

Robert Grosseteste and the simple benefice: a novel solution to the complexities of lay presentation

Philippa Hoskin

University of Lincoln – School of Humanities, Brayford Pool, Department of Humanities, Lincoln, Lincolnshire LN6 7TS, United Kingdom

That pastoral care was the main focus of Robert Grosseteste's theological work and correspondence is well-established: Grosseteste is often characterised as the vehement, uncompromising promoter of the pastoral ideal in the face of strong opposition, ecclesiastical and lay. Less close attention has been paid to whether the records of his diocesan administration demonstrate the practical outworking of his pastoral theories. Although narrow in compass, his administrative rolls are not entirely sterile. They show Grosseteste experimenting with a novel form of parish organisation, using grants of simple benefices (*simplex beneficium*) to ensure appropriate provision of parochial priestly function whilst offering a constructive compromise to the laity who had the right to nominate clergy for churches (the patrons) when their candidates were deemed inadmissible. The practical outworking of these proposals reveals that they had both educational benefits, particularly for potential clergy, and allowed Grosseteste to focus his educational and pastoral efforts directly within the parishes.

Keywords: Robert Grosseteste; medieval episcopate; benefices; Lincoln diocese; patronage

Robert Grosseteste, the uncompromising bishop of Lincoln (1235–53), bent on reform and determined to defend the parishes of his diocese from falling into the hands of

clergy unable or unwilling to perform their duty, appears frequently in secondary works. To Bishop Grosseteste placing a poor clergyman in charge of a parish was certainly an alarming prospect: badly prepared, neglectful clergy could lead their parishioners to hell and a bishop who allowed such a clergyman to take charge in a parish could well be damned along with them. It would be unsurprising if Grosseteste had therefore turned down all but the best candidates for his parishes. However, the picture is not this simple. Grosseteste's own records reveal that he did not always block the career of a less than ideal cleric. On occasions he chose to compromise, but in doing so he also found new and flexible ways to provide the best possible care for the souls of his parishioners.

Interpretations of Grosseteste's theory and practice of pastoral care – that is his approach to the salvation of souls – have tended to focus on his relationship with the clergy, who were charged with the spiritual care of parishioners which was the cure of souls, and on his scholarly, theological writings on the subject. Thus his writings on confession, his guidance for parish priests delivered through sermons and episcopal statutes, and his surviving letters have all been well considered,¹ and the influences on

*E-mail: phoskin@lincoln.ac.uk

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this paper: *NE*: W. Stinissen, ed., *Aristoteles Over de vriendschap: Boeken VIII en IX van de Nicomachische Ethiek met de commentaren van Apasius en Michael in de Latijnse vertaling van Grosseteste* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1963); Paris, *CMaj.*: H.R. Luard, ed., *Chronica majora Matthaei Parisiensis, Monachi Sancti Albani, Chronica Majora*. Rolls Series 57. 7 vols.(London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1872–84); *VCH*: *Victoria History of the Counties of England*.

For an introduction to scholarship on Grosseteste and pastoral care see L. Boyle, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Pastoral Care', *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 8 (1979): 3–51; J.H. Srawley, 'Grosseteste's Administration of the Diocese of Lincoln', in *Robert Grosseteste: Scholar and Bishop*, ed. D.A. Callus (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 146–77; R.W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 249–71 and the introduction to F.A.C. Mantello and J. Goering, eds., *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2010), particularly 18–22. There are many articles on individual works various articles on pastoral care manuals and the introductions to several of the editions of these provide important discussions. For some examples of this see Siegfried Wenzel, 'Robert Grosseteste's Treatise on Confession, *Deus est*', *Franciscan Studies* 30 (1970): 218–93; J. Goering and F.A.C. Mantello, 'The *Perambulavit Iudas* ... 'Speculum confessionis' Attributed to Robert Grosseteste', *Revue Bénédictine* 96 (1986): 125–68; J. Goering and F.A.C. Mantello, 'Notus in Iudea Deus: Robert

and nuances of his theological thought have been well explored.² Much of this analysis, however, takes a rather simplistic approach to Grosseteste's pastoral care as applied in his diocese and assumes that his surviving administrative records can reveal little about his motivating theology.

The laity are rarely considered at all or seen only either as the passive recipients of that crucial spiritual care which Grosseteste was so insistent should be delivered with diligence and discernment by the parish clergy, or as exemplifying the evils of self-interest in impeding good pastoral provision. These studies pass over Grosseteste's view of the partnership between the patron and the bishop in selecting and appointing suitable parish clergy who were fundamental to pastoral care. For Grosseteste, the laity's role in pastoral care was a vital one. As owners of benefices (that is of the income of individual parishes), some members of the laity both male and female – the lay patrons – had the right to choose and nominate (present) to the bishop candidates as clergy for individual churches whenever the previous incumbent resigned or died.³ These candidates would then be formally accepted and granted both spiritual authority in their parish through the process of institution and the right to hold the secular income based on land and offerings through induction. The laity thus played a central role in selecting the parish

Grosseteste's Confessional Formula in Lambeth Palace MS 499', *Viator* 18 (1987): 253–73; J. Goering and F.A.C. Mantello, 'The Early Penitential Writings of Robert Grosseteste', *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 54 (1987): 57–112; the introduction to J. Goering and F.A.C. Mantello, eds., *Templum Dei*. Toronto Medieval Latin Texts 14 (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1984).

² For an overview of this work see James R. Ginther, 'Robert Grosseteste's Theology of Pastoral Care', in *A Companion to Pastoral Care in the Late Middle Ages (1200–1500)*, eds. J. Caskey, A.S. Cohen and L. Safran (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 95–122; and for material published since this, see in particular M. Hessenauer, 'For a Larger Audience: Grosseteste's *Perumbulavit Iudas* in Anglo-Norman', in *Robert Grosseteste, His Thought and its Impact*, ed. J. Cunningham. Papers in Medieval Studies 21 (Toronto: University of Toronto 2011), 259–313.

³ On lay patronage and its problems see R.H. Helmholz, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England*, vol. 1, *The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to 1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 177–9, 478–9; Peter Smith, 'The Advowson: the History and Development of a Most Peculiar Property', *Ecclesiastical Law Journal* 5 (2000): 320–39; Glenn Olsen, 'The Definition of the Ecclesiastical Benefice in the Twelfth Century: the Canonists' Discussion of Spiritualia', *Studia Gratiana* 11 (1967): 431–45.

clergy and, consequently, in choosing the spiritual guides for the souls of their parishes. However, the primary aim of lay patrons was to provide incomes for relatives and retainers: they did not share the spiritual concerns of the bishops, leaving the episcopate largely at the mercy of these patrons. Bishops could be theoretically committed to improving the quality of the clergy, in terms of character and skills, and they could remove exceptionally inadequate clergy where they could find them. But they had little control over the appointment of clergy. In theory totally unsuitable clergy could be rejected, but there were occasions when a bishop, faced with the political tensions of lay patronage, was unable to do so.

In these circumstances Grosseteste experimented with a new structure for parish clergy, revealed in his administrative records, which allowed him to fulfil his pastoral duty and also to put into practice his views about both the lay patrons' obligations to pastoral care, and the obligations of those men selected as parish clergy. The system required compromise on both sides about the sorts of men who would be allowed to benefit from a church's income. It also, however, provided an education about the importance of pastoral care for both potential clergyman and patrons. Additionally it focused pastoral care within the parish, underlining Grosseteste's concern for the salvation of individuals.

Grosseteste, the laity and pastoral care

In discussions of his views of pastoral care, Grosseteste becomes almost a caricature reforming bishop, depicted as permanently at war with those around him, lay and ecclesiastical, popes and cathedral chapters as well as the king and individual lords,⁴ as

⁴ See for example Boyle, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Pastoral Care'; B. Tierney, 'Grosseteste and the Theory of Papal Sovereignty', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 6 (1955): 1–17; M.M. Morgan, 'The Excommunication of Grosseteste in 1243', *English Historical Review* 57 (1942):

he struggled to ensure proper cure of souls in the face of those equally determined to pursue only their own material interests. Grosseteste's attitude to the cure of souls has been characterised as ruthless, as 'impetuous in his zeal against all evil things',⁵ and a careful and scholarly analysis of his philosophy and theology has proposed that his schoolman's mind, which reasoned from first principles to conclusions, rendered his convictions unbending in practice.⁶ These statements certainly represent facets of the bishop's operations. His letters demonstrate that he was not afraid to oppose those who attempted to treat their role in pastoral duty to souls carelessly or lightly.⁷ Thirteenth-century depictions of the bishop as a defender of the church's rights and a challenger of secular authority tend to encourage this approach. Adam Marsh, the noted Franciscan and Grosseteste's personal friend, writing five years after the bishop's death in order to stir up the archbishop of York, Sewal de Bovil, to resist royal demands, presented Grosseteste's fight for the liberties of the church as driven by his pastoral concerns.⁸ After Grosseteste's death in 1253, Matthew Paris included him amongst the champions of the church in the illustrious company of Becket and Edmund of Abingdon, both of

244–50; F.A.C. Mantello, 'Bishop Robert Grosseteste and his Cathedral Chapter: an Edition of the Chapter's Objections to Episcopal Visitation', *Mediaeval Studies* 47 (1985): 367–78. For Matthew Paris' depiction of the bishop in this way whilst Grosseteste was alive see too, Paris, *CMaj.*, 3: 528–9, 638–9; 4: 151, 245–8, 497–501; 5: 381, 392, 414, 419.

