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The Isle of Man is an island situated in the Irish Sea at the geographical center of the British Isles. During the Middle Ages, the Isle of Man, which was only two hundred and twenty-two square miles, surprisingly was the seat of an important Viking kingdom that controlled and patrolled the Irish Sea and Hebrides. Rushen Abbey, a Savigniac monastery, was founded in 1134 near Ballasalla, in the parish of Malew, in the southeast of the Isle of Man.

This dissertation focuses on the influence that Rushen Abbey exerted on the ecclesiastical institutions and secular personas within the area of the Irish Sea and examines the external dignitaries which, in turn, influenced the abbey. Ecclesiastical issues include the relationship between Rushen and its motherhouse, Furness in Cumbria; the associations among monasteries situated in the Irish Sea region (Furness, Iona, Whithorn, Holmcultram, Inch, and Gray); the consequences of Rushen and Furness’ Savigniac heritage after the Congregation had been incorporated in 1147 into the Cistercian Order; and the
abbey’s influence on the bishopric of the Isles. Secular issues explored include the importance of Rushen Abbey to the magnates and nobles in the Irish Sea region in social, political, as well as economical relations, particularly the king of the Isles. Finally, the dissertation examines the ways in which both Rushen and its motherhouse, Furness Abbey, both thrived in frontier regions and secured a place as the predominant religious influence on the Isle of Man.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Situated in the Irish Sea at the geographical center of the British Isles, the Isle of Man, only 221 square miles, surprisingly was the seat of an important Viking kingdom that controlled and patrolled the Irish Sea and Hebrides during the Middle Ages. In 1134, on the southeast corner of the island, Rushen Abbey, a Savigniac monastery, was founded near Ballasalla, in the parish of Malew.

This dissertation focuses on the influence Rushen Abbey exerted on the ecclesiastical institutions and secular persons within the area of the Irish Sea and, conversely, examines how those institutions and persons influenced the abbey during the Manx Crovan dynasty (1079-1265). Ecclesiastical issues to be investigated include the relationship between Rushen and its motherhouse, Furness in Cumbria, not least Furness’ unique electoral right over the Sodor.

---

1. Caesar stated that the Isle of Man was situated in the middle between Britain and Ireland. (Gallic Wars, Lib. v. c. 13). Giraldus Cambrensis also places the island stretched in the middle between the north parts of Ireland and Britain (Topography of Ireland, c. 15). Mann was called by various names in classical sources: Mona or Menavia, by Caesar; Monabia by Pliny (Lib. ii. c. 9.); Monapia by Pliny the Younger (Natural History, iv. 103); Mevania by Paulus Orosius, Lib. i. c. 2:82); Menavia Secunda by Bede (Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, Lib. ii. c. 5); Eubonia and Manaw by Nennius (Lib. iii. c. 8, 14). Secondary sources are William Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, Manx Society 18 (Douglas: Manx Society, 1871), 4 and George Broderick, “Pre-Scandinavian Place-Names in the Isle of Man,” accessed November, 01, 2008, http://www.george-broderick.de/iom_docs/pre-scandinavian-place-names.doc.

2. See Appendix Figure 1, p. 248.

3. See Appendix Figure 2, p. 249.
Iona, Whithorn, Holm Cultram, Inch, and Gray); the significance of Rushen and Furness’ Savigniac heritage after the incorporation of the Congregation into the Cistercian Order in 1147; and, finally, the abbey’s influence on the bishopric of the Isles. Secular issues to be explored include the importance of Rushen Abbey to the magnates and nobles in the area, particularly the king of the Isles. Finally, the dissertation will examine the ways in which Rushen Abbey influenced neighboring kingdoms.

**Methodology and Statement of Sources**

The methodological framework of this dissertation is constructed from material cultural, and literary and archival sources. Since the nineteenth century, Manx researchers have provided abundant material cultural information through the publication of many archaeological reports about Rushen Abbey. Since most published theories concerning the abbey have largely been derivatively based on the concept of the conventional Cistercian house in architecture and daily life, material culture is of key importance to any study of Rushen Abbey.

the abbey and supplements the meager primary literature. Archival and primary literary sources will include the few documents relating to the Isle of Man which are scattered through various charters, papal bulls, monastic resources, and state archives.

Manx references can be found in the *Patent Rolls, Close Rolls, Charts Antiqua*, charter compilations, monastic and papal records. The *Patent Rolls* are charters recorded on open parchment sheets; a few of the records relate to Manx royalty and include letters of protection and safe conduct. The *Close Rolls* are charters recorded on closed parchment, and range in subject matter from royal edicts and ecclesiastical and civil judicature, to military affairs. The *Charts Antiqua* consist mainly of charters of religious houses and monastic transactions, such as releases, quitclaims, and manumissions. The witness lists, when they are included at the end of these charters, offer valuable information on genealogy and dates. Among compilations which have assisted researchers, that of Augustinus Theiner, *Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum Historiam Illustrantia*, published in 1864 in Rome, has been widely used as a resource by Manx historians on the Middle age in the Isle of Man. This compilation contains records relating to the ecclesiastical history in the Irish Sea region.\(^5\) Thomas Rymer’s *Foedera*, published between 1704 and 1713, contains many documents

---
issued by the English king and other rulers.\textsuperscript{6} Monastic records, the most valuable sources for this dissertation, include chronicles, chartularies, mortuary books, registers, and calendars. Finally, papal bulls to be used in this dissertation encompass the works of Jaffé, Potthast, and Holtzmann.\textsuperscript{7}

The key historical documentation needed to create this dissertation falls into three categories: Manx, Savigniac, and Cistercian. This dissertation will examine all the extant records of Rushen Abbey, Furness, and other Cistercian and Savigniac monasteries in the Irish Sea region and the ecclesiastical records that mention them for the purpose of analyzing the abbey’s monastic, ecclesiastical, and secular relationships. I have analyzed manuscripts, published primary sources, and secondary studies in the above categories and have provided a review of the primary sources and previous literature below.

**Manx Sources**

**Primary Sources**

The most important primary Manx source is *Chronica Regum Manniae et


*Insularum (Chronicle of Man)*, British Library, MS Cotton Julius A.VII. This unique manuscript, most likely composed by a monk of Rushen Abbey in the mid-thirteenth century, was perhaps made at the behest of a Manx king. The chronicle documents, year by year, historical events that concern the Isle of Man and the surrounding islands from 1016 to the fourteenth century. The *Chronicle of Man* bears witness to the island’s role as the capital of the Norse Kingdom of Mann and the Isles, as well as the influence of its kings and religious leaders. It also provides details of the role of the Rushen Abbey. Early entries are vague and concise, often dedicating only one or two lines to a year and recording nothing in some years; later events are narrated extensively, especially those referring to the royal family, miraculous events, and the bishopric. The chronicle concludes shortly after the death of the last Hiberno-Norse king of Man in 1316 with the plundering of Rushen Abbey by Scottish invaders. Like other monastic chronicles, the *Chronicle of Man* takes an interest in the family of the monastery’s patron. It is clear from his support of the Crovan dynasty against usurpers that the monk-chronicler regarded the Hiberno-Norse rulers as his rightful kings.

