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In contrasting the world of monastic learning with that of the cathedral schools, Sir Richard Southern said of the twelfth-century student, "He not only knew where to study, he also knew that his studies would have a market value." The schools, in Southern's words, "brought the idea of ... order and rationality into every area of human experience." In the early twelfth century, "slowly the ruling households of Europe, at all levels from the papal court to the household of a minor baron, were penetrated by men calling themselves masters, or as we should say, university men." This theme, the significant place of the schools in the formation of the twelfth-century state, permeates Southern's study of the period.¹

The key role of the northern French cathedral schools in the growth of Anglo-Norman administration—civil and ecclesiastic—is a near textbook example, which no doubt was very much in Southern's thinking when he wrote these statements. Names come to mind almost unbidden: John of Salisbury, Arnulf of Lisieux, Hugh of Amiens, Rotrou of Rouen, Gilbert Foliot, Gerald of Wales—men whose ascent up the Anglo-Norman ladder depended on schooling as well as (or even instead of) birth. Today we know them—in some instances, know them best—for their writings. Their contemporaries knew and honored (or feared, or disliked) them as well for their positions as, respectively, bishop of Chartres, bishop of Lisieux, archbishop of Rouen, bishop of Evreux who became archbishop of Rouen, bishop of London, and bishop-elect of St. Davids. Although only two of these were major literati, all were learned, all had been "schooled."

In the present paper we want to pursue this theme through the life of one such man whose career has been neglected: Philip of Harcourt, bishop of Bayeux from 1142 to 1163.² He wrote nothing that survives, which explains why he receives scant notice in surveys of the twelfth-
century Renaissance. His principal claim to notice has been his library, the 140 volumes that he left to the abbey of Bec. Although the books themselves, with slight exception, are not known today, the contemporary catalog of the collection provides much information.

Philip played a significant role in the transmission of ancient Latin authors. His library included such uncommon works as Cicero's *De academi-cis*, *De finibus*, Caesarian orations, and philosophical corpus; Seneca's *Natural History*, the Younger Pliny's letters, and Pomponius Mela's *De chorographia*. We have examined the list of Philip's books many times for what it may reveal about the transmission and dissemination of rare texts. Here we propose instead to examine it for the writings of Philip's contemporaries, and to use the books to illuminate the man.

We begin with the biographical information that can be assembled from the records, not a negligible quantity. Philip came from a significant though not princely Anglo-Norman family. His father Robert I fitz Anschetil was lord of Harcourt, a sizable holding midway between Evreux and Lisieux. Philip was one of, apparently, eight sons. In common with many Norman nobles, members of the Harcourt family held land on both sides of the Channel. The maternal side of Philip's ancestry is uncertain, but it seems likely that his mother was a sister of Philip of Briouze, lord of Bramber.

Philip's life was ineluctably shaped by the patronage of Waleran, count of Meulan, who was overlord of Harcourt and (given his consistent fostering of Philip's career) doubtless a kinsman as well. Waleran is reputed to have been a learned man, who not only read Latin but composed Latin verse that was admired by contemporaries. Geoffrey of Monmouth sought his patronage, upon the publication of the *Historia regum Britanniae*. Waleran's twin brother Robert, earl of Leicester, enjoyed a similar reputation for learning. Philip's early formation, then, may have benefited from his association with this literate household.

Philip's library, as we shall see, reveals the schoolman in several specific ways, just as his success as an administrator betokens training in both laws. We have no explicit information about Philip's schooling, no mention in document or letter, and we must rely on a combination of deduction and analogy. Given his geographical location, it is likely that at least a part of his studies were at the cathedral school of Chartres. Philip's friend and contemporary Arnulf of Lisieux studied there in the late 1120s-early 1130s, it is thought, before going to Italy to study law; and Philip's and Arnulf's younger contemporary John of Salisbury later studied at Chartres. Count Waleran's cousin Rotrou, bishop of Evreux, arch-
bishop of Rouen, and perhaps a distant kinsman of Philip's, is known to have studied with Gilbert de la Poreé; probably this also took place at Chartres, where Gilbert was chancellor. At least one of Philip's books seems to have been written by Chartres scribes. Orléans, too, is a good possibility for at least some of his schooling—again, to judge from the fact that some of the rarer texts that he owned were disseminated from twelfth-century Orléans. As the contents of his library suggest, he was trained in the ars, including the study of formal composition in speaking and epistolary style based on the models of classical and patristic letters and orations; and he read as well in theology and both civil and canon law, whether or not he had formal schooling in these disciplines.

Philip's first living, the rectory of Sompting in Sussex, derived from his maternal uncle (?), Philip de Briouze, lord of Bramber. Thereafter, his rise in the church was rapid, aided almost entirely by his connection with Count Waleran of Meulan. Before 1131, he became dean of Holy Trinity at Beaumont-le-Roger, burial place of the counts of Meulan and a dependency of Lincoln Cathedral, within the gift of Count Waleran. Thereafter, Philip became archdeacon of Evreux, Waleran's "neighborhood cathedral," and then dean of Lincoln Cathedral, during the episcopacy of Alexander (1123-1148). The precise dates are debatable, but these three steps must have been taken in very short order.

Philip was in England in a time of civil war; and in 1139, as a protégé of King Stephen's supporter Count Waleran, he was made chancellor of Stephen's government. In December of that same year Roger, bishop of Salisbury, died; and Philip of Harcourt resigned the chancellorship, to free himself to fill the vacancy—to which, as anticipated, he was named by King Stephen, at Waleran's urging. But support of the royal court was not adequate to overcome the objections of the cathedral chapter at Salisbury, who refused to elect Stephen's nominee Philip. The fact that Bishop Roger had died while imprisoned by King Stephen may have helped to make the Salisbury chapter a bit testy. At any rate, it was likely in the course of this melodrama that Philip became possessed of a reliquary, "an arm, gold plated and adorned with precious stones," from the treasury of Salisbury Cathedral—which he kept until he was persuaded to return it in 1148. This was the arm-reliquary of St. Aldhelm that had been given to Salisbury in the eleventh century by St. Osmund.

The setback in Philip's career was only temporary, for within three years he was elected bishop of Bayeux in Normandy, a position he held from 1142 until his death in 1163. With Stephen's capture by Angevin forces in 1141, Philip's patron Waleran had recognized that the future in Normandy lay with the Angevins, and had pragmatically shifted his
Continental allegiance to Geoffrey of Anjou in order to safeguard the family's Norman lands. Philip's election to Bayeux must have been part of an overall exchange of tokens between Waleran and Geoffrey. Subsequently, however, Waleran's relations with the Angevins cooled markedly as he flirted too openly with the French Crown. Apparently, Philip successfully distanced himself from Waleran in this matter; his tenure at Bayeux was marked from beginning to end by civil, and ultimately cordial, relations with the House of Anjou.

