was also an educational tool and textual arsenal which used *exempla* to provide all the historical material that a Cistercian might need in order to refute the errors of Cathars, both in public preaching and in private mediation. || Other Cistercian historians argued similarly. Writing in Champagne in the 1230’s, Aubri of Trois-Fontaines produced a chronicle that was strongly linked to the order’s preaching programme. It was filled with *exempla* that could be extracted from the historical narrative and used as set pieces in preaching against heretics. The same approach featured in Caesarius of Heisterbach’s *Dialogus Miraculorum*, where once again a set of *exempla* from the opening decades of the thirteenth century was used to attack Albigensian heresy. By the early thirteenth century, then, Cistercian history-writing on the continent was a polemical tool that taught Cistercians and wider audiences what to follow and what to avoid. And, in the early thirteenth century, the main practice that histories urged people to avoid was the practice of heresy’.

of William of Newburgh, an Austin canon with Cistercian connections⁹⁷ and the early thirteenth-century Cistercian abbot Ralph, chronicler at Coggeshall in Essex (*Chronicon anglicanum* [1207-18]), from which come such gems as 'the witch of Rheims'.⁹⁸ Ralph's supernatural excursions are celebrated.⁹⁹ He was particularly well connected and much in the world.¹⁰⁰ Cistercian historiography, indeed, reaches new heights of directed historicising and apparent factualising: the c.1230 *Quest del Saint Graal* has already been noted, and Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum*¹⁰¹ is an often-cited text that makes the same point. Similar pre-occupations guided the historical writing of the Augustinian Canon, preacher and Cardinal-Bishop Jacques de Vitry (1160/70-1240), whose interest in ecclesiastical administration in the Holy Land (he became Bishop of St. Jean d'Acre in 1216) involved him in crusade historiography. The first volume of his *Historia Hierosolymitana abbreviata, Historia orientalis*, provides a description of the Holy Land and a history of the crusading movement down to 1193 A.D., and the second volume, *Historia Occidentalis*, is devoted to the appearance of the mendicant orders, the University of Paris and related matters. His sermons are full of *exempla* and his 'history of Mary of Oignies'¹⁰² breaks new bounds in constructing his subject with salvationist, ideological certainties driving the enterprise. Similarly motivated and directed is the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais in the compilation of his enormous *Speculum*, one section of which

⁹⁷ Gransden 1974, p. 268. On 'wonders' see Freeman 'Cistercian Historical Writing', pp. 217ff, 244 ('Recent attention to wonders has indicated that the period from 1180 to 1320 witnessed an increase in stories of ghosts, monsters, marvels and miracles', 248).

⁹⁸ Wakefield-Evans, pp. 251-54. Freeman 'Cistercian Historical Writing', pp. 251ff.

⁹⁹ Gransden 1974, pp. 328, 330-31; Peters, *The Magician*, pp. 35-39. See also for other monastic 'ghost' stories Rosenwein *et al. Speculum* 1991 p. 794.

¹⁰⁰ Gransden 1974, p. 322ff. Freeman 'Cistercian Historical Writing' pp. 221ff discusses Ralph's work (pp. 231ff his natural wonders and disaster stories [pp. 241ff, 265-66], 236ff his 'vision' stories, 241 ['In these brief anecdotes the *Chronicon Anglicanum* indicates that Cistercian histories displayed many of the edifying characteristics more usually attributed to sermons or saints' lives'], 245 [his links with William of Newburgh, Gervase of Tilbury, Walter Map and Gerald of Wales]).

¹⁰¹ Wakefield-Evans pp. 243-44; John Shinnars ed., *Medieval Popular Religion* (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview, 1997) pp. 89-95.

¹⁰² See King, ed, *Two Lives of Marie d'Oignies*.

was devoted to history.¹⁰³ In a typical library ‘Vincent’s work is found ... in the company of concordances, Bible-commentaries and exegetical works, tools for *inventio* and *memoria*, in short, aids to study’.¹⁰⁴ Searchability, utility in the field (preaching, disputation, controversy – *praedicatio, lectio, disputatio, solutio, explanatio*) are the key notes.¹⁰⁵ In some cases, as with the Franciscan Salimbene de Adam, his *Chronica* grows out of and reflects a life of incessant preaching and priesting, in the course of which he observed much and could not believe it would not be useful to set it all down – ostensibly for his niece in the Order of St. Clare in Parma. But his autograph copy seems never to have been copied and thus, like Ordericus Vitalis, he reached few readers in his own day.¹⁰⁶

Jacques de Vitry’s *vita* of Mary of Oignies is a good example of the specific uses to which history was put in the ‘compilatory’ period. The life is the first of ‘a thirteenth-century dossier of twelve hagiographical *vitae* from the southern low countries’ increasingly used by historians ‘to illustrate the religious

¹⁰³ The *Speculum Historiale*; sixty-five medieval copies of the history of Alexander in the first of the four manuscript volumes in which the text of the whole has come down to us have been found so far: Aerts, Smits and Voorbij, p. 12. Significantly, in his ‘historical’ section, Vincent repeats Jacques de Vitry’s *vita* of Mary of Oignies (*Speculum Historiale* I XXX chs 10-51; on the volume and book arrangement of Vincent’s *Speculum Historiale* see J.B.Voorbij, ‘The *Speculum Historiale*: some aspects of its genesis and manuscript tradition’, in Aerts, Smits and Voorbij pp. 11-55). A work that began life, therefore, as directed hagiography, within decades had become ‘history’. I owe this observation to the kindness of a student, Keiko Nowacka, whose History IV thesis (Sydney 2001) ‘Editing and excluding medieval religious women: Heloise, Marie d’Oignies and Marie Porete in medieval and modern discourses’ provides excellent ideas on the (male ecclesiastical) ‘agendas’ behind the *vitae* of the *mulieres religiosae*.

¹⁰⁴ Aerts, Smits and Voorbij, p. 8.

¹⁰⁵ Aerts, Smits and Voorbij, p. 7. A good example of ‘Hystorie sive Cronice’ made completely over to the new mendicant-focussed agenda will be found in the eight titles listed under this heading for the Carmelite Library at Hulme (the Catalogue in question is fourteenth-century): K. W. Humphreys, *The Friars’ Libraries* (London: British Academy, 1990) pp. 160, 173.

¹⁰⁶ *The Chronicle of Salimbene*, trans. and ed. Joseph L. Baird, G. Baglivi and J. R. Kane (Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1986) introduction, pp. ixff.

sensibilities of the beguine movement'.¹⁰⁷ Whilst we cannot develop this subject here, it is surely significant that the authors of these 12 lives were all male, and nine of them were Dominicans or Cistercians. Of the women concerned, none have left writings of their own, except Beatrice of Nazareth, and Amy Hollywood

¹⁰⁷ Robert Sweetman, 'Thomas of Cantimpré, *mulieres religiosae*, and purgatorial piety: hagiographical *vitae* and the Beguine 'voice', in *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honor of Leonard E. Boyle O.P.* ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997) [606-27] p. 606. The other eleven are: Christina Mirabilis (d.1224), Juette of Huy (d.1228), Ida of Nivelles (d.1231-32), Margaret of Ypres (d.1237), Lutgard of Aywières (d.1246), Alice of Schaarbeek (d.1250), Juliana of Cornillon (d. 1259), Beatrice of Nazareth (d.1268), Elizabeth of Spalbeek (flourished in the second half of the thirteenth century), Ida of Leeuw (d.c.1260) and Ida of Louvain (flourished in the mid-thirteenth century). For an account of what can be learned from these lives of 'spiritual charity, vicarious suffering and purgatorial piety' see the thesis of Jennifer Carpenter, mentioned above. I have also found valuable a lecture by Dr. Carpenter given to the Sydney University Centre for Medieval Studies on the 31st of May 2001: 'The *mulieres religiosae* of the southern Low Countries'. See also her essays 'Women, religion and society: the experience of the medieval women mystics c.1100-1500' in J. O. Ward and F. Bussey, eds, *Worshipping Women: Misogyny and Mysticism in the Middle Ages* (Sydney: Sydney University Department of History, 1997) pp. 1-62; see also 'Juette of Huy, recluse and mother (1158-1228): children and mothering in the saintly life', pp. 57-93 of Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean, eds., *Power of the Weak: Studies on Medieval Women* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press 1995). Carpenter is an example of those historians who display reasonable faith in the *vitae* as authentic accounts of their subjects. See also Juliette Dor, Lesley Johnson and Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, eds, *New Trends in Feminine Spirituality: The Holy Women of Liège and their Impact* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1999). For an opposing view, see Amy Hollywood, *The Soul as Virgin Wife*, and her papers: 'Inside Out: Beatrice of Nazareth and her hagiographer' pp. 78-98 of Catherine Mooney, ed., *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and their Interpreters* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1999); 'Beauvoir, Irigaray, and the Mystical', *Hypatia* 9:4 (Fall 1994) pp. 158-85. The subject is being investigated most effectively by two University of Sydney students, Ms Francesca Bussey and Ms Keiko Nowacka, to both of whom I owe thanks for insights, discussion and bibliographical items. For Jacques de Vitry's polemical purposes, see the very suggestive 'thesis' of Miriam Marsolais in King, ed., *Two Lives of Marie d'Oignies*, pp. 13-32, that 'the true significance of the VMO [*Vita* of Mary d'Oignies] lies in the fact that it is the eager attempt of a renowned preacher to make more accessible the rich and complex teachings of Richard of St. Victor on mystical experience' (p. 31). See also Carol Neel, 'The origins of the Beguines', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14:2 (1989) [321-41] 326ff. Some recent work on Jacques will also be found in *Medieval Sermon Studies* 43 (1999) p. 117 and in C. T. Maier, *Crusade, Propaganda and Ideology*, edition of Latin texts [by Jacques de Vitry, Eudes de Châteauroux, Gilbert de Tournai, Humbert of Romans and Bertrand de la Tour], translation and introduction (Cambridge: University Press, 2000).

