Introduction

Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton

Most of the contributors to this book would not describe themselves as liturgists. Few have had any training in using liturgical sources or have had their doctoral theses supervised by scholars whose primary interest was in liturgy. But between us, we have spent many decades working with such sources, exploring their potential as evidence for medieval history, and dealing with the problems involved in using them. In recent years there has been a revival of interest in medieval rituals but, despite this flourishing activity, medieval liturgy is rarely taught in universities. This book is a response to these circumstances.

Aims

The main focus of the book is on so-called 'occasional rites' which were actually anything but occasional. This term refers to all those rituals other than the mass and office, such as rites of passage like baptism and burial, the ceremonies associated with major feasts including Candlemas and Palm Sunday, consecration of people and things, for example priests and churches, and legal actions like ordeal and excommunication. However, there is no firm distinction to be made: occasional rites frequently included masses, or took place during a mass or office. Some authors included here primarily work on the mass or office, and many ideas in this book are relevant to all types of medieval Christian ritual. There are several reasons, though, why we have focused on such rites. In part it is because they have received rather less attention than the mass and the office.[1] But it is also because occasional rites are so informative about many different aspects of life in the Middle Ages. And finally there has been much recent work on them that challenges many established ideas, especially about the extent to which rites differed from place

---

[1] For example, the following works focus on the mass and office: Theodor Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy: An Account and Some Reflections*, 2nd edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979; originally published as *Kleine abendländische Liturgiegeschichte*, 5th edn., 1969, trans. by John Halliburton); Pierre-Marie Gy, *La liturgie dans l'histoire* (Paris: Cerf, 1990); John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991); Pfaff, *Liturgy*; Matthew Cheung Salisbury, *Hear My Voice, O God: Functional Dimensions of Christian Worship* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014).

to place and over time, and how the surviving evidence should be interpreted. Modern scholarship has witnessed a shift away from a search for origins in the early Church and a focus on teleological accounts of development, to a renewed emphasis on the diversity of the liturgical record, yet these ideas, and their implications, have not previously been fully articulated in print.

One of the book's primary purposes is to provide guidance to those who are new to the subject, want to know more about it, or wish to conduct research on liturgical topics. These specially commissioned essays offer advice in several different ways. The three contributions to Part I explicitly discuss the practicalities of undertaking research: In Chapter 1 Helen Gittos considers some of the problems and possibilities of working on rites; in Chapter 2 Frederick Paxton illustrates some of these issues by means of an autobiographical case study of his own work on rites for the dying and William Flynn explores current approaches by musicologists in Chapter 3. The two studies in Part II explore the problems caused by uncritical reliance on modern editions of medieval liturgical texts and how to avoid them. Henry Parkes in Chapter 4 examines the presumptions of, and methods used by, Michel Andrieu, Cyrille Vogel and Reinhard Elze to construct their edition of the so-called Romano-German Pontifical, and shows how unrepresentative that edition is of the manuscript record. In Chapter 5 Matthew Cheung Salisbury explains how the debates of nineteenth-century Anglicanism shaped the editions of the late medieval Uses of York and Sarum which are still used today. The three essays in Part III each focus on a different ritual. They provide examples of the range of evidence available for occasional rites, the approaches that can be taken, and the kinds of questions such evidence can help address. Sarah Hamilton explores some of the earliest eleventh-century examples of episcopal excommunication in Chapter 6, and Florence Chave-Mahir sets out the twelfth-century hagiographical as well as liturgical evidence for exorcism in Chapter 7. Mette Birkedal Brunn and Louis Hamilton in Chapter 8 approach the rite for church dedication from the different perspectives of sermons and liturgical rites and show how taking into account a range of sources enriches our understanding of the meaning and experience of this rite. These three case studies also illustrate one of the key themes of all recent work on the field: the extent of diversity one finds in the sources. The two contributions to Part IV are concerned with how the surviving sources relate to the way liturgy was actually practised. In Chapter 9, Carolyn Marino Malone demonstrates the value of reading the liturgical evidence of monastic customaries alongside the surviving architectural record, through case studies of Saint-Bénigne, Dijon and Wells Cathedral, whilst Carol Symes in Chapter 10 addresses problems of interpretation that frequently surface in other chapters as well from the point of view of a specialist in drama.