⁵ Boyle, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Pastoral Care', 3–51; Srawley, 'Grosseteste's Administration of the Diocese of Lincoln', 171.

⁶ James McEvoy, *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 236.

⁷ See for example his letters to two archbishops, Boniface of Savoy and Edmund Rich, in which he reminds them of the duties of particular individuals in the realm of pastoral care and their own obligations: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 135–40, 230–57, 292–4, 371–4 (Ep. 108–13, 205–34, 273–5, 353–6); his discussions with the papal legate, Otto: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 172–4, 262–4 (Ep. 144–6, 241–3); and his letters to William of Raleigh: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 94–6, 123–5 (Ep. 63–5, 95–7).

⁸ C.H. Lawrence, ed. and trans., *Letters of Adam Marsh*. 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006–10), 2: particularly 613–21 (letter 245).

whom opposed royal encroachment on church liberties,⁹ whilst in the 1280s, bishops writing to the pope asking him to consider initiating a canonisation process for Grosseteste also spoke of his pastoral care in terms of battles, the defence of liberties and the protection of the church against both secular and ecclesiastical foes.¹⁰

The bishop's approach to pastoral care, as played out practically in the diocese, was more complex than this, however, and less adversarial. Grosseteste was not always working in opposition to lay authority, indeed the patronage network in which English benefices were caught, where so many of the laity had rights in particular churches, made this impossible; it was necessary for him to work with, not against, lay power on many occasions, and his theory of personal authority and obligation, drawn from the theological and philosophical works which he translated and commented upon, emphasised that laymen too had personal obligations for the performance of pastoral care, which the church, and particularly the episcopate, must guide them to understand and practise. In working with these lay patrons Grosseteste could be pragmatic. He was, certainly, the ecclesiastical warrior and upholder of the church's rights and liberties portrayed by his friends and contemporaries and revealed in so many of his letters; but

⁹ Paris, *CMaj.*, 5: 491, 653. Paris was not alone in this. The author of the Lanercost Chronicle, for example, records a dream supposedly had by a certain knight at the death of Sewal de Bovil, archbishop of York, also known for his opposition to the papacy in his concern for pastoral care. In this dream three dead members of the episcopate, Becket, Edmund of Abingdon and Robert Grosseteste, come to collect the newly deceased archbishop: W. McDowell, ed., *Chronicon de Lanercost MCI–MCCCXLVI* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club and McDowell Club, 1839), 72.

¹⁰ See Lincoln Cathedral Dj/20/2a, membrane 1. Oliver Sutton, bishop of Lincoln, speaks of Grosseteste's zeal for pastoral care above all things, 'zelum ferventissimum quem ad curam habuit animarum', and links this to his care for the liberty of the church in which he was 'murum pro domo domini', a wall of the house of the Lord, using an example from Ezekiel 13:5, 'a wall of the house of Israel'. Godfrey Giffard, bishop of Worcester, also calls him an impregnable wall, vigilant in his care of his flock but in the same context bold in his defence of the rights and liberties of the church against tyranny: 'curam gregis domini continue exhibuit vigilantem quod incessanter pro eo contra hostis antiquis insidias et pro defensione iurium et libertatum ecclesie Anglicane ipsum sanctiatis deo gratia perpessa cum tirannide diras persecuciones ultorum murus inexpugnabilis videbatur'. Notes on this dossier, although with omissions from the content of these letters, can be found in R.E.G. Cole, 'Proceedings Relative to the Canonisation of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln', *Associated Architectural Societies' Reports* 33 (1915): 1–34.

he was also a teacher and director of souls who had worked in the Schools, producing works on pastoral care within that instructional context,¹¹ and as such he knew how to lead and guide as well as how to command and oppose. He also knew when compromise was necessary. This is clear in his practical dealings with his ecclesiastical colleagues,¹² and further examination of this, particularly with regard to monastic communities and pastoral care, would also be worthwhile. But it is the neglected consideration of his pragmatic compromises with the laity which is the subject of this paper, and it is upon the relationship between the bishop and lay patrons that it will concentrate. And it is Grosseteste's often overlooked administrative records which provide the evidence of him engaging in negotiation and compromise.

Grosseteste's episcopal administrative records

A consideration of Grosseteste's relationship to lay patrons in terms of their role in pastoral care brings together several strands of his thought and a variety of his writings, practical and theoretical; his philosophical work, particularly his commentary upon Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book 8; his theology of pastoral care and, importantly, those surviving administrative documents from his episcopate: the eight extant rolls which record something of his daily work within his diocese.¹³ These, like the other

¹¹ In particular his works *De modo confitendi et penitentias iniugendi*, *Templum Dei* and *Perambulavit Iudas* have all been dated before his rise to the episcopate in 1235. For an overview of this dating and a consideration of the probability that Grosseteste wrote such works without personal parochial experience of cure of souls, see Joseph Goering, 'When and Where Did Grosseteste Study Theology?', in *Robert Grosseteste: New Perspectives on His Thought and Scholarship*, ed. J. McEvoy (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995): 27–34.

¹² See for example his attempts in 1235 to persuade W. de Cerda to return to England to take up his pastoral duties: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 88–90 (Ep. 57–9). He takes similarly persuasive tones when trying to persuade others to take up their pastoral duties in the diocese: see his letters to John of St Giles and Richard of Cornwall: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 93–4, 168–9 (Ep. 62–3, 140).

¹³ Lincoln, Lincolnshire Archives, DIOC/ROLLS/GROSSETESTE/1–8, ranging in length from 16 membranes to 6. The rolls are edited in F.N. Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, ed. F.N.

episcopal registers and rolls of thirteenth-century England, are both remarkable for their survival, and frustrating in their content. Grosseteste's preoccupation with the provision of competent pastoral care was played out in his work as bishop of Lincoln, yet the rolls give few indications of his concerns, largely containing formulaic notices of the institution of clergy to benefices. These rolls have been largely overlooked as a significant source for Grosseteste's pastoral work; instead they have been mined for entries which give evidential backing to particular points made in other sources.¹⁴ Researchers have looked elsewhere for evidence of Grosseteste's concern for cure of souls and in the process created the picture of a bishop who was implacable in upholding exemplary standards and processes. A reconsideration of the detail and phrasing of a particular group of entries in the rolls, however, supports a rather different picture. These seemingly sterile documents can cast light on the way in which the bishop drew upon the different strands of his learning and teaching to improve practical pastoral care in his see of Lincoln and also on the bishop's willingness to compromise process in order to achieve good cure of souls in the parishes.

Each of the eight archdeaconries of the diocese is represented by an individual roll, the front being made up mainly of brief entries, usually largely formulaic, recording institutions of clergy and installations of heads of religious houses, divided by pontifical year.¹⁵ Their formulaic nature does not immediately promise a great deal to

Davis. *Lincoln Record Society* 4 (Horncastle: W.K. Morton and Sons, for the Lincoln Record Society, 1914), The edition of these rolls is frequently erroneous: while this paper is based on a study of the original manuscript rolls, references are given to the entries in the printed edition.

¹⁴ See Boyle, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Pastoral Care', 3–51; Srawley, 'Grosseteste's Administration of the Diocese of Lincoln', 156, 162, 169–70.

¹⁵ A typical entry for an institution reads: 'Magister Ricardus de Keuremunt, capellanus, presentatus per abbatem et conventum de Bello Portu ad ecclesiam de Belesby, facta prius inquisitione per R. archidiaconum Lincoln' per quam etc., ad eandem admissus est et in ea, sub pena concilii, canonicè persona institutus. Et mandatum est eidem archidiacono ut ipsum in corporalem ipsius ecclesie possessionem inducat', giving the details of the individual instituted, their level of ordination (chaplain is a synonym for priest in the diocese of Lincoln at this date

the historian searching for evidence of Grosseteste's pastoral activities. Yet their emphasis upon institutions is precisely what makes these rolls a good source for considering pastoral care in the mid-thirteenth century see of Lincoln; for good pastoral care began in the provision of good clergy, who fulfilled the canon law criteria for exercising pastoral care in a parish in terms of residence, age, education, character and orders.¹⁶ In particular, although many entries are standard in form and phrasing, the variations that do arise raise important questions about changes in procedure and the reasons for deviation from standard practice.