has recently used these to show how starkly the male *vita*-writers may well have re-shaped the actuality they were embodying in their historiographical work. In the case of Jacques' *Life of Mary*, even on the recent reading of Miriam Marsolais, there seems to have been a careful attempt to 'read' Mary's 'life' in terms of a lay exegesis of the spiritual teachings of Richard of St. Victor. Mary thus became an eschatological 'exemplum' of salvation according to a pre-existing scholarly pattern, rather than a figure subject to 'objective', descriptive historical reconstruction. Nevertheless, the 'effect' of the life depends upon a stark and 'literal' description of the posited or envisaged 'reality: it was the human experience (suitably 'recovered') that was meant to impress, rather than the kind of elegant, rhetorical portrayal of human action that appealed in antiquity and to the twelfth-century 'rhetorical' historians. It remains, then, an open and interesting speculation that the reality of women's mystical experience in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries has been entangled in and clouded by the emerging 'new management' exemplary pattern which I am arguing overtook western historiography from the thirteenth century onwards.

We might add, in this connection, the example of Joachim of Fiore, whose extreme apocalyptic interest in history never took the form of conventional chronicling¹⁰⁸ and, like the *City of God* of Augustine, warned others away from traditional chronicling.¹⁰⁹ The poet Dante, for instance, took over Joachim's interest in history *and* his avoidance of history-writing in a more conventional

¹⁰⁸ Indeed, historiography in an exegetical sense 'involved dismantling and re-arranging ancient erudition so that it would solve specific problems of biblical interpretation or exposition'; '*Computus*, then, hovers somewhere between technique and a kind of science-in-progress, tentatively combing the flotsam and jetsam of ancient erudition in search of some as yet undefined identity'; 'The Christian concept of time is remarkable for its linear focus, its boundedness, and its exclusivity': see Faith Wallis, *Bede: the Reckoning of Time* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999) pp. xxii, xxvi-vii, 354 358-66; Arno Borst, *The Ordering of Time* (1990) trans. A. Winnard (Cambridge: Polity, 1993). According to David Dumville's keynote address at the second Utrecht Chronicles conference (17th July, 1999) 'What is a Chronicle?', Bede's achievement was to embed the universal chronicle into ecclesiastical mathematics, to embed annals into history.

¹⁰⁹ E. Randolph Daniel, 'Joachim of Fiore'; R.W. Hanning, *The Vision of History in Early Britain from Gildas to Geoffrey of Monmouth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966) pp. 32-43; R. A. Markus, *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) esp. pp. 157-196. Freeman, 'Cistercian Historical Writing' pp. 234, 265, stresses the links between Joachite theories of history and 'a new scientific understanding on the world'.

sense, leaving it to much humbler compatriot craftsmen to interest themselves in the latter (Villani, Dino Compagni), though he did not scruple to make use of their efforts (note his presumed use of Ricordano Malispini¹¹⁰). The historical interests of a Joachim or a Dante chime in, it seems, with the serious, focussed interests of the Cistercians and Dominicans, and extend the exegetical, salvational, interest in history on the part of figures such as Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Comestor¹¹¹ and others.

The case of Franciscan historiography has been recently examined with similar conclusions. Roest speaks of Franciscan choice of historical episodes that would have 'an exemplary value' and notes that 'For the creation of their own identity as distinct from other religious movements, the Franciscans had recourse to the writing of history'. This was especially true of the more universal historiographical output that characterized the period from c.1260 onwards, which should be

seen as a way of incorporating the Franciscan experience within the cultural memory of society, at a moment when the keepers of the living memory of the initial years were dying out. ... The friars inherited ... both traditional monastic historiographical traditions, and the newer scholastic forms of compilatory historiography ... creating historical compilations that could fulfil their role in the construction of a 'kulturelles Gedächtnis' [memory / recollection].

Seeking to show the ultimately didactic and specifically targeted conformity of the many Franciscan historical compilations, compendia and *florilegia* 'with the requirements of a more encompassing scheme of moral and religious education', Roest contests the conventional dismissal of a characteristic example of these works – the *Chronica Bohemorum* of John of Florence – as 'just the misshapen result of a somewhat haphazard and ill-thought-out compilation process' and sees it to be conforming to the new paradigms that overcame historiography from the thirteenth century onwards. We have already seen how Weiler has sought to

¹¹⁰ R. Morghen, *Civiltà Medioevale al tramonto: saggi e studi sulla crisi di un'età* (1971, Roma: Laterza, 1973) pp. 95-97; J. O. Ward, 'Realism, rhetoric and revelation: Dante's use of history in the *Purgatorio*', pp. 165-91 of *Dante Colloquia in Australia*, ed. Margaret Baker and Diana Glen (Adelaide: Australian Humanities Press, 2000).

¹¹¹ Buchwald-Hohlweg-Prinz, p. 685.

perform a similar re-evaluation for Matthew Paris. Whilst in the earlier ‘rhetorical’ period historiographical compilations were certainly made – such as William of Malmesbury’s *Polyhistor* or his (lost) ‘tres libri quibus Cronica dedi vocabulum’ – and quasi-historical works were composed for homiletic purposes – Guibert of Nogent’s *Monodiae* for example – in the later period compilation for new and specific purposes became a primary historiographical mode rather than one subject in rank and reader esteem to more polished, or rhetorical works, seasoned with ‘Roman art’. As Mikko Piippo has made clear, the ‘new focus’ of mendicant and especially Franciscan historiography is to be explained by a new vocational engagement, ‘by the Franciscan interest in preaching, especially to simple and uneducated lay people’, who could be expected to benefit from ‘the Franciscan use of history as a storage of *exempla* to be used in writing sermons’, ‘as a collection of *exempla sanctorum*’, as material for ‘homiletic use’.¹¹²

The picture I have presented of the ‘new management’ under which history-writing fell during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries may well be questioned. It does not reflect any exhaustive study of extant historiography in the period but is designed to encourage thinking about the relationship between history-writing and the larger intellectual concerns of the era. This relationship is one that must have resonance today, when history as a discipline is encountering new challenges and is being made over anew in important ways. The following brief remarks are designed to suggest in a cursory manner some ways of linking the pattern I have alluded to in twelfth and thirteenth-century Europe with more recent trends and patterns. I propose here, again, not the results of carefully and comprehensively researched investigation, but hints designed to produce larger meaning for the myriad texts and details that could be considered under the heading of historiography between the fourteenth century and the present.

In the first place, how do we relate Southern’s ‘new management’ to the ‘new management’ that history-writing is alleged to have come under around

¹¹² See Bert Roest, ‘Memory and the functions of history. Later medieval Franciscan chronicles’ in Mehtonen and Lehtonen, *Historia* [101-17] pp. 105-07, 111-13; Mikko Piippo, ‘Who belongs to history? John of Winterthur O.F.M. (d.1348) and the common people’ in *ibid.* [119-35] pp. 119-120, 123-24; Ward, ‘“Chronicle” and “History”’ p. 120; Weiler, ‘Matthew Paris, Richard of Cornwall’s candidacy for the German throne, and the Sicilian business’; Paul J. Archambault, trans., *A Monk’s Confession: the ‘Memoirs’ of Guibert of Nogent* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996).

1500 A.D.? Intriguingly, the picture I have presented for the late twelfth century and the thirteenth century is exactly what Black has noted for the later fifteenth century when history-writing again seems to have come under a kind of 'new management'. Early Italian humanists, notes Black, had very little interest in the theory of history-writing, even though they were avid consumers and producers of the genre. In this they simply followed Cicero who had claimed that the historian needed no 'special theoretical guidance'. Recent work on Guarino da Verona – who refused point-blank to write history on the grounds that it was too difficult and the consequences of impartiality were too severe – has illustrated how he cobbled up his theory from Cicero, Lucian and other classical writers. Similarly recent work on Bruni has shown how he abides not by the rules of modern historical research, but by the rules of 'old management' – antique and medieval – stylistic historiography: often concealing his actual sources (to which from a factual point of view he could add nothing), his efforts were directed towards ornamental rewriting of his sources, for stylistic and assertive reasons, to stress some theme of contemporary interest, or to evince the polish that he thought historical writing should display:¹¹³