All the contributions refer to key resources and the aim has been to show the ways in which they may be used, their strengths and weaknesses, rather than to provide a comprehensive bibliography.[2] In order to convey the range of approaches that can be adopted and types of questions asked by people working in different disciplines, we solicited contributions from scholars with various disciplinary backgrounds: history, theology, musicology, architectural history, drama and English literature. One of the themes of this collection is that in this field it is vital to draw on as wide a range of sources as one can, even if reconciling them can be tricky. So, William Flynn emphasizes what is to be gained by cross-disciplinary collaboration, whilst Florence Chave-Mahir, Mette Birkedal Brunn and Louis Hamilton explore such an approach by examining the types of information that can be sought from different sources for the same ritual. These last three authors, alongside Carolyn Marino Malone and Carol Symes, concentrate on sources of evidence that are not often central to liturgical study, including saints' lives, sermons and church architecture. We hope that this mixture of practical guidance, case studies and bibliographical orientation will be both helpful and stimulating.

We also hope that this book will be of value to those who know a great deal about the subject as well as to beginners. In this regard we have three main aims. One is to articulate more clearly than has been done before some of the major recent changes in the ways that liturgical sources are being interpreted. Another is to invigorate the subject by encouraging greater co-operation between traditional scholarly communities. There are enduring divisions between people working on medieval liturgy which are chronological, geographical and disciplinary. We hope to demonstrate the value of greater communication by showing that a number of common concerns cross-over these groupings. The third aim is to address the historiographical legacy that we have inherited. This is a particular focus in Chapter 3 where William Flynn considers the musicological historiography and Chapters 4 and 5 in which Henry Parkes and Matthew Cheung Salisbury draw attention to the problematic nature of some of the editions of texts that have been considered landmarks in medieval liturgical history. In short, we hope this will be a helpful and provocative book.

Having set out what this book aims to be, it is worth explaining what it is not. This is not intended to serve as a replacement for existing accounts of the development of medieval liturgy. Nor is it intended as a critique of all previous

---

2   For bibliographies see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*; Richard W. Pfaff, *Medieval Latin Liturgy: A Select Bibliography*, Toronto Medieval Bibliographies 9 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982); Angelus A. Häussling, Martin Klöckener and Burkhard Neunheuser, 'Der Gottesdienst der Kirche: Texte, Quellen, Studien', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 42 (2000): 106–202; 43/44 (2001–02): 97–221; Paul F. Bradshaw, ed., *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (London: SCM Press, 2002); F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

scholarship: an enormous amount of scholarly effort has been invested in the edition of liturgical texts, and in investigating the relationships between particular manuscripts; work which, whatever the problems identified below and in the chapters in this collection, remains absolutely fundamental to current and future research. Nor has it been our aim to write a detailed account of the development of occasional rites. Instead our hope is that the ideas presented here, by providing various perspectives on these materials, will help stimulate future research. What follows is intended as a brief introduction to some issues that those interested in occasional rites should be aware of.

Being Aware of the Scholastic Inheritance

Modern historians of medieval liturgy are heirs to a considerable historiographical inheritance which continues to shape the field in profound ways. Even the word 'liturgy' itself is an early modern construct. Medieval churchmen never used *liturgia*, and its related adjectives, to describe the prayers and rites which structured both private and communal worship. The word only began to be used in this way in the mid-sixteenth century at a time when there was considerable debate about religious ceremonial.[3] In the Middle Ages, it was more common either to refer to specific types of texts – prayers, chants, *ordines* – or types of books – such as sacramentaries, antiphonaries, pontificals and rituals.[4] When a collective noun was used it tended to be *officia* (offices).[5] The modern use of 'liturgy' to apply to a more or less wide range of medieval ceremonies is therefore

---

[3]   Symes, Chapter 10 below, 239–40; Christopher A. Jones, 'Performing Christianity: Liturgical and Devotional Writing', in *The Cambridge History of Early Medieval English Literature*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 427–50, at 428. On the relative rarity of the term before the twentieth century see Simon Ditchfield, 'Giving Tridentine Worship Back Its History', in *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship,* ed. R.N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 35 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1999), 199–226, at 203–204. See also the discussion of the significance of Reformation polemic about religious ceremony in Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 164–202.

[4]   *Ordo* (plural *ordines*) is generally used to refer to texts with directions for performance of particular religious services; *sacramentary* is a service book containing all the prayers needed to celebrate mass on each day of the year, often together with *ordines* for pastoral rites (such as baptism, penance, funerals), blessings and other texts; *antiphonary* or antiphonal contains a collection of antiphons; *pontifical* contains those rites that could only be celebrated by a bishop (such as confirmation, clerical ordination, church dedication); *ritual* or *rituale* (or *manual*) contains rubrics and texts for celebrating rites performed by a priest. For an introduction to liturgical books see Palazzo, *History*.