Normandy during the English anarchy, left largely on its own, had witnessed an upsurge in local autonomy, with the emphasis on survival of the fittest. The church, and especially the bishops, were for the most part faithful to Stephen. The turning point in the reestablishment of ducal authority in Normandy came, as we have seen, just before Philip took office. Geoffrey of Anjou, secure in his alliance with Robert of Gloucester, by 1141 dominated much of the south and west of Normandy; and by the spring of 1144 he received the submission of Rouen. Philip administered the see of Bayeux under Geoffrey duke of Normandy from 1144 until the spring of 1150, when Geoffrey gave the duchy to his son Henry, the future Henry II of England. At that time it was necessary for Philip once again to adapt to the court of a new ruler, though the adjustment was not so difficult as that in the period 1142-1144, no doubt; and for the last fourteen years of his life he worked effectively in and with Henry's court.

The Norman cathedral of Bayeux, consecrated in 1077 under Bishop Odo, had been burnt down in 1105 by Odo's nephew Henry I. Of Odo's cathedral, only the square towers and the crypt remained. The visible devastation of the building's fabric symbolized the financial ruin of the see itself. Philip's immediate predecessors, Bishop Richard II and his nephew Bishop Richard III, could not or would not withstand the encroachments of their assertive kinsman Robert, earl of Gloucester, who was the principal lay power in the diocese. This bastard son of Henry I was also the indispensable ally of Geoffrey of Anjou, who was not eager to alienate his supporter in order to benefit the new bishop of Bayeux whose political past was suspect, from an Angevin viewpoint. The great Norman abbeys like Fécamp and Troarn had also helped themselves to rights, privileges, and property at the expense of the bishops of Bayeux—no doubt largely a matter of self-preservation during the breakdown of authority.

Philip set about restoring his diocese. Much of the present cathedral was built or planned by him, with the six bays of the nave having been completed under his episcopacy and the gothic windows and buttresses
in the time of his successors. Along with his rebuilding in stone, Philip must have spent even more of his time and energy in rebuilding the episcopal authority, with the estates, rents, rights, and privileges pertaining to it; this was Philip's major undertaking, begun immediately and pursued relentlessly throughout his episcopacy. All the techniques at his disposal were brought to bear in this matter: his influence with Rome, and with the duke, and his knowledge of law. He was so zealous in this area that Haskins considered him instrumental in the development of the jury of presentment or inquest. Philip traveled back and forth to Rome at least three times, to secure the written instruments he needed. He was there in 1144 during the brief pontificate of Lucius II; we know, from the protocol of a trial held at the Curia, that he was present in Rome (still? again?), together with Archbishop Hugh of Sens and bishops Arnauld of Lisieux, Albero of Liège, Benedict of Orléans, and Bernard of Saragossa, on 15 February 1145 (N.S.)—the day when Lucius II died and the day of Eugenius III's election; and he went twice more (in 1146 and in 1150 or 1151) during the term of Eugenius III. Three bulls from Lucius, reissued virtually unchanged by Eugenius, herald the upswing in Bayeux's fortunes: (1) The first confirms to Philip all the possessions of the diocese (including rights and rents, as well as real property), itemized in prosaic detail; Philip had obviously arrived in Rome well briefed, with his claims indisputably documented. (2) The second called upon all the faithful in the diocese—abbots, priors, clergy, laity—to help Philip in his task of recovering his rights, ordering them to hand over any of the bishop's property that they might hold illegally, and nullifying all exchanges, sales, or gifts of Bayeux property by all bishops since Odo—an attempt to roll back the clock forty-five years at one go. (3) The third was addressed to Duke Geoffrey (just as a future one would be addressed to Duke Henry, as soon as he took the reins in Normandy), reminding him that Henry I in an earlier day had held inquests (or assizes, or recognitiones) to determine the possessions of the see, and asking Geoffrey to order a new recognitio to help restore Bayeux as it had been. (The purpose of Henry I's inquests, by contrast, had been to benefit the Crown, a difference that the pope did not dwell on.) Geoffrey, in response, not only ordered recognitiones on Philip's behalf (i.e., juries of inquest taking sworn information from people who knew), but he even empowered Philip to order recognitiones on his own initiative, and to compel compliance as if the order had come from the duke.

Philip's methods were those of a schoolman: He went after his goals armed with the written word—the right, effective words, written by those (the pope, the duke) whose words had power among lesser lords, lay and
ecclesiastic. Without an army, but simply by knowing how to use the written word and the law courts effectively, Philip persisted until he gradually established in law the see's rights, and secured the observation of those rights. (Actually, he never did quite compel submission from Robert of Gloucester, who made many promises but delivered nothing; but Philip outlived him, which had much the same effect.)

Philip's reliance on the power of documentation is visible in the well-known *Livre noir* of Bayeux, the cathedral cartulary that contains documents dating from the early eleventh century until the early fourteenth. As the *Livre noir*'s editor Bourrienne noted, the manuscript begins with a segment written in a single early thirteenth-century hand which has copied the first 213 charters, from the earliest (1035–1037) until 1205; later hands continued to record until the second decade of the fourteenth century. If we look beneath the surface of the opening segment, however, we can recognize a unit within a unit: almost certainly, its kernel is the archive that Philip assembled to place the privileges, liberties, immunities, and possessions of his diocese on unassailable legal grounds. Roughly one hundred of these 213 charters date from the twenty-one years of Philip's episcopate, compared with only ninety-eight for the following forty-two years. More distinctive still is the amount, and especially the nature, of the documentation in this segment that dates from before Philip's accession. There are only some fifteen of these earlier charters. Of them, nine are grants, or confirmations of grants, that date from Odo's day; this reminds us that papal bulls nullified all sales, gifts, or exchanges "since the time of Bishop Odo." The one still earlier charter, dated 1035–1037, is an inventory of diocesan lands and possessions drawn up by Bishop Hugh II; we recall that Philip's first concession from the papacy, in 1144, was papal confirmation of an inventory of Bayeux's possessions, which was itemized in terms similar to this. Of the only five charters in the *Livre noir* that date from the anarchic period between Odo's death and Philip's accession, all but one are *acta* of Henry I of England confirming or restoring rights of Bayeux as they had been at various previous times; and here we recall that, although the papal bulls nullified any loss the diocese had suffered, nothing was said to disqualify any gains enjoyed "since the time of Bishop Odo." It does not stretch the imagination to see in these early charters the documentation that Philip had gathered up to take with him to Rome, when he first set out in 1144 to put his episcopal house back in order.

The twelfth-century prelates of Normandy comprised a small interwoven society of familiar faces. For example, two successive deans of Philip's
cathedral became his colleagues as successive bishops of Coutances: Richard I de Bohun, seen in 1146 as dean of Bayeux, became bishop of Coutances in 1150; he was succeeded as bishop by William III de Tournebu, seen as dean of Bayeux in 1153 (his bishopric ends before 1183). Philip himself belonged to the inner cadre of four who at mid-century firmly ran the Norman church and served the often absent king-duke in the government of the duchy: Hugh of Amiens, archbishop of Rouen 1130–1164; Rotrou, bishop of Evreux 1139–1165; Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux 1142–1184; and Philip, bishop of Bayeux 1142–1163. The four were colleagues, and perhaps something more, centering on the figure of the archbishop. Hugh of Amiens (b. ca. 1095) was successively prior of St-Martial of Limoges, abbot of Reading, and (during the whole of Philip's episcopacy) archbishop of Rouen. Trained at the cathedral school of Laon, Hugh wrote several works of theology and exegesis, including *Contrahereticos sui temporis, De fide catholica, In laudem memoriae, Questiones theologicae* (or *Dialogi*), and *Tractatus in hexaemeron* (or *In Genesim I–3*). It is not only by virtue of his office but by virtue of these writings that Hugh of Amiens links his three suffragans: two of Hugh's works—the *Dialogi* and *De fide*—appear on the list of books that Rotrou (Hugh's successor as archbishop) left to the cathedral of Rouen. A third work, the Genesis commentary, which was praised by Bernard of Clairvaux, bore a dedication to Hugh's "dearest son, the learned Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux." Philip completes the circle, for he also owned something of Hugh's. We cannot tell which, since the booklist says simply *Liber Hugonis archiepiscopi;* perhaps it was the *Contrahereticos*, the most widely circulated of Hugh's works.