¹¹³ Robert Black, 'The new laws of history' *Renaissance Studies* 1:1 (1987) 126-56, esp. 126-28; Gary Ianziti, 'From Flavio Biondo to Lodrisio Crivelli: the beginnings of humanistic historiography in Sforza Milan' *Rinascimento* 20 (1980) 3-39; Ianziti, 'Storiografia e contemporaneità: a proposito del "Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarius" di Leonardo Bruni' *Rinascimento* 30 (1990) 3-28; Ianziti, 'Humanism's new science: the history of the future' *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 4 (1991) 59-88; Ianziti, 'I "comentarii" appunti per la storia di un genere storiografico quattrocentesco' *Archivio Storico Italiano* 150 (1992) 1029-63; Ianziti, 'Writing from Procopius: Leonardo Bruni's *De bello italico*' *Rinascimento* 37 (1997) 3-27; Ianziti, 'Bruni on writing history' *Renaissance Quarterly* 51 (1998) 367-91; Ianziti, 'Leonardo Bruni: first modern historian?' *Parergon* n.s. 14:2 (1997) 85-100; Ianziti, 'A life in politics: Leonardo Bruni's *Cicero*' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61 (2000) 39-58; Ianziti, 'The Plutarchan Option: Leonardo Bruni's early career in history 1405-1414' *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance* 8 (1999) 11-35; E. B. Fryde, *Humanism and Renaissance Historiography* (London: Hambledon, 1983); Ian Thomson, 'Guarino's views on history and historiography' *Explorations in the Renaissance* 3 (1976) 49-69; Gordon Griffiths, James Hankins and David Thompson, eds, *The Humanism of Leonardo Bruni: Selected Texts* (Binghamton, New York: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies / Renaissance Society of America, 1987) pp. 175-196; Mariangela Regoliosi, 'Riflessioni umanistiche sullo "scrivere storia"' *Rinascimento* 31 (1991) 3-37. I should like to thank here Professors Ianziti and Regoliosi for taking the trouble to send me their papers cited above. See also Bagge, *The European*

The beginning of the sixteenth century meant a great change in Italian historiography, a transition from Humanist exemplarism to political realism, increasingly focused on the problem of explaining the disastrous development in Italian politics after 1494, the foreign invasions and the subsequent decline of the country.

Thus, despite the changes and to some extent improvements taking place from Compagni and Villani to Bruni, the claim for the latter representing the ‘great divide’ seems somewhat exaggerated. There are better reasons for placing such a divide between Bruni and Machiavelli.

The main conclusions from the preceding discussion are therefore that there was indeed a Renaissance in the field of historiography, but that the ‘great divide’ may be placed as well in the early sixteenth century as in the early fifteenth. This chronology not only means that the fifteenth century was less modern than some renaissance scholars have maintained, but also that the early fourteenth century was more so.

Beginning in the very last year of the fifteenth century, however, a series of substantial treatises and discussions on the theory of history began to appear. First was a forty-page discussion on historiography in Pontano’s dialogue, *Actius*, dating from 1499; then followed lengthy discussions of the shortcomings of history and historians by Cornelius Agrippa in 1526-27 and Vives in 1531, when Vives also published discussions of historical reading and the methods of historical writing; 1542 saw the appearance of the first work exclusively devoted to the theory of history, Speroni’s *Dialogo dell’historia*, which was followed in 1548 by another treatise on history, Robortello’s *De historica facultate disputatio*. The *ars historica* was now well and truly

Footnote 113 continued from the previous page

Legacy 1351ff, who sees Bruni as stressing individuals and the city itself rather than the ‘groups’ and sin or fate in Dino and Villani. Bruni stresses what Bagge calls the ‘transpersonal republic of Florence’ and therefore displays more coherence and consistency (an aspect derived from his antique studies? Bagge 1366-67) than Dino and Villani, who yet have ‘more realism and a more “sociological” approach’ (1356). Bruni says Bagge is more medieval in his approach to character.

established as a genre, and as many as 20 further such treatises appeared before the end of the sixteenth century.¹¹⁴

These latter treatises emphasised the difference between history and poetry: we are reminded of the contrast with Otto of Freising's not untypical medieval view of Lucan as an historian.¹¹⁵ Black (1987, p.147) speaks of 'the more critical climate [for historiography] of the 1480's and 1490's'. So Shopkow locates the origins of critical historical methodology in the tension set up between the archdeacons and the monks in the latter part of the twelfth century.¹¹⁶

Coinciding with a classicising historiographical theory and practice (Bruni, Guarino, and perhaps also such vernacular predecessors as Dino, Villani, Malispini¹¹⁷) we have the uncertainty of socio-political form (commune or

¹¹⁴ Black 1987 p. 129. Other citations are from: Bagge, *The European Legacy* pp. 1356 and 1366. See also Uta Goerlitz 'The chronicle in the age of humanism: chronological structures and reckoning of time between tradition and innovation' in Kooper pp. 133-43 esp. p. 135; Giorgio Spini, 'Historiography: the art of history in the Italian Counter-Reformation' in Eric Cochrane, ed., *The Late Italian Renaissance 1525-1630* (London: Macmillan, 1970) [91-133] pp. 92-93.

¹¹⁵ *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa by Otto of Freising and his Continuator Rahewin, translated and annotated with an introduction* by C. C. Mierow (1953, New York: Norton, 1966) p. 28 (I prologue).

¹¹⁶ Leah Shopkow, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington D.C., U.S.A.: Catholic University of America Press, 1997) pp. 271-75. For the more conventional view of humanist historiography as establishing new and important paradigms, see the views of Eduard Fueter (*Geschichte der neuen Historiographie*, 1911) summarised in Hay, *Annalists and Historians* pp. 88-89, Hay's own words, pp. 97-10, and Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (1981, Chicago: University Press, 1985) esp. pp. 38, 511 (on Biondo as 'the first of all moderns' — according to Onofrio Panvinio, writing in the sixteenth century), 493 ('only a few of the works of the Renaissance historians may any longer be read by any more than a few specialists in Renaissance studies. But, in the age of computers, conventions, journals, and university chairs [i.e.the institutional paraphernalia of 'modernism'] their more significant innovations are as much part of the discipline they founded as they were in the age of secretaries, chancellors, *in-folio* tomes, and literary academies. Renaissance historiography may have vanished then. But its heritage is still very much alive').

¹¹⁷ Perhaps also *their* predecessor — the *De origine civitatis Florentiae* treatise of which Rubinstein speaks in his 'The beginnings of political thought in Florence: a study in medieval historiography' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 5 (1942) 198-227.

despotism?), and, coinciding with the clear triumph of the court-form (Alfonso V and Lorenzo Valla at the court of Naples, the papal court, Milanese despotism,¹¹⁸ for example) we have the new historiography that Black associates with Biondo and subsequent practitioners and theorists. Was the ‘new management’ of R. W. Southern but a way-station towards the ‘new management’ of the late fifteenth century (in which case how do we explain the age of Bruni?) or do we have something of an oscillatory pattern, with a heavy undertow of continuity: ‘rhetorical’ historiography from antiquity to the twelfth-century (with an undertow of Christian-inspired ‘factual chronicling’), then Southern’s ‘new management’ from the late twelfth-century onwards, then a return to rhetorical historiography in the age of Bruni, then the onset of critical historiography from the time of Biondo to the end of the fifteenth century, then the figure of Machiavelli, who represents a return to the paradigms prevalent in Bruni’s day, followed by Guicciardini representing the ‘new laws of history’ (again)? Grafton’s history of the ‘footnote’ confirms the (proudly) compilatory emphasis of historiography under the influence of Cartesian criticism.¹¹⁹

Further, the contrast between ‘rhetorical’ history and ‘new management’ history may have been exaggerated. Is the picture I have outlined above of the relation between these two phenomena the correct one? Does Matthew Paris, for example, lack the rhetorical virtuosity of a William of Malmesbury? Was Matthew’s chronicling but a continuation of that of William of Malmesbury? What about historians like Suger of St. Denis: were they groping towards some notion of truth through rhetoricised text or revelling in a new ‘factuality’? If the former, what happened to the concept of ‘new management’? Was ‘chronicling’ (as distinct from ‘history-writing’) exempt from the principles of the ‘new management’ or the prime illustration of it? Is Black correct in his analysis of historiographical trends around the year 1500 A.D.? How do we compare the obviously compilatory elements in earlier chroniclers with the ‘compilatory’ emphasis noted by Guenée for the thirteenth century? What must be said of the obviously Christian underpinning of all medieval chronicling, whether pre-twelfth-century or post-? How is the ‘exemplum’-story quality of the *Gesta*

¹¹⁸ Gary Ianziti, *Humanistic Historiography under the Sforzas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

¹¹⁹ Bagge, *The European Legacy 1356-1357*; Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (London: Faber, 1997) pp. 198-99, 206.