The rolls also serve as a reminder of the crucial role that the laity played in this provision of clergy, a role which the bishop did not and could not ignore. Grosseteste's relationship to the laity, his concern for pastoral reform and duty and his teaching about when and how to compromise, was to have a wider influence in the years to come, notably on Simon de Montfort, leader of the baronial rebellion against King Henry III in England which followed soon after Grosseteste's death,¹⁷ but during his lifetime it was

as in other sees), the patron, the church, notice of inquisition into patronage having been carried out, any details of the particular benefice and then notice of a mandate to induct (F.N. Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, ed. F.N. Davis. Lincoln Record Society 4 (Horncastle: W.K. Morton and Sons, for the Lincoln Record Society, 1914), p. 1). The dorse of the rolls is of less importance to this study and its relationship to the front is complex; pontifical years are not always noted and the content is more diverse. By far the most common entries there are full copies of letters of institution for particular individual clergy, probably reflecting, as Smith suggests when considering the rolls of Grosseteste's predecessor, Hugh of Wells, the fact that letters of institution were not necessarily issued at the point of institution in the diocese and were requested later: D.M. Smith, ed., *The Acta of Hugh of Wells bishop of Lincoln 1209–1235*. Lincoln Record Society 88 (Lincoln: Boydell Press for the Lincoln Record Society, 2000), xliii–lii; D.M. Smith, 'The Rolls of Hugh of Wells, Bishop of Lincoln 1209–1235', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 45 (1972): 187–92. One or two of these provide additional information within this study. There are also some additional notes of installations of heads of religious houses in the same format as those on the front of the roll, with records of establishments of private chapels and some documents not easily categorised.

¹⁶ For a discussion of this in an English context but from an international perspective see the 1237 constitutions of the legate Otto, chapter 12: F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods with Other Documents Relating to the English Church. II: 1205–1313*. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 1: 250–1.

¹⁷ J.R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 77–105; F.S. Stevenson, *Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1899), 269–75;

played out in the sphere of influence that was closest to the bishop's concerns: pastoral care within the parish. In particular, Grosseteste recognised the need to compromise with the local secular lords and holders of manors who were his lay patrons. In these administrative rolls we see Grosseteste experimenting with a new structure of parish clergy which encouraged patrons to present and support suitably ordained clergy, whilst still acknowledging these patrons' own needs and desires to use their patronage for secular ends.

A novel use of the simple benefice

Amongst the entries in the rolls relating to presentations by the laity are a small number of noteworthy and unusual ones. Twelve of Grosseteste's institutions contain a reference to a *simplex beneficium*, or simple benefice, that is an annual payment granted from the income of a particular church to be paid to a named individual who has no apparent connection to the church in question. These 12 institutions make use of the simple benefice in circumstances which are outside normal use of such payments at this date.¹⁸ References to simple benefices are found, occasionally, in contemporary records of other dioceses, and in thirteenth-century England they were, in general, a form of pension. Usually the clergyman who became the rector of a parish took as his income the tithes of that church. If he was not resident and a substitute, a vicar, was needed actually to perform the duties of the church, then part of the church's income was

Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 244–6; F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966), 390–1.

¹⁸ These refer to, in Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, the churches of Aston Clinton (361), Great Tew (480, 483-4), Langton by Partney (131), Rearsby (385-6, 389), Long Bennington (15), Blisworth (165–6), Somerby (59), Harby (391), Dingley (241), Gayhurst (363, 365), Harpole (205) and Hulcott (372) and in actuality there may have been more; Harby is known only because full letters of institution are entered on the dorse of a roll, the brief entry for the institution on the front makes no reference to any such arrangement. Rearsby is complicated by a grant of the patronage to the bishop for this turn by the patrons, but this seems unattached to a dispute.

received by the vicar with the rest passing to the rector. Sometimes this system was complicated by the payment of pensions: payments in money or kind made annually to a third party, either an individual or organisation. In the thirteenth-century simple benefices were pensions of a less specific kind that that laid down for them in the Council of Trent in 1542:¹⁹ they are found most frequently in disputes over patronage, where the losing patron or presentee was consoled by the receipt of one.²⁰ In Grosseteste's rolls they were occasionally used in this way,²¹ and on at least one occasion such a benefice provided consolation for a religious house whose patronage had been temporarily usurped when a church was granted to a papal candidate.²² Grosseteste also used them to give an income to unsuitable rectors, such as those who were married, who could be persuaded, or forced, to resign the cure of souls. As almost all of these men had reached the higher levels of ordination they could not now, under canon law, take a full role in secular society and their maintenance was considered the obligation of the diocese which had ordained them. Giving these man a simple benefice, that is income without the duty of caring for parishioners' souls, provided for their

¹⁹ These were defined as benefices without cure of souls and without obligations of residence in a parish, allowing a clergyman to hold more than one benefice if necessary. See Council of Trent chapter 17: J. Waterworth, trans., *Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent* (London: C. Dolman, 1848), 224.

²⁰ See examples in C. Harper Bill, ed., *English Episcopal Acta 32: Norwich 1244–66* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) no. 29; B.R. Kemp, ed., *English Episcopal Acta 36: Salisbury 1229–1262* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), nos. 124, 132, 150; B.R. Kemp, ed., *English Episcopal Acta 37: Salisbury 1263–1297* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), nos. 247, 286. Interestingly neither the rolls of Hugh of Wells, Grosseteste's predecessor, nor those of his successors as bishops of Lincoln mention simple benefices at all.

²¹ For example, the church of Oakham, where an agreement between Westminster Abbey and the church of Lincoln led to the establishment of a simple benefice for the monks: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 158; and Carlby where there has clearly been a dispute over the patronage of the church between Robert de Karleby and William de Wasteneys whilst Robert was in his minority: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 96, 110.

²² At the induction of John, clerk, son of Landulf, citizen of Anagni, into the church of Chesterton, Royston Priory, patrons of the church, were granted a simple benefice of 20s. a year: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 255, 267; for their patronage of the church, see W. Page, ed., *VCH Hertfordshire*, vol. 4 (London: Constable, 1914), 436.

material needs at a basic level.²³ The 12 entries which concern us here, however, served a different purpose and have noticeable features which draw them together.

In the first case, they do not fit into the other possible categories mentioned. The recipients of these simple benefices are not previously instituted incumbents who have been removed; although they are several times directly said to have been previous presentees to the churches in question their nominations were never approved by the bishop so they did not need to be removed from office. Nor is there reason to think that their simple benefices were a consequence of any dispute over patronage since both the successful candidate and the recipient of the pension seem to have been presented by the same patron. The majority of these recipients of simple benefices were, indeed, clearly related to that undisputed patron. Of these 12 entries, nine reveal a close relationship: either the simple benefice is specifically said to go to the patron's son, brother or nephew, or the surnames of those involved suggest a close relationship.²⁴ In the other five instances there is no evidence for or against such a familial relationship, but as one aunt and nephew can only be identified because longer letters of institution appear on the dorse of the roll,²⁵ evidence not available for every institution, we know that the brief entries on the front do, on occasion, omit such information. As the nomination of family members suggests that patrons were more concerned with the

²³ There are 20 such entries on the rolls ranging from Roger, the married rector of East Keal who receives 3 marks a year, to Simon, ordained priest but who was the son of the former rector of his church of Radwell, who received 4 marks. In one instance the rector of a moiety of a church has been removed through the consolidation of a benefice, at Navenby. Here the removed rector, Master W. de Parvo Ponte, received 15 marks. Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 44, 283, 99. These pensions could also be considered a form of compromise in themselves, encouraging resignation of unsuitable clergy, thus removing them quickly from the parishes where they were deemed harmful.

²⁴ These include three specifically named fathers and sons, two pairs of brothers, one female patron with her nephew, and three cases where patron and simple benefice recipient have the same surname: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 15, 59, 165–6, 205, 241, 363, 365, 372, 386, 389, 391, 363, 365, 205, 372).

²⁵ Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 165, 166.

material benefit of their kin than parishioners' spiritual health, there was clearly tension between the bishop's ambition for his parochial clergy and the ambitions of the patrons.