---

8. *Chronicle of the Kings of Man and the Isles*, BL Cotton Julius A.vii: this is the only extant copy of the *Chronicle of Man*.


probably because the royal family founded and continued to patronize Rushen throughout the dynasty.\textsuperscript{11}

The text of the \textit{Chronicle of Man} is available in five forms: the manuscript at the British Library;\textsuperscript{12} a microfilm facsimile of the manuscript;\textsuperscript{13} digitalized images of certain pages of the manuscript published by the British Library;\textsuperscript{14} a facsimile published in a limited edition by the Manx Museum;\textsuperscript{15} and, finally, the printed editions.\textsuperscript{16}

The 1860 edition by Peter Andreas Munch was published with the addition of notes from sources not previously associated with the Isle of Man. Munch added explanations to the Hiberno-Latin text to explain terminology in

\textsuperscript{11} For example, the chronicler expresses his aversion to Somerled of Argyll, who seized control of Mann in 1158-1164, and whom the chronicler considered to be the downfall of the kingdom: \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 35 v, 37 v, 39 r.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Chronicle of the Kings of Man and the Isles}, BL Cotton Julius A.vii.


\textsuperscript{14} ‘Online Images,’ at the British Library Online Gallery: see bibliography for more information on exact images taken from the Online Gallery. http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/index.html. I also ordered the folios of BL Cotton Julius A. vii missing from the Online Gallery through the British Library’s Imaging Services.


the manuscript.\textsuperscript{17} He also supplied translations of those parts of the work that had been previously given in Latin alone. Munch’s work is dated by today’s standards; however, it remains the most scholarly edition to date. In 1979, \textit{Chronica Regum Mannie et Insularum} was edited by George Boderick.\textsuperscript{18} Boderick’s introduction provides a paleographic analysis of the manuscript,\textsuperscript{19} describes the state of the manuscript, the various hands, changes in scribes, and the history of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{20} These editions are all unreliable and none of the published translations of the \textit{Chronicle of Man} are reliable for modern academic research. In the near future I plan to publish a new critical edition.

Beyond the \textit{Chronicle of Man}, primary sources about the Isle of Man in the Middle Ages were compiled in 1860 as \textit{Monumenta de Insula Manniae} by John Robert Oliver at the request of the Manx Society.\textsuperscript{21} These volumes contain editions of all the charters relating to the Isle of Man that Oliver could discover in numerous archives and public records offices in the United Kingdom. The charters contain bilingual, Latin and English, texts, mainly from English sources and papal letters. No subsequent comparable collection has been attempted. The

\begin{enumerate}
\item Munch, \textit{The Chronicle of Man and The Sudreys}.
\item Boderick, \textit{Chronica Regum Mannie et Insularum}.
\item Boderick, “Preface,” in \textit{Chronica Regum Mannie et Insularum}, i-xii.
\item Munch, \textit{The Chronicle of Man and The Sudreys}; Boderick, \textit{Chronica Regum Mannie et Insularum}.
\end{enumerate}
first volume of Oliver’s work contains selected excerpts from chronicles that pertain to the Isle of Man.22 Included in Monumenta Volume One are selected passages from the chronicles of Jocelin of Furness,23 Florence of Worcester,24 William of Malmesbury,25 Orderic Vitalis,26 Henry of Huntingdon,27 Matthew of Paris,28 Roger of Wendover,29 William of Newburgh,30 the Annales Cambriae,31 and the Account of Haco’s Expedition.32 Volume Two and Volume Three contain a

22. Oliver, Monumenta de Insula Manniae, vol. 1, Manx Society 4 (1860), 1-244.


32. Norwegian Account of King Haco’s Expedition against Scotland, trans. James Johnstone (Edinburgh: 1883), AD 1248, p. 13-4; AD 1249, 14-7; AD 1261, 17-8; AD 1262, 18-9; AD 1263, 20-4.
series of muniments that illustrate the state of the island in late antiquity and the Middle Ages and includes Manx and English state papers and letters, as well as papal bulls and all patent and close rolls, antique charts, and grants pertaining to the monastery. Volume Two features charters dated from 1134 AD to 1408 AD, while Volume Three contains those from 1414 AD to 1770 AD.

In 1871, the Manx Society published in one volume, compiled by William Harrison, *The Old Historians of the Isle of Man*, a selection of mostly secondary early historical sources not included in Oliver’s *Monumenta*, detailing the secular and ecclesiastical life of ancient and medieval society on the Isle of Man. The author decided against including the *Manx Chronicle*, because it had already been published and was widely available at the time. Harrison’s work also includes translations of the synodal statutes of the Manx Church and passages from various post-medieval histories: Camden’s *Britannia*, Speed’s *History*,

33. Oliver, *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, vol. 2, Manx Society 7 (1861), 1-250.
34. Oliver, *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, vol. 3, Manx Society 9 (1862), 1-269.
Dugdale’s *Monasticon Angelicanum*, Cox’s *Magna Britannia*, Bishop Wilson’s *History*, Willis’ *Survey of the Cathedral of Mann*, and Grose’s *Antiquities*.

**Secondary Sources**

Among the published secondary sources on Manx ecclesiastical history, the most useful monograph is Arthur William Moore’s *Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man*. Moore traced the history of the Manx Church from its early Celtic foundation to the nineteenth century. The Celtic and medieval history of the church and monastic houses on the island, from early Christian influences through the changes incorporated by the Norse Crovan dynasty to the end of Viking rule, is covered in three chapters: the “Celtic Period,” the “Scandinavian Period (?850-1275),” and “The Rule of the Monks.”

---


In his history of the Catholic Church on the Isle of Man, William Dempsey developed a trustworthy account of the “great recovery” of Catholic Christianity in the island brought about under the leadership of Olaf I (1102-1153).\textsuperscript{48} In 1958, Anne Ashley, in a short pamphlet, wrote about the Church in Mann from its Celtic Christian background through the Viking Age and the Crovan dynasty (1079-1266).\textsuperscript{49} It was during the Crovan dynasty that the Manx Church rapidly converted from the tribal Irish tradition of Christianity to that of the Roman Church.

Recent publications include “Bishops in the Isles before 1203: Bibliography and Biographical Lists,” a detailed list of the bishops of the See of Sodor and Man in 1994.\textsuperscript{50} Its compiler, Donald Watt, provides brief biographies for all Manx bishops, rumored and documented, in chronological order.

A 1996 master’s thesis by Mary Buck at the University of Guelph investigated the introduction of the twelfth-century reformed monastic Orders to northern England and the Isle of Man and the establishment in England of the Cistercian Order and the Congregation of Savigny, paying special attention to


\textsuperscript{48} William S. Dempsey, “The Great Recovery” in \textit{The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man} (Wigan: Birchley Hall Press, 1958). The Manx Church was most prestigious during the Viking Crovan dynasty.

\textsuperscript{49} Anne Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man} (London: St. Anthony’s Press, 1958).

Furness Abbey in Cumbria and its daughter house Rushen on the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{51} Buck examined the ways in which Furness Abbey came to exercise authority in Mann during the late-thirteenth century. She relied heavily on secondary sources for her conclusions, often failing to substantiate her theories with primary sources.\textsuperscript{52}

In 1998, Donald Dugdale, describing the early history of Christianity in the British Isles, concentrated on the Isle of Man from the third century to the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{53} Unlike many other modern scholars\textsuperscript{54} who assert that Celtic traditions were assimilated and incorporated by the Viking settlers after the Norse invasion of Mann, Dugdale theorizes that the Celtic heritage of the island was too heavily overwritten to have survived in any aspect of Manx culture.\textsuperscript{55}


\textsuperscript{52} Buck’s sources are mostly secondary works; papal bulls and charters are pulled from these records even when they can be found in extant copies or more accurate editions: Harrison, \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}; Moore, \textit{Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man}; David Knowles, \textit{The Religious Orders in England} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959); R. H. Kniving, \textit{Isle of Man: A Social, Cultural, and Political History}, 3rd ed. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1975). Buck has also mistaken an editor’s comment for an actual transliteration of a charter, on page 116.