Romanorum to be distinguished from the *exemplum* quality of previous histories or 'memoirs' such as Guibert of Nogent's *Monodiae*, complete with their close link to the sermon genre, or Gregory of Tours' *Gesta Francorum*?¹²⁰

My excursion into the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century patterns prompts some questions concerning possible links between the 'new management' under the aegis of which Southern argues history-writing was practised after the bankruptcy in the twelfth century of the ancient, rhetorical mode, and our own practice of the art today. Will history' as traditionally practised survive the 'new management' of the third millennium ('cultural studies', 'postmodernism', technological 'tomorrowism', 'the urgency of the present and the market' etc.), stressing as it does 'representation' rather than the recovery of 'truth' through evidence?¹²¹ What similarities might there be between the pressure history is currently under and the pressures that Guenée, Southern and others have noted for the twelfth century? How valid is the comparison between the medieval monastery as an 'institutional bulwark of [Latin] historiography' and the modern

¹²⁰ Lacroix (Hanning, *History and Theory* 12 [1973] p. 423) also compares the development of 'critical historiography' in both the twelfth century and in 'several fifteenth- and sixteenth-century historians'. See for other points made in this paragraph: Vaughan, *Matthew Paris* p. 117; the 'chronicle of Nennius' as cited already and the paper by David Dumville in Kooper, pp. 103-123 ('A millennium of Gaelic chronicling'); Scheibelreiter on Fredegar in Kooper pp. 251ff; Hay, *Annalists and Historians* chs 2-4; *Guibert de Nogent Autobiographie*, ed. et trad. by Edmond-René Labande (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981) esp. pp. 135-45; *Self and Society in Medieval France: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent*, trans. C. C. Swinton Bland, ed. with an introduction by J. F. Benton (New York: Harper, 1970) esp. pp. 87-92; *A Monk's Confession: The Memoirs of Guibert of Nogent* trans. and with an introduction by Paul J. Archambault (esp. pp. 58-63); Guibert's 'A Book about the way a sermon ought to be given' trans. J. M. Miller in *Readings in Medieval Rhetoric* ed. J. M. Miller, M. H. Prosser and T. W. Benson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973) pp. 162-81; Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, trans. with an introduction by Lewis B. Thorpe (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1974).

¹²¹ Cf. the remark of Alun Munslow: 'The idea of the truth being rediscovered in the evidence is a nineteenth-century modernist conception and it has no place in contemporary writing about the past' (*Deconstructing History* [London: Routledge, 1997] p. 178). That this approach has become 'Gospel' is indicated by (among other things) the 1998 issue of the Sydney University Undergraduate History journal *Past Imperfect* which carries on its initial pages a paper entitled '(post-structuralist history) and postmodernism'. Citing (and relying upon) in the main the oral words of lecturers and students in the course for which the paper was apparently written, and spelling 'Foucault' consistently without the second 'u', the author ends with the hope that 'with enough historians and enough humility' the past can actually be described.....!

university as a (last?) refuge of the traditional discipline of historiography? Is Humphrey McQueen's recent assertion that the 'free-lance' historian is 'freer' to write on whatever he / she wants than the institutionalised, academic historian in fact the case?¹²² Some reflections on these points will conclude my essay.

The pattern I have alluded to for twelfth- and thirteenth-century historiography casts a long and late shadow. The nineteenth century, for example, begins with the Romanticism of Walter Scott, Barante (whose *History of the Normans* [1817] uses the romances¹²³ as sources), and the liberal-progressive historiography of Michelet, Guizot, Augustin Thierry and others; they sought a kind of heroic truth in the romanticized, rhetoricised text and dramatically imagined situation that is alleged to have lain behind the text, or else in the liberal-progressive emergence of 'freedom', 'parliament', 'town autonomy', the 'state' etc. (being the equivalent of Christian progressive views of historiography 1070-1160 A.D.).¹²⁴ The same century ends with the establishment of institutionalised

¹²² See my paper '“Chronicle” and “History”'; Suger's St Denis, Matthew's St Albans and Hugh of Poitiers' Vézelay, amongst others, come to mind here as monasteries with a focus on historiography; Roger Ray (in Mantello-Rigg) pp. 645-46; Humphrey McQueen at the Sydney Writers' Festival Sunday May 20th panel 2.30pm-4pm, 'Take a look at history', presented by the History Council of NSW. The free-lance historian must, of course, write on 'fashionable' subjects because his / her income derives from frequent and popular publishing and celebrity appearances (note for example, McQueen's *Suspect History: Manning Clarke and the Future of Australia's Past* [Kent Town, S.A.: Wakefield Press, 1997] and his most recent work *The Essence of Capitalism*), whilst the academic historian can, within reason, choose whatever he / she likes to write on. The same contrast can be made between the free-lance writer of 'public history' and the academic.

¹²³ So, according to E. D. Kennedy's already cited paper at the second Utrecht Chronicles conference, the authors of the later medieval prose romances, continuing the variegated approach to historiography and historiographical genres of their twelfth-century Latin and vernacular *chanson de geste* predecessors, claimed historical truth on behalf of their efforts.

¹²⁴ I have used here a recent doctoral dissertation by W. R. Kudrycz, 'The Modern Making of the Middle Ages: historiography and philosophy from the Age of Reason to the twentieth century' Sydney 1997. Kudrycz deals with Prosper de Barante, p. 140. I should like to thank Dr Kudrycz here for so many profitable discussions on historiography over the years, and for his help at this point in my paper. See also John Scott and J. O. Ward: *Hugh of Poitiers. The Vézelay Chronicle* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992) pp. 39-42; and add, on Augustin Thierry, L. Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990) ch. 4 and for Thierry's commitment to political liberalism and 'liberty' pp. 85ff; for the French communes of the middle ages see pp. 87-88, 96, 109, 125. For general comment: G.P. Gooch, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913) (Boston: Beacon 1968); J. W. Thompson (with B. J. Holm), *A History of Historical Writing* 2 vols (New York: Macmillan 1942).

'factual' historiography, with Stubbs and the academic / professional movement of Ranke (whose Hegelian approach defined itself against 'Romanticism'), Round, Maitland, Fustel de Coulanges (1830-89).¹²⁵ In this latter phenomenon we note the following tendencies: (a) controversy over contemporary economic, institutional and political questions as a motivating force behind historiography; (b) a Christian ideological underpinning (Stubbs through to R. W. Southern); (c) the influence of Hegel, whose quasi-Christian 'truth / reason' dialectic underpins the modernist historiographical phenomenon.

Prior to the nineteenth-century, we can note a *mélange* of elements that flowed into the mature professional historiographical pattern that developed by the end of that century: (a) the institutional factuality of the lawyer-historians of the 16th century;¹²⁶ (b) the scepticism of Hume, who had a Tory, anti-progress, anti-liberal view of History; (c) the birth of the antiquarian factual movement in the seventeenth century, the presence of classicising romanticism in figures such as Gibbon, and the foundations for ideological certainty in the thinking of a philosopher such as Hegel.

In the same way, elements established prior to c.1150 A.D., became part of the 'professional' historiographical pattern that Guenée describes for the later twelfth- and the thirteenth centuries.

All the elements just noted for the period immediately prior to the nineteenth-century were brought to academic fruition in a movement that took major form in the latter part of that century, and is now evaporating before our very eyes, as the rhetorical uncertainties and ideological vacuum that characterised the beginning of the twelfth and fifteenth centuries are returning, with the advent of cultural studies, the birth of post-modern historiographical

¹²⁵ R. I. Moore ('World History' in Michael Bentley, ed., *Companion to Historiography* [London: Routledge, 1997] p. 942) comments on J. B. Bury's Cambridge Inaugural Lecture in 1902: Bury's main concern was to vindicate history's intellectual respectability and autonomy. It was, he maintained, a rational discipline in its own right, with its own justification, goals and methods, which had completed its emergence from the penumbra of other divisions of knowledge in which it had been embedded since antiquity — rhetoric and theology, law, metaphysics and literature'. It could, perhaps, be said of 'postmodern' history, that the discipline returns to that state of 'embeddedness' that it inherited from antiquity and the medieval period.

¹²⁶ See for example Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law and French History in the French Renaissance* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).

forms (fiction, dialogue, film, feminist historiography etc.), the debate over the ‘end of history’,¹²⁷ and the decline of professional history as people like myself knew it. As R. W. Southern has recently observed, ‘I must say that, having spent most of my working life within a system and syllabus that were still recognisably similar to, and derived from, the creators of History as an academic subject about a 150 years ago, we are now likely to diverge pretty widely from it’.¹²⁸

Lest we take too little consolation from this view of things, the possibility of an eternally oscillatory movement might be suggested. The pattern of history-writing conforms either to what we may describe as ‘Pattern [A]’, that is rhetorical, ‘classical’ in the grand manner, post-modernist, aesthetic (to use a term proposed by Walter Kudrycz in the dissertation to which I have already referred), institutionally unfocussed, or to what we might describe as ‘Pattern [B]’: ‘factual’, scientific (to use a contrasting term proposed by Kudrycz), modern (-ist), heavily institutionally focussed.

We may thus suggest that for the major period of the present essay, in the so-called ‘liminal twelfth century’, Pattern [A] matured from foundations laid in classical times (though Guenée would find there early traces of Pattern [B]), and for the thirteenth century and beyond in northern Europe, as intellectual and institutional development came more into phase, Pattern [B] developed. During the early Italian Renaissance, the highly volatile and institutionally unfocussed political and social world produced a recurrence of Pattern [A], whilst later on, with the growing institutional dominance of the court, Pattern [B], developed. Something like the same shifts may perhaps be observed as the nineteenth-century

¹²⁷ Cf. the review by Wayne Cristaudo of Francis Fukuyama’s *The End of History and the Last Man* (London: Hamilton, 1992), in *Current Affairs Bulletin* 69:3 (1992) pp. 29-31.