In these special cases of simple benefices the clerical orders of both rector and pension recipient are also noteworthy in each case. Ordination was divided into major and minor orders. Those in minor orders, of which the rank of acolyte was the only one used in the thirteenth-century for adults or those on the verge of adulthood, could still enter the secular world. They could marry and take up secular lives. Those in major orders, the orders of subdeacon, deacon and priest, were committed to a career in the church, although only priests could undertake all the duties and services necessary to guide the souls of parishioners. Only they could perform the mass or hear confession. In these 12 cases Grosseteste reveals a definite preference for rectors who were ordained priests, or for those whose quick ordination to this level could be expected, even though in the thirteenth-century it was not necessarily expected that rectors were priests since it often happened that they did not undertake the work of their parishes personally. In one instance a simple benefice proposed in circumstances which would fit the criteria of those under examination, is specifically said to have been denied to a clerk because the patron refused to appoint a suitable man already ordained priest to the benefice: the bishop accepted his presentation of a subdeacon as rector, having refused his original presentation on the grounds that the candidate was not sufficiently literate, but withheld the grant of a simple benefice from the church to the original presentee.²⁶ The bishop was not entirely consistent in insisting on a priest as rector in these 12 simple benefice

²⁶ In the archdeaconry of Northampton in the thirteenth year of the episcopate (1247–8), Master Thomas de Burg', subdeacon, is instituted as rector of All Saints Aldwinckle. Reservation is made to the bishop to make an allowance for William of Aldwinckle, the patron's brother, previously presented and not admitted because of insufficient learning, but a note is added that the bishop has refused to make any grant because the patron, Richard of Aldwinckle, had not presented a suitable chaplain: in the diocese of Lincoln *capellanus* is used in the institution records to mean a man ordained to the priesthood, so the complaint is about the successful candidate's level of ordination. Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 230.

cases, but there is a much higher percentage of priests here than amongst Grosseteste's general institutions. In general a third of rectories for which institutions are recorded in Grosseteste's rolls were filled by priests, although almost all rectors were ordained to the higher orders of subdeacon or deacon. Amongst these 12 simple benefices eight had priests instituted as rectors; that is two-thirds of the whole. Of the remaining four, the ordination level of one is unknown,²⁷ one was a deacon and two were subdeacons.²⁸ But of these three who were definitely not in priest's orders two, the deacon and one of the subdeacons, were described as holding their benefices with 'the burden and obligation of vicars', a common phrase in Lincoln institutions, used across more than one episcopate, which signified that the clergyman took on the obligations of residence and that personal performance of service in the church, for which ordination to the priesthood would have been necessary.²⁹ Used in these instances, this implies that these two, deacon and subdeacon, were obliged and able to be ordained to the priesthood swiftly.

In such a small sample, a high level of priests as rectors could be a coincidence but this is improbable. Rectors in the particular instances in which simple benefices were granted would have needed to be ordained priests, since another notable feature of these entries is the low level of orders amongst those who were receiving the simple

²⁷ In the case of the church of Long Bennington, the grant of a simple benefice to Adam de Bennington, clerk, brother of the patron, is known only through letters of institution for the eventual rector, Master Richard de Cressingham dated January 1237. There is no entry of any sort for this institution on the front of the roll, although Richard's later death and replacement is recorded: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 120 (the identification of the parish as the same as Long Bennington, recorded earlier in the volume, has not been noted by the original editor). In these letters master Richard is described as 'clerk', a title used on the front of the roll to describe men in lower orders: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 15. However, almost all clergy are called 'clerk' in these letters of institution, whatever their level of ordination as revealed elsewhere in the records. It is not possible, therefore, to be certain of Richard's level of ordination.

²⁸ Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 131, 165, 205.

²⁹ Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 131, 165.

benefices and were sharing the proceeds of the benefice with the rector. In all cases they were only in lower orders. All were called clerk – a description usually used in institutions entries on these rolls to denote ordination below the level of subdeacon – and in six instances this is substantiated by the further information that they could in the future leave the church to marry.³⁰ It is improbable that many of the rectors in these cases could have afforded additional clerical help. Comparisons of the values of churches as given in the Taxatio of 1291 against the amounts of income from the churches granted as simple benefices suggests these payments averaged half the value of the church. Even a generous estimate of benefice income, assuming that claims of undervaluing of churches for these papal taxations are not only correct but that the undervaluation was large, would still make them usually more than a third of the benefice income.³¹ Sustaining the rector as well as paying the pension for an additional

³⁰ Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 361, 483, 165, 391, 386, 363.

³¹ There are two occasions when the simple benefice appears to be less than a quarter of the church's value, at Collyweston, where the pension is 20s. and the value of the church in 1291 is £5 (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.NO.PE.07>. Accessed 28/02/2013), and at Long Bennington where the pension of 20 marks is only a fifth of the church's whole value of £66 13s. 4d. (100 marks) (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.LK.LV.06>. Accessed 28/02/2013). However in two of the churches the pension was nearly the whole claimed value of the church; Hulcott, where the 6 mark (£4) pension was from a £5 benefice (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.BU.WE.07>. Accessed 28/02/2013) and at Blisworth where the church's 1291 value, after payment of a pension to a religious house, was £6 13s. 4d. (10 marks) (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.NO.PR.16>. Accessed 28/02/2013) and the simple benefice was valued at the same. At Great Tew the simple benefice of 25 marks (£16 13s. 4d.) was half the church's 1291 value of £33 6s. 8d (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.OX.DE.05>. Accessed 28/02/2013) and at Gayhurst the simple benefice recipient had 4 marks (£2 13s. 4d.): exactly half of the church's claimed value of £5 6s. 8d (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.NO.PR.16>. Accessed 28/02/2013). Three other churches' simple benefices were nearly half the stated income: Harby, with a pension of 12 marks (£8) from a value of £20 (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.LC.FR.17>. Accessed 28/02/2013); Dingley with a pension of 3 marks (£2) from a value of £4 13s. 4d (*Taxatio 1291 Database* <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.NO.WE.18>.

clerk would have left few churches with additional resources amounting to the minimum 5 marks supposed to be paid to a substitute or vicar in an English benefice after 1222.³² Thus the rector would almost certainly have had to perform the duty himself.

These benefices, in fact, reversed the usual roles of clergy within Grosseteste's parishes by restructuring the expected relationship between the rector and his assistant clergy. The bishop's statutes of 1239 make it clear that he could accept the institution of men who were not priests as rectors because he did not expect this to make a practical difference to the cure of souls within the parishes. He worked with a theoretical model in which there would be a second, assistant clergyman in the parish, who would be a priest, paid by the rector: the statutes talk about a rector and his priest where both were clearly expected to be resident in the parish. That deputies of non-resident rectors – vicars who were paid from the income of the church – were in full orders would have been normal: such vicars would have had to be capable of delivering the sacraments of mass and confession in the absence of the rector. It is not clear, however, that Grosseteste is always talking about vicars when he writes of the rector and his priest – when he means vicars he uses the term – and he also emphasises the level of ordination by referring to this second additional clergyman as *sacerdos*.³³ In churches with simple

Accessed 28/02/2013). and Harpole with a pension of 5 marks (£3 6s. 8d.) from a value of £8 *Taxatio 1291 Database*
<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.NO.HA.01>. Accessed 28/02/2013). At Aston Clinton the pension of 10 marks was a third of the income of £20 (*Taxatio 1291 Database*
<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=LI.BU.WE.08>. Accessed 28/02/2013) and at Langton by Partney it was just under a third, at 3 marks (£2) from a value of £6 13s. 4d (*Taxatio 1291 Database*
<http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/taxatio/db/taxatio/printbc.jsp?benkey=L.LLK.HO.19>. Accessed 28/02/2013).

³² See Council of Oxford, Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 112.

³³ For example chapter 17 of the statutes begins 'Inhibemus quoque districtius ne aliquis rector ecclesie faciat huiusmodi pactum cum suo sacerdote', and goes on to discuss provision for this

benefices, roles were reversed. It was the second clergyman receiving a share of benefice income who could not offer the vital sacraments and looked to the rector to say mass and hear confessions.

These simple benefices were clearly in the bishop's gift to grant,³⁴ and they seem to have arisen as a form of compromise with lay patrons. Explicit evidence comes in the form of a detailed description of such an agreement in a letter of 1238, from Grosseteste to the papal legate, Otto, querying the presentation to Rand church of Thomas, son of the earl of Ferrers, the patron.³⁵ Grosseteste agreed that the candidate was well-educated, and of good reputation, but objected that he was too young and not suitably ordained. The emphasis upon his age, suggests that he may have been too young to be canonically ordained to major orders in the immediate future, although to Grosseteste Thomas's age was also a problem because he was too inexperienced: giving him a parish, the bishop declared, would be like handing over a ship in a storm to someone who had never steered one before.³⁶ Other letters show that Grosseteste did reject unsuitable candidates,³⁷ but in this instance he sounds uncertain about doing so.

sacerdos. The next chapter speaks about the need for sufficient means to be given to the *sacerdos* by the rector. Chapter 43 talks about the rectors and *sacerdotes* of their parishes. This is the same word Grosseteste uses for priest when discussing the proper administration of the sacraments of mass and confession in these statutes: Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 271–4.

