
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS
Advancing Knowledge

Chapter Title: Conclusion: Endings and Beginnings

Book Title: England in Europe

Book Subtitle: English Royal Women and Literary Patronage, c.1000—c.1150

Book Author(s): ELIZABETH M. TYLER

Published by: University of Toronto Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/j.ctt1whm96v.15

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms


This content is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.


University of Toronto Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *England in Europe*

This content downloaded from 203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Conclusion: Endings and Beginnings

A book of this nature, which traces a literary culture that has been passed down through direct genealogical or marital links from one queen to the next and looks at the wider influence of that culture, could in theory go on without end. We could ask in what ways the practices of Anglo-Saxon educated queens were passed on to figures such as Henry II's wife Eleanor of Aquitaine.[1] Or we could look at Barking, an Anglo-Saxon nunnery with close ties to Wilton, where Henry II's illegitimate daughter Matilda became abbess circa 1175. Goscelin wrote saints' lives for this foundation, as he did for Wilton, and much later in the twelfth century a nun of Barking wrote a French version of the life of Edward the Confessor that derives ultimately from the Anonymous's *Vita Ædwardi*.[2] My book finishes, however, with a brief consideration of how Edith/Matilda's daughter, the empress Matilda, and her successor, Adeliza of Louvain, discontinue and transfer into French, respectively, the legacy of Latin learning that was bequeathed to them by the royal women of the West Saxon dynasty. The aim is to bring into sharp focus just how deep, influential, and distinctive the Latinate learning of English royal women was from the beginning of the eleventh century to the middle of the twelfth century.

1 For recent minimalist views of Eleanor of Aquitaine's patronage see Broadhurst, "Henry II of England," 71–83, and Gillingham, "Cultivation of History," 26, 28, 36–7, 39; for a classic maximalist view see Lejeune, "Rôle littéraire."

2 For a recent collection of essays on Barking see Brown and Bussell, *Barking Abbey*.

This content downloaded from
fff:ffff:ffff:ffff:ffff:ffff:ffff:ffff on Thu, 01 Jan 1976 12:34:56 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The Empress

The empress Matilda, as we have seen, was fully, or more accurately potentially fully, integrated into the textual culture that united the English royal women across the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Like her aunt Adela of Blois, she was the recipient of a text from Hugh of Fleury, who addressed his history of the Franks from Louis the Pious up to the present to her as a newly married princess. In its preface he figures her conquering grandfather as a modern-day Claudius and Julius Caesar. Hildebert wrote classicizing poetry about her, celebrating her as above all her mother's daughter. What is strikingly absent from these texts is a sense of her own agency and deep literary learning, reminding us that this was no empty topos when deployed in praise of the empress's predecessors. Hugh's chronicle seems to be sent speculatively to the empress, in marked contrast to the texts for Emma, Edith, Adela, and Edith/Matilda. The praise he includes of her Norman ancestors is tacked on at the end of the preface to a work devoted to the Franks, and it is not part of the work as a whole. Although through her great-grandmother (Robert the Pious's daughter, Adela) the empress too is a Frank, Hugh makes no effort to associate her with the Capetian dynasty.[3] He did not write his chronicle with the empress as a patron of dynastic history in mind; she is secondary. The passivity, which in this instance can be attributed to her youth, continues. Hildebert's poem virtually conflates the empress with her mother, leaving no sense that the younger woman has carved out a distinctive place for herself within the literary culture that she inherited from Edith/Matilda.[4] William of Malmesbury's attempt to present the *Gesta regum* to the empress, while seriously made, has an air of desperation; his *Gesta regum* above all called for a female reader of the West Saxon dynasty, which left him with the empress. But he nowhere appeals to her own learning or even claims that she asked to receive the *Gesta regum*. Indeed, he approaches her, rather tentatively, through her uncle King David of Scotland; there is no direct contact, such as we have seen as characteristic of the relationship of author and active patron. The dedication of the final version to Robert of Gloucester is a recognition that he and other writers had tried and failed to shape the empress into a reader like her mother.[5] The empress was