¹²⁸ In a reponse to a review by David D’Avray of his *Scholastic Humanism* (1995): <http://www.ihrinfo.ac.uk/ihr/reviews/rick.html>. In a sense, what may be important is the nature of the ‘market forces’ that exercise an influence upon how history is written ‘by the professionals’. Thus, in the middle ages, those inside the ‘academy’ (monasteries, cathedral schools, universities) often wrote for a lay market *outside* such institutions (cf. King [ed.] *Two Lives of Marie d’Oignies*, p. 31 ‘Jacques [de Vitry] wrote for the general public’). In the Renaissance, courtier-historians wrote for themselves as an elite (perhaps), just as in the later nineteenth century the ‘academic’ history-writing elite coincided with, drew into itself and ‘represented’ the developing educated readership of the day (the same ‘solidarity’ of interest between history-writers and history-readers might have been present also in Gibbon’s day). Today, however, the main driving or drawing force is located outside the universities, and hence the latter institutions must modify their notion of the ‘product’ they must ‘supply to their consuming clients’.

world shifted from the institutionally unstructured model of history-making to the more professional, institutionally sponsored pattern, and in our own day the withdrawal of public funding from institutions teaching the humanities, together with the decline of elitism generally in humanist studies, has produced a reversion to Pattern [A]. In practice, of course, patterns [A] and [B] are 'ideal-types' – actual instances of historical writing no doubt fall amply between them. Nevertheless, as 'ideal-types', they help to clarify our understanding of the larger meaning of what might otherwise be a kaleidoscopic phenomenon without perceptible pattern.

Important aspects of the approaches suggested above have lately come under criticism. Elizabeth Freeman in a recent essay¹²⁹ has accused me of placing the argument that many aspects of our postmodernist approach to the objective reality and recoverability of the past were anticipated in the medieval approach to 'history', into a 'medieval versus Renaissance', or an 'origins' debate. She claims that medievalists are 'heartily sick' of the former,¹³⁰ and that the latter short sells 'many other ways of defining postmodern practice'.¹³¹ While it is true that the generating context of the article of mine that Freeman is taking to task¹³² was an ongoing debate with Gary Ianziti about the place of Leonardo Bruni's historiographical achievements (a debate I find 'enriching' rather than sick-making, because it gets to the heart of what the historians in question were, in aggregate, doing), any argument I might have been seeking to make in regard to 'origins' is less significant than the proper identification and defined succession of 'medieval' / 'Renaissance' / 'modern' / 'postmodern' historiographical patterns.

¹²⁹ "Meaning and multi-centredness in [postmodern] medieval historiography: the "Foundation History of Fountains Abbey", *Parergon* n.s. 16:2 (1999) pp. 43-84. See also Freeman, 'Cistercian Historical Writing' pp. 161ff.

¹³⁰ See her essay p. 44. That she is wrong, of course, is indicated, at the least, by the interest of the noted historian of medieval historiography, Sverre Bagge, in the debate (*The European Legacy* 2:8 December 1997 pp. 1336ff). It is probably truer to argue that recent feminist students of medieval historiography are less interested in the old patriarchal Medieval / Renaissance debate. They have undertaken to unearth aspects of medieval historiography that, when displayed, seem almost inevitable and rather far from the major stated and unstated intentions of the medieval historian (cf. the recent work of Elisabeth van Houts, for example).

¹³¹ Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centredness' p. 47.

¹³² "Chronicle" and "History": the medieval origins of postmodern historiographical practice?'. See Grafton, *Footnote* ch. 2 esp. p. 43, for Ranke's rejection of Guicciardini as one of the 'founders' of 'modern' historiographical method.

There can be no real ‘link’ as such between medieval and our own historiographical practices, if only because of the occlusion affected by Renaissance polemical and historiographical practices. Nor is it true that the essence of ‘postmodern interpretations’ (‘that the relationship between things and the words which describe these things is never a transparent one’¹³³) was unequivocally absent in the middle ages: the ‘universals’ debate that flourished in the time of Roscelin and Peter Abelard and the notion of ‘involucrum’ / ‘integumentum’ that flourished among the so-called Chartrian platonists and Latin poets of the twelfth century¹³⁴ is evidence enough of a vigorous medieval awareness of the mediating nature of language in regard to ‘truth’. Conventional medieval wisdom, however, as Freeman recognises, held that ‘history’ related to what was ‘true’ ‘as opposed to what was false or fabulous’.¹³⁵

Nevertheless, medieval chroniclers’ efforts were seldom devoted to painstaking research into the factuality of the events they were chronicling;¹³⁶ rather, they listed these things as given, or they sought to render persuasive in a generally ethical climate their own representation of this ‘factuality’.¹³⁷ Emphasis was inevitably upon the persuasive or the exemplary. In other words, the ‘fit’ between ‘facts’ and (rhetorical) presentation of facts was loose at the best. So, today, the extreme multi-centredness of historical scholarship has resulted in the chronicling of everything from private genealogical research and oral histories, multitudinous regional and local or ‘public’ histories, stolen children, children generally, motherhood, forgotten (aboriginal) wars, the social significance of (Australian) war memorials, patterns of masculinity, homosexuality, black and

¹³³ Freeman, ‘Meaning and multi-centredness’ p. 47.

¹³⁴ J. Jolivet, *Arts du langage et théologie chez Abélard* (Paris: Vrin 1969, 1982); Wetherbee, *Platonism and Poetry* (esp. pp. 36ff); Peter Godman, *The Silent Masters: Latin Literature and its Censors in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).

¹³⁵ Freeman ‘Meaning and multi-centredness’ p. 48, and cf. Mehtonen *Old Concepts and New Poetics*.

¹³⁶ This point is made clearly in Spiegel, ‘Theory into practice: reading medieval chronicles’, Kooper p. 2.

¹³⁷ Cf. Spiegel, ‘Theory into practice: reading medieval chronicles’; Kooper p. 1: ‘... in sharp contrast to modern historiography, where “content” – “facts”, data, etc. – is presumptively “real” and style is to some extent optional, medieval chronicles tend to employ a realistic style but to include as morally serious “content” a vast range of material systematically excluded from the precincts of modern historical realism: miracles, resurrections, saints, myths, and visions inter alia’.

female autobiography, 'contagion', incest, child abandonment and the like to the fall of the Soviet Union¹³⁸ Historians stress less the 'truthfulness' or 'factuality' of their representations (in the trade historians assume the veracity of their methodology with relatively few attempts to defend it against the claims, for

¹³⁸ See, to take a few illustrations from some of these categories of inquiry: Chris Sidoti 'Australia's stolen children' *Current Affairs Bulletin* (Australia) 74:4 (Dec. 1997 — Jan. 1998) pp. 4-10; the Sydney Writers' Festival 'Take a look at history' session already referred to concentrated entirely on this issue, and the *Sydney Morning Herald* 'Spectrum' for June 9-10, 2001 lists under 'Best-sellers, non-fiction' *In Denial: The Stolen Generations and the Right* by Robert Manne, Black Inc. \$9.95'; Daniele Alexandre-Bidon and Didier Lett, *Children in the Middle Ages: Fifth to Fifteenth Centuries*, trans. Jody Gladding (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999); Mary Dockray-Miller *Motherhood and Mothering in Anglo-Saxon England* (New York: St.Martin's Press, 2000); the acclaimed writings of Henry Reynolds; Susan Jason and Stuart MacIntyre, eds, *Through White Eyes: Rediscovering Aboriginal History* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1989); Jan Kociumbas, ed., *Maps, Dreams, History: Race and Representation in Australia* (Sydney: Sydney University History Department, 1998) index s.v. 'Reynolds, H.'; K. S. Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* (Melbourne: Miegunyah Press and Melbourne University Press, 1998) — Inglis himself admits that 'as recently as 1980, war memorials had almost no scholarly literature' [p. 7]; John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); John Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers* (N.Y. : Random, 1988); Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes* (London: Michael Joseph, 1994; Alison Bashford and Claire Hooker, eds, *Contagion* (London: Routledge, 2001). Postgraduate students in my own Department of 'History' have lately produced *Playing the Man: new approaches to masculinity*, ed. Katherine Biber, Tom Sear and Dave Trudinger (Annandale, N.S.W.: Pluto Press, 1999). They admit the role of historiographical 'fashion': "Masculinity", it seemed, was the hot academic buzzword of the nanosecond' (p. 4). The editors were sought out by the media (or claim that they were), and the appeal of the topic even reached 'Two schoolgirls from the Central Coast [who] wagged school for a day to attend the conference' [from which the papers in the collection were derived]. The 'introduction' (also titled 'Pre-match entertainment') from which this information has been gleaned represents as complete a blurring of 'academic' and 'popular culture' as might be desired ('Fuck' appears on page 2, and repeatedly thereafter!). Indeed, the rapidity with which a publisher came forward for the proceedings of this 'conference' is a ready enough explanation for the stance adopted in it: less fashionable topics wither on the vine before a publisher comes forward to garner them. Although the Italian Renaissance is mentioned in passing (on the subject of *homo melancholicus*, p. 41), there are only two papers that would have been classified as properly 'historical' in my student days (both are on the eighteenth-century: 'Man or monster? Masturbation and the challenge to hegemonic masculinity in the eighteenth century' and 'Military masculinity and the Macaroni challenge: the British experience 1760-1780'). The rest might more properly be classified 'contemporary cultural studies'. Although there are

example, of fiction or journalistic ‘history’), and more the exemplary and the persuasive: such and such an account (as ‘true’ as any that could be embarked upon) is particularly revelatory of suppressed, hidden or neglected aspects of or contrasts with contemporary attitudes and events.¹³⁹ What is to distinguish a definitive Cistercian ‘foundation history’ for example) or a Cistercian history of