Assertive, capable, and learned, these four prelates in addition enjoyed the happy accident of exceptionally long tenures shared concurrently, providing an unexpected bedrock of stability beneath the agitated surface of Norman affairs through the middle of the twelfth century.

Philip was the first bishop of Bayeux since Odo to play an important role in the government of the duchy. He was one of the entourage of Norman bishops who accompanied the duke to England for his coronation as Henry II in 1154. Philip's role in Duke Henry's administration comes to the surface particularly for the period after the duke was crowned, because English records survive in much greater measure than do Continental ones. Following the coronation we see Philip attesting royal charters issued from every corner of Henry's sprawling domain, ranging from Périgueux down in Aquitaine to York in the north of England. At least sixty-one of Henry II's *acta* have Philip as witness. Not surprisingly, the largest group of these (fifteen) were issued at Rouen, capital of the duchy and seat of the Norman archdiocese, where both Henry and Philip
were apt to find themselves, not necessarily on joint errands. Another three emanated from Bayeux itself. Of the remainder, seventeen were issued from various English sites, and twenty-six from different locales in Henry's Continental domains. Philip was joined as witness by Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux on forty-three occasions, and in nineteen instances by Bishop Rotrou of Evreux. His appearance as a witness indicates, of course, that Philip was frequently in attendance upon the king and his itinerant court, and that the king found him reliable—just as, in 1161, the king is said to have entrusted Philip with taking a message to Pope Alexander III during the schism, although age ultimately prevented Philip from making the journey.

Philip seems on occasion to have wielded extensive authority in Normandy on the duke's behalf. At the same time that Philip was employing the process of the sworn inquest to reestablish and maintain the rights of his see, Henry II was extending the use of this process throughout the duchy; a regularized procedure of ducal justice was especially necessary after the coronation in 1154, when Henry divided his time between the Continent and England. For this purpose he resurrected the post of justiciar of Normandy, to act as chief judicial officer of the duchy in the duke's absence. There were ordinarily two of these at one time, most often the seneschal of Normandy and a Norman bishop, or other combinations, on a rotating basis. Philip's confreres Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, and Rotrou, then bishop of Evreux, served as justiciars during this period. Not surprisingly, in at least two surviving documents Philip too seems to act in this capacity—once with Robert de Neubourg, seneschal of Normandy, and the second time in tandem with Bishop Rotrou, the seneschal's brother.

Thus, Philip's ecclesiastical career, which crossed over the Channel and back, was paralleled by a career in civil administration on both sides of the water, as Stephen's chancellor in England in young manhood, as a member of Henry II's traveling entourage and witness to his charters in England in ca. 1154–1155 and on the Continent ca. 1156–1163, and perhaps as Henry II's justiciar in Normandy. Arnulf of Lisieux asserted that Philip was, "in the deliberations of the king, as in the affairs of the church, both welcome and effective."

The full extent of his involvement in the Angevin administration can only be surmised, given the paucity of Continental records—which is a pity. To judge from what is known about him, Philip had both the nature and the training of a model civil servant, and was doubtless employed more frequently than the surviving evidence documents.
According to the *Chronicle* of Robert of Torigny (d. 1186), Philip had intended to retire at the end of his life to the abbey of Bec (just as his friend Arnulf of Lisieux was to end his days, and leave his books, with the abbey of St-Victor), but death intervened; however, Robert adds, Philip had already given the abbey 140 books. A copy of the list of Philip’s books survives, on the first flyleaf of Avranches Bibliothèque municipale MS 159 (fol. 1v), in a hand not much later than the date of his death. Also, beginning on the second flyleaf (fols. 2–3), a different hand of similar date has enrolled a list of books in the Bec library. Avranches 159, written at Mont-St-Michel, is a book of histories that begins with Eusebius and his continuators and ends with the last redaction of Robert of Torigny’s *Chronicle*. Robert was a monk at Bec from 1128 until he left in 1154 for Mont-St-Michel, where he was abbot until his death in 1186. He had been an avid builder of Bec’s library, and after his move he commissioned books for Mont-St-Michel to be copied from Bec exemplars. To all appearances, Avranches 159 is Robert’s own copy of his *Chronicle*. His interest in securing copies of the books at Bec may explain the presence of the two Bec booklists on the flyleaves, but that point is uncertain.

Philip’s list is headed “Tituli librorum quos dedit Philippus episcopus Baiocensis ecclesie Becci” (“Titles of the books that Philip bishop of Bayeux gave to the congregation of Bec”). The two opening words are written in display letters and the entire heading is slashed in red, with the next eight lines spaciously arranged. But then the writer decided that he wanted the whole text on one page, and he compressed the remainder of the list into forty-three long lines. Individual volumes (each of which may contain several works) are distinguished by the formula *In alia*, slashed in red. The body of the list appears to have been rapidly copied (presumably from the original at Bec), to judge from the minor slips of the eye. At the end of the list is the note, “Summa uolumnum .cxiii. exceptis .xxvii. uoluminibus quos [sic] dedit episcopus sed nondum habuerunt”. (“Total number of volumes 113, not counting twenty-seven volumes which the bishop gave but which they [i.e., the Bec monks] do not yet have”). The flyleaf list describes the 113 volumes; the missing twenty-seven, which would raise the total to the 140 cited by Robert of Torigny, have not been identified.

The second list, headed “Tituli librorum Beccensis almarii” (“Titles of the books in the Bec library”), is not as straightforward as it looks. It apparently represents an integration of Philip’s books with other books at Bec, to judge from the frequent duplications of one list by the other.
Indeed, in some instances it seems as if his volumes have been taken apart and rebound with other works at Bec to form new codices (containing the works of a single author, or works on a single topic); any search for survivors from Philip of Harcourt’s collection must take the possibility of rearrangement into account. The list does not appear to be a complete inventory of the Bec library, however, since a significant number of Philip’s books do not reappear here; moreover, it seems to be a composite of an older list and of a partial revision with certain authors grouped together—which results in some duplication.

Unfortunately, history has not lent a helping hand in reconstructing Philip’s library; neither he nor Bec’s librarian left an ex libris mark on their books themselves, although a distinctive table of contents was entered in some of Bec’s books before the end of the twelfth century. No later Bec inventory survives. It is a hopeful sign that the surviving manuscripts thought to have been Philip’s, few though they are, have been identified just within the last dozen years or so. For now, however, the two lists contain the bulk of our knowledge of his books.