3 Hugh of Fleury, *Liber qui modernorum*, pp. 376–7. See chapter 6 herein.
4 Hildebert, *Carmina minora* 35. See chapter 7 herein.
5 See chapter 7 herein.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

repeatedly approached by historians and poets and chose not to patronize them. They sought to fit her into a genealogy of literary patronage stretching back to Emma and having roots in the tenth-century establishment of royal nunneries. Whereas Edith/Matilda had consciously modelled herself on her mother, Margaret, using historiography to achieve this in her commission of a life of her mother, the empress turned away. Although the empress's generosity to religious houses is recorded, she is not remembered for her literary patronage.[6]

When we catch a glimpse of the empress, much later in life in 1164, participating in Latin textual culture, she is intervening between her son, Henry II, and Thomas Becket. In a letter to the archbishop, the prior, Nicholas, of the Augustinian hospital of Mont-Saint-Jacques in Rouen, recounts how he sought the help of the empress in negotiating the increasingly intractable conflict between Henry and Becket. She asks that the Constitutions of Clarendon, which restricted ecclesiastical legal jurisdiction in favour of the crown, be read to her in Latin, which she evidently understands, and then be explained in French ("praecepit nobis eas latine legere, et exponere gallice").[7] The Latin of the constitutions is not the demanding prose of William of Malmesbury or the poetic language of Hildebert, such as her mother read; rather it is direct documentary prose, which the empress asks to have explicated in the vernacular. This episode points to a different way of interacting with texts than that of her mother. The empress is associated with historical writing of a straightforward chronicle type, more of a piece with William of Malmesbury's *Historia novella*, written for Robert of Gloucester, than the *Gesta regum*. She may have brought chronicles back with her when she returned from Germany, and she was likely known to Robert of Torigni, who, in his continuations of the *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, praises her lavishly and suggests that she knew Turgot's life of her grandmother Margaret.[8] However, she is not an active literary patron who deeply shapes both the content and the form of texts she commissions. Neither do we find classicizing or a turn to the Roman story world for interpretative frameworks and reflection on the truth of fiction in work written for her. She is not

6 Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 177–94.

7 Duggan, ed., *Correspondence* 41; Stubbs, ed., *Select Charters*, 163–7. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 169–71; and Van Houts, "Latin and French," 68.

8 Robert of Torigni, *GND* 8.11, 8.25–7, and 8.33. Van Houts, "Latin and French," 54–7, 62–3, and 67–9.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

approached as if she were a poetic or an intellectual collaborator, or even an informant.

Educated from childhood in the household of the bishop of Trier, the empress did not experience the Anglo-Saxon royal nunnery education that had so formed her mother and other Anglo-Saxon elite women (nor did she have a similar German nunnery education). Indeed, in a letter, Hildebert laments the lack of direct contact between mother and daughter, despite his episcopal efforts.[9] What we know of her education comes not from Latin historians or poets but from a vernacular writer, Benoît de Sainte-Maure, who, in reference to her learning German, emphasizes her vernacular education.[10] This gap between types of education, however, is only part of the story. Nicholas offers a portrait not of an exceptionally learned woman but of a politically powerful one. Her mother, her grandmother, her aunt, Edith, and Emma were all politically powerful and astute women who participated in governing the kingdom. There was, however, no question of their ruling it in their own right, and in different circumstances they all turned to history writing to further their own cases. Recognized by her father as his heir, Empress Matilda was in a different position: she envisaged and fought for a future where she ruled in her own name. This ambition and this understanding of herself did not leave time for the cultivation of dynastic poetry and history.

The *Vita Ædwardi*, like Goscelin's Wilton texts, Baudri's poem for Adela, and Turgot's life of Margaret, announced that it required ruminative readers, whose reading drew on the habits of monastic *lectio divina*.[11] The training and leisure required to be such an enquiring, self-conscious, and reflective reader would rarely be available to a ruler; it is marked as clerical or, in the case of the secular elite, as female. Edith/Matilda was not satisfied with the brief account of her ancestors that William had originally produced; the result of her persistence is a very long history, written in elegant Latin, which reached out to include Hildebert's linguistically and conceptually challenging poem on Rome. For all of Robert of Gloucester's cultivation of letters, the annals that William wrote specifically for and

9 Hildebert, *Epistolae* 3.14. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 55; J. Green, *Henry I*, 198; and see chapter 7 herein.

10 Benoît de Sainte-Maure, *Chronique des duc de Normandie* lines 43255–63. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 25.