\textsuperscript{53} Donald S. Dugdale, \textit{Manx Church Origins} (Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1998).


\textsuperscript{55} Dugdale, \textit{Manx Church Origins}, 5; though Dugdale seems to contradict himself on pages 188-190.
The Centre for Manx Studies recently published *A New History of the Isle of Man*, a five volume history of the Isle of Man, each volume containing articles on recent research by Manx scholars from prehistory to the present day. In fall 2015, *A New History of the Isle of Man: Volume Three: The Medieval Period 1000-1405* highlighted the island’s influence in the Irish Sea region and explores the multicultural traditions of Man. The book is separated into two parts, focusing on politics and society.

In 2006, Francis Coakley established an electronic database containing a compilation articles, books, and journals concerning the Isle of Man. The website includes fully printed texts of various monographs and documents concerning the history of Mann. A number of articles from the *Journal of the Manx Museum* and some unpublished documents are included, as are many of the *Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society*.

**Archaeological Reports**

Archaeological research on the Isle of Man began with mid-nineteenth-century reports of Joseph G. Cumming. During the early twentieth century,

---


William C. Cubbon reported the findings of the initial excavations at Rushen Abbey (1924-1935) and discussed what might be extrapolated from them. More recently, Lawrence Butler has reported on new archaeological discoveries and reinterpreted previous finds. Butler points to inaccuracies in Cubbon’s work and reinterprets his evidence in light of 1988-89 excavations. In 1999, Peter Davey edited *Rushen Abbey, Ballasalla, Isle of Man: First Archaeological Report* following the 1998 excavations at Rushen. This work identifies potential future archaeological and historical work on the political and social significance of the abbey and raises questions, which this dissertation shall address.

**Savigniac Studies**

Scholars have not explored the relationship among Savigniac houses in the British Isles. What work has been done has concentrated on the foundation of the Norman Savigny and its relationship with daughter houses in England, or


debated aspects of the merger of the Congregation of Savigny with the Order of Citeaux. There is, however, no modern monograph of the Congregation of Savigny and no current study of Savigniac English houses. The only study of relationships among the English Savigniac houses focuses on a debate between Savigny and Furness over filiation rights to Byland Abbey.

Main Savigniac Sources

The Histoire de la congrégation de Savigny was published in three volumes between 1896 and 1898, but written by Claude Auvry, prior of Savigny from 1698 Vital, which concerns the early history of the congregation: Jaap van Moolenbroek, Vital l’ermite, prédicateur itinérant, fondateur de l’abbaye normande de Savigny (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990).


For example, Burton, “The Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx,” see note 64.

Laveille, Histoire de la Congregation de Savigny, see note 66.
to 1712. It is not surprising, considering Auvry’s position, that he presented the early history of the Congregation of Savigny favorably and highlighted the life and deeds of Serlo, who was abbot of Savigny during the merger of the Savigniacs and the Cistercians. Auvry’s history remains the only comprehensive history of Savigny (to c. 1244) and a unique source on the state of Savigny before and after the merger. In the twentieth century, Jacqueline Buhot published a few chapters on the Savigniac Order in *Le Moyen Age*, giving a general history of the congregation and its merger with the Cistercians. Buhot’s research covers the Abbey of Savigny itself and the Congregation of Savigny, as well as detailing the leadership of the abbots who succeeded Vital (?-1122), the founder of the Savigniac Order: Geoffrey (1122-1139), who created the Congregation of Savigny; Ewan the Englishman (1139), who went to Savigny from Furness and held office only for one year, 1139; and Serlo (1140-1153), who brought the congregation into the Order of Cîteaux.

In 1909, Léon Guilloreau, in *Revue Mabillon*, also described the origins of Savigny and provided a short biography of Vital and Geoffrey chronicling early Savigniac history. After describing the Savigniac administration, governance, and spirituality, Guilloreau gave a brief account of the English


houses. In 1980, Bennett Hill, in his study of the origins of Savigny and its first six daughter houses in France, demonstrated that these seven Savigniac monasteries were among the principal reasons behind colonization in forest and frontier territories.

In *Church History*, 1983, Terrence Deneen and Francis Swietek examined the alleged episcopal exemption of Savigny before and after the merger with the Cistercian Order. Their research indicates that episcopal exemption of Savigniac houses in the early twelfth century was unlikely on the grounds that evidence of exemption is unreliable and ambiguous in wording. The same year, they published an examination of two bulls long believed to have been issued by Pope

---

71. Tulket (1124, which trans-located and became Furness in 1127), Neath (1130), Quarr (1132), Basingwerk (1133), Combemere (1133), Rusben (1134), Calder (1134), and Swineshead (1135), Stratford Langthorne (1135), Buildwas (1135), Buckfast (1136), Devon (1136), Hood ((1140), which was settled by dislocated monks from Calder and trans-located twice more: Old Byland (1143) and Byland (1177)), Coggeshall (1140), Jervaulx (1145).


73. Beaubec, Pays de Bray, Normandy (1127/28); Vaux-de-Cernay, Yvelines (1128); Chaloché, Angers (1129); Saint-André-en-Goffern, Falaise (1130); Foucarmont, Seine-Maritime (1130); La Boissiere, Denézé-sous-le-Lude (1131). In 2002, Karen Billings applied a ‘frontier paradigm’ to research on Furness Abbey in her thesis. [Karen Billings, “Furness Abbey: Wayward Daughter of Savigny,” (M.Phil. thesis, University of Cambridge, 2002).]

Lucius II on December 5, 1144 on behalf of Savigny. The first bull, *Desiderium quod*, was a *privilegium* confirming Savigny’s possessions; the second, *Quia igitur*, placed Savigny under papal protection and again confirmed its possessions. They concluded that *Quia igitur* was a forgery. In 1993, Swietek and Deneen analyzed *Quia igitur* using a recovered copy of the complete text. They again concluded that the bull was a forgery fabricated between 1148 and 1153, and that the forgery was modeled on the bull *Habitantes in domo*, issued by Pope Innocent II to Cîteaux in 1132, and on *Desiderium quod*, to which it was later found attached.


76. *Desiderium quod*: original is in Paris, Archives nationales L 966, no. 5; copies can be found in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS nouv. acq. Lat. 1022, 737-6 and Deneen and Swietek, ‘Appendix I’ in “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 20-3.


Sources on Furness Abbey

On Furness, there are several studies. In 1412, the abbot of Furness, William Dalton, requested that John Stell, a monk of the abbey, record its charters and deeds.82 In 1774, in The Antiquities of Furness, Thomas West presented ancient customs, rights, privileges, and bylaws of Furness Abbey and included a detailed description of the abbey’s buildings.83 In his account, West reproduced many of the charters from the Furness cartulary. In 1880, Joseph Richardson published a second version of The Antiquities of Furness,84 chronologically listing the abbots and their deeds and discussing the extant letters and documents, especially those involving secular persons. His history of Furness, its foundation, patrons, and benefactors, extends until just after the abbey’s dissolution in 1537.