For Philip, the written word—instrument of the secular schools as represented in the *ars dictaminis* and in legal training, in collections of model letters and law codes—was the basis of his power. The list of his books vividly reflects this attitude. Philip owned the books of the early twelfth century, books embodying the codification of subjects, books relevant to the professional ecclesiastical administrator: exegetical texts, law codes, dictaminal models, histories. His collections of ancient letters and orations—the Younger Pliny, a very great deal of Cicero, and even Ennodius, a rare find—would have served as models of style for a training in *dictamen*, a discipline of increasing formality though not as yet well served by manuals, and one that led to training in the law. Like later generations, Philip saw books as useful instruments, part of the equipment of his profession; and throughout his life, it seems, he continued to acquire new works as they appeared.

Naturally, much of his library was commonplace. The standard works of the Fathers—Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Gregory, and others—comprise about a third of his collection; and he had kept, as one tends to do, a handful of very elementary schoolbooks—rhetoric, geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and the like. What makes us value the collection, in contrast, is its indication that Philip kept abreast of what was new, and never ceased to acquire the very latest books that were of use. Thus he owned many works written by his contemporaries, both older and younger, such as Gerald of York (d. 1108), Petrus Alfonsus (d. ca. 1115), Gilbert Crispin (d. 1119), Hildebart of le Man (d. 1133), Hugh of St. Victor
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(d. 1141), Adelard of Bath (d. ca. 1146), Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153), Gilbert de la Porree (d. 1154), Zacharias Chrysopolitanus (d. 1156), Gratian (d. ca. 1160), Hugh of Amiens (d. 1164), Simon Chevre d'Or (d. 1170), and perhaps Geoffrey of Monmouth (d. 1155).

The Gospel harmony Super unum ex quattuor typifies Philip's acquisition of the up-to-date and the useful.58 The work of Zacharias Chrysopolitanus, a Laon Premonstratensian who died in 1156, Vnum ex quattuor was compiled at Laon between 1140 and 1145; thus it is one of the many works that Philip acquired after he had become bishop. Like the later Bible history of Peter Comestor, which it clearly influenced, Zacharias's Vnum ex quattuor filled a need for an adequate cross-referenced merging of the Gospel accounts, and its popularity was immediate. In an era when the bishop was expected to do most of the preaching in his diocese, Philip no doubt found Zacharias' work an indispensable exegetical tool for the making of sermons. The text disseminated rapidly from Laon, with eleven of the 102 surviving manuscripts dating from the twelfth century. As is often the case, we can see that Philip's copy (pre-1164) must have been one of the earliest.

Although one would expect to find law books on Philip's list, given his involvement with legal matters for his diocese and with judicial matters for his duke, nevertheless his collection of law texts both civil and canon exceeds expectation. The study of civil law goes back to the late eleventh century in Bologna, and the influence of Roman law in northern Europe can be seen in the second quarter of the twelfth century; but mid-twelfth-century manuscripts of the whole corpus of civil law are not common. Philip's list represents the earliest documentable appearance in northern Europe of the full array of Roman law, in seven volumes—Codex, Tres partes, New Digest, Inforciatum, Old Digest, Liber authenticorum, and Institutes—in varying combinations and in duplicate.59 More remarkable still, in the field of canon law, is the fact that (besides the old law, the letters and decretals of Ivo of Chartres and the decretals of Burchard of Worms) Philip owned not one but two copies of Gratian's Decretum.60 Philip's copies of Gratian (nos. 69-70), like his manuscript of Zacharias, attest to the speed with which a new tool could be put to use: Gratian is thought to have finished his compilation only about 1140; and although the Decretum was known to the masters and students at Bologna, there is no evidence of its use in the papal chancery itself before 1160.61 It is reasonable to suppose that Philip acquired both his Roman law manuscripts and his manuscripts of the Decretum in the course of his trips to Rome (1144, 1146, 1150/51).62 Other evidence of early acquaintance with Gratian in the North includes an unmistakable
quotation in a letter of John of Salisbury written at Canterbury in 1158-1160, and a *Decretum* bequeathed to Lincoln Cathedral sometime between 1151 and 1158 by Hugh, archdeacon of Leicester. Philip may well have played a significant role in the early and rapid dissemination of Roman and canon law among the Anglo-Norman jurists.

Like other contemporary princes of church and state—such as Henry the Liberal, count of Champagne—Philip collected histories. No doubt he felt that a familiarity with the past was a fitting enlargement of his horizon—as well as a practical guide for behavior in the political world. He owned such venerable works as Florus' *Epitome* of Livy, Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, a *Gesta Caesearum*, Pseudo-Clement, the *Historia tripartita*, Orosius, the early medieval historians Gregory of Tours and Freculf of Lisieux, the Jewish historian Josephus, and Nennius; and he owned contemporary works like the *Historia Normannorum* of William of Jumièges, doubtless with the revisions of Robert of Torigny, and Henry of Huntingdon.

We should like in the concluding section to consider the information afforded by three particular titles on Philip's booklist. To say they illuminate "Philip's circle" would be an exaggeration. Certainly, however, they provide evidence about Philip's relationships with various contemporaries which is available from no other source.

The first of these is the *Historia* of Henry of Huntingdon, no. 95 in the list of Philip's books. The Bec catalog specifies that the *Historia* contained ten books, which means that Philip must have owned Henry's last version, including events to the year 1147. The possible source of Philip's text is a matter of some interest, since evidence of knowledge of the *Historia* on the Continent is narrowly limited to (1) a mid-twelfth-century manuscript, BN lat. 6042, containing the 1147 ten-book edition; (2) quotations in the *Chronicle* of Robert of Torigny, monk of Bec and (after 1154) abbot of Mont-St-Michel, based on a text similar to but not identical with MS lat. 6042; (3) a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century manuscript, Rouen BM 1177, copied from BN lat. 6042 for the abbey of Jumièges; and (4) the mention in Philip of Bayeux's booklist.

For our purposes, the unanswered question is where Philip could have laid hands on an exemplar from which to have his copy written, given the extreme rarity of this text in Normandy. An obvious possible source, within the duchy, is Robert of Torigny. Robert states, in the prologue to his *Chronicle*, that Henry of Huntingdon had sent him a copy of the *Historia*, to be one of his sources; but, according to this same statement, it was a version that ended with the year 1135—thus, a copy of the seven-book edition, which could not have been the exemplar for Philip's ten-
book version. When one looks at Robert's use of the Historia, however, one sees that despite his description of the text he was given, he has in practice used the final version that extended to the year 1147—hence, a different manuscript from Henry's gift.\(^7\) One of the post-1135 elements that appear in Robert's Chronicle is a letter from Henry of Huntingdon to an unidentified Warinus Brito, mentioning inter alia Henry's stopover at Bec in 1139 on his way to Rome in the entourage of Theobald, the new archbishop of Canterbury (and, until his election, abbot of Bec). Curiously, a passage of the letter as quoted by Robert does not, in fact, occur in the text of this letter in manuscripts of Henry's Historia; Robert's version has Henry describing the occasion in these terms: "I met [at Bec] a certain Robert of Torigny, monk of that place, a seeker-out of sacred and secular books and a very learned collector. When he had asked me questions about my history of the English kings, and had eagerly listened to my answers, he brought me a book to read about the British kings who held our island before the English [i.e., Geoffrey of Monmouth]." It is hard to ignore the possibility that Robert inserted this bit of flattery himself.\(^7\) Apparently, this encounter with Henry of Huntingdon impressed Robert, for a miniature that depicts the meeting is included on fol. 174 of Avranches MS 159, Robert's own manuscript of his Chronicles.\(^7\)