Footnote 138 continued from the previous page

no papers on medieval or ancient topics in this collection, masculinity has, of course, emerged as a topic of discussion in medieval scholarship. Indeed, a review of the titles in Bonnie Wheeler’s ‘The New Middle Ages’ (Garland Publishing and now St.Martin’s Press) easily convinces us that the ‘Middle Ages’ are indeed new, and if we fail to get the point from this exercise, a glance through the titles offered for the major international medieval congresses (Kalamazoo and Leeds for example) should dispel all doubt. A good example of the chronicling of the tiniest detail of local history is a work that grew out of personal experience of the author and an M.A. degree in the [former] department of History at the University of Sydney in 1995: *The History of the Battle to Save Kelly’s Bush* [Hunters Hill, Sydney, N.S.W.]. See also Margaret Shaw, *The Green Ban Movement in the Early 1970s* (Petersham, N.S.W.: Buckleys, 1996). Another dimension of the great pluralism of the ‘historical enterprise’ in recent years is indicated by the ‘factional’ stories of Chester Eagle: *Didgeridoo: Some Histories* (Ivanhoe, Victoria: Trojan, 1999), in which the personal stories of members of a University of Melbourne History Department tutorial group are turned into fiction of an engagingly ‘real’ kind. Needless to say, private publishing and personal subsidies are essential to these kinds of enterprises, and this too is made possible by the personalised decentredness of modern computer publishing processes.

¹³⁹ Thus Marilyn Lake, describing her *Getting Equal: The History of Australian Feminism* (St. Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen and Unwin, 1999) writes ‘It [her book] aims to be that impossible thing — a combination of scholarship but one that can reach the general public and one that can be read by a wide range of people ... it would seem that we’re ready for another feminist mobilisation in the first decade of the next century, and certainly there are still issues that need to be addressed. My question is: what are you going to do about it?’ (‘Breaking the Waves’ *Sydney Morning Herald* Monday 11th October, 1999, by Stephanie Peatling, p. 13). These comments neatly express both the need for academic history to be relevant and ‘popular’, and the involvement with ‘political action’ by those who rely upon the academic for a story about the past that will galvanise them to that action. See Inga Clendinnen, *True Stories* (Boyer Lectures 1999, Sydney: A.B.C. Books, 1999); Inga Clendinnen *Reading the Holocaust* (Melbourne: Text Publishing 1998); Henry Reynolds *This Whispering in our Hearts* (St.Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen and Unwin, 1998); Sid Marris ‘History as a weapon for the oppressed’ *The Australian* 19-4-00 p. 34. Norman Davies, in an introduction to his popular and much reprinted *Europe: AHistory*, delivered recently at GleeBooks (Glebe Point Rd., Sydney), pointed out how his aim was to write ‘academically’ for people outside academe, and hinted at the obstruction of his purpose he had encountered in his own academic context. There is a good, balanced discussion of

Footnote 139 continued on the next page

the Albigensian crusades, from a history of the stolen (aboriginal) children, other than the hegemonic position from which the former were often written?¹⁴⁰ Gone today – it seems – are the scholastic debates and revisionist articles about the factuality of this or that time-honoured view concerning remote aspects of the canonical past (Sparta, Periclean Athens, the fall of the Roman Republic or Empire,¹⁴¹ the Coronation of Charlemagne, the Investitures Disputes, the nature of the Norman Conquest, the origins of the crusading movement, of papal absolutism, the origins and rise of capitalism and the middle class etc.) in favour of revelations of hitherto unsuspected (and hence undebated) aspects of gender,

Footnote 139 continued from the previous page

the current state of 'historical objectivity' in Richard J. Evans, *In Defence of History* (London: Granta, 1997) ch. 8. Henry Reynolds himself concludes that 'objective' history still has an important role to play in world affairs: '... events outside the academy reaffirm the moral authority and political potency of history. While it has always been used by the rich and powerful, it is a weapon within the reach of the poor, the oppressed and the disregarded. Though still dressed in her dowdy late-Victorian clothes, Clio can move the world ...' ('The public role of history' *Dissent* 3 [2000] pp. 2-5, esp. p. 5); one is reminded of E. P. Thompson's remark that he was rescuing the 'underclass' from the condescension of history; cf. his *Making History* (N.Y.: New Press, 1994) and *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1980).

¹⁴⁰ See Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centeredness' pp. 60ff; Peter of les Vaux-de-Cernay, already mentioned; Evans, *In Defence* pp. 197-200, important reading.

¹⁴¹ In fairness, it should be said that the scholarly community, insulated from the market by the institution and the professional salaried career, continues to pursue its 'revisionist' studies of the great historical questions of the past and this is no more eminently the case than amongst ancient historians, who keep alive in its purest modern form the spirit of antiquarian enquiry. Thus, in a recent lecture to the University of Sydney ancient history community ('Liber: myth, drama and ideology in the Roman Republic' September 22, 1999), Professor T. P. Wiseman strove to show that ancient Roman republican society *before* the age of writing (i.e., for the first two and a half centuries of its existence) was *not* uncouth and rustic, but had a highly developed dramatic tradition. He used the graphic illustrations on ancient *cistae*, preserved in various museums around the world, to help make his point. Now, while ingenious and entertaining, such an enquiry from a postmodern point of view is relatively 'useless' because (a) no other form of this ancient Roman republican dramatic literature survives to have an impact on us today and since ancient Greek drama is far more richly represented in the modern performing repertoire, we might as well rest content with that, and (b) because a reconstruction for its own sake of certain parameters in a long-dead and otherwise minimally represented society can have no impact on the way we think today about major issues and interests.

the body,¹⁴² the monstrous, prisons, the ‘other’.¹⁴³ It is the very abolition of the marginal in historiography that marks postmodernist pluralism and the extension of medieval chronicling to every minor abbey¹⁴⁴ or principality constitutes a kind of parallel development, on the unclassical principle ‘that one must “sing” history like a hymn in honor of Him who created the world and governs it with justice’.¹⁴⁵ As Ordericus Vitalis wrote,

¹⁴² Caroline Bynum, ‘Why all the fuss about the body? A Medievalist’s perspective’ *Critical Inquiry* 22:1 (1995) 1-33. For the impact of ‘fashion’ on the research publications of a leading scholar of French institutional, intellectual, social and political history, see J. W. Baldwin’s *The Language of Sex: Five Voices from Northern France around 1200* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994). One might also cite my own colleague John Pryor’s paper ‘Stephen of Blois: sensitive new-age crusader or victim of history?’ (*Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association* 20 [1998] pp. 26-74), where a concern for *commenda* contracts, ship-building techniques, pilgrimage human- and horse-traffic, naval combat, Mediterranean sea-currents, and the geopolitical aspects of the crusader movement east are replaced by an interest in the nature of Adela’s marriage to Stephen of Blois, her ‘beauty’ (or lack of it) and comparable topics. For examples even closer to home, see Ward and Bussey, eds., *Worshipping Women*; Patricia Crawford and Philippa Madden, eds., *Women as Australian Citizens: Underlying Histories* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 2001).

¹⁴³ See the currently very fashionable article about historiographical change as fashion: Paul Freedman and Gabrielle M. Spiegel, ‘Medievalisms old and new: the rediscovery of alterity in North American medieval studies’ *American Historical Review* 103 (1998) pp. 677-704. It goes without saying that Spiegel would be very surprised if she were to be told that as a result of a reading of this article all her previous medieval ‘research’ was to be judged not so much as recovery / discovery of ‘new fact / verified ‘true’ historical circumstance’, but rather as an expression of the contemporary wave of fashion and whim that dictated the direction of her claims. Richard Evans, *In Defence of History* p. 148 writes: ‘It may be part of the postmodern turn in historical studies that so much work is now being done on the irrational, the bizarre and the exceptional in the past’ (and note the comment on the outmoding of ‘master-narratives’ p. 150). Evans comments usefully p. 249 on the reasonably ‘objective’ aims of ‘reasonable historiography’ today. Note also the session I chaired at the Second Colloquium of the Australian and New Zealand Association for Medieval and Early Modern Studies, University of Sydney 1-4 February 2000 ‘Rattling the chains: rethinking medieval imprisonment’, with papers by Stephanie Trigg, Megan Cassidy-Welch (who has an A.R.C. grant to work on the topic) and Helen Hickey.

¹⁴⁴ Freeman, ‘Meaning and multi-centredness’ pp. 49, 67, 83.

¹⁴⁵ Jean Leclercq *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God* (1957), trans. Catharine Misrahi (1961, N.Y.: Fordham University Press, 1993) p. 158. For Knappe (‘*Historia*, textuality and *episteme* in the middle ages’ p. 19), ‘In the middle Ages, historiography served to cope with the present ...’. Roest, ‘Memory and the functions of History’ p. 105, writes of ‘history and memory in pre-modern societies’ thus: ‘History was only true insofar as it cohered with contemporary concerns’. The same could be said of Australia today in many areas, from ‘stolen children’ and ‘reconciliation’, to the place of women, the Vietnam War and similar topics.