In 1870, a guide to the abbey ruins and its history by James Morris included a list of abbots, discussed the public and private transactions of the abbey, and provided a translation of the Furness Abbey foundation charter.85 In


84. Joseph Richardson, History and Antiquities of Furness (J. Richardson, 1880).

1884, Thomas A. Beck published many of the charters from the cartulary in his extensive history of Furness Abbey, *Annales Furnesienses*.\(^8^6\)

A printed edition of the *Coucher Book of Furness Abbey* published in 1886 by John C. Atkinson consisted of three parts: \(^8^7\) the foundation charter of the abbey and charters regarding the abbey’s right to certain surrounding lands; \(^8^8\) the exemption of the abbey from numerous secular taxes; \(^8^9\) and an annotated list of abbots, as well as bulls granted to the abbey by the popes (Alexander III to Urban VI).\(^9^0\)

In 1915, John Brownbill produced *Coucher Book of Furness Abbey: Volume Two* to supplement Atkinson’s *Furness Coucher Book* by including charters involving land owned by Furness but located at a distance from the abbey.\(^9^1\)

Brownbill’s *Coucher Book* is also divided into three parts: (1) the original charter of foundation, land donations involving Furness’ surrounding towns, and

---


records of property sales;\(^{92}\) (2) similar charters from Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and Cumberland;\(^{93}\) and (3) lists of abbey rentals and accounts, Manx and Irish charters, and notes and additions made to Atkinson’s *Furness Coucher Book*.\(^{94}\)

**Cistercian Sources**

Building on the early modern *Monasticon Anglicanum* volumes by William Dugdale,\(^{95}\) Thomas Tanner’s *Notitia monastica*,\(^{96}\) and Francis Gasquet’s *The Greater Abbeys of England*,\(^{97}\) David Knowles,\(^{98}\) in the mid-twentieth century,

---


launched modern scholarship on British monasticism. Monographs on religious Orders in England have increasingly proliferated. Susan Wood’s *English Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* appeared in 1955, the

---


works of Bennett Hill\textsuperscript{102} and those of Emma Cownie in 1968 and 1998, respectively.\textsuperscript{103} An extensive bibliography on the Cistercian Order in Britain was published by Robin Donkin\textsuperscript{104} and Cistercian library holdings were identified by David Bell.\textsuperscript{105} Studies on Cistercian material culture\textsuperscript{106} and monographs about


\textsuperscript{103} Emma Cownie, Religious Patronage in Anglo-Norman England, 1066-1135 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1998). Cownie also examined religious patronage in Anglo-Norman England, from the Norman Conquest in 1066 to 1135. She analyzed gift-giving between laymen and monks, particularly gifts of land, and the motives for such pious generosity.

\textsuperscript{104} Robin Donkin, Cistercian Bibliography. A Check List of Printed Works Relating to the Cistercian Order as a Whole and to the Houses of the British Isles in Particular, La Documentation Cistercienne 2 (1969): 1-104. This is a helpful but now outdated bibliography of printed works on the Cistercian Order, particularly their houses in the British Isles.

\textsuperscript{105} David N. Bell, The Libraries of the Cistercians, Gilbertines, and Premonstratensians (London: The British Library, 1992). This book is one of the volumes of The Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, whose goal was to publish the extant catalogs of British medieval libraries. David N. Bell, An index of Cistercian authors and works in medieval library catalogues in Great Britain (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1994). This work includes indexes of British Cistercian library holdings and works in existing library catalogs of monastic houses and other institutions in Great Britain.

particular Cistercian houses have expanded our knowledge of the Cistercians in England.\textsuperscript{107}

A few recent publications relate, in particular, to Cistercian monasteries around the Irish Sea. In 1981, Geraldine Carville looked at monastic economic activities of Cistercian houses close to the Irish Sea, focusing on monastic trade imports and exports between religious houses.\textsuperscript{108} Keith Stringer, in 2003, examined the reformed Church in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Galloway and Cumbria,\textsuperscript{109} and connected religious houses in Galloway and Cumbria with the Isle of Man by tracing trade and possession of Manx property.\textsuperscript{110}

**Historical Significance and Thesis**

**Historical Context**

Despite the published research cited above, research on the Congregation

---


\textsuperscript{108} Geraldine Carville, “The Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” *Cîteaux* 32 (1981): 37-73. Furness Abbey, Holm Cultram, and Rushen Abbey can be documented to have imported and exported materials to and from Ireland.


\textsuperscript{110} Stringer, *The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria*, 23-8, 38-40. He also includes charters of property rights and church allocations in the appendix, 41-54.
of Savigny in general has been significantly neglected by the academic community. This dissertation hopes to help remedy this absence in the literature by expanding our knowledge of these Orders. Specifically, this dissertation focuses on Savigniac monasteries in the British Isles under the imposing influence of its first English foundation, Furness, and so develops new perspectives on the relationship of Savigniac and Cistercian monasteries in the Irish Sea region.

The ecclesiastical history of the Isle of Man has also been neglected by modern scholars by comparison with research and publications available on that of other early kingdoms in the British Isles. Prior research has addressed particular abbeys, but not adverted to the network of relationships among them. Research on Rushen Abbey has until now been confined to archaeological reports, guidebooks, and a few books and articles about the general history of the abbey. Documentarial resources on Rushen are sparse, while archaeological


data are abundant. However, archaeological reports do not further our knowledge of Manx or Savigniac inter-relationships. While the influence of this abbey’s powerful motherhouse, Furness, has been noted by previous historians, Rushen Abbey has not been analyzed to ascertain its role in Savigniac history.

Statement of Thesis

This dissertation builds on previous scholarship by drawing on primary sources, published scholarship, and archaeological reports to address previously unstudied questions. One of the major goals of this research has been to reveal the diplomatic and social relationships that existed between Rushen Abbey and its motherhouse, Furness. Some previous works have claimed that Rushen was merely a satellite community of Furness, housing three monks instead of the thirteen needed to found a monastery. I shall argue that Rushen did not begin


113. William of Worcester, Itinerarium, ed. James Nasmith (Cambridge: James Nasmith, 1778), 312: Castrum monasterii de Russyn cum iii monachis. A fifteen-century source does not confirm the number of monks at the time of Rushen’s foundation. Reformed houses usually started out with twelve monks plus an abbot, and even at the dissolution of Rushen, the abbey still had six monks.
as a satellite plantation of Furness and, as a Cistercian house, the abbey was definitely autonomous. Even so, Rushen always maintained close connections with Furness and would have held the same ideas and traditions as its motherhouse.

Another area of research will be Rushen’s ties to other monasteries in the Irish Sea region for the purpose of discovering the kinds of connections that may have existed between Rushen, Cistercian monasteries in the Savigniac tradition, and other religious Orders with land on the Isle of Man. The research undertaken in this dissertation should substantiate that connections were developed between these monasteries by means of political relationships among monastic patrons; economic, trade, and ecclesiastical ties; and the filial connections within the religious Order.\footnote{There is documentation of these connections in archaeological remains and primary literature such as monastic charters. Secondary sources include a few sources but I will make the Manx and Cistercian connection: Carville, “The Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” see note 108; Stringer, \textit{The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria}, see note 109; McDonald, \textit{The Kingdom of the Isles}, see note 54; Hudson, \textit{Viking Pirates and Christian Princes}, see note 54.}

Finally, this dissertation will discuss the relationships between Rushen Abbey and the King of the Isles, giving special attention to the influence on Rushen of social and political matters within the kingdom. I shall examine the circumstances surrounding the foundation of Rushen and the extraordinary gift to Furness of jurisdictional powers over the Bishopric of Sodor in order to discern the early motives of the Manx kings in their patronage to Rushen and
Furness and both abbeys’ continued influence on the Isle during the Crovan dynasty. Although the King of Man had been ordered by the Pope Gregory IX and also by Henry III, king of England, not to interfere in monastic affairs, the monastery was nevertheless drawn into secular life as its abbots were barons in the island and held a number of secular responsibilities, especially over their tenants.