We think it likely, however, that Philip of Bayeux acquired his text of the Historia directly from Henry of Huntingdon. Certainly he did not require Robert of Torigny to serve as his link to Henry, archdeacon of Huntingdon: Huntingdon is an archdeaconry of the see of Lincoln, where Philip was dean in the 1130s. Alexander, bishop of Lincoln throughout Philip's deanship, was likewise Henry's patron who encouraged and supported his historical writing. Philip and Henry were contemporaries who would have known each other at that time. The acquaintance had an opportunity to be revived when Philip's attendance on Henry II in the months after the coronation led him again to Lincoln, where we see him witnessing royal charters (ca. 1155). The likeliest source of Philip's Historia is a text secured from Henry of Huntingdon himself during a trip to England, perhaps to be copied by scribes back in Normandy.

The second title we shall discuss, the Ylias of Simon Chevre d'Or, has a double-edged interest: Simon's work is the latest datable work on Philip's booklist (no. 112), and Philip's booklist is the earliest datable mention of Simon's work.\(^7\) The Ylias, a Latin poem dealing with the Trojan War, was written at the behest of Henry the Liberal, count of Champagne—therefore after 1153, when Henry became count—and its appearance on Philip's list gives it a terminus ante quo of 1163. Not a great deal is known
about Simon—that he wrote poetic epitaphs for contemporary figures who died in 1151 (Hugh of Macon, bishop of Auxerre), 1152 (Suger of St-Denis and Count Thibaut of Blois), and 1153 (Bernard of Clairvaux and Pope Eugenius III), presumably shortly after the dates of their deaths, and that he became, whether early or late in his life, a canon of St-Victor in Paris. Simon was still alive after 1170, for he wrote a poem on the death of Becket. The appearance of this title on Philip's booklist accomplishes two things at once: it serves, as medieval booklists so often do, to help date the composition; and it documents in striking fashion that Philip, a busy administrator for church and state, could notice and acquire a work of contemporary poetry written for the court of Champagne shortly after it was completed. How it came to Philip's notice is not known—perhaps via Arnulf of Lisieux who, like Simon, had ties with both St-Victor and the comital house of Blois/Champagne; or perhaps Simon himself sent it to Philip in hopes of future patronage.

The booklist reveals that Philip's copy of the Ylias was part of a volume (no. 112) that included a number of other works; Seneca's Natural Questions, a work that had emerged from obscurity only in Philip's lifetime; the Natural Questions of Adelard of Bath, composed in 1111-1116 and dedicated to Richard II, Philip's predecessor in the see of Bayeux; the Virgilian Cantos of Proba, a fourth-century Christian poet; and poems and other works of Hildebert of Le Mans (d. 1133).

Philip's manuscript of this collection does not survive—though a fragment of it may exist. It seems, however, to have been the progenitor of a small but important body of manuscripts. Four manuscripts figure in this story, Escorial 0.3.2, Vatican Reg. lat. 585, Avranches 93, and Copenhagen Gl. Kgl. 546 fol. The Escorial manuscript, written in the early fourteenth century, is the only one to preserve the whole sequence of works reported to have comprised Philip's volume. Parrott, the editor of the Ylias, has demonstrated that, for that work, the Escorial manuscript is a direct copy of the Vatican manuscript, which was written in the second half of the twelfth century, perhaps late in the century. The Vatican manuscript now is just a fragment, containing only the poetry portions (Proba, Simon, Hildebert) of the collection that was in Philip's codex, the Natural Questions portion having been detached to go its own way. Vatican Reg. lat. 585 could possibly be the remains of Philip's own manuscript, but we are doubtful that it is old enough. A third echo of Philip's manuscript appears on the front and back flyleaves of the Avranches manuscript, whose medieval home was Mont-St-Michel: in the late twelfth century, someone at the Mont copied onto these flyleaves a text of Simon's Ylias from an exemplar closely related to the Vatican/Escorial ver-
sion; the most logical source is Philip's manuscript, which by that date was at Bec, the source (it seems) of a number of Mont-St-Michel texts. The fourth witness to Philip's codex no. 112 is the Copenhagen manuscript, which is a fragment, a quire of eight leaves (Proba, Hildebert, and some unidentified Carmina). The extant quire does not contain either the Ylias or Seneca's Natural Questions—i.e., the only works in the group that have been sorted out by a modern edition; thus, its affiliation with the rest of the manuscripts is not yet established. It needs to be collated with the Vatican manuscript, for those texts that the two have in common. Until that has been done, one can only say that the Copenhagen fragment dates from the mid-twelfth century and, thus, it could on the basis of date be a fragment of Philip's codex. In any event, the existence of these four manuscripts and fragments, presumably descendants of Philip's codex, indicates that Bec could on occasion serve as a point of dissemination for the interesting texts left by Philip.

The last volume to consider (no. 57) contained the works of Ennodius, late fifth-/early sixth-century rhetorician and bishop of Pavia: letters, verses, dictiones, epitaphs, epigrams, and panegyrics. His works were prized in Carolingian times primarily as purveyors of a variety of classical verse forms; and the brief flurry of interest produced three surviving ninth-century manuscripts. Thereafter—in a common enough pattern—Ennodius was not again heard from until the middle of the twelfth century. A number of witnesses survive from that time, including two surviving manuscripts, excerpts in the Florilegium Angelicum, and a mention in a letter. The record of Philip's Ennodius is as early as any of these, and earlier than most. The discussion of Ennodius in a letter—the only medieval literary assessment of Ennodius—probably refers directly to Philip's manuscript. In 1160, Philip's colleague Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux wrote to Henry of Pisa, "I am sending you the book of Ennodius. It belongs to someone else, but if you decide that you like it, I shall have a transcript of it sent to you as soon as possible." The indications are that it was Henry of Pisa, cardinal-priest of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus and a papal legate to France, who had inquired about Ennodius; for Arnulf remarks that he himself had never seen the work until Henry mentioned it. (Henry was often in Normandy in the late 1150s and 1160s and knew both Arnulf and Philip.) Arnulf's letter continues with an oft-quoted diatribe on Ennodius's turgid style ("Once having seen the work, I was amazed that an author should have had the gall to publish it, or that anyone else should have been disposed to make copies of it..." etc.)—concluding that the perpetrator of such writings should more aptly be called "Innodius" (complicated, tangled) than "Ennodius" (open, plain).
Was this Philip's book that Arnulf had in his hands? As we have mentioned, Arnulf and Philip were contemporaries, colleagues, and friends. By 1160, Philip and Arnulf had been associated with one another in the king's service on numerous occasions, and from one end of Henry's domains to the other—York, Lincoln, Oxford, Westminster, as well as Rouen, Caen, LeMans, Périgueux, and so on.81 They had shared common adversaries who had usurped the rights of their respective sees, most notably the Benedictines of Fécamp; and in about 1153 Arnulf had petitioned Eugenius III on Philip's behalf in a strongly supportive letter.82 Almost certainly, then, Philip of Harcourt was the "someone else" from whom Arnulf borrowed a rare copy of Ennodius to satisfy Henry of Pisa. Henry must thereafter have returned it, for it was included with Philip's gift to Bec.