11 See chapters 5, 6, and 7 herein.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

about him when he was fully engaged in war with Stephen on behalf of the empress are brief and persuasive.[12] Their intellectual framework is designed to cement the earl's support for his half-sister at a critical time, rather than to explore and analyse multiple perspectives (as in the *Vita Ædwardi*) or centuries of history (as in the *Gesta regum*). After Edith/Matilda, secular history writing takes on a more accessible style, marked by its inclusion of documents, not poetry, and its use of romance syntax that enabled it to be easily read aloud in French for a lay audience or comprehended quickly and orally by the learned among them. Its audiences and producers were largely male, many with experience of court administration.[13] Seen from this perspective, the empress, chastised in the *Gesta Stephani* for being unfeminine, is revealed as a woman who used textual culture in a more instrumentalist manner, as a tool for governing the kingdom.[14] Perhaps the comment made of Henry II, who was well educated but with little time for literature, would fit her too. Gerald of Wales lamented that in addressing his work to Henry and his son Richard I he had written for "principibus parum literatis et multum occupatis" (princes too little lettered and too much occupied).[15] Henry II himself is associated with the direct promotion of history writing in French, specifically with Wace's *Roman de Rou* and Benoît of Sainte-Maure's *Chronique des ducs de Normandie*, not in Latin.[16]

Recognizing that the empress, sought by poets and historians alike, chose not to deploy literary culture politically offers critical insight into the history writing of eleventh- and twelfth-century England. The Latin historiographical culture that Emma initiated and Edith refracted through an Anglo-Saxon nunnery education stops with the empress because she was interested in exercising power as men do; also she was not nunnery educated (either at Wilton or in Germany). From this perspective we see

12 William of Malmesbury, *GRA Epistola* 1, and 4.351; and William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella*. See chapter 7 herein.

13 Gillingham, "Cultivation of History," 28–32, 36, and 39; Bainton, "Literate Sociability," esp. 23–4; and Mortensen, "Comparing and Connecting."

14 *Gesta Stephani* 58–60. Chibnall, *Empress Matilda*, 62–3 and 97.

15 Gerald of Wales, *Itinerarium Kambriae*, first preface. Gillingham, "Cultivation of History," 31. Gillingham argues persuasively that Henry II was not a patron of Latin historical writing. However, the same could be said of earlier kings. What has changed is that queens are no longer patrons of Latin historical writing as they had been in earlier generations.

16 Wace, *Roman de Rou*; Benoît, *Chronique*. Gillingham, "Cultivation of History," 28–30.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

politics having a very visible impact on literary culture, throwing into high relief that the secular Latin historiography that flourished from the *Encomium* to the *Gesta regum* was the realm of royal women. This history's use of the Roman story world to negotiate conquest, its rigorous exploration both of the relationship of history and poetry and of the place of fiction within history, and its exploitation of learned Latin's symbolic value in complex multilingual court societies are all directly related to the way in which women used literary patronage to wield political power on an international stage.

Adeliza of Louvain

Although English royal women ceased to be the patrons of Latin historical writing with the death of Edith/Matilda, the never-static international literary culture created by these women across the eleventh and early-twelfth centuries did not disappear in 1118. The interlinked historiographical and poetic culture fostered by Edith/Matilda fed into the appearance of written French in a context within which written vernacular literature, unlike in Anglo-Saxon England, would be produced by female authors, such as Clemence of Barking and Marie de France, and be associated with female patronage.[17] French was a written language well before the twelfth century, with examples surviving from the mid-ninth-century Oaths of Strasbourg onwards. However, this early written French was sporadic, attested in fewer than a dozen manuscripts and largely in the form of short texts.[18] It was not until the twelfth century that French, in Northern *langues d'oïl* forms, began to be used, in Anglo-Norman court circles in England, for extended texts.[19] Adeliza of Louvain, Henry I's second wife, whom he married in 1120, is closely associated with this development, including the first known use of written French for history writing.[20]

17 Tyson, "Patronage of French Vernacular History," 185 and 220–1; and Field, "Romance as History," 166.

18 Careri, Ruby, and Short, *Livres et écritures*, xvii–xviii.

19 Clanchy, *Memory to Written Record*, 199–225; Short, "Patrons and Polyglots"; Wogan-Browne, *Saints Lives*, 1–18; Tyler, "Old English to Old French"; and O'Donnell, Townend, and Tyler, "European Literature," 635. See chapter 3 herein.