The overall goal of this dissertation then is to reveal the influence of Rushen on monastic and secular society in the Irish Sea, not least the monks’ ties to the magnates of the neighboring realms of Ireland, Scotland, and England. The island may have been overlooked by modern scholars, but as Mann, inclusive of the Hebrides in the Irish Sea, was a significant kingdom from 1095-1265, I shall argue that Rushen Abbey was a significant monastery in the Irish Sea region and definitely the most powerful religious institution on Mann. The Church of the Isle of Man held great significance in the Isles, and so I propose that Rushen Abbey and its motherhouse profoundly influenced the medieval culture of the Isles.

115. Moore, Diocesan Histories, 60. This bull, of which the original is not known to exist, is preserved in a modern transcript (c.1600) which was discovered by Bishop Bardsley at Bishop’s Court in 1888. Moore, “Bull of Pope Gregory IX to the Bishop of Sodor, 30 July 1231,” The English Historical Review, vol. 5, no. 17 (Jan., 1890): 101-107: 101-105, text is given on 105-7.

116. Oliver, “Henry the III to Olave, 1218,” in Monumenta de Insula Manniae, 42.
Structure of Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into analytical categories that provide its primary structure, while individual chapters are written according to historical chronology. Chapter II provides a brief background on the Cistercian and Savigniac Orders and examines the history of Savigniac monasteries in England and their unification with the Cistercian Order as a way of discerning any features unique to this subgroup or to Rushen Abbey. Chapter III investigates the rapid conversion of Viking settlers to Christianity, connections between the king of Mann and Furness Abbey anterior to Rushen Abbey’s foundation, the circumstances behind the grant of Manx land to Furness Abbey and possible reasons for the Rushen foundation, and provides a clear history of Rushen Abbey and the political landscape on the Isle of Man. Chapter IV evaluates the impact of twelfth-century reformed monasticism on the region, the familial connections of Rushen Abbey with its motherhouse, Furness, and its ongoing influence in Manx affairs, and investigates Rushen’s position as a Savigniac-become-Cistercian monastery. Chapter V examines early religious traditions in the Isle of Man and the Hebrides, the filiation connections of other Savigniac and Cistercian houses, as well as their relationship with other religious Orders and the secular church. Chapter VI addresses the secular associations of Rushen Abbey within the Kingdom of Man and the Isles and the neighboring lordships of Galloway, Ulster, Argyll, Scotland, Ireland, and England, as well as the bishopric of the
Isles. Monastic patronage and disputes between the crown and monastery are discussed in this chapter, as is the abbey’s secular involvement with magnates and monastic tenants. The last chapter, Chapter VII, presents the conclusion at which I have arrived from a careful analysis of these sources. The research examined and theories formed by this study will, I hope, contribute to a broader understanding of circumstances surrounding Savigniac and Cistercian monasticism in this unique area of the British Isles.
CHAPTER II
NEW MONASTIC ORDERS

During the eleventh century, a “new monasticism” developed in Western Europe, deriving its ideals from accounts of early desert hermits.¹ These reformed Orders considered the Cluniacs’ (traditional monks) landed wealth and feudal power contradictory to the Rule of St. Benedict and desired a return to a life of “apostolic poverty” and strict adherence to the Rule.² Among them were the Cistercians and Savigniacs, who emerged in 1098 and 1105, respectively, and merged in 1147. What follows is a brief historical survey of the two Orders, which will highlight the differences between the two, the merger of 1147, and its meaning for the English Savigniac houses, particularly Rushen Abbey.


Brief History of Cîteaux

Robert of Molesme, the house he founded in 1075, became disillusioned by the abbey’s increasing involvement with society at Molesme, in the hope of reforming the customs derived from Carolingian monasticism by way of early Cluny. Robert, along with several other monks of Molesme, believed that customs had begun to supersede observance of the Rule of St. Benedict and they desired strict adherence to the Rule. These monks petitioned and received authorization from the papal legate in Lyon to establish a new monastery. In 1098, a small group of monks left Molesme together with Robert. They


5. Ibid., 6, 419, 430-34.


7. Ibid., 421.
established a “New Monastery” in the forest of Citeaux. A year later, Robert returned to Molesme. Alberic became abbot of Citeaux (1099-1109) and Stephen Harding prior.

Following the principles of simplicity, seclusion, and a literal observance of the Benedictine Rule, Cistercian monks rejected anything not mentioned in the Rule: “namely, coats, fur garments, linen shirts, hoods, too, and drawers, combs and coverlets, mattresses, and a variety of dishes in the refectory, as well as lard and all else that was contrary to the Rule in all its purity.” They rejected all sources of income that required involvement with secular society and they built “far from human habitation.”

---

8. Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux, ed. Waddell, A, 420-421: the archaic name of the monastery was Novum Monasterium, and was later changed to Citeaux, the name of the forest.


12. Ibid., A, 419-421, 430-34.

13. Ibid., A, 434: froccos videlicet et pellicias ac staminia, caputia quoque et femoralia, pectina et coopertoria, stramina lectorum ac diversa ciborum in refectorio fercula, sagimen etiam et caetera omnia quae puritati Regulae adversabantur.

The Cistercians returned manual labor to the horarium, or daily schedule, and they insisted that communities be self-sufficient as described in the Benedictine Rule. This led to the introduction of conversi, lay brothers, to manage and supervise granges, and allowed the choir monks time for liturgical prayer and private meditation, from which the aliterate conversi weren’t allowed to participate.

Life at Cîteaux was harsh, as Stephen Harding, third abbot of Cîteaux (1109-34), in his first years as abbot faced bad harvests, disease, and, according to the Exordium Parvum, the monks’ own account, lack of vocations. This may have been an exaggeration, as by 1113, Cîteaux had enough monks (twelve monks and an abbot) to found a new monastery at La Ferté. In that same year, the young Bernard of Fontaine and thirty of his companions entered the


18. Ibid.


20. There is indication of thirty novices, who simultaneously entered the monastery in the Exordium Parvum (“Exordium Parvum” in Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux,
“new monastery” at Citeaux. Over the next three years, the four “elder daughters” of Citeaux were quickly established: La Ferté in 1113, Pontigny in 1114, and Clairvaux and Morimond in 1115.

Uniquely among the reformed Orders, Citeaux legislated for observances to be followed in all Cistercian houses and instituted a system of mutual dependences. They instituted an innovative administration consisting of the General Chapter of Citeaux, the constitutional body supervising the Order, and

ed. Waddell, A, 438): this occurs right before the founding of new monasteries. Many early scholars have taken the Exordium Parvum to mean that Bernard entered in 1112, including Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 6; Lawrence, Medieval Monasticism, 173; and Knowles, The Monastic Orders in England, 200 has Bernard entering Citeaux in 1111. Louis Lekai, The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1977). Finding the Exordium Parvum faulty and basing his research on the Vita prima, Lekai asserts that Bernard was admitted to Citeaux in 1113, not 1112 (which had been the previously believed myth).


22. La Ferté was founded May 1113. Waddell, ed. Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux, 207; P. Leopoldus Janauschek, Originum Cisterciensium, CCLIII, 4.

23. Pontigny was founded on June 30, 1114. P. Leopoldus Janauschek, Originum Cisterciensium, CCLIII, 4.

24. Clairvaux and Morimond were simultaneously founded on July 26, 1115. Janauschek, Originum Cisterciensium, CCLIII, 4-5; Waddell, ed. Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux, 265.

a system of visitation. These relationships are enshrined in their early documents, the *Carta Caritatis* and the *Instituta Generalis Capituli apud Cistercium*, so that all houses would follow uniform rules and visitation. As the *Carta Caritatis* indicates, the Cistercian fathers were inspired by the ideal of mutual charity.