All the good or bad works performed in the world by the will or the permission of God ought to serve for the glory and edification of the Church; but if men are ignorant of them, how can they contribute to glorify God or to edify the Church?¹⁴⁶

Is this not in some way analogous to the postmodern principle that all things may be chronicled, since they all serve to glorify / illuminate / correct humanity in all its aspects? Christianity, as it promoted *sermo humilis*,¹⁴⁷ brought the humble and the weak into the mainstream of history, just as history today writes in the formerly marginalised and excluded. By contrast, pre-Christian historiography permitted a greater degree of selectivity,¹⁴⁸ stressing in the main the transmission of power, and this emphasis remained paramount throughout 'modern' times. 'Decentredness', however, gathered momentum in Christian times and has remained with us as a sub-theme ever since, whether the history of saints and martyrs, holy women and Queens,¹⁴⁹ beleaguered monasteries, minor towns and

¹⁴⁶ Leclercq, *The Love of Learning* p. 157.

¹⁴⁷ Eric Auerbach, 'Sermo humilis', pp. 25ff of *Literary Language and its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages* (1958), trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1965).

¹⁴⁸ Though some writers, such as Suetonius, strayed into the 'postmodern' by including a study of the contemporary, the ordinary and the biographical (N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, eds, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, [2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970] pp. 1020-21).

¹⁴⁹ See lately Christiane Raynaud, 'La reine dans les Grandes Chroniques de France' in Kooper pp. 226ff; Freeman, 'Cistercian Historical Writing' pp. 80-96; Jennifer Carpenter and Sally-Beth MacLean, eds, *Power of the Weak*, pp. 126-219.

potentates or warriors, peasants and the working classes, social revolutionaries and the history of others who challenged the location of power and privilege.¹⁵⁰

While decentred, diversified historiography today has a long past, the point must not be stressed too far and I will admit to the agenda for my 1997 paper that Freeman duly notes.¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, an adherence to multiple readings of the 'littera', to 'variety, pattern and play' does represent an interesting lack of that focussed conformity aimed at, it seems, by post-1500 A.D. essays on

¹⁵⁰ The vast expansion of the possible historiographical curriculum in schools, universities and among the public today (Evans *In Defence* p. 163 'History has become too diverse ...') must be largely *additional* to the older curriculum, if it is to have full effect. This in itself creates problems of focus, bibliographical control and the sheer digestion of the ever-growing bulk of sources, discussions, data-bases, bibliographies, internet sites and other accessible information sources. These difficulties in turn create a need for choice, and whilst formerly choice between – say – this church or that, this political controversy / figure or that, this major idea or that, this war or that, entailed no real marginalisation of effort, the vastly wider range of choice facing students and readers today can result in a major loss of focus and perspective. This has led Geoffrey Bolton to assert in recent fora [the latest being his 'University of Sydney Sesquicentenary Distinguished lecture' 'All downhill from Barton? Educating Australia's political leaders'] that the politician of tomorrow will know a great deal more about Australia than his or her predecessors – Menzies, Whitlam, Barton and others – but a great deal less about the world and history in general. Thus, an interest in, say, 'stolen children' or Tudor / Stuart notions of fatherhood must be contextualised within the power and property systems of the day which created such notions and practices. Further, to understand many other aspects of such societies, a student or teacher will need to know and teach how these power and property systems were created and operated. This may be a problem, given the declining study of history today, the declining supply of teachers of history and the dwindling number of history 'slots' within the new range of school and university 'options'. Such problems could, of course, be alleviated by some comprehensive expansion of historical / humanist teaching / study of history, such as the notion that all vocational or technical or tertiary training (music, architecture, medicine, computer systems, marketing, engineering, the sciences and similar) must be preceded by a tertiary qualification in the humanities (including environmental studies), but such a requirement must be viewed in the present political climate as utopian. Indeed, one of the factors making possible the very diversification of the historical curriculum I am discussing in this note, is the very abandonment of a reformist 'perspective' on social and political issues by government and society in general.

¹⁵¹ 'Obviously it allows Ward to respond to those Renaissance commentators who claim the Renaissance to be the birth of the modern, by pointing out that today the 'modern' is in fact terribly outdated'. Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centredness' p. 56.

historiography.¹⁵² It also enables me to embrace under the umbrella of 'historiography' genres that perplex Freeman, and to exclude 'philosophical texts, legal texts and so on'¹⁵³ because they do not function as representations of the alleged past as such, and if by chance they do,¹⁵⁴ then they should enjoy a place in the medieval historiographical panorama, even if Renaissance strictures and modern tastes have banished them from the canon of historical writings.¹⁵⁵

A further consequence of an emphasis upon multiple readings of the 'littera', upon 'variety, pattern and play' brings us to another criticism Freeman advances in regard to my 1997 paper, that I fail to appreciate a parallelism between the medieval and the postmodern approaches to history-writing that arises out of the already-cited paper by Spiegel and Freedman:¹⁵⁶ that (post)modern and medieval historians betray a similar paradox, as they seek (in critical circumstances) identity and security from an emphasis upon (historical) tradition and continuity, while at the same time effacing it. Freedman and Spiegel note 'the simultaneity of our desire for history and the recognition of its irreparable loss'.¹⁵⁷ Elsewhere Spiegel erects this idea into an elegiac lament for the impossibility of secure historical knowledge and the ever-present urge for it.¹⁵⁸

As Knappe has acutely shown, however, the status of 'historical knowledge' as sign¹⁵⁹ is no novelty: Cicero makes much of history as a flexible, purpose- and audience-oriented, memory-based recall of events and persons that have disappeared: 'history is the actual life-form of social memory'.¹⁶⁰ Medieval historians were very much aware of Ciceronian rhetorical theory,¹⁶¹ and there is

¹⁵² See Black's paper as cited above; Freeman 'Meaning and multi-centeredness' p. 55.

¹⁵³ Freeman would exclude genres such as 'medieval Romance', 'dramatic texts'. See, on the whole point, Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centeredness' p. 55.

¹⁵⁴ Bernard Silvester's *Cosmographia* for example, or Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus*?

¹⁵⁵ See the remarks of Spiegel, 'Theory into practice', ed. Kooper p. 1. 'But medieval historiography does this in a particularly disturbing way ...'.

¹⁵⁶ Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centredness' pp. 56-63.

¹⁵⁷ Cited by Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centeredness' p. 54. The phrase is repeated in Spiegel, 'Theory into practice: reading medieval chronicles', Kooper p. 10.

¹⁵⁸ Spiegel, 'Theory into practice' pp. 10-11.

¹⁵⁹ Spiegel, 'Theory into practice' p. 11; Joachim Knappe, 'Historiography as Rhetoric' (circulated paper at the second Utrecht Chronicles Conference, July, 1999) p. 1.

¹⁶⁰ Knappe, pp. 1-2, esp. p. 1, referring to the second book of Cicero's *De oratore*.

¹⁶¹ See Morse, *Truth and Convention* intro. and ch. 1 for example.

no reason to doubt that they were also aware of the importance of linguistic and rhetorical reconstruction of the past as part of the paradox of desirable yet impossible knowledge. Indeed, Spiegel has herself argued that linguistic innovations in thirteenth-century French historical writing are an illustration of the ‘premise’ ‘that social groups most affected by changes in status tend to be the most conscious of alternative modes of discursive behavior, that they are, in other words, most sensitive to the power of language’.¹⁶² Such an assertion prepares us for the burden of what I have already hinted at above, that medieval historiographical and the most recent western historiographical practice represents a discursive response to the removal of a stable and assured institutional context: ‘modern’ historiography has been in recent times the creation of assured and funded research and tertiary teaching institutions, whilst postmodern practice ‘flourishes’ in a nether-world in which these institutions are, on the one hand, under-funded, depreciated in value and stripped of social prestige or support, and on the other, rivalled by ‘public’ history, fiction, journalistic history and other practices that are to be found in the market-place, outside the institution.¹⁶³

So in medieval times, prior to the twelfth century, history had a flexible, rhetorical place outside the official curriculum of studies set up by the institutions

¹⁶² ‘Theory into practice’ p. 5.

¹⁶³ As an example, I could cite the brochure for ‘History Week’ in N.S.W. (Sat. Sept. 19th-26th 1999): from almost 100 items, only four dealt with topics outside Australia, and among ‘currently available lectures’ (i.e. being given as part of courses running at the time) only the topics of ‘sex and scandal’, ‘cultural transmission’ and ‘living memory’ were offered. The only reference to the middle ages was a ‘Galop de Salon’ entitled ‘Jeanne d’Arc’ performed by Associate-Professor R. I. Jack in a concert entitled ‘Victorian Masterpieces’! Presumably more European and medieval material was not offered because the organisers did not think to contact specialists in those fields ... because they felt the presumed audience was not interested. So drastic has become the ‘departure’ of young people from ‘academic history’ that the Australian Federal Minister for Education has recently commissioned ‘a national inquiry into the teaching of history in schools ... to halt the steady drop in students studying the subject over the past decade’ (*The Sydney Morning Herald* 11/10/1999 p. 12). R. I. Moore has aptly put his finger on one of the major shortcomings of ‘academic’ history lately. ‘European historiography [he says] has suffered increasingly in recent decades from a surplus of data and a shortage of new questions ...’ (*Modern Asian Studies* 31:3 [1997] p. 601. On ‘the flight from history in recent years’ see Stuart Macintyre and Peter McPhee, eds, *Max Crawford’s School of History: Proceedings of a Symposium held at the University of Melbourne 14 December 1998* (Melbourne: History Department, University of Melbourne, 2000) p. 48.

of the day, and only an incipient place within the curriculum of Biblical and exegetical studies as the literal meaning of a (sacred) text. This latter place was considerably strengthened and given pronounced chronological and eschatological emphasis by Bede, in his *De temporum ratione*.¹⁶⁴ In the twelfth century, with Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Comestor, Joachim of Fiore¹⁶⁵ and other scholars, the investment of theology and exegesis in history received further impetus, and as the place of monastery and church in society became both extended and threatened, history, on the one hand, took on the form of a more specialised research activity closely associated with the pretensions and alleged pasts of new orders (Cistercian,¹⁶⁶ Franciscan, Dominican), and, on the other, ceased to be a vital activity for the new pattern of institutionalisation that stressed instead scholastic truth and salvational certainty (the universities).