³⁴ See above note 25 above for the bishop's ability, and willingness, to withhold a simple benefice.

³⁵ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 179–82 (Ep. 151–4). Thomas was the son of William de Ferreres, fourth earl of Derby.

³⁶ Age of presentees was an issue for Grosseteste on at least one other occasion. When he instituted Robert de Harrington, clerk, as rector of two-thirds of Fulleby church at his father's presentation the bishop's concern about the age of the presentee led him to insist upon a vicar, with a pension of just 1 mark retained for the rector, until that young rector was ordained to higher orders, which happened the next year. That Grosseteste did not use a simple benefice here may reflect the fact that this presentation followed a dispute in the king's courts and he did not wish to cause further delay, or the fact that young Robert was so close to ordination to higher orders and clearly actively intended to enter the church: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 109.

³⁷ These included royal clerks, household members and relations of the legate, relatives of important men at court, a candidate sent to him by Boniface, archbishop of Canterbury, an

Instead a compromise is suggested. If the patron insists on presenting Thomas to the benefice as rector there should also be a vicar in the parish,³⁸ or instead, and preferably, if the legate is happy that this situation is within the law, the patron should present another candidate in priest's orders as rector whilst the original young presentee, Thomas, would receive a simple benefice.³⁹ If such a benefice was granted, however, Thomas must be resident.⁴⁰ In other words Thomas is permitted to benefit financially from the benefice which belongs to his father the earl, but in return he must play an active role as a clerk in the parish.

The outcome of this particular case is unknown, there is no institution to this benefice in the rolls at the period of the letter, but our 12 cases from the rolls suggest that this proposal was put into practice on other occasions: not often, but then it would be hoped that such a stalemate in presentation was not frequently reached. Although Grosseteste presents the solution as a new one to the legate – perhaps a courtesy as the legate had taken an interest in this case – he had in fact made use of it from the first year of his episcopate, although the system is not found under his predecessor, and he continued to use it to the last year.⁴¹ In fact the very existence of this description in the letter collection suggests this was a practice Grosseteste wished to highlight. If Mantello and Goering's recent assertion is correct, that the letter collection was planned and

unsuitable monastic appointment and others as well as the famous example of Frederick de Lavagna, the pope's nephew. See Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Grosseteste*, 82–6, 94–6, 99–100, 125–8, 130, 142–4, 172–3, 229–30, 292–4, 367–8, 441–6 (Ep. 50-4, 63-5, 68-9, 97-100, 102, 116-17, 144-5, 203-4, 273-5, 348-50, 432-7).

³⁸ 'idoneus vicarius ad bonam vicariam in sepefata ecclesia constituatur': Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Grosseteste*, 182 (Ep. 154).

³⁹ Called an 'annua prestatio de eadem ecclesia sine cura animarum nomine simplicis beneficii': Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Grosseteste*, 182 (Ep. 154).

⁴⁰ That is, whilst receiving his simple benefice Thomas will be 'residentiam continuam in eadem [ecclesia] faciente' along with an 'idoneus pastor animarum': Goering and Mantello, eds., *Letters of Grosseteste*, 182 (Ep. 154).

⁴¹ The simple benefice at Blisworth was established in the first year of Grosseteste's episcopate, and that at Langton by Partney in the last: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 131, 165.

compiled by Grosseteste himself with an overarching theme of modelling pastoral care,⁴² it becomes possible to see the letters relating specifically to benefices as demonstrating different approaches and objections to presentations, with particular letters chosen to exemplify clear discussions or solutions of certain points. The bishop's letter to the legate concerning Thomas is a clearly laid out description of the reasons for, and administration of, a particular compromise used in a particular circumstance which arose in the diocese: the appointment by a secular patron of an underage relative to a benefice.

Grosseteste, then, specifically articulated in his letters the process of using a simple benefice to deal with a problem presentation; that is to provide an income for a patron's relative who was unsuitable for institution to a benefice. These simple benefices, their description and use, provide a glimpse of the bishop's practical implementation of his theology of pastoral care and his understanding of the importance of individual obligation for pastoral care within this theology.

Grosseteste and individual responsibility

A hierarchical model which made explicit the relative responsibilities of individuals underpinned Grosseteste's theory of pastoral care and although this has frequently been considered in ecclesiastical terms, exploring the relative responsibilities of pope, prelates and priests, it was also central to his understanding of lay responsibility for cure of souls. Influenced by his work on the treatises of Pseudo-Dionysius concerning the celestial and ecclesiastical hierarchies, the bishop emphasised the role of secular, that is non-monastic, ecclesiastics in mediating God's goodness and mercy to creation, and for him the central significance of this hierarchy was ensuring the delivery of pastoral

⁴² Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Grosseteste*, 16–21.

care.⁴³ Within this, the greatest responsibility in the work of saving souls was that of the bishop, and the practical outworking of this is seen in Grosseteste's letters. He held himself personally responsible for the salvation of the souls of all of those over whom he exercised authority: an extensive responsibility stretching above and beyond the understanding of his contemporaries in the episcopate.⁴⁴ As prelate he had the duty of ensuring the quality of pastoral care, including the obligation to ensure the institution to benefices of canonically qualified candidates, and, in fulfilling this duty, he was personally responsible for the salvation of every parishioner in his very extensive diocese. If he neglected his obligations the consequence would be his personal damnation. In writing to William Raleigh, then treasurer of Exeter Cathedral, of his rejection of the ill-educated W. de Grana for a pastoral benefice, he declares that if he gave a cure to such a man he would expose himself to hellfire.⁴⁵ In responding to the legate Otto's request that he appoint the chaplain Master Azo to a prebend with pastoral care he emphasises that abuse of the power to dispose freely of ecclesiastical benefices, even by the pope, builds up the fires of hell,⁴⁶ and he cannot be part of it. Later he speaks to the same legate of his personal fear of a terrible fall from the path of holiness, if he grants a church to a man who already holds cure of souls and has no dispensation

⁴³ Writing on Grosseteste's view of hierarchies is extensive and several authors have noted how for him the hierarchy's central importance was to ensure the exercise of pastoral care: an emphasis not found in Pseudo-Dionysius's work. See McEvoy, *Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste*, 121; C. Taylor-Hogan, 'Pseudo-Dionysius and the Ecclesiology of Robert Grosseteste: a Fruitful Symbiosis', in *Robert Grosseteste: New Perspectives on His Thought and Scholarship*, ed. McEvoy, 189–212, particularly 190–8; Candice Taylor Quinn, 'Robert Grosseteste and the Corpus Dionysiacum: Accessing Spiritual Realities Through the Word', in *Editing Robert Grosseteste*, eds. E.A. Mackie and J. Goering (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2003), 79–95; Ginther, 'Robert Grosseteste's Theology of Pastoral Care', 107–8.

⁴⁴ See for example Southern's assessment, Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 261.

⁴⁵ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 95 (Ep. 63): 'non possemus curam pastorem committere nisi transgrediendo regulas sacre pagine et reverendas sanctorum partum constitutiones, sicque nosmetipsos evidenter ignibus gehanne condemnantes.'

⁴⁶ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 173 (Ep. 145): 'Scio quoque quod quiquis abutitur hac potestate [that is of presentation] aedificat ad ignem gehenne.'

to hold more than one benefice for this purpose.⁴⁷ Elsewhere he declares that if he grants a benefice to an unworthy recipient he will surely find himself on the Day of Judgement amongst the murderers.⁴⁸ Grosseteste's hierarchical model of ecclesiastical power and responsibility may have been focused around the bishops, but the model distributed responsibility for pastoral care throughout the secular clergy, from pope to chaplain. The office of the papacy was the heart of unity in the church, and responsible for its guidance. So in 1250, at the Roman Curia, part of Grosseteste's case against the archbishop of Canterbury concerning the process of the latter's correctional visits to religious houses outside his diocese, considering the nature of good rule and tyranny and the ideal form of authority within the church, drawing together his work on Pseudo-Dionysius and Aristotelian models of kingship, to consider the obligations of pope and archbishop: he described both good rule within the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchies in terms of tyrants, who rule for themselves, and good rulers, who rule for others.⁴⁹ In this instance the good which an ecclesiastical authority – pope or archbishop – must consider was the spiritual health of his flock. At the bottom of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, parish clergy had an equally serious responsibility to their parishioners: Grosseteste describes an unworthy clergyman as spiritually dead: a murderer of souls,

⁴⁷ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 263 (Ep. 241–2).