The rapid growth and expansion of the Cistercian Order is believed to have been due to the eloquent expression of spirituality of their monks and to the shared written ideals mentioned above. Some scholars attribute this to

---

26. The origins, development, and function of the General Chapter are provided in Chrysogonus Waddell, *Twelfth-century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2003), 37-9; see also Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism*, 187-90. Primary sources on the General Chapter include the “Summa Cartae Caritatis (SCC)” and the “Carta Caritatis Prior (CC1)” in Waddell, ed. *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux*, B, SCC Ch. III-IV, 404-7, B, CC1 Ch. VII-VIII, 446-7. Primary sources on visitation include B, CC1, Ch. IV-VI, 445-6 and the *Instituta Generalis*, C, Ch. XXXIII-XXXIV, 470-1 [*Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux*, ed., Waddell.].

27. The latest source on the origin dates of early Cistercian legislation and documents and their evolution into later documents with similar content can be found in *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux*, ed. Waddell, 1-397. The earliest documents concerning this are the *Carta Caritatis Prior* (CC1) and the *Instituta Generalis Capituli Apud Cistercium*. CC1 is the 1119 confirmed edition of the *Carta Caritatis*, written by Stephen Harding (there is likely an older version undiscovered). The *Instituta Generalis* is a codification of General Chapter statutes starting with statutes from the time of Stephen Harding to those enacted under Guy (1133/4?) and Raynard.


Bernard’s leadership, spirituality, and activity on the political scene.\textsuperscript{30} Whatever the case, the number of houses climbed quickly from five houses in 1115 to thirty-eight in 1129.\textsuperscript{31} By 1151, there were three-hundred thirty-three houses in Europe, fifty-four of them in England.\textsuperscript{32} See below for the expansion of Cistercian houses in England.\textsuperscript{33}

The Congregation of Savigny’s History

Rushen Abbey, the focus of this study, was not originally a Cistercian house. At the time of Rushen’s foundation (1134) it belonged to the Congregation of Savigny, which had developed from a small hermitage Vitalis of Mortain established around 1093 in the forest of Mortain, which connects Normandy, Maine, and Brittany.\textsuperscript{34} In 1112, Vitalis’ hermitage at Savigny came

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{31} Logan, F. Donald, \textit{A History of the Church in the Middle Ages} (New York: Routledge, 2002), 139.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{33} See Chapter II, Section “First English Houses,” 42-46.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
under the auspices of Raoul, Lord of Fougères. That same year Savigny received the confirmation of Turgis, Bishop of Avranches, and Henry I, King of England, but the abbey had not yet been founded (although the Manx Chronicle dates the founding of Savigny to 1112). The abbey had certainly been founded by 1115, when Guillaume, Count of Mortain, in giving land for a nunnery to Vital, identified him as the Abbot of Savigny. Thus, the foundation for the monastery lies within the years 1112-1115. A bull granting episcopal exemption by Pascal II (1099-1118) may narrow that date to 1113-1115. Most scholars


37. Laveille, Histoire de Savigny, 1, 118; Sammarthani, Gallia Christiana 11, Instrumenta, 110-1; Moolenbroek, Vital l’ermite, 257-8. Vitalis was still called heremite, not abbot.


40. Laville, Histoire de Savigny, 1: 164; Moolenbroek, Vital l’ermite, 264; Phillip Jaffe, Regesta pontificum romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII, corrected by W. Wattenbach, S. Loewenfeld, et al., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1885-1888), n. 6501 (4802) and Buhot, “L’Abbaye normande de Savigny,” 5, whose source is the destroyed Cartulaire de Savigny,
assume a date close to 1112/3.41

Like the Cistercians, Vitalis desired that his monastery strictly observe the Rule of St. Benedict,42 in a return to manual labor, poverty, and simplicity.43 No early legislative documents survive from the Congregation of Savigny, so their original traditions are known only from secondary sources.44 At Savigny, Vitalis coupled the austere spirit of the hermitage with apostolic preaching.45 Preaching in neighboring regions, caring for the sick, and performing pastoral work were distinctive to Savigny among the reform Orders.46 Having been a


46. Ibid.
hermit for years, Vitalis had little experience in structuring cenobitic monastic life and, until his death in 1122, advocated preaching away from the monastery.  

Vitalis was succeeded by Geoffrey of Bayeux (1122-39), who tightened monastic discipline and is credited with the development of the Savigniac Congregation. As a former monk of Cerisy-la-Forêt in Normandy, Geoffrey’s experience as a cenobite enabled him to plan monastic buildings and to formulate regulations. In the manner of the Cistercians, Geoffrey established a Chapter General and system of regular visitations within the Congregation.

Savigniac and Cistercian Growth

Rapid Expansion

The Congregation of Savigny spread rapidly, not unlike its Cistercian

47. Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 86-9, 93-4.


Some scholars claim that it was less expensive to found a Savigniac or Cistercian monastery than an abbey of black monks. Cistercians and Savigniacs required only an area of wasteland and forested lands. Patrons often viewed their role as that of investors and expected both spiritual and material returns. A baron or knight would undoubtedly have had spiritual motives, whether penance or piety, in founding a monastery, and gained the prayers of monks in return, yet many also expected to acquire visible status and financial gains. Considering the reciprocal nature of the relationship between patron(s) and monastery, expenditure by and losses to him/them were outweighed by perceived benefits.


54. Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 44-53, on where Savigny was situated; the movement of Furness and Byland to hospitable lands the founding lords could not use is mentioned in Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 85, 97-98.


First English Houses

Within thirty years, Savigny possessed thirty-three houses in all,\(^{58}\) fourteen of them in England.\(^ {59}\) The first Savigniac house in England was founded in 1124 at Tulketh near Preston, Lancashire, on land belonging to Stephen of Blois, Count of Mortain.\(^ {60}\) Stephen may have supported the foundation because he possessed land both in Mortain, France and Lancashire, England.\(^ {61}\) Three years after arriving at Tulketh, the Savigniacs transferred to Furness in Cumbria.\(^ {62}\)

By the time of King Stephen’s ascent to the throne of England in 1135, there were ten Savigniac houses in the British Isles: seven founded directly

\(^{58}\) Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, 97-98. According to Hill, Beaubec in 1127 or 1128, Vaux-de-Cernay in 1128, and Chaloché in 1129 were the first Savigniac monasteries founded in France. (Hill, “The Beginnings of the First French Foundations of the Norman Abbey of Savigny,” 130-152.)


\(^{63}\) Of these ten, Stephen personally founded Furness (1124), Neath (1130), Basingwerk (1131), Quarr (1132), Combermere (1133), Stratford Langthorne (1135), and Buildwas (1135). (With Matilda of Boulogne, Stephen later founded Buckfast, Devon (1136), Coggeshall, and Essex (1140). [Dates provided by Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, 98; Guilloreau, “Les
from Savigny, sixty-four three from Furness. The rapid growth of the Order before the Savigniac General Chapter and regulations had begun to be established in 1132 led to Furness wielding enormous authority amongst the English Savigniac houses and directly controlling one-third the English houses by filiation and by geographical proximity.

Four years after the first Savigniacs arrived in 1128, Cistercians from L’Aumone in Normandy crossed the English Channel to found Waverley in Surrey. Three years later, in 1131, the Cistercians founded Tintern in Monmouthshire. Even though the Cistercians arrived later to England than the Savigniacs, they rapidly spread throughout the island, especially in the south and northeast. Within twenty years of their arrival, thirty-one Cistercian

---


66. Waverley was founded on Nov. 24, 1128 from, L’Aumone. [Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales, 114, 127-128.]