20 The account of Adeliza here draws directly on O'Donnell, Townend, and Tyler, "European Literature," 627–34, and on O'Donnell and Tyler, "From the Severn to the Rhine." In the joint article by O'Donnell, Townend, and Tyler the section including Adeliza was written by Thomas O'Donnell, and I have benefited in this chapter from further discussion with him about Adeliza.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Adeliza is said to have commissioned a French life of Henry I from one David. In so doing, she was continuing to cultivate history for dynastic commemoration, following a model set by her Anglo-Saxon predecessors but doing it in the vernacular. David's French life of Henry does not survive. We know of it from Gaimar who, writing in the late 1130s, boasted that his own *Estoire des Engleis* was far more exciting than David's dull history; it was written at the behest of a noble woman, Constance Fitz-Gilbert, and drew on both the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia regum Britanniae*.[21] If Gaimar's claim about David's history is not a piece of fiction (in step with Geoffrey's claims about a Welsh book, perhaps), Gaimar's own work may offer insight into vernacular history writing in Adeliza's court.

Despite his disparagement of David, we can register how firmly Gaimar had his eye on developments at court in his claim that Constance herself had a copy of David's book, and wonder how many features of his text reflected what he knew of history writing there for the queen. As writers from the Encomiast to William of Malmesbury had done when writing for queens, Gaimar gives great emphasis to Constance's active patronage of his text.[22] Like William of Malmesbury, he includes women in his history by adding romance episodes to a narrative that draws heavily on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle; it is easy to see that female patronage also challenged Gaimar's understanding of *historia* (or rather *estoire*) and of the nature of the historical record.[23] Although the surviving text of the *Estoire des Engleis* begins with the *adventus Saxonum* (coming of the Saxons), Gaimar claims that his full two-volume work (the first volume of which has not survived) spanned the Trojan origins of the Britons up to the death of William Rufus. While we cannot read David's life, Gaimer's text shows us that history, written in French, which ostentatiously displayed its links to the royal court, continued to promote the Roman story world. Especially in light of the texts patronized by English royal women, we can suspect that classicism in some guise was a central element of David's own work. In Gaimar's acceptance of Trojan origins for the British we see a

21 Gaimar, *Estoire*, lines 6488–9. Short's commentary on these lines and Short, "Epilogue."

22 Gaimar, *Estoire*, lines 6435–98.

23 See for example Gaimar's accounts of Haveloc (lines 27–818) and Æthelthryth, lines 3587–974. Gransden, *Historical Writing*, 209–12; Press, "Precocious Courtesy"; and Gaimer, *Estoire*, ed. Short, xiv–xv and xl–xli.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

new resolution of the debate that went back at least to the *Encomium* and which powerfully shaped the idea of fiction.[24]

The disputed patronage of the Anglo-Norman *Voyage of Saint Brendan*, which scholars (like the manuscripts themselves) attribute to both Edith/Matilda and Adeliza, underscores the very close links between the development of French as a written literary language in England and the literary culture of English royal women. The *Voyage of Saint Brendan*, a French reworking, by an unknown Benedeit, of the Latin *Navigatio sancti Brendani* is a key text for French literary history because of its early date (in the first quarter of the twelfth century), its substantial length, and its affinities with romance. Although generically it remains a tale of a sea voyage, its emphasis on wonder and adventure shares qualities with later romance, as does its octosyllabic verse form.[25] The difficulty of determining whether Edith/Matilda or Adeliza commanded its composition not only suggests how influential the Anglo-Saxon model of queenly literary patronage had become but also exposes something of what was at stake for literary scholars trying to work outside the boundaries of nationalizing literary history.[26]

Scholars, initially myself too, have often favoured Edith/Matilda's candidacy.[27] Although of the surviving four manuscripts of the prologue only one identifies Edith/Matilda as commissioner, that manuscript is textually distinct from the two main groups of manuscripts and may go back to an early exemplar.[28] As the daughter of the Scottish king, Edith/Matilda might be thought to have had a particular interest in an Irish saint, given the close ties between Scotland and Ireland. The romance aspects of William of Malmesbury's stories about women responded to Edith/Matilda as patron and reader, as perhaps also did the romance elements of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan*. If Edith/Matilda was the patron of the Anglo-Norman *Voyage of Saint Brendan*, then the royal women of Anglo-Saxon England took a very direct role in encouraging the beginning of French written literary culture, including the new genre of romance. From that perspective the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* becomes a tangible instance of the way in