⁴⁸ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 293–4 (Ep. 274): 'In tradenda animarum cura toti timor concutimur, ne forte pro vivificatoribus eas occisioribus exponamus, ac nosmetipsi per hoc in tremendo iudicio cum homicidis condemnemur.'

⁴⁹ For Grosseteste's use of the idea in his commentary on Aristotle, see *NE*, Book 8, commentary on Aristotle 1160a31–b21, lines 20–30, pages 39–41. For his consideration in 1250, see Servus Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia, Lyons, 1250: Edition of the Documents', *Collectanea Franciscana* 41 (1971): 378. Here, although the pope's own position is clearly part of the consideration, it is notable that an archbishop too can be a 'super-tyrant' if he neglects his obligations. The links between the two types of authority were also noted by W.A. Pantin, 'Grosseteste's Relations with the Papacy and the Crown', in *Robert Grosseteste: Scholar and Bishop*, ed. Callus, 178–215, particularly 212. For a more recent, brief consideration of this passage, see James McEvoy, 'Grosseteste's Reflections on Aristotelian Friendship: a 'New' Commentary on the *Nichomachean Ethics* 8: 8–14', in *Robert Grosseteste: New Perspectives on His Thought and Scholarship*, ed. J. McEvoy. *Instrumenta Patristica* 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995), 157–9.

an antichrist.⁵⁰ So when he refuses to institute W. de Grana, Grosseteste is not only saving himself from hell, but the unsuitable candidate from almost certain damnation also.⁵¹ He also emphasises that the sin of a clergyman is a graver matter than that of his parishioners, for it is his duty to provide a pattern of a good and upright life.⁵²

For Grosseteste, however, responsibility for pastoral care also stretched beyond the ecclesiastical sphere. Although his concept of hierarchy did not map so easily onto secular life, Grosseteste saw the laity at several levels as personally responsible for the salvation of souls and for exemplifying a good life to those who served them. He held secular lords accountable for the spiritual health of their families, their households and their tenants, and above them the king was held responsible for the security and safety of the realm and the protection of the church's liberties, vital for the spiritual health of his subjects.

The quotation that Grosseteste used for considering ecclesiastical authority, 'A king and a tyrant differ in this: that a tyrant looks to his own interest, but a king looks to the common good of his subjects' was from Book 8 of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, a work which Grosseteste considered to be useful for pastoral education,⁵³ and to which

⁵⁰ See quotation from a currently unidentified letter transcribed and translated in Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 12–13, (introduction). Grosseteste also speaks of his horror of the unqualified priest and the harm he can do in his *Dicta*. See for example *Dictum* 51, considering the man who undertakes rule of souls without proper understanding, he declares, 'Cum tamen si hic erratur non possessio sola, non vita qualiscumque, sed vita eterna periclitatur. Non sit in vobis tam audax presumptio.' Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 798, f. 38rb. A transcription of Grosseteste's *Dicta* is available online, in open access at <http://grosseteste.com/dicta.htm> (Accessed 28/02/2013).

⁵¹ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 95 (Ep. 63–4).

⁵² Ginther, 'Robert Grosseteste's Theology of Pastoral Care', 117; Wenzel, 'Robert Grosseteste's Treatise on Confession, *Deus est*', 253–4; *Dictum* 51 in the paragraph referenced in note 50 above.

⁵³ See F.M. Powicke, 'Robert Grosseteste on the Nicomachean Ethics', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 16 (1950): 85–104.

he added a largely original commentary, complete by 1242,⁵⁴ emphasising the extent of the king's obligations, condemning not just the tyrant, who works actively for his own good and against that of his subjects,⁵⁵ but also the weak king, whose coffers – both material and spiritual – are empty and whose exploitation and lack of leadership of his subjects although unintentional, are none the less damaging: a leader who jeopardises the security of his subjects.⁵⁶ Just as the pope's office included responsibility for ensuring the secular unity and security of his subjects, enabling them to live a 'good life', the king was responsible for the unity of the church, although in both instances the individual office holder often fell short of his ideal.⁵⁷ When writing to Henry III he emphasised that his duty of maintaining peace and stability in the kingdom was, or should be, exercised in order to aid the church in its mission of bringing eternal, spiritual peace. The two swords, spiritual and secular, both belonged to the church in origin and from the grant of the secular sword to secular authority arose royal responsibility to protect the church; royal power existed principally to assist the priesthood.⁵⁸ In one of his *dicta* arising from a synodal sermon preached to the clergy to accompany the presentation of his episcopal statutes – which themselves focused on the provision of pastoral care – is an extended consideration of the royal priesthood, comparing the duties of kings and priests. Both are to protect those under them, to

⁵⁴ Daniel A. Callus, 'The Date of Grosseteste's Translations and Commentaries of Pseudo-Dionysius and the Nicomachean Ethics', *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale* 14 (1947): 200–7.

⁵⁵ *NE*, Book 8, commentary on Aristotle, 39–40. See too McEvoy, 'Grosseteste's Reflections on Aristotelian Friendship', 157–9.

⁵⁶ This was Grosseteste's interpretation of the *clerotes*, a Greek king chosen by lot, who was misunderstood by Grosseteste (*NE*, Book 8, commentary on Aristotle, 40–1): on this see McEvoy, 'Grosseteste's Reflections on Aristotelian Friendship', 153; Philippa Hoskin, 'Cantilupe's Crusade: Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester and the Baronial Rebellion', *Transactions of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society*, 3rd series, 23 (2012): 91–102.

⁵⁷ Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia', 378; for Henry III, see Grosseteste's letters to the king: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 326–7, 366–9, 370–1 (Ep. 308–9, 348–51, 351–3).

⁵⁸ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 367 (Ep. 348–9).

provide an example of good character and to correct through the good use of the law.⁵⁹

The emphasis may be on the clergy, but the secular obligation is also clear.

Whilst the king had the ultimate responsibility amongst the laity for the spiritual well-being of the kingdom, others of the laity had their own obligations. Writing to Margaret de Quincy, countess of Winchester, to advise her of her bailiff's behaviour – he had forbidden the purchase of goods which had been paid in tithes to Grosseteste's parish church – the bishop warned her that, if she did nothing to correct him, the bailiff's vices would be her sins.⁶⁰ His treatise on estate management for the countess of Lincoln emphasised her personal responsibility for her household. It was her duty to ensure the behaviour of all its members, to urge them to obedience to God's commands. She was also to provide a personal example, sitting at table with them whenever possible, not eating privately, so as to exemplify courteous and upright behaviour and to oversee the conduct of her household.⁶¹ To Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, the bishop spoke of the earl's obligation to treat a bailiff, whom he was responsible for disciplining, fairly, balancing the virtues of justice and mercy and working within the law: not just common law, but also natural, divine, equitable law, ensuring that justice served to guide the wrongdoer but did not, through undue leniency or unnecessary severity, endanger the soul of the miscreant and in consequence imperil de Montfort's

⁵⁹ *Dictum* 51, in Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 798, ff. 37r–38v.

⁶⁰ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 70 (Ep. 38): 'ne ministorum vitium congrua severitate non repressum, vobis reputetur in peccatum'.

⁶¹ Robert Grosseteste, 'Les Reules Seynt Roberd', in *Walter of Henley, and Other Treatises in Estate Management and Accounting*, ed. Dorothea Oschinsky (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 121–45. For the dating of this piece to Grosseteste's episcopate and for a favourable consideration of his authorship, see Michael Burger, 'The Date and Authorship of Robert Grosseteste's Rules for Household and Estate Management', *Historical Research* 74 (2001): 106–16. For a more recent consideration, which suggests a dating of 1245–53, still within the episcopate, see Louise Wilkinson, *Women in Thirteenth-Century Lincolnshire* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), 59–60.

own soul.⁶² Of secular judges he said that their obligation was to exhibit mercy which the whole community should also demonstrate towards the accused, reflecting God's mercy shown to men.⁶³

Simple benefices: education and pastoral care

So how did Grosseteste's concept of individual responsibility relate to his innovative use of simple benefices to solve difficult patronage issues? We have seen that for Grosseteste, the laity's role in pastoral care was both vital and one which sometimes necessarily involved some compromise by one or other party. As patrons of benefices, members of the laity had the right to choose and present to the bishop candidates for institution in vacant churches; to play a role in the choice of individuals who would constitute the hierarchical government of the church. Smith has calculated that only 40% of the benefices in Lincoln had lay patrons.⁶⁴ But in such a large diocese 40% must be calculated from nearly 2000 parishes: still a large absolute number. And in the exercise of this patronage, Grosseteste held the laity responsible for pastoral care just as he did ecclesiastics. In 1253, episcopal complaints laid before the King, and composed by Grosseteste, set out the duties and limits of this lay involvement. The patron, including the lay patron, must provide a suitable man who can guide souls, whilst the king must understand that pastoral care is vital for the parishioners' salvation and allow the bishops to do their work unhampered.⁶⁵

The quality of such candidates was vital: the patrons and king were told that they must not encourage the appointment of the 'impotentes, ignorantes et

⁶² Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 169–72 (Ep. 141–3).