67. Tintern was founded on May 9, 1131 from L’Aumone [Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales, 114, 127-128.]
monasteries had been founded in England. By 1148, L’Aumone had a great-great-granddaughter house when Stoneleigh, the daughter house of Bordesley, a daughter of Garendon, founded Marevale. In 1147, Morimond founded one of the early English houses, Dore. Bernard of Clairvaux was the driving force behind the Cistercian colonization of Yorkshire, and this led to most early English Cistercian houses being affiliated with the Clairvaux family. Nineteen of the thirty-five early foundations were Claravallian ties; five were founded directly from Clairvaux:

68. Waverley (1128), Tintern (1131), Rievaulx (1132), Fountains (1132), Garendon (1133), Wardon (1135), Forde (1136), Thame (1137), Bordesley (1138), Kingswood (1139), Kirkstead (1139), Louth Park (1139), Newminster (1139), Whitland (1140), Stoneleigh (1141), Revesby (1142), Cwmhir (1143), Boxley (1143), Pipewell (1143), Woburn (1145), Rufford (1146), Kirkstall (1147), Vaudey (1147), Roche (1147), Bruern (1147), Biddlesden (1147), Margam (1147), Sawtry (1147), Dore (1147), Merevale (1148), Sawley (1148). [Long, “1147 Rejected. A Study of Cistercian and Savigniac Possessions in England and Wales, 1127-1176,” cxxv-cxxviii; Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales, 110-128.]

69. Waverley (1128), Tintern (1131), Forde (1136), Thame (1137), Garendon (1133), Biddlesden (1147), Bruern (1147). Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales, 110-128.

70. Waverley (1128), Garendon (1133), Bordesley (1138), Stoneleigh (1141), Merevale (1148). Knowles and Hadcock, Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales, 110-128.


Rievaulx, Fountains, Whitland, Boxley, and Margam.\textsuperscript{73} Both Fountains and Rievaulx expanded quickly in England: Fountains had six daughter houses by 1147\textsuperscript{74} and three granddaughter houses by 1148,\textsuperscript{75} while Rievaulx had three daughter houses by 1146\textsuperscript{76} and one granddaughter house by 1147.\textsuperscript{77} Another six houses, nearly all from the Clairvaux filiation, were founded in England by 1153.\textsuperscript{78}

David Knowles suggested that the rapid development of reformed monasteries in twelfth-century England was caused by the renaissance of monastic life spurred by the Gregorian reform movement.\textsuperscript{79} The twelfth-century historian William of Newburgh noted that this great monastic expansion in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{73} Rievaulx (1132), Fountains (1132), Whitland (1140), Boxley (1143), Margam (1147). Knowles and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales}, 110-128.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Fountains (1132): Kirkstead (1139), Louth Park (1139), Newminster (1139), Woburn (1145), Kirkstall (1147), Vaudey (1147). Knowles and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales}, 110-128.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Newminster (1139): Pipewell (1143), Roche (1147), Sawley (1148). Knowles and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales}, 110-128.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Rievaulx (1132): Wardon (1135), Revesby (1142), Rufford (1146). Knowles and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales}, 110-128.
\item \textsuperscript{78} Combe (1150), Holm Cultrum (1150), Sibton (1150), Flaxley (1151), Meaux (1151), and Tilney (1153). Long, "1147 Rejected. A Study of Cistercian and Savigniac Possessions in England and Wales, 1127-1176," cxxv-cxxviii; Knowles and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales}, 110-128.
\item \textsuperscript{79} Knowles, \textit{Monastic Orders}, 191-247: specifically 197.
\end{itemize}
England occurred during King Stephen’s reign. Bennett Hill proposed a more political solution. The years 1135-1155, when thirty-one Cistercian monasteries were founded, he observed, corresponded to a period in England when baronial power was strong.

Cistercian and Savigniac Orders: Compared

Similarities

Cistercians and Savigniacs were founded on similar principles: strict observance of the Rule of St. Benedict, manual labor, and simplicity. As a twelfth-century Benedictine observer, Orderic Vitalis, wrote, the Savigniac monks observed “the modern institutions of the new [Orders],” rather than the older Carolingian traditions. Since Savigny was founded by at least 1115, one

---


year after the first draft of the *Carta Caritatis*, the Cistercian regulations and customary, it is plausible that its regulations were similar to those of the Cistercians, especially in view of the “stricter rules” introduced by Geoffrey, the second abbot of Savigny, when he became abbot in 1122.

Overall, there were several other similarities between the Savigniac and Cistercian Orders. Both Savigniacs and Cistercians founded monasteries in secluded locations in order to live a contemplative life. Both Orders professed a strict adherence to the Rule of St. Benedict. Both Savigniac and Cistercian monks wore an undyed woolen habit. Moreover, in 1132, Geoffrey established a General Chapter and abbatial visitation imitating the organization of Citeaux.

84. The first draft of the *Carta Caritatis*, was probably written around 1114 and was confirmed in 1119 by Pope Callistus II (CC1). *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, ed Waddell, 22-24, II, 261-281.


Purported Differences

There were also undeniable dissimilarities between the two Orders. The most important difference was that the Congregation of Savigny accepted the patronage of churches and tithes and managed mortgages and rentals.\textsuperscript{90} There is reason to believe, however, that many early Cistercian houses also accepted some resources forbidden by their own regulations.\textsuperscript{91} Tradition has it that Savigny was exempt from diocesan jurisdiction and subject only to the papal see, though this has been disputed.\textsuperscript{92} The first Cistercians were not exempt.\textsuperscript{93} It has been argued that the abbot of Savigny presided unrestrictedly over all Savigniac houses much as did the abbot of Cluny,\textsuperscript{94} although Savigniac houses were permitted to found daughter houses without the consent of Savigny and


\textsuperscript{92} Francis R. Swietek and Terrence M. Deneen, “‘Ab antiquo alterius odinis fuerit’: Alexander III on the Reception of Savigny into the Cistercian Order,” *Revue d’histoire ecclesiastique* 89 (1994): 5-28. In Deneen and Swietek’s “The Episcopal Exemption of Savigny, 1112-1184,” 297-8, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that Savigniac exemption was more myth than reality since their status was ambiguous from 1112-1184, when they gained exemption under their status as a Cistercian house.


most were considered abbeys, not priories.\textsuperscript{95} If Savigniac houses were all subject
directly to Savigny, however, Furness would never have been able to claim
Byland as a daughter house.\textsuperscript{96} Furness, being geographically close and having
founded one-third of the English houses, may have viewed itself as head of the
English nucleus of Savigniac houses. An 1144 Bull of Pope Lucius II, \textit{Quia
Igitur},\textsuperscript{97} identified various authorities and rules given to Savigny over her
daughter houses; however, it has been proven by Swietek and Deneen to be a
forgery. Thus, it is not likely that Lucius II gave Savigny authority over all
Savigniac houses in 1144. Furthermore, \textit{Quia Igitur} would have given Serlo the
authority to deal with recalcitrant Savigniac houses if the bull were not a
forgery.\textsuperscript{98} Since Savigny did not have complete regional authority before 1147, it

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{95} Hill, \textit{English Cistercian Monasteries}, 91-97; Suydam, “Origins of the Savigniac Order,”
97, 100.

\textsuperscript{96} The controversial claim of Furness for Byland is described in detail in Janet Burton,
“The Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx, and the Problems of the English Savigniacs, 1134-56,” in
William Dugdale, \textit{Monasticon Anglicanum}, vol. 5 (London: Turks Head, 1693), 5. 349-52; and the
primary source \textit{History of Byland}, located at the Bodleian Library MS Dodsworth 63, fol. 10v-14r.