In fact, there is every reason to see medieval historiography as a tough plant that flourished because of diversity and challenge: threatened nobles responded to challenges with compositions in prose or verse,¹⁶⁷ new market niches were found in the areas of genealogy, new national groupings and chivalry.¹⁶⁸ The base definition of the historiographical genre in the period was the representation or reading of an alleged past event or set of events.¹⁶⁹ Such readings / representations could be patently fictitious,¹⁷⁰ or passionately

¹⁶⁴ See the excellent translation and commentary by Faith Wallis, *Bede: the Reckoning of Time*, and note 107 above.

¹⁶⁵ Ambrogio Piazzoni, 'Geschichte studieren: warum und wie? Die Antwort des *Chronicon* Hugos von S. Viktor', ed. Kooper [pp. 212-225] p. 223.

¹⁶⁶ Freeman, 'Meaning and multi-centredness' pp. 60ff, esp. p. 63 and cf. her paper 'The many functions of Cistercian histories, using Aelred of Rievaulx's *Relatio de Standardo* as a case study', in Kooper ed. pp. 124-32.

¹⁶⁷ Spiegel, *Romancing the Past*; W. C. Calin, *The Old French Epic of Revolt: Raoul de Cambrai, Renaud de Montauban, Gormond et Isembard* (Geneva: Droz, 1962).

¹⁶⁸ See the papers by Kennedy, Ainsworth, Goerlitz, Grzesik and Kowalska in Kooper.

¹⁶⁹ I do not share Freeman's worries, 'Meaning and multi-centeredness' p. 59.

¹⁷⁰ As in the case of the events related by Pons of Provence at the beginning of his course of dictaminal lectures: L. Delisle 'Les Écoles d'Orléans au douzième et au treizième siècle' *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire de France* 7 (1869) pp. 150-52: 'As I was wandering anxious by mountain plain and valley, I encountered a certain maiden and was at once quite stricken with love for her ...'; compare the alleged circumstances with which Dante opens his *Divine Comedy*, and with which Brunetto Latini opens his *Tesoretto*: 'perdei il gran cammino, e tenni a la traversa d'una selva diversa' etc.; p. 12 of Julia B. Holloway, ed. and trans., *Brunetto Latini 'Il Tesoretto' ['The Little Treasure']* (New York: Garland, 1981).

factual,¹⁷¹ but they all represented frontline engagements between intellectuals or readers and their lay public, with only minimal insulation derived from the institution. As the shorings of patronage, the religious institution, independent wealth and the tertiary teaching or research institute that characterized ‘modern’ historiography retreat, we are today faced with another engagement between the tough plant of the historiographical impulse and the lay public,¹⁷² not unlike that familiar to us from the middle ages.

Nevertheless, we ought not engage in the classifying of medieval historiography as universally ‘this’ or ‘that’. Close attention to modern debate reveals instead an intriguing oscillation between the rhetorical / postmodern on

¹⁷¹ For example, the chronicle of Dino Compagni, ed. Gino Luzzatto (Turin: Einaudi 1968), trans. D.E.Bornstein (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1986). See the comments of Bagge, *The European Legacy* pp. 1337ff.

¹⁷² In which the nature of academic’ historiographical topics abandons time-honoured and canonically approved themes, moving closer to subjects and aspects that can be readily appreciated and understood ‘in the street’. Thus a specialist in Machiavelli’s Italy will write a (most carefully and imaginatively researched) book on modern Australian women travellers to Europe (Ros Pesman *Duty Free: Australian Women Abroad* [Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1996]). ‘Daily life’ topics abound, such as masculinity, electrification of the Australian home, shop-fronts and commercial history, recent tourism and travel history, contemporary sex and sexuality history, popular culture in its many aspects and Australian historical studies generally. These gradually supersede topics drawn from the major epochs and themes of European and American history. Even within older fields (such as medieval studies) topics selected for research attention have moved closer to more broadly understood and experienced paradigms – ‘tears’, ‘women’s emotional / religious experiences’, ‘death and the family’ (Z. Janekovic-Römer ‘“Pro anima mea et predecessorum meorum”’: death and the family in fifteenth-century Dubrovnik’ *Medium Aevum Quotidianum* [*Otium: Journal of Everyday Life History*] 35 [1996] 25-33), various aspects of social history, motherhood, childhood, masculinity, consolation, death, sainthood, popular religion and folk beliefs, witchcraft and such replace topics that have to do with the institutional church, medieval government, economic structures, Latin culture and scholasticism. ‘Discourse-’ or ‘representation-’ oriented’ topics replace attempts to locate and describe the ‘objectively real’ that lies behind the discourse / representation. Texts that used to be ‘shaken for facts’ and turned into ‘documents’, are now reverently edited according to the several versions in which they have come down to us, and left to speak for themselves. Topics such as the inquisition, torture, imprisonment flourish because they contrast so markedly with modern liberal impulses. Alterity, the bodily, the monstrous flourish: ‘Favoured topics of scholars interested in alterity include such themes as the grotesque, contagion, disorder, pain, death and, in short, anything which destabilises identity’ (Freeman, ‘Meaning and multi-centredness’ p. 53). See above at nn. 138-40, 142 etc.

the one hand, and the philologically / methodologically empirical on the other. Whether this is a phenomenon that can be given chronological patterning (as suggested above) or whether it represents the eternal elegiac nostalgia referred to by Gabrielle Spiegel, the tension between, on the one hand, 'a kind of mourning for the unpossessed (or lost) "other"', and, on the other hand, 'our desire for history ... a longing for presence, a presence we simultaneously acknowledge as always already absent ... the desire for history ... the desire to recuperate the past or the other',¹⁷³ may be left to the speculations of the readers of this journal.

*Department of History
University of Sydney*

¹⁷³ 'Theory into practice' ed. Kooper p. 10. Dr Stephanie Trigg (English, University of Melbourne), in a lecture to the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Sydney, on 22nd September 1999 'Chaucerian voices: becoming Chaucerian at the end of the twentieth century' made the comparable point that the modern 'scholarly community' conducting research into Chaucer's life and writings acts as a kind of 'consolation' for the 'loss' of authorial presence felt by the modern scholar.

APPENDIX A

Content Analysis of William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*
and Henry of Huntingdon's *Historia anglorum*

(Each topic is followed by an approximate estimate of the percentage of space allocated in William's chronicle, followed by the amount of space allocated in Henry's, according to the translations by J. A. Giles [1847, the translation by Mynors-Thomson-Winterbottom not being available when the analysis was conducted], and Diana Greenway [1996]. As with the second appendix, percentages do not in the case of each author add up to exactly 100% owing to the necessarily approximate working methods used)

<i>Topic</i>	William	<i>Henry</i>
1. prologue; prefatory material	2.53%	0.99%
2. background descriptions or 'digressions', of a geographical, historical, ethnographical sort.	0%	2.35%
3. Deeds of kings, rulers (incl. Julius Caesar, Roman Emperors, especially those relevant to English history, some Queens and their daughters)	42%	37.45%
4. History of tribes or peoples	0%	1.36%
5. History of the Church and churchmen, including, in William's case, saints and monasteries, letters of churchmen, much continental material and female ecclesiastical learning	26.45%	20.12%
6. Continental secular history, including the Normans; mainly, in William's case, French and Norman (while still separate from England), Charlemagne and his successors	7.06%	0.96%

7. the <i>pagani</i> ; Vikings, and, for William, Danish and Norwegian rulers	2%	8.16%
8. <i>gesta dominarum</i> , i.e. aristocratic women	0.31%	0.74%
9. crusading matters	12.77%	3.28%
10. Biblical, OT history, Hellenistic, Roman history, Persian, medieval imperial history to Conrad III (7/3/1138)	1.72%	6.18%
11. <i>Historia Brittonum</i> , Arthurian material	0.09%	3.21%
12. occult, non-hagiographic miracles, marvels and wonders	4.78%	0%
13. Moralising themes	0.046%	15.2%

APPENDIX B

A Content Analysis of Matthew Paris's annals for the last four years of his original version (1247-50), using the categories presented in Appendix A. %'s are approximate only and are rounded out for the paper.

1: 0.12%	3: 16.75%	4: 2.95%
5: 36.5%	6: 11.83%	8: 0.98%
9: 25.1%	12: 5.91%	