⁶³ *Dictum* 103, noted by Ginther, *Master of the Sacred Page*, 156.

⁶⁴ David M. Smith, 'The Administration of Hugh of Wells, Bishop of Lincoln 1209–1235'. 2 vols. (PhD diss., University of Nottingham, 1970), 2: 40.

⁶⁵ Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 471–2. Presentations should be carried out 'sola intentione salutis animarum operande facta'.

negligentes'.⁶⁶ However, such principles had little to recommend them to lay patrons whose primary aim was to provide incomes for relatives and retainers. The danger of inadequate candidates being presented was not limited to secular patrons; Grosseteste's letters provide several examples of secular churchmen and monastic patrons attempting to appoint the unappointable, but the fear that secular patrons, in particular, might not understand the extent of their spiritual obligations must have been very great. And the bishop's ability to deal with substandard clergy before they entered a parish was limited. Once a man was rector of a parish, bishops had a little more power: they could, as Grosseteste did, undertake systematic parochial visitations in person, enquiring into the clergy already in the benefices and overseeing the resignation or removal of men who were married or had otherwise infringed canon law.⁶⁷ Visitation certainly allowed him to identify some deficient rectors. In 1251 Matthew Paris notes that Grosseteste used such an occasion to attempt to remove sin from his diocese by depriving clergy who had concubines or wives of their benefices.⁶⁸ Lower ecclesiastical officials with a different process of visitation could also pass information about the clergy's behaviour back up so that it reached the bishop's attention.⁶⁹ But visitation was not an entirely satisfactory solution. To be certain of removing all unsuitable clergymen, a bishop

⁶⁶ Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 471.

⁶⁷ For Grosseteste's parochial visitations, see Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 263–5; Callus, 'Grosseteste's Relations with the Papacy and the Crown', 209–15; Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia', 375–6; *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III: Preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. 5, 1242–7 (London: H.M.S.O., 1916), 543; *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III: Preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. 6, 1247–51 (London: H.M.S.O., 1922), 221–2; *Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office*, vol. 7, 1251–3 (London: H.M.S.O., 1927), 224, 226; Paris, *CMaj.*, 4: 579–80; 5: 256–7. For the bishop of Worcester's parochial visitation, see *Close Rolls 1247–51*, 554. Later bishops' registers record parochial visitations in detail. For references, see Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 262, note 5.

⁶⁸ Paris, *CMaj.*, 5: 526.

⁶⁹ See the process described in Ian Forrester, 'The Archive of the Official of Stow and the "Machinery" of Church Government in the Late Thirteenth Century', *Historical Research* 84 (2011): 1–13.

would have needed to undertake personal visitations regularly, which was not possible particularly in a see the size of Lincoln. Even Grosseteste, a dedicated visitor, can only be proved to have undertaken parish visitation on five occasions during his episcopate.⁷⁰ Limits were also placed on these visitations: the royal ban on the use of sworn inquest by bishops may have made collecting and sifting evidence harder. The political tensions caused by episcopal attempts to take oaths must have made even zealous bishops hesitate.⁷¹

And even if parishes were repeatedly investigated and poor clergy removed this was not the best option: for Grosseteste, these men had already had an opportunity to damage the souls of their parishioners. It was far better to make such disciplinary action unnecessary by instituting dedicated clergy of the highest quality in the first place who would take their pastoral duties seriously. Yet rarely could bishops personally choose a parish rector: benefices were served by the men their patrons nominated. If the candidate was just on the borderline of acceptable, if they were just literate enough to pass their examination, if they fulfilled legal requirements but had papal dispensations not to exercise cure of souls at all – to be absent from their parishes – the bishop was legally obliged to institute such substandard or mediocre men. These were the clergy of whom the legate Otto complained in the 1239 in the statutes of the Council of London, when he bemoaned the fact that whilst churches really needed resident rectors who were exemplary in orders, appearance, character, knowledge and doctrine, they far more often got either just a vicar, a substitute paid out of the benefice income, or a rector who was not ordained priest, dressed as though he was a knight, and who had little to

⁷⁰ Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 261–2.

⁷¹ For episcopal complaints about bishops being prevented from taking oaths from laymen, see the bishops' complaints to the king of 1253 and 1261: Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 470, 678–9; and see too the king's complaints about bishops attempting to impose such oaths, *Close Rolls 1242–7*, 543; *Close Rolls 1247–51*, 221–2, 554.

recommend him in lifestyle and learning.⁷² It was not possible to reject such men outright, although they were not the ideal clergy that a bishop such as Grosseteste, who feared damnation for himself and his clergy if one parishioner was lost, would have chosen. If a candidate was very poor, the bishop could try to reject him and Grosseteste's letters provide examples of the bishop doing just that. But, as Grosseteste's letter concerning Thomas, son of the earl of Ferrers, makes clear, even in these cases it was not always possible to reject a candidate out of hand.⁷³

Lay patrons' choices of candidates, even when they were their relatives, were no doubt sometimes acceptable, and sometimes they were rejected by the bishop if they were not, but as we have already seen there were occasions when Grosseteste felt unable to reject even an uncanonical candidate and then he sought a compromise. If lack of education was the sole issue, and many of the ill-educated in the rolls were indeed related to the patron of the benefice to which they were presented, Grosseteste, like his predecessor Hugh of Wells used a system of conditional institution dependent on future improvement, although he only once followed his predecessor in sending them to the Schools, preferring instead to require a master to teach the ill-educated clergyman

⁷² Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 250–1.

⁷³ Even the rejection of candidates who did not completely fulfil canon law criteria could be difficult. Grosseteste's rolls reveal occasions when he allowed uncanonical institutions of rectors and vicars. On five occasions he instituted vicars who were subdeacons not priests: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 133 (Burton upon Stather), 251 (Kimpton: the printed edition suggests the details of the vicar's orders are omitted but they are given in the margin of the roll), 40 (Moulton), 39–40 (All Saints Stamford) and 275 (Ashwell); although in theory in 1237 the legate Otto had allowed vicars who were not priests to be instituted, provided they were ordained to the priesthood within the next year (Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 249), it would have been more reassuring if the candidates had been deacons, requiring ordination through only one more order. External constraints of a different kind were responsible for another type of worldly compromise although not with the laity. Grosseteste's recognition of the pressures on clerical members of his households to obtain incomes whilst pursuing their careers led him to allow them to be appointed to churches as rectors where they had no intention of being resident in the parish and in fact to hold more than one of these churches at once despite the implications for the souls of their parishioners: Lawrence, ed., *Letters of Adam Marsh*, 1: xxvii; M. Burger, *Bishops, Clerks, and Diocesan Governance in Thirteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 77–8.

within the parish.⁷⁴ Where there were other issues, of age or status, Grosseteste used the simple benefice.⁷⁵

These simple benefices allowed Grosseteste to put into practice his views about lay obligation to and involvement in pastoral care, and indeed about the obligations of the parish priests, whilst also fulfilling his episcopal duty. The reasons that this approach appealed to Grosseteste are clear. It did not involve him placing the cure of souls in the hands of an unsuitable candidate; thus he had put neither himself nor the parish clergyman at that risk of eternal damnation, which he clearly feared. Nor, as the rector paid the pension from the church's income in these cases, were these clerks who obtained a simple benefice a drain on the episcopal purse or an extra expense to the parishioners. Twice Grosseteste had tried to mitigate his refusal of candidates by offering to pay the rejected man a pension from his own treasury,⁷⁶ but this was too heavy a burden to bear frequently. In addition, the system had the advantage that the patron's first choice of candidate, often a relative, was still receiving an income, often a generous proportion of the church's income, and the trust established through an arrangement based on mutual compromise between bishop and patron limited the chance of a full-blown legal dispute over presentation which could lead either to a court

⁷⁴ Smith, 'Administration of Hugh of Wells', 53–5. There are 16 incumbents in Grosseteste's rolls whose learning is questioned or whose examination is mentioned in these circumstances: they are variously required to be re-examined or examined at a particular point in the future, to have a master or to provide particular knowledge of the bishops' statutes, the Ten Commandments, seven deadly sins and seven sacraments. The benefices concerned are Barholme, Wigham, Mablethorpe, Saxilby, Wroot, Easton Neston, Ashton, Crick Cranford, Whiston, Great Wymondley, Ashby de la Zouche, Noseley, Branston Foxton and Sproxton: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 36, 50, 60, 138, 151, 195, 198 (3), 203, 275, 411, 412, 415, 415–16, 416.