24 Gaimar, *Estoire,* lines 6528–30.
25 *Navigatio sancti Brendani*. Benedeit, *Brendan*, ed. Short and Merrilees, 18–22.
26 Benedeit, *Brendan*, lines 10 and 13. For an account of the *Brendan*, including its patronage, see O'Donnell, Townend, and Tyler, "European Literature," 631–3.
27 Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 139–43; and Tyler, "Old English to Old French," 176.
28 Benedeit, *Brendan*, ed. Short and Merrilees, 7–8.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

which the long experience of English as a confident written language was instrumental in creating an environment in which French became a written literary language.

Edith/Matilda's linguistic experience is directly relevant to this story. Not only was she exposed from an early age to a number of European vernaculars (English, French, Gaelic, and perhaps even the German, Hungarian, and Russian of her mother's youth), but we can infer that she was aware of written English from childhood. Goscelin referred to vernacular texts at Wilton, and through William of Malmesbury she would have learned of a range of texts and documents written in English, especially the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, if she did not already know of them.[29] She was someone who would at least have known of the Chronicle, perhaps even directly. Thus she was well placed to understand at first hand the full potential of the written vernacular word and that, in the international and multilingual contexts of the Anglo-Norman court, this potential was ebbing away from English and could be turned towards French. William of Malmesbury himself signals the importance of French literary culture within the Anglo-Norman court when he includes the first reference to the *Chanson de Roland*'s being sung by the Normans in his *Gesta regum* account of the Battle of Hastings.[30] And from the perspective of the internationalism of the literary culture of English queens, the nature of French is highly relevant. French, unlike English, was not bound to a single polity but was itself an international language – of France, the Low Countries, the western German Empire, Norman Sicily and, with the Crusades, Outremer.[31] According to this story of French, one of the pivotal moments in the development of written French, the production of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan*, not only is claimed for England but is the culmination of the educational traditions and internationalism of the Anglo-Saxon royal nunneries.

Yet, pushing hard for Edith/Matilda as the patron of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* – however attractive that might seem for an account, such as this current book, which argues for Anglo-Saxon England's central place in European literary history – would in the final analysis shut down rather than open up the dynastic literary culture of the Anglo-Saxon royal nunneries. The Latin literary culture of the English court across the eleventh

29 See chapters 6 and 7 herein.

30 William of Malmesbury, *GRA* 3.242. William of Malmesbury, *GRA*, ed. Thomson, 2:233–4.

31 See most recently Gaunt, "French Literature Abroad."

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

and twelfth centuries demands to be situated in a distinctively international context in which England, France, Flanders, Normandy, and the Empire (including both Lotharingia and Germany) met.

Adeliza was the daughter of Godfrey, count of Lower Lotharingia and duke of Brabant. Three of the four surviving prologues of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* claim that she commissioned it.[32] If our focus is the active literary patronage that is so characteristic of Anglo-Saxon queens, Adeliza is a much better candidate than Edith/Matilda. Benedeit does, after all, insist that such patronage stands behind the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* when he writes twice in the opening lines of his poem that the queen commanded him to make his translation.[33] And for all its Irish subject matter, the *Navigatio sancti Brendani*, from which the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* is translated, was especially popular in Lower Lotharingia in the early-twelfth century and apparently not known in Britain or Ireland.[34] Adeliza, rather than Edith/Matilda, is thus more likely to have known the *Navigatio* and sought its translation into French. Her commissioning of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan* is not, moreover, an isolated act; among surviving early French texts, as well as being the putative patron of David's history, she is also the dedicatee of Phillipe de Thaon's *Bestiaire*.[35]

As with Edith/Matilda, Adeliza's linguistic experience also needs to be taken into account. She was a francophone woman from a part of the Empire where Romance and Germanic languages intermingled and where ethnicity, polity, and language were obviously not identical and where social standing had a strong role to play in language choice. The place of French as a high-status language in Lotharingian elite circles may have been a factor in Adeliza's desire to have a written French translation of the *Navigatio*.[36] Adeliza was a queen with an elite experience of the interaction of French and a Germanic language, in this case Dutch rather than English, which was not framed by conquest. In this regard it is worth noting that Edith/Matilda's request for information about her West Saxon ancestors entailed a *translatio* of history from English, a language whose

32 Benedeit, *Brendan*, ed. Short and Merrilees, 4.

33 Benedeit, *Brendan*, lines 10 and 13.

34 Selmer, "Study of Latin Manuscripts," 179, and his edition of the *Navigatio*, xxviii. But note that the existence of an eleventh-century copy at Saint-Évroult points to a route, via this Norman monastic house, for the *Navigatio* to have become known to Edith/Matilda.