If Arnulf had not heard specifically of Ennodius before, yet knew a good place to seek out a text when Henry of Pisa asked, the implication is that Arnulf knew Philip had a large and varied library. This in turn raises the intriguing possibility that some of the library which Arnulf left to St-Victor may have been copied from Philip's books, or that the two at least may have shared common sources of supply and common interests.

Medieval booklists have various uses for modern scholars, the most obvious being to date texts and authors, and to document the circulation of this or that work in a given area and time. Here we have seen, as well, that a booklist can add substance to an otherwise shadowy but important figure, and can document the use of codified learning in twelfth-century administration.

Robert of Torigny's epitaph for Philip is more than a little disapproving: "Philip, the bishop of Bayeux . . . was prudent and shrewd both at increasing, and at recovering, the property of his church, and he accomplished much there; but 'the wisdom of this world is foolishness, to God' [1 Cor. 3:19]." Proper, if uncharitable, sentiments for a Benedictine. But Philip's diocese, Philip's king, and Philip himself were well served by his share of the wisdom, and the learning, of this world, as contained in and attested by the books he owned.

Appendix: Charters of Henry II Witnessed by Philip

Philip attested at least sixty-one acta of Henry, count of Anjou, duke of Normandy, and (from 1154) king of England. A selection of Henry's
acts were first sorted by Léopold Delisle; they were further edited, after Delisle's death, by Elie Berger, who published them in three volumes (Recueil des actes de Henri II, roi d'Angleterre et duc de Normandie, concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France [Paris, 1916–1927]). They are listed here in the order of the numbers assigned by Berger (occasionally different from Delisle's); documents numbered with asterisks date from before Henry's accession to the English throne.

Readers should recall that, although the arrangement of the acts in the edition follows the rules of chronology applicable to charters, the result is not necessarily convincing in historical terms. For example, no. 2 is dated March 1155 in London, while the only other London act, no. 231 (near the end of the present list), is dated 1155/1163—which is to say, one can demonstrate with certainty only that the act was written after Henry's accession in 1154 and before Philip's death in 1163; but common sense suggests that Philip affixed his signature to both no. 2 and no. 231 during one and the same sojourn in London, in 1155.

As we have mentioned above, for some twenty-eight of these acts, Arnulf bishop of Lisieux joined Philip as a witness; for another four, Rotrou bishop of Evreux was co-witness; and for fifteen, Philip was joined by both Arnulf and Rotrou. The name of no other signatory, lay or ecclesiastical, is coupled with Philip's with any regularity (save, of course, the name of the king/duke's agents, English chancellor or Norman seneschal, who signed with Philip as without him). Consequently, we have noted those acts that bear the signatures of either or both of these bishops.

20.* Bayeux, 1151.
35.* Rouen, 1151–1153. Arnulf.
45.* Rouen, 1151–1153. Arnulf.
72.* Le Mans, 1154. Arnulf.
74.* Périgueux, 1154. Arnulf.
78.* Fontevrault, 1154. Arnulf.
32. Chéci (near Orléans), 1156 or 1157. Arnulf.
35. Falaise, 1157. Arnulf, Rotrou.
40. ? n.p., ca. 1157.
44. Lincoln, 1155–1158. Arnulf.
50. Northampton, 1155-1158.
64. Westminster, 1155-1158. Arnulf.
95. Argentan, 1156-1159.
97. Argentan, 1156-1159.
100. Argentan, 1156-1159. Arnulf.
104. Caen, 1156-1159.
122. ? n.p., 1156-1159.
123. Le Mans, 1157-1159. Arnulf.
137. Lions, 1160.
180. Rouen, 1156-1161.
188. Rouen, 1156-1161. Arnulf, Rotrou.
204. Les Andelys, 1156-1162. Rotrou.
206. Argentan, 1156-1162.
230. Lincoln, 1155-1163.

Notes

*We thank Robert L. Benson, John F. Benton, and Margaret T. Gibson, who kindly read an earlier version of this essay and gave sound advice. We are grateful to Terry Nixon for his help over the years with the two Bec booklists, as well as for suggestions on specific aspects of this article. We are indebted to Patricia Stirnemann for generously sharing with us her detailed knowledge of many of the manuscripts mentioned below.

The title derives from epistle 8 of Arnulf of Lisieux (cited in n. 9 below), who says of Philip, “Homo enim consilii et fortitudinis est, potens in opere et sermone, in regalibus consiliis et negotiis ecclesiasticis acceptus et efficax....”


2. Concerning Philip’s life see V. Bourrienne, Un grand bâtisseur: Philippe de Harcourt, évêque de Bayeux 1142-1163 (Paris, 1930), and Sarell Everett Gleason, An Ecclesiastical Barony of the Middle Ages: The Bishopric of Bayeux, 1066-1204 (Cambridge, Mass., 1936). Bourrienne has amassed an impressive amount of information, but it is inextricably mixed with credulous borrowings from “romantic” earlier histories of the Harcourts and their region. Most recently, Philip’s career can be followed as that of a recurring minor character in David Crouch, The Beaumont Twins: The Roots and Branches of Power in the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 1986).

3. The catalog of Philip’s books has been edited by Gustav Becker, Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui (Bonn, 1885), 199-202; and, with slightly different numbering, by H. Omont, Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques 2 (Paris, 1888), 394-98, the edition cited here. The collection is briefly discussed by Geneviève Nortier, Les bibliothèques médiévales des abbayes bénédictines de Normandie (Caen, 1966), 39-45. R. W. Hunt groups Philip’s collection with the fifty-six volumes that belonged to the near-contemporary Celestine III (d. 1144), and with the libraries of two thirteenth-century churchmen, Cardinal Guala Bicchieri (d. 1227) and Bernard II archbishop of Santiago de Compostela (1223-1237), whose collections were similar in size to Philip’s; see his “Universities and Learning,” in The Flowering of the Middle Ages, ed. Joan Evans (London, 1985), 1645.


5. Unless otherwise noted, the events of Philip’s biography given here are based upon the works cited in n. 2 above.

6. Crouch, Twins, 120-27 discusses the evidence for the individual Harcourts and their holdings; for a summary and genealogical table see 220-21. Abbé Bourrienne, 1-3, presents a genealogy that differs in most details, for which he offers nothing in the way of substantiation.

7. As Crouch recognizes, there is no concrete evidence that Philip is Robert Fitz Anschetil’s son (Twins, 220 n. 7)—nor even that Robert and Walere were
cousins, though contemporary Bec historians record unspecified kinship (ibid., 120–21). Both assumptions are reasonable, and they explain much about Philip's career which would otherwise be perplexing. We are grateful to David Crouch for sharing with us his further thoughts on Philip's family.