⁷⁵ For a discussion of Grosseteste's expectations of the clergy concerning pastoral care, see Ginther, *Master of the Sacred Page*, 163–72.

⁷⁶ In c.1235, when he offers 10 marks to William de Raleigh's candidate, W. de Grana; and in c.1237 when writing to the legate Otto about a prebend for his chaplain, Master Azo, he says he is willing to give any of Otto's staff the full value of that prebend as a free grant: Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 96, 174 (Ep. 65, 146).

case or even, in some instances, a violent lay invasion of the parish, both of which would seriously have disrupted the provision of pastoral care to the unfortunate parishioners to a greater extent.

However, the disadvantage was that the rector's income in these cases was seriously reduced. Elsewhere, Grosseteste was vocal in his concern that resident parish clergy should be well provided for, so that they could fulfil their duties and to limit the temptation for them to seek to hold churches in plurality.⁷⁷ To have allowed these agreements, where a rector in full orders was effectively sharing his income with an unqualified junior, he must have thought they had particular benefits outweighing that loss. The first of these was educational. Grosseteste was an educator; he had been eminent in the schools with which he retained his links throughout his life.⁷⁸ The simple benefice agreements discussed here were a form of education for both patron and potential clergyman, teaching both of them about their personal obligations. The patron was shown the importance of making a good presentation and putting into practice the requirements of canon law by finding another, this time suitable, rector. He was, in fact, instructed with regard to the extent of his own, personal responsibility for the provision of good pastoral care and shown, by the intervention of the bishop, where the limits of his authority lay. The clerk receiving the simple benefice, residing in the parish,⁷⁹ although not holding the cure of souls, would have received something like an apprenticeship. One reason for insisting on residence for the simple benefice recipient must have been the western church's uneasiness about pensions being paid to those who played no parochial role: in these arrangements these resident clerks received an opportunity to experience practical pastoral care within the parish. In other dioceses the

⁷⁷ Gieben, 'Robert Grosseteste at the Papal Curia', 373–5.

⁷⁸ Goering, 'When and Where did Grosseteste Study Theology?', 27–30; Goering and Mantello, 'Early Penitential Writings of Robert Grosseteste', 52–9.

⁷⁹ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 179–82 (Ep. 151–4).

practical result of recommendations in thirteenth-century English ecclesiastical statutes that rectors should have resident clerks should have been to provide these assistants with a chance to experience and observe pastoral care.⁸⁰ But Grosseteste's provision was different. He was not focusing on providing a clerk to assist a rector where any educative advantage was incidental; rather he had a rector instituted to provide a role model for an aspiring presentee who would now have to work as a resident clerk, and he says explicitly in his letter to the legate about the earl of Ferrers' son that he does this in preference to the system of providing a vicar, which would have provided pastoral care through a more familiar system of dividing the income of the benefice. He wanted the presented, although unqualified, candidate to reside within the parish. The rector was to do for the clerk what Grosseteste already urged them, in his sermons, to do for the parishioners: to provide them with an example to follow.⁸¹ The clerk, too, was learning about the personal obligation of the clergy to their parishioners and the importance of not taking such duties lightly. The intention was that the recipients of simple benefices would move on in the future, to another benefice when suitably qualified, or out of the church, and at that point the money paid as a pension would return to the rectory. This may not have been an entirely successful plan. In one parish a simple benefice recipient

⁸⁰ See for example Norwich, 1240 × 1243; Winchester 1247; Ely 1239 × 1256: Powicke and Cheney, eds., *Councils and Synods*, 1: 350, 408, 519.

⁸¹ See for example *dictum* 51, based on a sermon to his clergy at an episcopal synod which urges them not just to teach the rules of life – the Ten Commandments and the articles of faith – to their parishioners, but to model the living of their own life by these rules: Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 798, f. 38ra–b; <http://grosseteste.com/dicta.htm>. The emphasis on teaching through example calls to mind the teaching 'verbo et exemplo', which Walker Bynum has explored as a twelfth-century practice amongst regular canons, but in this context it is more likely to be influenced by the early thirteenth-century emphasis found amongst some Paris masters on supplementing preaching with example to further parochial pastoral care: Caroline Walker Bynum, *Docere verbo et exemplo: an Aspect of Twelfth-Century Spirituality*. Harvard Theological Studies 31 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979); idem, 'The Spirituality of Regular Canons in the Twelfth Century', in idem, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 36–58. For an exploration of this point, see Stephen C. Ferruolo, *The Origins of University: the School of Paris and Their Critics 1100–1215* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), 218–22.

outlasted the rector and none of the men identified seem to have taken on a full benefice in the future, suggesting that they did not move to full ordination.⁸² At the least, however, a parish was spared finding itself in the sole charge of an unqualified clergyman. Both patrons and candidates may have refused to learn or taken their lessons lightly, but that is the enduring risk of attempts at education.

Education was one benefit. The second was related: the focusing of pastoral care within the parish. This was at the heart of Grosseteste's pastoral work: it is demonstrated through his works on confession, through his sermons and through his letters. It can also be seen in the way he providing for ill-educated clergy. When Grosseteste sent them not to the Schools as his predecessor had done, but back to their parishes and ordered them to demonstrate their understanding of works which were of practical importance, such as weekly sermons, manuals of penance and the instructions found in his own statutes, he was directing these men to the stuff of daily parochial care. Grosseteste was not unconcerned with education within the universities, but his emphasis was on close, parochial, pastoral engagement above all. As early as 1229 he had been influenced by Jordan of Saxony's challenge to the masters of Oxford to go back to their parishes,⁸³ and as bishop he tried to persuade those who held benefices in his diocese, yet spent their time in the schools to do so too: it is better to teach the sheep than the shepherds, he told more than one Paris master.⁸⁴

Conclusion

A close analysis of the administrative rolls from his episcopate suggests that

⁸² Humphrey de Bassingbourn's pension at Great Tew is mentioned in two institutions: Davis, ed., *Rotuli Roberti Grosseteste*, 480, 483, 490. One man also clearly left the church: Walter le Grant, who received a simple benefice at Harpole, was his father's heir and took over his estates there: W. Page, ed., *VCH Buckinghamshire*, vol. 2 (London: Archibald Constable, 1908), 343.

⁸³ Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 74.

⁸⁴ Mantello and Goering, eds., *Letters of Robert Grosseteste*, 89–90, 176–9 (Ep. 57–9, 147–51).

Grosseteste's practical implementation of pastoral care was more complex than sometimes assumed. He was not an uncompromising upholder of impractical standards: in fact in providing these simple benefices Grosseteste was prepared to compromise his model of ideal pastoral arrangements. This should not be surprising: Grosseteste had acted as papal judge delegate: he was thus entirely familiar with compromise solutions.⁸⁵ He understood the way in which the world of secular preferment and secular law worked and he could be pragmatic in dealing with it. He also attempted, in his concern that all men should understand the extent of their personal responsibility for the souls of others, to educate both laity and clergy in the obligations of their position, their responsibilities to the church, to God and to those under them, and in the necessity of working within the law in all its forms. In the practical implementation of pastoral care, as in so many other areas, English bishops knew it was necessary to walk the tightrope between church and state carefully: a small slip could have disastrous consequences. Both layman and ecclesiastic must be satisfied, and Grosseteste knew that both needed to be guided. He has been described as looking for the commonalities in his broad sweep of learning, and his concepts of personal responsibility were part of his integration of different strands of his learning.⁸⁶ Pastoral care was the main focus of Grosseteste's episcopal work, and he had high standards for his own practice: where he compromised, it was to ensure that pastoral care was provided in the present, and that patrons and candidates understood what was required for the future. Grosseteste's use of the simple benefice demonstrates both that he could and would negotiate and that in his

⁸⁵ R.R. Darlington, ed., *The Cartulary of Worcester Cathedral Priory*. Pipe Roll Society new series 38 (London: Pipe Rolls Society, 1968), 72–3.

⁸⁶ See, for example, on Grosseteste's use in his pastoral works of his philosophical and scientific knowledge through the most recent psychology of his day: McEvoy, *Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste*, 448–9; Beryl Smalley, 'The Biblical scholar', in *Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop*, ed. Callus, 84–8; Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 2nd edn. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1964), 276–7, 279–80.

concessions he maintained his uncompromising belief in the paramount importance of pastoral care.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on a conference paper delivered at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, 2011 and the International Medieval Congress, Leeds in the same year. I am grateful for comments from audiences at both events.

Philippa Hoskin is reader in medieval History at the University of Lincoln. She is the General Editor of the British Academy's English Episcopal Acta series and of the Canterbury and York Society