[5]   Jones, 'Performing Christianity', 428.

anachronistic. All the contributors to this volume have self-consciously used 'liturgy' in its modern sense. However, it is fair to say that there are disagreements about what should be considered as liturgy and the whole topic of how church rituals were classified in the Middle Ages merits further investigation.[6]

The debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries among and between Roman Catholics and Protestants did not just provide us with a specious vocabulary. They also shaped the study of what we now know as medieval liturgy in terms of modern scholars' chronological and geographical emphases, the questions they ask, and materials they study. These battles were largely fought over the mass and, to a lesser extent, the round of daily prayer known as the office. The Protestants' quest for authenticity led them to become interested in the history of the practices of the early Church before (as they saw it) the liturgy had been corrupted by Rome. And the Catholics sought validity for their ceremonies by trying to demonstrate continuity with apostolic practices and across Christian history.[7] The search for authority has left its mark in present-day scholarship, especially in the English-language history of pastoral rites such as baptism where attention has largely focused on Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages.[8]

It was, however, late medieval liturgy which shaped the rituals of both sides in the early modern period. In England many of the medieval rites characterized as Sarum were adapted into the Book of Common Prayer (1549).[9] The service books which emerged in the wake of the Council of Trent (1545–63) and which were promoted universally throughout Catholic Europe, also had their origins in the late medieval Church; the Roman Pontifical approved by Pope Clement VIII in 1595 is based, essentially, on the late thirteenth-century compilation

---

[6] For problems of definition see below, Chapters 1, pp. 30–32; 6, pp. 157–58; and 10, pp. 239–41.

[7] Interpretations of medieval liturgy are inevitably caught up in wider understanding of Christian history; for an overview see Anthony Grafton, 'Church History in Early Modern Europe: Tradition and Innovation', in *Sacred History: Uses of the Christian Past in the Renaissance World* ed. Katherine Van Liere, Simon Ditchfield and Howard Louthan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 1–26; the other contributions to this volume are also relevant. An example of the Reformers' interest in the origins of liturgical uses can be found in q. 5 of Archbishop Thomas Cranmer's questionnaire sent to other bishops in 1547, cited by Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 2nd edn. (London: A. and C. Black, 1945), 640–42.

[8] E.C. Whitaker and Maxwell E. Johnson, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy*, 3rd edn., Alcuin Club Collections 79 (London: SPCK, 2003); Bryan D. Spinks, *Early and Medieval Rituals and Theologies of Baptism: From the New Testament to the Council of Trent* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006). On early Church liturgy see Paul F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship* (London: SPCK, 2009).

[9] Salisbury, *Hear My Voice*, 65.

of William Durandus (1293–95).[10] The use made of late medieval liturgy was balanced, though, by a renewed emphasis on the regional: local churches looked to validate their past, be it in Italy through local saints' cults, or in England where there was a special interest in the Anglo-Saxon Church as exemplifying an indigenous form of Christianity untouched by the perceived corruption of the later medieval Church.[11] In the sixteenth-century Reformation, there was, then, keen interest in the Late Antique and early medieval Churches and much use made of later medieval rites but perhaps rather less concern for the liturgy of the period in between; that is, of the central Middle Ages.

These tendencies to focus on the earlier and later periods were exacerbated by developments in the nineteenth century. The Liturgical Movement, which was initially Roman Catholic, sought to counteract the trend towards clerically dominated public rites and bring the laity back into active participation, especially through chanting responses in the mass.[12] They looked back to a time before the divisions of the Reformation, viewing the Middle Ages as a period of great lay piety, manifest in church building, and wanted to revive the chants of the period. At the same time, they, like their Tridentine predecessors, sought authority and authenticity in the study of rites from earlier periods. The focus, perhaps inevitably, was on chants for the mass and office. This emphasis helped reinforce the view that the late medieval Church had excluded the laity from active involvement in the liturgy, and that vernacular languages were not widely used in liturgical contexts.[13] In the Church of England, the proponents of the

---

[10]   Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 255–56.

[11]   Ditchfield, 'Giving Tridentine Worship Back its History'; Simon Ditchfield, *Liturgy, Sanctity and History in Tridentine Italy: Pietro Maria Campi and the Preservation of the Particular* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Vivienne Sanders, 'The Household of Archbishop Parker and the Influencing of Public Opinion', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 34, no. 4 (1983): 534–47; Angelika Lutz, 'The Study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the Seventeenth Century and the Establishment of Old English Studies in the Universities', in *The Recovery of Old English: Anglo-Saxon Studies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Timothy Graham (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000), 1–82, esp. 1–2 and n. 2.

[12]   'Liturgical Movement', in *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. Cross and Livingstone, 987–88; Katherine Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments: The Revival of Gregorian Chant at Solesmes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

[13]   For example, Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971). For a corrective to views about the exclusion of the laity see Virginia Reinburg, 'Liturgy and the Laity in Late Medieval and Reformation France', *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 23, no. 3 (1992): 526–47; Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400–c. 1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 91–130. On the use of vernacular languages in the English liturgy see Helen Gittos, 'The Use of English in the Liturgy in the Middle Ages: A Case-Study from York' (working title, forthcoming); and Bruce Holsinger, *The Work of God: Liturgical*

emerging High Church movement sought to emphasize their Church's descent from the universal Church, and the continuities between its practices and those of the late medieval period: this led to the interest in the late medieval Uses of Sarum and York traced by Matthew Cheung Salisbury in Chapter 5. It is also manifest in the foundation of the Cambridge Camden Society (which later became the Ecclesiological Society) in 1839 and the Henry Bradshaw Society 'for the editing of rare liturgical texts' in 1890. These nineteenth-century concerns helped shape the development of much scholarly work and the creation of editions upon which, whatever their shortcomings, modern researchers still rely.

The confessionalization of scholarship on medieval liturgy has had other legacies too. Until the mid-twentieth century, research on liturgy was largely the domain of professional religious, belonging to both the Catholic and Protestant traditions. In England, for example, with certain notable exceptions such as the Catholic layman Edmund Bishop, this was the case until well after the Second World War.[14] But it is also worth recognizing the contribution made by art historians who, in England at least, helped in the twentieth century lead the turn away from such confessional approaches, for those interested in manuscript art have long recognized the need to understand the liturgical material. Art historians have, however, largely, but not wholly, focused on the evidence for saints' feasts recorded in calendars and litanies, seeking to attribute manuscripts and to trace relationships between different houses.[15] They have been much less interested in occasional rites.

Culture and Vernacular Writing in Britain, 550–1550 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming).

[14] Many of the most influential works on medieval liturgy in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries are the work of churchmen, including Adalbert Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter Iter italicum* (Freiburg: Herder, 1896); Josef A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia: eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, 2 vols., 2nd rev. edn. (Vienna: Herder, 1949), trans. Francis A. Brunner as *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, 2 vols. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1951–55); Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*; *OR*; *Le pontifical romain au moyen âge*, ed. Michel Andrieu, 4 vols., Studi e Testi 86–89 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1938–41); Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*. For Edmund Bishop see his posthumously published papers, *Liturgica Historica: Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918).

[15] Key figures in English medieval liturgical manuscript studies include Francis Wormald (see for example his *English Benedictine Kalendars before AD 1100*, HBS 72 (London: HBS, 1934)); Christopher Hohler, for whom there is a partial bibliography in Alan Borg and Andrew Martindale, eds., *The Vanishing Past: Studies of Medieval Art, Liturgy and Metrology Presented to Christopher Hohler* British Archaeological Reports, International Series, 111 (Oxford, 1981), 1–6; Derek Turner, for whom there is a bibliography in Janet Backhouse and Shelley Jones, 'D.H. Turner (1931–1985): A Portrait', *The British Library Journal* 13, no. 2 (1987): 111–17; and Nigel J. Morgan (see for example his *English Monastic Litanies of the Saints after 1100*, 2 vols., HBS 119–20 (London: HBS, 2012–13)). See also Eric Palazzo, 'Art and Liturgy in the Middle

Much of the work in the last fifty years has continued along the chronological lines set down by early modern and nineteenth-century churchmen and this helps to explain the relative neglect of the central Middle Ages, and of occasional rites, in the prevailing narratives of liturgical history. Thus accounts tend to focus on either the earlier or the later Middle Ages, and particularly on the early Church and the Carolingian reforms, or the years after the Fourth Lateran Council.[16]

The essays in this book address this legacy in several ways. First, many are concerned with evidence from the tenth to twelfth centuries; this is, in part, to challenge traditional ideas that the foundations of Christian liturgy were laid in the early Church and flourished in the High Middle Ages. Second, we have included some explicit discussion of historiographical topics, especially in Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5. Given the extent to which past debates continue to shape modern research it is vital to understand the framework within which current narratives have developed. Third, our focus on occasional rites is also intended to address another example of how early modern concerns have skewed contemporary debate. Occasional offices have always received less attention and one reason for this is that the debates of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were focused principally on the mass and the office, as these were seen as the most theologically contentious areas. Fourth, all the chapters address one of the most potent legacies of earlier scholarship. This is a series of teleological narratives about how rites developed during the Middle Ages which traces the origins of later collections back to earlier texts, and gives seminal importance to particular works, such as the 'Romano-German Pontifical', and periods, such as the Carolingian Reformation.[17] The attraction of such stories is that they simplify the complexity of the evidence. But, as the contributions to this volume make clear, they are also deeply problematic because they do not take account of the very diverse nature of the rites themselves. It is therefore vital to reassess the nature and influence of traditional landmarks in liturgical history.

Ages: Survey of Research (1980–2003) and Some Reflections on Method', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105, no. 1 (2006): 170–84.

[16]   For example, Palazzo's *History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century* focuses mainly on the years pre-1000; John Harper's *Forms and Orders*, whilst it begins in the tenth century, focuses its attention on the later Middle Ages; Richard Pfaff's study, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History*, devotes some seventy pages to the Anglo-Saxon period, one hundred pages to the years 1066–1215, and some 350 pages to the years after 1215; Andrew Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982) has a similarly later focus.

[17]   For example, see the efforts to construct a genealogy for the evolution of liturgical traditions in Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, 399, 403 (Tables A and E).

Challenges

This brief discussion conveys something of the extent to which modern research into medieval liturgy continues to be shaped by early modern and nineteenth-century preoccupations. How can we break away from them? In these studies, and the discussions that helped shape them, several potentially fruitful approaches have emerged. One is that it is essential to recognize and find ways of working with the diversity of the evidence, be it for individual rites, as with excommunication, exorcism or church dedication, or collections of rites, such as those now known as the Romano-German Pontifical. It is also useful to pay attention to the contexts in which individual rites were recorded. For example, it is instructive to ask: Why was this rite written down?[18] There is much that can be learnt here from the approaches taken by relevant research in musicology and drama.[19] Other ways in which to contextualize rites include trying to answer questions like: How were these texts read? What was the audience for a particular manuscript? Why were some rites viewed as core to most collections, whilst others, such as those for exorcism and excommunication, seem to have been more peripheral?[20] In asking these questions, scholars need to be mindful, as Carol Symes points out in Chapter 10, that medieval manuscripts of liturgical rites were rarely, if ever, intended simply as a prescription for how the service should be conducted, as with some modern service books. By focusing on the local and the particular scholars may identify fresh ways in which to interpret, and understand, medieval rites. One example of this is Sarah Hamilton's comparison of excommunication rites in Chapter 6 which helps explain how and why the collections in which they appear were compiled. It is also helpful to make use of other types of evidence in addition to the rites themselves. Considering other genres and media alongside liturgical texts can be very revealing, as Florence Chave-Mahir, Mette Birkedal Bruun, Louis Hamilton and Carolyn Marino Malone demonstrate in Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

We hope these essays convey something of the excitement of current work in the field, the potential value of the evidence, and some directions for future research. Liturgy should not be a marginal subject, of interest only to those who

---

[18]   For an example of this approach, see S. Hamilton, Chapter 6 in this book.

[19]   See, for example, Susan Rankin, 'From Memory to Record: Musical Notations in Manuscripts from Exeter', *Anglo-Saxon England* 13 (1984): 97–112; Carol Symes, 'The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theater', *Speculum* 77 (2002): 778–831; eadem, 'The Medieval Archive and the History of Theater: Assessing the Written and Unwritten Evidence for Premodern Performance', *Theatre Survey* 52, no. 1 (2011): 29–58.

[20]   Hamilton, Chapter 6 and Chave-Mahir, Chapter 7 below.

study the lives of medieval professional religious.[21] Occasional rites, in particular, were often directed towards, and involved, the laity as well as the clergy. And the liturgy was not nearly as static as often supposed: it was continually adapted to meet new circumstances. Investigating how and why this was offers not only new ways of understanding medieval liturgical evidence, but also of improving our understanding of the Middle Ages.

---

[21]   Unfortunately Arnold Angenendt's pioneering work in this respect is yet to be fully taken up by English-language scholarship: see his *Geschichte der Religiosität im Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1997) and his *Liturgik und Historik. Gab es eine organische Liturgie-Entwicklung?* (Freiburg: Herder, 2001). Other examples of recent books that attempt to integrate liturgy and social history include Eric Palazzo, *Liturgie et société au Moyen Age* (Paris: Aubier, 2000) and Sarah Hamilton, *Church and People in the Medieval West, 900–1200* (Harlow: Pearson, 2013).