8. See Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, 207–11. Crouch is occasionally more willing than we are to accept at face value formulas in charters, such as *uidi et legi* or *legiet confronmaui*, as indications that Waleran "made it his business personally to research the archives of his dependent religious communities" (208).

9. Frank Barlow, ed., *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, Camden Third Series 61 (London, 1939), xiii–xv. The facts are three: (1) Arnulf, in letter no. 34, reveals that he had obtained his basic education at the cathedral school of Séez where his older brother John (bishop of Séez from 1124) was archdeacon—hence, before 1124; (2) in the introduction to his *Inuectiua in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum* written in the summer of 1133, he notes that he was then in Italy, for the study of law; and (3) the *Inuectiua* is dedicated to Geoffrey de Lèves, bishop of Chartres, whose clerk Arnulf had been—again, according to the introduction. Thus, Arnulf clearly spent some years in Chartres, between his earliest education at Séez and his legal studies in Italy; Barlow thinks it likely that those years were spent in schooling.


11. Rotrou was first cousin to Count Waleran de Muelan; see Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, 16 fig. 2, etc. Crouch elsewhere (45) suggests that Philip was a distant relative of the count.

12. When Gilbert was examined at Paris in 1147, and again at Reims in 1148, he alluded to his pupil Rotrou as evidence of the soundness of his teaching; see *Histoire littéraire de la France*, 14:296. Southern, *Medieval Humanism*, 67, argues that Gilbert's most important teaching probably occurred at Paris after he had left Chartres, which may well be correct. Gilbert is first documented at Paris in 1141, however, and by that date Rotrou was well past his school days, having become bishop of Evreux in 1138 or 1139.


15. Concerning Philip's relationship with Count Waleran and his twin Robert of Leicester, see Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, esp. 45 and 220.

16. For the documentation, such as it is, see Crouch, *Twins*, 45 and nn.

17. See the index sub nom. "Philip de Harcourt" in Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, for the indications of consistent support from Waleran in the stages of Philip's career.

all that we know about the incident: Hugh abp. of Rouen (no. 61) notifies the archbishops of Canterbury and York and all the English hierarchy that bishops Philip of Bayeux and Jocelin of Salisbury have reached agreement for return of the arm, along with a "gift"—doubtless some sort of amends—of ten silver marks. In fact, though only the arm is returned, the "quarrel" concerned "certain things [plural] carried off from the treasury of Salisbury Cathedral" (controversia... pro quibusdam abportatis de thesauro Salesburiensis ecclesiae); perhaps the ten marks are payment for losses. For reasons unknown, an identical charter was addressed to the same recipients presumably at the same time by Rotrou, bishop of Evreux (no. 62). Neither document is dated; in both cases, Bourrienne has named the English archbishops as "Thomas of Canterbury" (1162-1170) and "Henry of York" (Henry Murdac, d. 1153), an impossible combination. R. H. C. Davis, King Stephen, 1135-1154 (Berkeley, 1967), 47 and n., sensibly suggests that the manuscript must have said (or meant) "T[heobald]" rather than "Thomas" as archbishop of Canterbury—hence, that the agreement occurred between 1147 and 1153 (the tenure of Henry of York), probably in 1148 at the Council of Reims. This is the date accepted by Thomas G. Waldman, who is preparing an edition of "The Acta of Hugh 'of Amiens,' Archbishop of Rouen, 1130-1164" for the Royal Historical Society's Camden Series. We are grateful to Dr. Waldman for this information.

19. Previous mentions of this incident have not, to our knowledge, identified the relic at the center of the quarrel. The list of Osmund's gifts, ca. 1078-1099, is printed by C. Wordsworth, Ceremonies and Processions of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury (Cambridge, 1901), 183: "brachium sancti Aldelmi argenteum et deauratum." William of Malmesbury's Vita of Aldhelm explains how Osmund was given Aldhelm's left arm by Malmesbury in 1078; lodged in a sumptuous reliquary, it performed miracles of healing at Salisbury: see William of Malmesbury, De gestis pontificum anglorum, ed. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, Rolls Series (London, 1870), 428-29. The reliquary recurs in the inventory of ornaments found in the treasury at Sarum in 1214; Wordsworth, 169: "brachium sancti Aldelmi coopertum argento, cum multis lapidibus, continens alias reliquias." For a revisionist view of Norman regard for Anglo-Saxon relics see S. J. Ridyard, "Condigna veneratio: Post-Conquest Attitudes to the Saints of the Anglo-Saxons," Anglo-Norman Studies 9, Precedings of the Battle Conference (1987): 179-206; we thank John Benton for this reference.


22. Concerning the architecture of the new cathedral see J. Vallery-Radot, La Cathédrale de Bayeux, 2nd ed., rev. (Paris, 1958). It would be interesting to know if the famous bas-reliefs were placed on the walls of the new nave under Philip's direction. We have found no distinct connection between any of the scenes
depicted and any of the books in Philip's library. The bas-relief of a chained ape is particularly interesting, in that it is an early depiction of this subject in northern Europe according to H. Janson, *Apes and Ape Lore* (London, 1952), 49. E. Lambert, "Les écoinçons de la nef de la Cathédrale de Bayeux," in *Mélanges Henrik Cornell* (Stockholm, 1950), 262–71, did not explore potential literary sources.


25. See Helmut Gleber, *Papst Eugen III. (1145–1153) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner politischen Tätigkeit*, Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte 6 (Jena, 1936), 11, who suggests that this group of northern prelates influenced the election. The protocol is printed by Paul Fridolin Kehr, *Abh. Göttingen*, N.F. 22.1, p. 345, no. 46. We are grateful to Robert L. Benson for this reference.

26. The bulls are preserved in the cartulary of Bayeux cathedral, the *Livre noir* edited by Bourrienne.

27. *Livre noir*, nos. 154 (16 May 1144, Lucius II); 155 (18 March 1145) and 156 (3 Feb. 1153, Eugenius III).


29. *Livre noir*, no. 206 (16 May 1144, Lucius II); cf. *Livre noir* no. 39 (ca. 1144) for the duke's allusion to the corresponding bull of Eugenius, which evidently does not survive. In these actions Philip was following a pattern visible in other North French dioceses of his time. See D. Lohrmann, *Kirchengut im nördlichen Frankreich*, Pariser historische Studien 20 (Bonn, 1983), and esp. 137–39; we are grateful to John Benton for this reference.

30. *Livre noir*, vol. 1, p. xiii, the charters numbered 1–214; nos. 33 bis and 168, which pertain to the 1260s, are later insertions.


34. *Livre noir*, nos. 8, 29, 34, 38; no. 102—confirmation of a gift of land to the cathedral's succentor, dated 1135–1142—is the only charter that does not patently fit the mold.


36. Dom Martène's edition of Hugh's works is printed in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 192; a modern edition of the Genesis commentary (of which Martène knew only a fragment) was produced by Francis Lecomte, "Un commentaire scripturaire du XIIe siècle: Le 'Tractatus in Hexaemeron' de Hugues d'Amiens (archevêque de Rouen 1130–1164)," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* 33 (1958 [1959]): 227–94. For Hugh's biography see the article of
E. Vacandard in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*; Lecomte's introduction; and the D.Phil. dissertation of Thomas G. Waldman, "Hugh of Amiens; Archbishop of Rouen 1130-64" (Oxford University, 1970).

