
H-France Review Vol. 19 (September 2019), No. 178

Egbert Türk, *Arnoul de Lisieux: Lettres d'un Évêque de Cour dans l'embarras*. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2018. vi + 559 pp. Notes, bibliography, and Index. €70 (pb). ISBN 9782503551135.

Review by Stephen Church, University of East Anglia.

There have been four attempts in modern times to present in printed form the letter collections of Arnulf (1105/1109-1184), [1] bishop of Lisieux in Normandy (1141-81); the first three in Latin, and the fourth in an English translation. [2] This fifth attempt, in a French translation, is to be much welcomed since it opens up the letters to study by a Francophone audience.

Arnulf was elected bishop of Lisieux in 1141 and so was, nominally at least, the man of the duke of Normandy. During the early 1140s, however, when no one family dominated the duchy, he served the king of France, Louis VII, playing a part as papal legate for the Norman contingent on the second crusade (1145-49). In 1149, he acted for Louis in negotiations with Henry fitz Empress, and by 1150, he had entered the service of Henry who had assumed, on his father's resignation of the title, the office of duke of Normandy. From this moment onwards until his fall from favour after he supported the Young King's rebellion (1173-4), Arnulf was an influential member of King Henry II's entourage, regularly attesting to his charters, and playing an important part in the great moments of the day, including the Becket crisis. Arnulf's letter collections are, therefore, an important witness to the relationship between temporal and spiritual at the court of one of the key players in twelfth-century western European history.

There are nineteen manuscripts of the letter collections of Arnulf (and other products of his pen) which date from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and they allow us to distinguish the two distinct editions of Arnulf's letters, the first up to 1166, prepared by Arnulf himself at the request of Giles of Perche, archdeacon of Rouen, and containing forty-five letters; the second edition, with letters written between 1166 and 1172, reaching its final form in 1175, containing thirty-four letters, also prepared by Arnulf for wider circulation. This much is uncontroversial. What is controversial is what we should do with the other letters of Arnulf which survive to us and what we should do with the order of all the letters which Arnulf wrote. It is at this point that historical opinion diverges. For much of the modern history of Arnulf's letters, from their first appearance in a modern edition in 1844 through to the 1990s, historians have been content to see them arranged in (roughly, since none of them are actually dated) chronological order. Then, in 1997, Carolyn Poling Schriber produced an English-language translation of Arnulf's letters but presented them in a radically new way. Having examined the entire corpus of manuscripts, she argued that, to publish Arnulf's letters in a chronological order, while useful for historians searching after "facts," misrepresents Arnulf's intentions for his letters and therefore has left

modern historians in a difficult position when it came to evaluating them as historical sources. Schriber showed that we should see the letters as collections (plural) numbering four: the first two editions collected by Arnulf (uncontroversial), plus two further groups: a group consisting of letters discovered by historians and not intended by Arnulf for publication and which she characterised as "private letters" (twenty-two fall into this category); and a further group of forty letters preserved by Richard of Ilchester, one of Henry II's chief administrators and bishop of Winchester (d. 1188), and long-time friend of Arnulf. This fourth group of letters were written between 1175 and 1184. Schriber argued that we should see all the letters that Arnulf wrote in the context of these four separate groups, two intended by Arnulf to be used by others as good examples of letter forms, a third a miscellany of personal letters, and a fourth those collected by his friend, Richard of Ilchester.

Egbert Türk has decided to return to the traditional way of presenting Arnulf's letters. He has examined Schriber's argument and declared that the "fourfold division proposed by the American translator lacks coherence and can hardly claim to replace the classification of Barlow" (p. 9). Türk is clearly on safe ground when rejecting Schriber's attempt to return the letter collections to the forms that would have been recognisable in Arnulf's own day; it is, after all, the way that letter collections have been published by those who have undertaken to edit the letters of, for example, Arnulf's contemporaries, Thomas Becket and John of Salisbury.[3] But this reviewer cannot help but wonder if Schriber isn't right and that we should see documents in the context in which those who wrote and compiled them would have recognised them. Schriber's argument for presenting the letters in a fourfold division has the authority of manuscript evidence. In ordering Arnulf's letters in chronological form, Barlow (building on the work of his predecessors) presented to the world an edition which did not exist before he created it in 1939. This is the text which Türk has translated into French. I feel slightly uneasy about the practice of imposing a modern construct onto medieval texts to fit modern notions; it is a practice about which I have been critical in the past and tried to eschew in my own editorial work.[4] Türk has now enshrined this modern structure on Arnulf's letters for a Francophone audience; O reader, therefore, beware.

Because of the difficulty of finding Barlow's edition of Arnulf's letters in French libraries, the publishers have provided an annexe comprising the edition and annotations to the Latin texts of Arnulf's letters provided by Barlow in 1939 (pp. 343-559). The reader may therefore check Türk's translation against the original Latin. When they do so, they will discover that the translator has done a good job in rendering Arnulf's Latin into French. Following the guidelines of the *École Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs de Paris*, he has produced a volume which does indeed give a sense of the language Arnulf used while being faithful to the meaning of Arnulf's Latin as well as to its sense. M. Türk is to be congratulated in producing a fine French-language volume of Arnulf's letters making the work available to a French-speaking non-Latinate audience.

NOTES

[1] "Arnulfi Lexoviensis episcopi Epistolae," J. A. Giles, ed. *Patres Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1844); *Opera Omnia*, J. P. Migne, ed. *Patrologia Latinae* 201 (Paris: 1903), cols 17-151; *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, F. Barlow, ed. Camden Society, Third Series, 61, (London: Royal Historical Society, 1939).

[2] *The Letter Collections of Arnulf of Lisieux*, C. P. Schriber, trans. Texts and Editions in Religion, vol 72, (Lewiston, Queenston: Lampeter 1997); see also her *The Dilemma of Arnulf of Lisieux: New Ideas Versus Old Ideals* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990).

[3] *The Correspondence of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1162-70*, Anne Duggan, ed. and trans. 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000); *The Letters of John of Salisbury*, W.J. Miller and C.N.L. Brooke, eds. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979).

[4] For example, *Dialogus de Scaccario and Constitutio Domus Regis*, E. Amt and S. D. Church, eds. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007), where my central criticism of previous editions is that those editors created a text which amalgamated the medieval surviving texts to create something that had never existed in the middle ages.

Stephen Church
University of East Anglia
s.church@uea.ac.uk

Copyright © 2019 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172