35 Phillipe de Thaon, *Bestiaire*, line 18.

36 Haubrichs, "Volkssprache"; and Haubrichs, "*Pêle-mêle*."

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

sound distressed William of Malmesbury, into Latin in order to save it from oblivion.[37] From this perspective written English may have been more obviously a model for French in the context of the patronage of Adeliza than of Edith/Matilda. Although for both Adeliza and Edith/Matilda French was an international language, French and English likely had different symbolic values for each woman. If Adeliza was the original patron of the *Voyage of Saint Brendan*, we have, moreover, another example of the catalyzing impact of the movement of royal women on literary culture, this time from Brabant to Anglo-Norman England.

Although Adeliza takes the radical step of asking repeatedly for written French texts, and even if we have no reason to expect that she received the intensive education characteristic of Wilton, we cannot attribute her turn to the vernacular as a mark of her exclusion from Latin literary culture. French is not so much a replacement for Latin as a wholly new direction, a vernacular language that was both international and written. She held Wilton and thus was well placed to know of the nunnery's reputation for Anglo-Saxon royal learning.[38] Serlo of Wilton, a Latin poet who had studied in Paris and who also wrote French verse, may have been in her service.[39] Some manuscripts of Phillipe de Thaon's *Bestiaire* begin not with its French dedication but with a Latin poem in praise of Adeliza. The terms of its praise evoke the classicizing of the Loire poets, even if the poem itself is far from their sophistication. Adeliza is compared to Juno, Venus, and Minerva, and the gifts granted to her by Nature, such a prominent figure in Hildebert's poems about Cecilia, are said to exceed even Ovid's skill.[40] The flat-footedness of this poem, in stark contrast to the Loire poets, manifests an awareness of the cultural currency of the Roman story world when addressing an English queen. This clumsy imitation speaks of an effort to perpetuate an image of Adeliza consonant with the one so deliberately cultivated and projected by Emma, Edith, Adela, and Edith/Matilda as connoisseurs of the Roman story world. Adeliza's patronage of

37 William of Malmesbury, *GRA* 1, prologue; and William of Malmesbury, *Gesta pontificum* 4.186. It is interesting to note that William refrains, in the *GRA*, from making his sharpest criticisms of English, perhaps in deference to his patron.

38 Huneycutt, *Matilda of Scotland*, 64.

39 Rigg, *Anglo-Latin*, 70–1; and Rigg, "Serlo of Wilton."

40 Phillipe de Thaon, *Bestiaire*, ed. Walberg, ci–cii; and O'Donnell, Townend, and Tyler, "European Literature," 631. See chapter 6 herein.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

French literary culture, on which Benedeit's prologue insists, was built explicitly on models forged by Anglo-Saxon queens.

The direct passing on of an English inheritance to a now francophone world is too limited a narrative: in Adeliza's circles, as in Emma's, the English queen was the active focal point of international literary culture. The marrying in of Emma and Adeliza, the marrying out of so many royal women after 1066, and the links between the Anglo-Saxon, Norman (Holy Trinity), and Angevin (Le Ronceray) nunneries insured that the movement of women was critical both to English court culture and to its being a major constitutive dimension of secular western European literary culture in the High Middle Ages. And even after the end of our story of English queens consciously following Anglo-Saxon models of literary patronage, Phillipe de Thaon's rededication of the *Bestiaire*, originally for Adeliza, to Henry II's wife Eleanor of Aquitaine reminds us that the promotion of French history writing by these Angevin monarchs drew in part on the attitudes towards the written vernacular that were current in England. Opening up the eleventh- and twelfth-century Latin literary culture of English queens brings into view the overlapping of Anglo-Saxon, Norman, Flemish, German, Lotharingian, and Northern French literature in the English royal court that put Anglo-Saxon England, though politically dead, at the heart of early-twelfth-century European literary culture.

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

This content downloaded from
203.99.157.59 on Mon, 25 Oct 2021 00:58:47 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms