PROJECT MUSE®

The Bishop in the Bedroom: Witnessing Episcopal Sexuality in an Age of Reform

Megan McLaughlin

Journal of the History of Sexuality, Volume 19, Number 1, January 2010, pp. 17-34 (Article)

Published by University of Texas Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/sex.0.0076>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/369563>

The Bishop in the Bedroom: Witnessing Episcopal Sexuality in an Age of Reform

MEGAN MCLAUGHLIN

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

A bishop should revere and constantly review the Lord's command: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning" [Luke 12:35]. He who wishes to carry burning lamps in his hands along with the wise virgins [Matthew 25:1–12], let him gird his loins. For if no one shall see God without chastity, how much more is this true for a bishop? For a bishop who is not chaste in mind and body, although he may appear to live, yet is dead and buried.

—Bonizo, bishop of Sutri and Piacenza¹

EFFORTS TO ENFORCE THE ANCIENT regulations concerning clerical celibacy arose in various centers of European religious life around 1000 and received further impetus from the reformed papacy during the second half of the eleventh century.² Modern scholarship has generally focused on the implications of the celibacy campaign for priests and deacons, members of the "lower" clergy. But for contemporaries, episcopal sexuality also remained in question. A significant number of bishops continued to marry during the

¹ Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita christiana*, 2.41, ed. Ernst Perels, *Texte zur Geschichte des römischen und kanonischen Rechts in Mittelalter*, 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1930), 55; cf. 3.106, p. 107. On this work see Walter Berschin, *Bonizo von Sutri: Leben und Werk* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 57–75.

² On the development of rules about clerical celibacy see Henry Charles Lea, *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1867) and later editions; A. M. Stickler, "L'évolution de la discipline du célibat dans l'Église en Occident de la fin de l'âge patristique au Concile de Trent," in *Sacerdoce et célibat: Études historiques et théologiques*, ed. Joseph Coppens et al. (Gembloux: Duculot/Louvain: Peeters, 1971), 373–442; Georg Denzler, *Das Papsttum und der Amtszölibat*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1973–76). On the period from the tenth to the twelfth century specifically see Jean Gaudemet, "Le célibat ecclésiastique: Le droit et la pratique du Xe au XIIIe siècle," *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung* 68 (1982): 1–31; Anne Llewellyn Barstow, *Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy: The Eleventh-Century Debates* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellon, 1982); Michael Frassetto, ed., *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform* (New York: Garland, 1998).

eleventh century. Bishop Segenfrid of Le Mans (971–97), for example, took a wife in his old age who became known as the “bishoress.” He had several children with her and even endowed one of them with church property.³ Such behavior continued to occur even after decades of reform efforts, as demonstrated by the case of Bishop Juhel of Dol (1039–ca. 1076), attacked by Pope Gregory VII in a letter of 1076.⁴ Even those who did not marry might still fail to resist the “fragility of the flesh,” conducting extramarital affairs with women or sometimes with men.⁵ (Of course, we know about these mostly from scurrilous attacks on individual bishops that may or may not be rooted in reality. However, human nature being what it is, it seems likely that such affairs did take place.) There remained, then, much work for reformers to do in this area.

In his collection of canon law texts from the second half of the eleventh century, the reforming Cardinal Bishop Bonizo of Sutri (1075–90) paid almost as much attention to episcopal sexuality as to that of the lower clergy. A passage from his work was cited at the beginning of this article. A somewhat earlier figure than Bonizo, Cardinal Bishop Peter Damian (1057–72), discussed the sexual misconduct of his fellow bishops in two different works. In his notorious treatise against sodomy among the clergy (known as the *Gomorrhian Book*), composed for Pope Leo IX around 1049, Peter Damian reserved his strongest condemnation for bishops who had sex with clerics from their own diocese: “Who will make a mistress of a cleric, or a woman of a man? Who, by his lust, will consign a son whom he has spiritually begotten for God to slavery under the iron law of satanic tyranny?”⁶ What was already a heinous sin in Peter’s view was made even worse by the relationship between those involved. A bishop’s clerics were his “spiritual sons.” To have intercourse with them was therefore a form of incest—and an especially egregious form:

It follows, therefore, that the same sentence is rightly inflicted on him who assaults his own daughter, or who by sacrilegious intercourse abuses his spiritual daughter, and on him also who in his foul lust

³ *Actus pontificum Cennomannis in urbe degentium*, ed. Gustave Busson and Ambroise Ledru (Le Mans: Société des archives historiques du Maine, 1902), 354–55. Throughout this article the dates provided are for the years of the bishop’s pontificate. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

⁴ Gregory VII, Epistola (hereafter Ep.) 16 (1076), in *The “Epistolae vagantes” of Pope Gregory VII*, ed. and trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972), 44–47.

⁵ *Gesta episcoporum Magdeburgensium*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (hereafter MGH), *Scriptores in folio* (hereafter SS), 14:399, concerning Archbishop Engilhard (1051–63).

⁶ Peter Damian, Ep. 31 (1049), in *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. Kurt Reindel, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 4 vols. (Munich: MGH, 1983–93), 1:294–95; *The Letters of Peter Damian*, trans. Owen J. Blum, 6 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989–2004), 2:15. On Peter’s interest in the celibacy issue see Jean de Chasteigner, “Le célibat sacerdotal dans les écrits de saint Pierre Damien,” *Doctor Communis* 24 (1971): 169–83, 261–77.

defiles a cleric, whom he has ordained. Perhaps we should distinguish here the quality of both crimes; in the two prior cases, even though he practices incest, he is sinning naturally, because he sinned with a woman; in the latter case, by his shameful action with a cleric, he commits a sacrilege on a son, is guilty of the crime of incest on a man, and violates the law of nature.⁷

When a bishop had sex with a cleric from his own diocese, he combined a breach of the taboos against sex with relatives with a flouting of the laws of nature.

There were close parallels between Peter's treatment of episcopal sexuality in this text on sodomy and in another, composed ten years later, devoted to the problem of bishops who married. Writing to Pope Nicholas II in 1059, Peter argued that episcopal marriages were a problem primarily because they threatened sacramental purity:

O bishop, you whose name means to make sacred, that is, that you should offer sacrifice to God, why are you not terrified to offer yourself in sacrifice to the evil spirits? By committing fornication you cut yourself off from the members of Christ, and make yourself physically one with a harlot . . . [1 Corinthians 6:15–16]. . . . What business have you to handle the body of Christ, when by wallowing in the allurements of the flesh you have become a member of antichrist.⁸

Because a bishop was ultimately responsible for all the sacramental activity in his diocese, his sexual misconduct threatened his entire church with defilement:

And since all ecclesiastical orders are accumulated in one awesome structure in you alone, you surely defile all of them as you pollute yourself by associating with prostitutes. And thus you contaminate by your actions the doorkeeper, the lector, the exorcist, and in turn all the sacred orders, for all of which you must give an account before the severe judgment seat of God. As you lay your hand on someone, the Holy Spirit descends upon him; and you use your hand to touch the private parts of harlots.⁹

In order to underline the shocking nature of this pollution, Peter again invoked the specter of incest. He spelled out here what was only implicit in his earlier treatise: the special relationship between the bishop and his church, which made him the father of all those within his diocese:

All the children of the church are undoubtedly your children. And it is also quite obvious that spiritual generation is something greater than

⁷ Peter Damian, Ep. 31 (1049), ed. Reindel, 1:296; trans. Blum, 2:16.

⁸ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:214; trans. Blum, 3:9–10.

⁹ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:215–16; trans. Blum, 3:11.

carnal parenthood. Moreover, since you are the husband, the spouse of your church, symbolized by the ring of your betrothal and the staff of your mandate, all who are reborn in her by the sacrament of baptism must be ascribed to you as your children. Therefore, if you commit incest with your spiritual daughter, how in good conscience do you dare perform the mystery of the Lord's body?¹⁰

In both treatises, then, Peter was concerned with the incestuous nature of episcopal sexuality, which heightened both the sin of the individuals involved and the threat of pollution to the church.

Peter was also worried about the impact of bishops' sexual activities on their authority. He warned Pope Nicholas II in 1059 that the "disease" of episcopal marriage was already widespread and getting worse. Other problems in the church have been investigated, but not "clerical sexuality [*de clericorum . . . libidine*]" for fear of insults from laymen."¹¹ Apparently, Peter's contemporaries were worried that if they revealed the clergy's sexual activities, the authority of the priesthood would be undermined. A similar concern had been expressed in the *Gomorrhian Book*: "Who can expect the flock to prosper when its shepherd [the bishop] has sunk so deep into the bowels of the devil? *What man will continue to be under his authority*, knowing that he is so hostilely estranged from God?"¹² In fact, Peter's worries turned out to be justified. As the reform movement accelerated in the second half of the eleventh century, criticism of clerical morality did contribute to the rise of popular anticlericalism.¹³ But Peter's real complaint in 1059 was that while lower-level clerics were prosecuted for being sexually active, similar misconduct on the part of bishops was tolerated. Reformers feared "publicly to disgrace" bishops; they were reluctant to make them lose the "honors of their office."¹⁴

Peter's language made it sound as though the failure to prosecute lecherous bishops was the result of worldly considerations. But there was more to the problem than that. What he never explicitly stated (although it is implicit in his argument) is that church law made it very difficult to bring a case of this sort against a bishop. Normally, a bishop's subordinates were forbidden to bring charges or testify against him. The only exception was

¹⁰ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:215; trans. Blum, 3:10–11. On the idea of the bishop's marriage to his church see Megan McLaughlin, "The Bishop as Bridegroom: Marital Imagery and Clerical Celibacy in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries," in Frassetto, *Medieval Purity and Piety*, 209–37.

¹¹ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:208; trans. Blum, 3:4.

¹² Peter Damian, Ep. 31 (1049), ed. Reindel, 1:294–95; trans. Blum, 2:15, emphasis added.

¹³ R. I. Moore, *The Origins of European Dissent* (London: Allen Lane, 1977), 46–81; Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002), 43–51.

¹⁴ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:213; trans. Blum, 3:8.

if he were suspected of heresy; the law of the church decreed that all other forms of misconduct besides heresy were to be tolerated by subordinates.¹⁵ Peter had a threefold response to this unstated problem. First, he asserted that the problem could not be hushed up because it was already too public: "Shamelessly, this epidemic has been so audaciously revealed that everyone knows the houses of prostitution, the names of the mistresses, the fathers-in-law and mothers-in-law."¹⁶ (Notice that Peter, whose example was followed by other opponents of clerical marriage, condemned the bishops' wives as "prostitutes" and "mistresses." He nevertheless recognized that those involved see themselves as married by naming their relatives as "in-laws.") Second, he suggested that metropolitan bishops should take the lead in correcting their suffragan bishops so that superiors rather than subordinates were acting against bishops.¹⁷ And third, in what was at the time a novel argument, he claimed that while sexual misconduct itself was merely a sin, the *defense* of clerical sexuality was actually a heresy—the heresy of the "Nicolaitans."¹⁸

For churchmen such as Peter Damian, the correction of episcopal behavior, including sexual behavior, was the first and most essential step in a much broader program of reform.¹⁹ For without moral and effective bishops in place, the reform of all the other members of Christian society would be impossible. Yet reformers faced considerable opposition from sinful bishops, from their relatives in the nobility, and from conservative rulers and church leaders who supported the goals of the reformers but opposed their high-handed ways. In this atmosphere of reform and resistance the bishop's bedchamber became a highly charged symbolic space not only for the bishop himself but also for those around him. Even if the bishop himself remained celibate, contemporary writers used his bedchamber and his very bed as sites within which struggles over reform, which were closely tied to the bishop's identity as a man and as an effective leader, were enacted.

Two examples may serve to make this clear. The first story comes from the biography, or *vita*, of Lietbert of Cambrai (1051–76). Early in his clerical career, before he became bishop, Lietbert had earned the enmity of John

¹⁵ Burchard, *Decretum*, 1.136, in *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina* (hereafter *PL*), ed. Jean-Paul Migne, 221 vols. (Paris: Migne, 1844–64), 140:589–90; Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum*, 5.250, *PL* 161:401.

¹⁶ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:208; trans. Blum, 3:4.

¹⁷ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:213; trans. Blum, 3:9.

¹⁸ Peter Damian, Ep. 61 (1059), ed. Reindel, 2:216–17; trans. Blum, 3:12. On early attempts to define "Nicolaitism" as a heresy see Émile Amann, "Nicolaites," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, 15 vols. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1903–50), 11:499–506; on the reform period see Giuseppe Fornasari, *Celibato sacerdotale e "autocoscienza" ecclesiale: Per la storia della "nicolaitica heresis" nell'occidente medievale* (Udine: Del Bianco, 1981).

¹⁹ On the relationship between celibacy and other reform issues see Johannes Laudage, *Priesterbild und Reformpapsttum im 11. Jahrhundert* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1984).

of Arras, the troublesome castellan of Cambrai. After the previous bishop's death Lietbert was nominated to succeed him, but the process of election and consecration took him away from Cambrai, and in his absence John invaded the cathedral and episcopal palace, ejected the clergy, seized the cathedral treasury, and "installed his wife in the bishop's own bed."²⁰ The other acts of aggression mentioned in this account were not terribly unusual during the transition period between pontificates. Indeed, in some dioceses it was customary for the people of the city or the nobles of the area to plunder a bishop's property after his death. However, installing one's wife in the bishop's bed was not so common. Surely this was intended as a calculated insult. The idea may have been suggested to John by Lietbert's preoccupation with chastity—on which more below. Lietbert was in fact notable for the normal *absence* of a wife from his chamber. By introducing any woman into the bishop's bedroom, John was undermining Lietbert's status as a celibate bishop; it is also possible that by making that woman his own wife, John intended some humiliating comparison between his own manhood and Lietbert's lack of virility suggested by the bishop's sexual abstinence. For in a period when many bishops still shared with laymen sexual markers of manliness, the masculinity of a celibate bishop may well have been in doubt.²¹

The bedchamber plays a very different role in a story from the life of Bishop Godfrey of Amiens (1104–15). Godfrey was an assertive, indeed, an aggressive reformer. From the very beginning of his career as bishop he insisted that the clergy in his diocese give up their wives—a move that his biographer characterized using the language of virility. Godfrey "manfully" excluded married priests from church services; he fought "with a manly spirit" against the recalcitrant clergy's efforts to oppose him. However, his efforts so enraged the "concubine" (the term reformers often used to refer to clerical wives) of one of his priests that she sent him a poisoned drinking cup. Godfrey innocently received the gift; but instead of drinking from it immediately, he dipped a piece of bread in it to feed a stray puppy that had wandered into his residence. The puppy gobbled it down, then went into the bishop's bedroom and settled down to sleep on his bed. When one of the chamberlains later tried to chase it off the bed, he discovered that it was dead, revealing that "most wicked" woman's plan.²² Here a "concubine," seeking to penetrate the bishop's bed and body with her poison (a symbol

²⁰ Rudolph of Saint-Séculcre, *Vita Lietberti episcopi Cameracensis*, 14, *MGH, SS* 30:2:848.

²¹ Vern L. Bullough, "On Being a Male in the Middle Ages," in *Medieval Masculinities: Regarding Men in the Middle Ages*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 34.

²² Nicholas of Soissons, *Vita S. Godefridi episcopi Ambianensi*, 2.8, in *Acta Sanctorum*, ed. Jean Bolland et al., 3rd ed. (Paris: V. Palmé, 1863–69), Nov. III, col. 920. On Godfrey see John S. Ott, "Writing Godfrey of Amiens: Guibert of Nogent and Nicholas of Saint-Crépin between Sanctity, Ideology and Society," *Mediaeval Studies* 67 (2005): 317–65.

of feminine sexuality in many reforming polemics), was foiled by divine intervention. Surely the story at some level suggested Godfrey's sexual impermeability as well as his invulnerability to physical threats. It underlined his forcefulness and helped to explain his success as a reformer.

If we know about Godfrey's evasion of death and Lietbert's humiliation, it was because the bishop's bedroom was a very public place in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Violent attacks that occurred in the bedroom became widely known; so, too, did the details of the bishop's sexuality. Two remarkable texts from the late eleventh century actually refer to songs composed about bishops' homosexual activities. Archbishop Manasses of Rheims (1069–81) reported of his enemy, Bishop Reynard of Langres (1065–85), that he “behaved himself so shamefully, so lustfully, they say, that around here songs about the lovers he left behind in places he had been are sung by those like him. One of these begins in this way: ‘Come, dainty one and fair, Girlish skin, untouched by hair.’”²³ Two decades later remarkably similar accusations were lodged with the papal legate in France by the reforming bishop, Ivo of Chartres (1091–1116). Ivo claimed that Bishop John of Orléans (ca. 1088–96) had raised his lover (a young cleric known to his fellow canons as “Flora” because of his sexual proclivities) to the position of archdeacon at Orléans. After John died his brother, Archbishop Raoul II of Tours (1087–1118), whose own relationship with “Flora” was in question, supported the young man's bid to become bishop of Orléans. As evidence against the new bishop, Ivo of Chartres sent the legate a copy of a song about “Flora” that—he asserted—was being sung “by other young men like him” and that the new bishop himself liked to sing with his bedmates and to have sung to him.²⁴

There is no way of verifying these stories, whose sources are certainly questionable. Yet regardless of whether the bishops involved really did have sex with men or even whether songs were really sung about them, the fact that Manasses and Ivo could include these details in their charges suggests that their audiences were accustomed to very open discussion of the behavior of bishops in their bedrooms. Indeed, it would have been difficult for any bishop in this period to keep such behavior secret, for there was little privacy in a bishop's bedroom. A medieval bishop normally lived night and day surrounded by his entourage, made up of both laymen and clerics. He had his own knights to protect him from (and perhaps to engage in attacks against) his enemies. At least some of these knights would sleep in his bedchamber, side by side with the clerics who made up the rest of his retinue—and who might themselves fight and die for their

²³ “Die Hannoversche Briefsammlung,” Ep. 107, in *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV*, ed. Carl Erdmann and Norbert Fickermann, *MGH*, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 5 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1950), 179.

²⁴ Ivo of Chartres, Epp. 54 (1096), 65 (1098), in *Correspondance*, ed. Jean Leclercq (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1949), 216–22, 282–90.

lord in moments of desperation.²⁵ Nevertheless, the clerics were there primarily for peaceful purposes. The literate clerical chamberlains kept track of the bishop's treasure, which was normally kept in the bedchamber (hence the juxtaposition, in the above account, of John of Arras's seizure of the treasury and the installation of his wife in the bishop's bed). Other clerical attendants, including boys and young men destined for clerical careers, normally served the bishop at table and provided him with advice and with intimate bodily care in life and in death.

The presence of an entourage was normal for any person of high rank in this period. Canon law, however, envisioned specific functions for episcopal attendants. Burchard of Worms (1000–1025) and Ivo of Chartres ("Flora's" opponent) were great experts in church law whose careers bracketed the eleventh century. Both included in their influential collections of canons a decree originally issued by a ninth-century synod at Ticino:

The holy synod decreed that a bishop's private domestic business should be made impenetrable to all criticism and suspicion, so that, according to the Apostle, we may "provide good things, not only before God, but also before all men" [cf. 2 Corinthians 8:21]. It is, therefore, proper that priests and clerics of good repute be present in the bishop's bedroom and at his most secret duties of every kind. They should dutifully attend the bishop as he keeps vigil, as he prays, and as he studies Holy Writ, and act as witnesses of his holy conversation and imitators of his preaching to the glory of God.²⁶

Similar decrees were to be found in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, that ninth-century collection of real and falsified papal decrees that became so important to the proponents of ecclesiastical reform in the eleventh century.²⁷ One such decree encouraged bishops to have clerics rather than "lay boys" as attendants in their private quarters so that the clergy would be the ones to benefit from the bishop's edifying example.²⁸ Another, however, cited the need to protect the bishop against unfounded accusations: although his own conscience should suffice, it was still proper for him to have good witnesses in case "malevolent men" accused him of crimes. Therefore, he should have two priests or three deacons with him wherever he should go

²⁵ For the presence of knights in the bedchamber see Guibert of Nogent, *Autobiographie*, 1.15, ed. Edmond-René Labande (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981), 118–20; for their use against enemies see Guibert, *Autobiographie*, 3.5, p. 300.

²⁶ Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, 1.103, *PL* 140:581; Ivo of Chartres, *Decretum*, 5.205, *PL* 161:386.

²⁷ Horst Fuhrmann, *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorische Fälschungen, von ihrem Auftauchen bis in die neuere Zeit*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1972–74), 2:290–353.

²⁸ "Decreta S. Gregorii papae," 2, in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, ed. Paul Hinschius (Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1863), 746.

“for the sake of ecclesiastical testimony.”²⁹ According to church law, then, there were two reasons for a bishop to have clerics constantly in attendance around him: on the one hand, they could serve as witnesses to disprove in court any assertions about his vices; on the other, they could learn themselves and help others learn from his virtues.

If reform-minded clerics made sure such canons were included in the collections of church law they were promulgating in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, it was partly because the contemporary campaign for clerical celibacy was opening prelates up to accusations of sexual misbehavior by their enemies. By spelling out the evils of episcopal sexual impurity, reformers like Peter Damian made prosecution of incontinent bishops imperative. And by defining the defense of clerical marriage as heretical, reformers made prosecution easier, for subordinates *were* allowed to testify against bishops accused of heresy. The reformers’ goal was to eliminate episcopal as well as priestly sexual activity, but the unintended consequence of their efforts was to provide the enemies of particular bishops with a new and useful weapon. Instead of trying to kidnap or kill them (something often attempted in this period), they could simply charge them with sexual misconduct, then stand back and let the ecclesiastical courts, impelled by the reform movement, act for them.

This is precisely what happened to the unfortunate bishop Pibo of Toul (1069/70–1107). An unnamed cleric of Toul who had gotten into a dispute with his bishop went to Pope Gregory VII to accuse Pibo of simony (that is, buying his office) and “open” fornication “with a certain woman by whom he had begotten a son—although the rumour was that he had united her to himself after the manner of laymen by vow and betrothal.”³⁰ Properly speaking, Gregory should have dismissed the charges, for the cleric had no legal right to bring them against his bishop. However, the pope was a zealous opponent of clerical “fornication” (and of simony) and was thus reluctant to allow the behavior alleged against Pibo to go unpunished. Gregory followed Peter Damian’s suggestion in ordering Pibo’s metropolitan, Archbishop Udo of Trier (1066–78), to investigate—which Udo did, although he complained bitterly about the bad precedent Gregory had set in allowing a subordinate to lodge complaints against his bishop.

Udo’s letter to Gregory offers a fascinating account of how such investigations were conducted. First, the plaintiff was questioned, but he refused to repeat his charges to Udo in court. Next, the archbishop brought in the archdeacons of Toul—that is, the witnesses a bishop was required by canon law to keep around him at all times to prevent “malevolent men” from

²⁹ “Decreta Lucii papae,” 1, in *ibid.*, 175–76.

³⁰ *Das Register Gregors VII*, 2.10 (1074), *MGH, Epistolae selectae*, 2, ed. Erich Caspar (Berlin: Weidmann, 1920), 140–42; *The Register of Pope Gregory VII, 1073–85: An English Translation*, trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 104–5.

falsely accusing him. In the end the archdeacons declared Pibo innocent, as did the bishop of Osnabrück, who confirmed that Pibo had received his office without any payment to the king (and future Holy Roman Emperor) Henry IV. Next, Pibo himself swore an oath affirming his innocence and then went on to provide his own explanation of why the cleric had brought false charges against him. All of this testimony seems to have taken place in public before the archbishop's court. The following day Udo interviewed Pibo secretly, asking him in a friendly way about all the charges, which he again denied. And so the case was dismissed—and Udo begged the pope never to make him undertake such an investigation again.³¹

In the heated atmosphere of this period, then, the intimate details of what went on in a bishop's bedroom might be discussed publicly in court, even though some people, like Udo of Trier, found this distasteful. What is even more striking, however, is how extensively episcopal sexuality was canvassed in more positive contexts during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The second reason, mentioned above, why a bishop should always keep witnesses around him, even at night, was to imitate his good deeds and proclaim them to others. Presumably, this happened orally as well, but what have come down to us are accounts of episcopal deeds in one or both of two written forms. A bishop who had acquired a reputation for sanctity during his lifetime might be the subject of a full-length biography, or *vita*, which outlined his accomplishments, his virtues, and his miracles. Such a *vita* became part of the saint's cult, often read aloud during his annual feast day. However, even less saintly bishops often had the details of their lives recorded in a genre of historical writing that developed during the Carolingian period but became much more widespread during the eleventh century.³²

Texts known as *gesta episcoporum*, or “deeds of the bishops,” can be understood as histories of a particular episcopal church (and the city within which it was located) organized through relatively brief notices concerning the pontificates of individual bishops.³³ In the late eleventh century, for example, an unnamed cleric of Auxerre noted that it was the custom of his church, whenever a bishop died, to immediately record “his final moments, his accession to the throne, and especially his good deeds.” The result was *The Deeds of the Bishops of Auxerre*.³⁴ The compilers of such *gesta* devoted most of their attention to the most revered pontiffs of their city whose notices might also serve a ritual function, being read during the annual prayer services on the anniversaries of their deaths.³⁵ However, even a “bad” bishop, like Segenfrid of Le Mans, would receive his allotted

³¹ “Die Hannoversche Briefsammlung,” Ep. 17 (1075), in Erdmann and Fickermann, *Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV*, 38–41.

³² Michel Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1981), 7.

³³ *Ibid.*, 15.

³⁴ *Les gestes des évêques d'Auxerre*, ed. Pierre Bonnerue et al., 2 vols. (Paris: Belles Lettres, 2002), 1:278.

³⁵ Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*, 19.

space.³⁶ Members of the cathedral clergy were normally responsible for compiling the *gesta episcoporum*, and most often they were also the authors of full-length *vitae*, although monks from communities with close ties to the saintly bishop might also compose *vitae*. Yet regardless of the identity of the author or the form his account took, the information upon which it was based came from the bishop's most intimate companions, the clerical witnesses who remained by his side night and day. This does not, of course, guarantee that the information is true. It does, however, give us an excellent idea of how the clerics associated most closely with a bishop wanted to present their lord to themselves and to others.

We have particularly clear evidence of how this process worked from the *vita* of Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester (1062–95), composed by the monk William of Malmesbury probably in the 1120s. Wulfstan “felt that Heaven had poured into him the gift of chasteness, and he did not keep this ungratefully silent: the heavenly nectar he had drained down himself he was ready to pour out for others, without stint.”³⁷ As a young man, long before he became bishop or even entered religious life, Wulfstan had benefited from a miracle that had “cooled” his lust (this miracle will be discussed below). As soon as it occurred, he told his friends about it “so that the flame of heavenly love that had shone on him should be reflected onto his companions.” Much later in life, after he had become bishop of Worcester, he continued to tell the youths in his service about his own early struggles with desire and about the miraculous ending to those struggles “so that his hearers would not despair of doing things which they heard that thanks to the grace of God he had been able to do” (significantly, the story was not considered suitable for the younger children in his entourage). His followers, in turn, served as witnesses to his shining example by passing the story along to others. William of Malmesbury got his information about Wulfstan's sexuality from a previous biographer whose work is no longer extant. But William said that that biographer got it from Hemming, the subprior of Worcester, who learned it—presumably as one of the “youths”—from the saint himself.³⁸

Drawing on this kind of evidence, the episcopal *vitae* and *gesta episcoporum* provide us with remarkably detailed testimony about how bishops in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries wrestled with the “desires of the flesh.” They tell us, for example, that all too often the blame for those unacceptable desires was placed on the person to whom the bishop was attracted, leading not only to a distancing from but also to a vilification of

³⁶ See n. 2 above.

³⁷ William of Malmesbury, *Saints' Lives: Lives of SS. Wulfstan, Dunstan, Patrick, Benignus and Indract*, ed. and trans. M. Winterbottom and R. M. Thomson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 16.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 20. The details of Bishop Wazo of Liège's austerities were reported to his biographer by those who “familiarily frequented the intimacy of his presence”—in other words, by those who attended him in his private quarters, from which, nevertheless, his personal piety was made public; see Anselm of Liège, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, MGH, SS 7:231.

that person. Many scholars have noted that the reform campaigns of the central Middle Ages heightened existing misogynist tendencies within medieval clerical culture. Some reformers, like Peter Damian, as well as some individual bishops struggling with their own sexual feelings quite literally “demonized” women, identifying them with the devil as the sources of sin and sometimes punishing them for behavior that would seem quite innocuous to us today.³⁹ Before he became bishop of Worcester, Wulfstan told a woman who had made sexual advances to him: “Away with you, and take with you the hatred you deserve, you tinder of wantonness, daughter of death and vessel of Satan!” He then slapped her “with such force that the smack of his palm could be heard right through the door of the church.” For many days the people of Worcester talked about Wulfstan, “this second Joseph” (cf. Genesis 39:6–12), and how he had rejected this “womanish lewdness” with heart and hand.⁴⁰ The unnamed woman in this story was punished with a blow and with public shaming merely for propositioning a young cleric—but at least she had actually done something inappropriate.

The story of Archbishop Poppo of Trier (1016–47) and the canonesses of Aula Palacii is even more troubling, for these religious women were punished not for any sexual misbehavior on their part but simply for presenting a temptation to the bishop and his staff. The author of *The Deeds of the Archbishops of Trier* introduces this tale with a reference to Eve’s seduction of Adam at the devil’s instigation. In the same way, he suggests, the devil made an attempt on Poppo’s chastity through a young canoness. The archbishop had commissioned her to make him a pair of sandals to wear while he celebrated mass. “Wanting to make him a partner in her lewdness,” she infused the shoes with some unknown form of magic that made the wearer desire her. While the author of this text attributed sexual feelings to the canoness, the only actions ascribed to her would normally be seen as completely unrelated to sex and were, in any case, undertaken at Poppo’s own request. Only by positing an enchantment could blame be placed on the woman in this case.

As soon as the archbishop put the sandals on he thought life would no longer be worth living unless he could have sex with the young woman (*haberet rem cum muliere*). Astonished by such “unexpected titillation” of the flesh, he hastily took them off again but said nothing (in other words, the author suggests that Poppo did not normally experience desire and that he resisted it as soon as it occurred). His experience of enchantment was then confirmed by other men. The clerics in his household, one after another, tried on the shoes and had the same experience—but again said nothing. Finally, the bishop ordered the “prefect of the city” to try them on, and he broke the silence, roaring with fury and declaring himself to be “enchanted.” None of

³⁹ Dyan Elliott, “The Priest’s Wife: Female Erasure and the Gregorian Reform,” in *Fallen Bodies: Pollution, Sexuality, and Demonology in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 100–103.

⁴⁰ William of Malmesbury, *Saints’ Lives*, ed. and trans. Winterbottom and Thomson, 32.

them had any doubts about the canoness's guilt, although the only evidence was their own feelings of arousal. She was promptly sentenced to be expelled from her community. The other canonesses, who were not involved in the incident at all, were condemned to wear black habits instead of white ones and to lead a much stricter life than before. When some of them resisted, the entire community was shut down.⁴¹ It is worth noting that Poppo appears to have felt some guilt of his own about the whole incident—we know that he departed on a penitential pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which in this text is represented as a result of this whole affair. However, according to *The Deeds of the Archbishops of Trier* (written more than half a century later), Poppo's concern was not his unfair treatment of the women but the fact that no one was left at their church to praise God. He eventually made up for this by replacing the displaced women with a new community of religious men.⁴²

The externalization of guilt associated with sexual desire is particularly clear in the story of Poppo and the canoness. But the projection of anxiety and guilt onto the object of desire is powerfully evident in many works from this period. Bishops were frequently warned to avoid women in terms very similar to those used to warn monks on the same subject. As Bonizo of Sutri wrote, "Let a bishop avoid conversation with women, and especially with women in their households. What business does a bishop have trading tales with women?"⁴³ Yet a bishop was not a monk, and he must sometimes really have had an obligation to converse with women. Admonitions like Bonizo's were at odds with the bishop's role as pastor of souls, female as well as male.

Fear of temptation also probably alienated medieval pastors from men. Mathew Kuefler in a recent article has argued that it was only in the twelfth century that suspicion came to be thrown on male friendships as "breeding grounds for sodomitical behavior." He contends that the impetus behind this growing suspicion came from a variety of figures associated with the newly emerging royal and ecclesiastical hierarchies of the period who used concerns about sodomy to undermine traditional male solidarities and replace them with "new patterns of support for lineage and obedience to

⁴¹ Similar allegations of sexual misconduct were used to justify the closure of a number of women's communities in the early eleventh century; see Jane Tibbetts Schulenburg, "Women's Monastic Communities, 500–1100: Patterns of Expansion and Decline," *Signs* 14 (1989), reprinted in *Sisters and Workers in the Middle Ages*, ed. Judith Bennett et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 226–32.

⁴² *Gesta Treverorum*, MGH, SS8:176. On Poppo and the men's community see Franz-Josef Heyen, "Simeon und Burchard-Poppo: Aus den Anfängen des Stifts St. Simeon in Trier," in *Institutionen, Kultur und Gesellschaft im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Josef Fleckenstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Lutz Fenske, Werner Rösener, and Thomas Zutz (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1984), 195–205.

⁴³ Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita christiana*, 2.41, ed. Perels, 55. On a divine admonition to Pope Gregory VII to avoid women see Paul of Bernreid, *Vita S. Gregorii VII*, 3, PL 148:52; trans. I. S. Robinson, "Life of Pope Gregory VII," in *The Papal Reform of the Eleventh Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 280–81.

authority.”⁴⁴ Kuefler’s argument is particularly compelling in its depiction of a traditional male culture of “love and ritual” involving physical admiration and touch that he locates in lay military households.⁴⁵

It is worth remembering, however, that a similar male culture at least sometimes existed in ecclesiastical households as well—which is hardly surprising, considering that most bishops in this period came from families belonging to the military elite. William of Malmesbury had the following to say about Wulfstan of Worcester: “Boys of elegant appearance he marked out by fondling them with his holy hands and kissing them [*sane pueros elegantis formae dignanter sacrarum manuum tactu et osculis demulcens*], for he embraced in them the grace of God’s handiwork. He drew a moral from the beauty of their features, often exclaiming: ‘How beautiful must be the Creator who makes such beautiful creatures!’”⁴⁶ William’s nonchalance about this behavior is, to modern eyes, remarkable. He apparently felt no need to defend it, for no suspicion of sodomy ever hung around Wulfstan—indeed, he was famous for his chastity. Instead, the bishop was admired for the kindly way he touched the members of his entourage. In another instance William reports how Wulfstan stroked the hair of Prior Nicholas “like a kind father” while Nicholas joked about going bald.⁴⁷ Yet in other circumstances, even in Wulfstan’s day, such behavior might have provided fodder for charges of sexual misconduct. Anxiety about the sexual implications of physical contact among men had apparently already begun to emerge by the middle of the eleventh century.⁴⁸ The campaign for celibacy was thus beginning to alienate bishops not only from the women but also from the men in their congregations. It must have been a rather lonely business being a bishop in this period.

If sexual anxieties were often externalized, located in the female or male objects of desire, who were therefore to be avoided, they could also be internalized, located within the self. Medieval medicine associated desire with heat, the vital force of the body. When the body became heated, desire increased, whereas when the fires of the body were tamped down, desire, too, declined.⁴⁹ Heat was especially associated with youth, which is perhaps

⁴⁴ Mathew Kuefler, “Male Friendship and the Suspicion of Sodomy in Twelfth-Century France,” in *The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality*, ed. Mathew Kuefler (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 179.

⁴⁵ The terms Kuefler uses to describe these friendships have much in common with Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, “The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations between Women in Nineteenth-Century America,” *Signs* 1 (1975): 1–29.

⁴⁶ William of Malmesbury, *Saints’ Lives*, ed. and trans. Winterbottom and Thomson, 118.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 132.

⁴⁸ This suggests that Kuefler’s chronology must be moved back by a few decades, a point that I cannot pursue in this article.

⁴⁹ See Constantine the African, *Liber de Coitu*, 3 and 5, ed. Enrique Montero Cartelle (Santiago de Compostela: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Santiago, 1983), 86, 96–98; on this work see Joan Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 60–64.

one of the reasons why the canonical age for becoming a bishop was forty. A man of mature years was more likely to remain continent, preserving the purity of the sacraments he performed and serving as an example of chastity to other clerics. The young, on the other hand, needed to be more careful to avoid temptation.

To the lucky few, chastity in youth, which allowed virginity to be preserved, was granted by divine grace. While still living as a layman, Wulfstan of Worcester was already eager to preserve his chastity. Nevertheless, he once almost succumbed to lust when a girl “designed by nature for shipwrecking chastity” pursued him. Just as he was on the verge of giving in, Wulfstan “came to his senses.” He burst into tears and ran off to a spot “bristling with thorns and brambles,” where he lay, reproaching himself, until he fell asleep. As he slept his friends saw a cloud descend from heaven and veil Wulfstan’s sleeping body. Later they asked him what the cloud meant, and he told them how he had recently been “pricked by the lusts of the flesh, and had blazed up to an enormous heat; but now he had been watered by the dew of heaven, and was cold in his groin and in his whole innards.” From that time on, he reported to the youths in his service, he was never again troubled “in heart or in eye” by (female) beauty, and “never was his quiet sleep interrupted by a wet dream [*turbulenta eluvies*].”⁵⁰

Most bishops, however, were not so lucky. Absent the divine gift of chastity, they were forced to cool their own heated flesh. Bishop Fulbert of Chartres (1007–28) described this struggle in one of his poems. He noted that there were six stages to attaining perfect chastity: “First, when you are awake, not to experience carnal pleasure; next, not to entertain lustful desires; then, when you see someone who is pretty, not to feel any craving; fourth, not to be physically aroused in any way; fifth, not to let the sound of love-making distract you; finally, when asleep not to dream of anything provocative.” Fulbert added, rather wistfully, that no one could reach the sixth stage by his own efforts; complete chastity was the “gift of Christ’s grace.” Nevertheless, it was helpful to watch your diet: “a pound of solid food, a single measure of wine, besides work, vigils, and frequent prayer, so that a glutton body will not weaken and destroy your sense of shame.”⁵¹

The regimen Fulbert laid out here was one familiar to other bishops struggling with the unruly desires of the flesh. Bishop Robert of Auxerre (1076–84) was so concerned to control the “lascivious motions of the flesh” that he almost never drank wine. His doctors warned him that he might die prematurely if he continued to avoid what was considered a strengthening

⁵⁰ William of Malmesbury, *Saints’ Lives*, ed. and trans. Winterbottom and Thomson, 16–20. Udo of Toul was also miraculously granted chastity in his youth; see *Gesta episcoporum Tullensium*, MGH, SS 8:644–45. Anselm of Canterbury may not have been so lucky: see in this issue Sally N. Vaughn, “Saint Anselm and His Students Writing about Love: A Theological Foundation for the Rise of Romantic Love in Europe,” nn. 65–67.

⁵¹ *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 251.

drink, but Robert refused to take their advice. He was still a young man, and, being ardent “by nature and by his age,” he worried that wine would arouse his lust. Continuing in this abstinence despite their warning, he did indeed die young.⁵² Hildebert of Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans (1096–1125) and later archbishop of Tours (1125–33/34), had not been chaste as a youth. In fact, his neighbor, Bishop Ivo of Chartres, accused him of having fathered several illegitimate children.⁵³ Moreover, Hildebert became bishop of Le Mans before the canonical age of forty. Worried that his still youthful body would “weaken the vigor of his spirit with its blandishments,” he undertook a program of austerities to bring it under control. He cut down on food and drink, slept in a hard bed, wore a hair shirt, devoted himself to vigils, prayers, and tears, and tried to redeem the “faults of his youth” by giving alms.⁵⁴

Diet was the first line of defense against lust, but chastity could also be cultivated in other ways. A number of bishops in this period made a point of practicing night vigils and sleeping only on hard beds to exhaust their bodies and thus curb desire. Avoiding baths might also be important, for baths heated the body. Abbot Poppo of Stablò, a close friend to Wazo of Liège (1041–48), told Wazo’s biographer that the bishop excelled all the monks known to him in his abstinence: he prayed continually, avoided eating too much, rarely slept on a soft bed, practiced flagellation, and never bathed.⁵⁵ Only in his final illness did he agree to clean the accumulated dirt off his aged body. With the help of a priest, a subdeacon, and his chamberlain, “without any sensual pleasure [*remota omni voluptate carnis*]” but “solely in the hope of the blessed resurrection,” he washed the body that had for many years known no bath. What he had avoided while he was healthy “lest he encourage noxious pleasure [*ne noxiae serviret voluptati*],” he was now willing to undergo because the suffering caused by his illness would prevent him from feeling sensual pleasure.⁵⁶

A final source of temptation for the bishop who wished to remain continent was the tactile sense. It was therefore crucial to avoid touching one’s own body in any way that might lead to arousal. Bishop Lietbert of Cambrai was reported never to have touched his own genitals during the last ten years of his life. If he needed to urinate, he would wrap his hand in a cloth or in his shirt so as to avoid direct contact, which would presumably have been arousing in some way.⁵⁷ Lietbert was bishop for twenty-five years. Does this suggest that desire grew stronger within him during the last ten years of his pontificate (when he was already over sixty)? Was he forced to adopt a new ascetic practice to combat a new temptation? Or was he simply less

⁵² *Les gestes des évêques d’Auxerre*, ed. Bonnerue et al., 1:287.

⁵³ Ivo of Chartres, *Epistolae*, Ep. 277, PL 162:279–80 (the Leclercq edition of Ivo’s letters is incomplete and does not include 277).

⁵⁴ *Actus pontificum Cennomannis*, ed. Busson and Ledru, 399.

⁵⁵ Anselm of Liège, *Gesta episcoporum Leodiensium*, MGH, SS 7:218.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 7:232.

⁵⁷ Rudolph, *Vita Lietberti*, 65, MGH, SS 30:2:865.

concerned with his own chastity during the early part of his pontificate (in the 1050s and early 1060s), when clerical celibacy was not yet an important issue in many parts of the Holy Roman Empire? Certainly, by the end of his life chastity had become a major concern for Lietbert. One of his two postmortem miracles also focuses on his sexual organs. Apparently, while the bishop's body was being washed for burial, his dead hands rose up and laced themselves together to form a shield over his genitals; when the ritual of washing was over and his loins were again suitably covered, the hands fell back to his sides. According to his biographer, this miracle demonstrated to everyone how Lietbert had preserved his sexual purity: it was a visible confirmation of what would otherwise have been an invisible virtue.⁵⁸

It is hardly surprising that well-meaning bishops in this period should have struggled to control their sexual feelings, sometimes blaming others for their own arousal, sometimes striving through various austerities to keep the heat of their own bodies under control. What is more interesting is their openness in discussing these efforts with other people and their biographers' willingness to include detailed descriptions of their practices in accounts intended for public consumption. To a modern eye such descriptions often appear unseemly. It is certainly hard to imagine the biographer of a modern bishop telling us whether his subject ever touched his genitals or had wet dreams. Were such details equally distasteful in the eleventh century? Was it fully in keeping with episcopal dignity to have these behaviors made public? None of the biographers whose works have been examined here seems at all apologetic about his account, so perhaps the period was simply not as squeamish as our own.

But the question remains, Why should this information have been included at all? What purpose did it serve? In the two treatises discussed earlier Peter Damian associated two problems—loss of authority and pollution—with episcopal sexuality. Yet we find no echo of his concerns in the *vitae* and *gesta episcoporum* of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. Biographers did not praise their subjects' continence in order either to bolster their legitimacy or to allay fears about their ability to perform the sacraments. To concentrate for the moment just on Lietbert of Cambrai: here was a bishop who at some point became preoccupied with continence, but, as we have already seen, this did not help him gain greater authority within his diocese. The troubles he had with John of Arras, who barred Lietbert's entry into his own episcopal city at the very beginning of his pontificate, was just the beginning of a long series of disputes with the castellans of Cambrai, in most of which Lietbert came off the worse. Lietbert's biographer does celebrate his hero's spiritual "marriage" to the church of Cambrai, which he contrasts with the merely carnal marriage of the king of France to his new queen in the same year.⁵⁹ Presumably, this marriage

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 20, *MGH*, SS 30:2:850.

made the people of Cambrai Lietbert's spiritual children. But there is no suggestion that either the bishop or his biographer's concern with celibacy arose from a desire to avoid the pollution of "incest" or, indeed, any pollution at all.

Something rather different was going on in these accounts, I would suggest. And a clue is provided by another letter of Peter Damian written in 1064 to Bishop Cunibert of Turin. Cunibert was apparently chaste himself but made no effort to encourage chastity among the clerics of his diocese. Peter warned him to begin enforcing the existing rules on this subject, citing, rather surprisingly, Leviticus 22:24 ("You shall not offer to the Lord any animal whose testicles are crushed or bruised or cut or missing"). This text applied to Cunibert: "But if God so hates sterility in the brute beasts which are offered to him through the ministry of priests, how much more does he disdain it in the priests who offer sacrifice to him? Surely, just as offspring in the flesh are required of [the beasts], so priests [meaning bishops] should propagate holiness in others. Only then will your chastity be approved in the divine gaze, if it is extended by propagation among your clerics."⁶⁰ In other words, Cunibert could only be the true spiritual father of his diocese if he used his "spiritual" genitals to propagate chaste priests.

In this age of reform the control of episcopal sexuality was essential not only because it supported episcopal authority and preserved the purity of the sacraments but also because it was the first and essential step toward controlling the sexuality of priests. The passages on episcopal celibacy in the *vitae* and *gesta episcoporum* were, in a sense, "how-to manuals" for cathedral canons and priests struggling to control their own sexuality. The details of episcopal austerities, read on the feast days and anniversary services for departed bishops, provided other members of the clergy with valuable information on how they too might approach the problem of sexual continence—by watching their diet, avoiding too much wine, limiting sleep and baths, keeping their hands off themselves, and—above all—praying for the gift of continence. It was a bishop's obligation to teach his flock by "word and example" how they should behave.⁶¹ These accounts should be read, then, as testimony to the efforts of spiritual fathers during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries to propagate chastity among their clerics and of clerical witnesses to fulfill their obligation under canon law to publicize their bishop's good deeds.

⁶⁰ Peter Damian, Ep. 112 (1064), ed. Reindel, 3:260–61; trans. Blum, 4:259–60.

⁶¹ *Das Register Gregors VII*, 2.11, ed. Caspar, 142; trans. Cowdrey, 105: "Nam illi, qui propter lucrandas animas episcopi vocati et constituti sunt et subditos suos verbo et exemplo viam veritatis docere deberent."