37. Edited by L. Delisle, "Documents sur les livres et les bibliothèques au moyen âge i: Bibliothèque de la cathédrale de Rouen au XIIe siècle," *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes* 11 (1849): 218: "Liber Hugonis archiepiscopi ad Albanensem episcopum [= Dialogi]; libellus eiusdem de expositione fidei catholice et orationis Dominice." The second volume is now Geneva, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire MS lat. 41. Rotrou's list includes in addition Pliny, *Natural History*; Jerome, *Epistolar*; Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei*; Isidore, *Etymologies*; and Vitruvius, *De archetectura*. Evreux Bibliothèque municipale MS 92, containing the *Confessions* and other Augustiniana—but not *De ciuitate Dei*—also bears Rotrou's ex libris, part of a bequest to his first cathedral, Evreux ("Hunc librum dedit dominus Rotrodus Rothomagensis archiepiscopus ecclesie Ebroicensi").

38. Cf. Lecomte, 227 and n. 6.


40. See Nortier, *Les bibliothèques*, 346. We are grateful to Thomas G. Waldman for confirming this suggestion.


42. See Appendix below, for a list of the locations and the dates of the 61.

43. For a list of these acts, together with the dates and locations, see the Appendix below.


46. Ibid., 167 and n. 63. Not surprisingly, the seneschal was also a frequent joint witness, with Philip, of royal acts (see above)—twenty of the sixty-two charters witnessed by Philip were also attested by Robert. We note, in passing, that Robert de Neubourg retired to the abbey of Bec (he had funded the building of the abbey's chapter house) at the end of his life in 1159, just as Philip was to do in 1163; ibid., 166 n. 57. Robert de Neubourg and Bishop Rotrou were brothers, first cousins of Waleran of Meulan, and thus probably distant kin of Philip; see Crouch, *Beaumont Twins*, 16, fig. 2.

47. Barlow, *Letters*, 11 ep. 8, "in regalibus consiliis et negotiis ecclesiasticis acceptus et efficax."


49. For a reproduction of fol. 1v see Nortier, *Les bibliothèques*, facing p. 66.


51. Numbered 115 by Omont's edition, which assigns numbers (69, 76) to two
entries written in the margins. Because the text of Becker's edition is inaccurate, being derived from F. Ravaisson's edition of 1841 rather than from the manuscript, we cite Omont's text and numbers here.

52. This list is printed with Philip's booklist (see n. 3 above): Becker 257–66, Omont 385–94. The possible merger of Philip's manuscripts with Bec books, suggested by Patricia Stirnemann, was worked out in detail by Terry Nixon; we are grateful to them both for lengthy discussions of this matter. David N. Dumville dates the Bec catalog "from the mid-twelfth century"; see his "An Early Text of Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia regum Britanniae and the Circulation of Some Latin Histories in Twelfth-Century Normandy," Arthurian Literature 4 (1985): 1–36 at 7 and n. 26. Unfortunately, the appendix that was to present the evidence for this dating was not published with the article. We thank Dr. Dumville for calling this article to our attention.

53. For example, no. 95 (Omont, 397) on the list of Philip's books reads "In alio [uolumine] historia Henrici de Anglia, et liber Bede minor de temporibus et de natura rerum." The Bec catalog implies that the two Bede works were removed, and added to a manuscript containing Bede's Ecclesiastical History and some smaller works: no. 80 (Omont, 389), "In alio [uolumine] historia Anglorum libri V [= the Ecclesiastical History]. De temporibus liber I minor. De naturis rerum liber I. Liber Gilde sapientis de excidio Britannie. Vita sancti Neoti, qui in capite ponitur." The Henry of Huntingdon from Philip's no. 95 was left on its own, Bec catalog no. 132 (Omont, 393): "In alio [uolumine] historia Henrici de gente Anglorum libri X."

54. See, e.g., Leiden BPL 20, Historia Normannorum (Bec no. 120); Paris, B.N. MS lat. 1685, Athanasius (Bec no. 113); B.N. MS lat. 12211, Augustine (Philip no. 12 = Bec no. 6); and possibly B.N. MS lat. 3808, Fulgentius (Bec no. 112?). Léopold Delisle, in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes 71 (1910): 506–21, noted this feature of certain Bec manuscripts and suggested that the Bec catalog was compiled from these lists.

55. These manuscripts belonged, or possibly belonged, to Philip of Bayeux: Paris, B.N. lat. 152 fol. 32, Pomponius Mela (a leaf from no. 66 in the catalog of Philip's books); B.N. lat. 5802, Suetonius etc. (nos. 68 and 79); B.N. lat. 12211, Augustine (no. 12); and perhaps B.N. lat. 6042, Henry of Huntingdon (no. 95). Patricia Stirnemann has recently suggested persuasively that MS 6042 was in fact Philip's manuscript of the Historia. This assumption provides a possible solution to the problem of the source of Robert of Torigny's second text of the Historia, discussed below: since Robert seems to have had copies of Bec exemplars made for Mont-St-Michel, it would be logical for him to have used a copy of lat. 6042 in writing his Chronicle if 6042 were a Bec manuscript (as a result of Philip's bequest).

56. Hunt ("Universities and Learning," 165) observed that Philip's collection was "remarkable for the relatively large number of Latin classical prose writers with not a single poet"—a reflection, surely, of his dictaminal training.


58. Cat. # 113, "In alio Zacharias super 'Vnum ex quatuor.'" This does not


60. One of these, no. 69, has been added in the margin by the scribe, presumably in correction of an omission.

61. For the dissemination of Gratian through the Anglo-Norman hierarchy, see the reference to Van Caenegem in the preceding note. Concerning the appearance and early knowledge of Gratian's *Decretum* in northern Europe see W. Holtzmann, "Die Benutzung Gratiens in der päpstlichen Kanzlei im 12. Jahrhundert," *Studia Gratiana* 1 (1953): 325–49. See also Robert L. Benson, "Barbarossas Rede auf dem Reichstag von Roncaglia (1158): Zur Benutzung kanonischen und römischen Rechtes bei Rahewin," forthcoming; we are grateful to him for allowing us to see the relevant portion of this article in typescript.

62. Philip perhaps was the recipient of a decretal from Alexander III addressed simply "Baiocensi episcopo": see Walther Holtzmann, *Decretaales ineditae saeculi XII*, ed. and rev. Stanley Chodorow and Charles Duggan, Monumenta iuris canonici B: Corpus collectionum 4 (Vatican City, 1982), 39, no. 21, which is a reply to a query about penances. Such a request implies canonistic knowledge, rather than ignorance; we thank Robert L. Benson for bringing this decretal to our attention.


64. See Van Caenegem, *Royal Writs*, 368.

us to read the latter in typescript. Dr. Stirnemann has discovered the inventory of Henry's library and is preparing an edition of it.
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67. _Tituli librorum Beccensis almarii_, no. 132: "In alio [volumine] historia Henrici de gente Anglorum, libri X."
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