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Quia Igitur}: copies can be found in Peregrinus of Vendôme, \textit{Historia praetatorum et
possessionum ecclesiae B. Mariae de Fontanis}, ed. L. D’Achery, \textit{Spicilegium sive collectio veterum
alqaut scriptorum} 2 (Paris, 1723), 578; André Salmon, \textit{Recueil de chroniques de Touraine}
(Tours, 1854), 277-78; Deneen and Swietek, ‘Appendix II’ in “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 23-24 and a
recovered copy [Paris, Bibliothèque nationale MS nouv. acq. Lat. 2652, fol. 61 r-v] is printed with
textual criticism in Deneen and Swietek, “A Savigniac Forgery Recovered,” 366-69. The
controversial quote from \textit{Quia igitur}: \textit{Si quis vero ex abbatibus, monachis quoque vel conversis vertre
congregationis a proposito et ordine exorbitaverit, et secundo terciove commontus incorrigibilis
permanserit, abbate absque ulla contradictione retento iuxta providentiam Savigniensis abbatis qui pro
tempore fuerit, loco ipsius [alius] idoneus substituatur, monachus vero si contumax fuerit regulariter
corrigatur.}

\textsuperscript{98} Deneen and Swietek, “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 17-18.
\end{flushleft}
seems more logical that during Geoffrey’s abbacy, the Savigniacs were more filially inclined than had been believed by Hill and Suydam. This would weaken the hypothesis of a Cluniac model. While Savigniac English abbeys were not regulated by annual visitation until 1132, they, like Cistercian houses, were autonomous and, in the case of Furness, maybe slightly too autonomous. An examination of the major differences between the two Orders makes it obvious that they were not as estranged as was once thought, especially given the new research on monetary gains, exemption status, and organization.

99. Geoffrey established a Savigniac General Chapter and a system of visitation [see note 50], Furness tried to claim Byland as a daughter house and houses were autonomous as seen by Calder’s plight [see note 96], and it is clear that the Savigniacs thought of a daughter house as dependent upon its mother, not grandmother [Burton, “The Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx,” 129].

100. Hill and Suydam consider both considered Savigny to have similar traits to a Cluniac model. [Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 90-104 and Suydam, “Origins of the Savigniac Order,” 94-108.] Buhot considered the Savigniac to be more Cistercian in Buhot, “L’Abbaye normande de Savigny,” 112.


The Savigniac monks differed from both Cluniacs and Cistercians in one major aspect. Savigniac monks often left their monasteries to preach and perform pastoral duties.¹⁰⁴ This activity must have been regarded as distinctive, for Orderic Vitalis commented on it in his short account of the Congregation.¹⁰⁵ This Savigniac peculiarity certainly contradicts Thomas Merton’s statement that a monk’s vocation is to find God, while other religious vocations are to bring souls to God.¹⁰⁶ Until Innocent III’s authorization of the Franciscan Rule in 1209, no other monastic Order was distinguished by its preaching to secular society;¹⁰⁷ even so, the mendicant Orders did not have the cloistered contemplative spirit of the “New Monasticism.” Thus, the Congregation of Savigny was unique among the reformed Orders in mixing the contemplative life of the cloister monks with their preaching vocation.

The Merger of the Congregation of Savigny with the Cistercian Order

Despite any dissimilarity, in 1147, the Congregation of Savigny became part of the Cistercian Order. The main role in bringing the Congregation of


¹⁰⁷ Lawrence, Medieval Monasticism, 238-260.
Savigny into the Cistercian Order was played by Serlo, the fourth abbot of Savigny.\(^{108}\) The Cistercian Order may have been attractive to him on two counts. First, Cistercians writers such as Bernard of Clairvaux and Ælred of Rievaulx articulated Cistercian spirituality, and Carta, which made Serlo desire to be a monk of Clairvaux.\(^{109}\) Secondly, and more likely, the most attractive quality of the Order of Cîteaux was its strong central administrative organization. Savigny lacked a strong central administration,\(^{110}\) which led to fractious independence in the Congregation, especially within the nucleus of the English daughter houses.\(^{111}\) By 1132, four English Savigniac houses had grown accustomed to autonomy;\(^{112}\) Furness for eight years had been left in a self-governing position in England with little other Savigniac contact, which was enough time to give a sense of independence. English dissent may have prompted Savigny to forge the bull, \textit{Quia Igitur}, granting it total control over all Savigniac houses.\(^{113}\) Deenan


\(^{112}\) Furness (1124), Neath (1130), Basingwerk (1131), Quarr (1132).

\(^{113}\) Laveille, \textit{Histoire de Savigny}, 2:340-43; Deenan and Swietek, “A Savigniac Forgery Recovered: Lucius II’s Bull \textit{Habitantes in Domo} of December 5, 1144,” 366-9, 743-5. The following section of the bull refers to the controversy with the English monasteries following the merger:
and Swietek concluded that *Quia Igitur* is a forgery based on Innocent II’s bull *Habitantes in domo* and Lucius II’s bull *Desiderium Quod* after discovering that nine of the thirteen sections were replicated from these two bulls.\(^{114}\) Serlo, unable to control his foreign houses, approached Pope Eugenius III at Reims, proposing a possible merger with the Cistercians, to which Eugenius assented.\(^{115}\)

On Trinity Sunday 1147,\(^{116}\) the Savigniac General Chapter voted to petition to be incorporated into the Cistercian Order.\(^{117}\) Only fifteen abbots were present; among the three from England, Furness was notably absent.\(^{118}\) Three months later, in September, the unification was approved at the Cistercian General Chapter at which the Cistercian Pope Eugenius III was present.\(^{119}\) On September 19, 1147, Pope Eugenius confirmed the union of the Congregation of

---


115. Laveille, *Histoire de Savigny*, 2: 371-2, 378; Swietek, “The Role of Bernard,” 299-300. Thus it was Serlo’s initiative and by papal agreement that Savigny was incorporated later that year into the Cistercian Order.


118. The abbots of Byland, Neath, and Quarr were present from the English Savigniac houses. [Burton, “The Abbeys of Byland and Jervaulx,” 128.]

Savigny and the Cistercian Order in *Pax ecclesiae*, issued at the abbey of Saint-Seine.\textsuperscript{120}

Gilbert of Sempringham was also present at the Cistercian General Chapter of 1147, in the hope of merging his Order with Citeaux as well, but his petition was denied,\textsuperscript{121} probably because the houses under his wardship consisted of many nunneries and the Cistercians did not want to be involved overtly with female Orders.\textsuperscript{122} Moreover, there was considerable disorganization in the Sempringham Order, following no common legislation and having no unified General Chapter.\textsuperscript{123} The Savigniac Congregation included some nunneries and was similarly disordered within the English nucleus, and, as such, may have been fortunate in a successful merger with the Cistercians when Sempringhams were denied.

**Controversy over Merger, Particularly with English Houses**

When the Congregation of Savigny merged with the Cistercians, Serlo received most of what he desired.\textsuperscript{124} Savigny was to hold direct authority over


\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{123} Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism*, 225.

\textsuperscript{124} Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries*, 101-2; Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism*, 69.
all thirty-one Savigniac daughter houses and retain its own privileges.\textsuperscript{125} Savigny and its houses were accepted as daughter houses of Clairvaux.\textsuperscript{126} This action created problems: by ranking Savigny just after the four “elder daughters” of Citeaux, Savigny supplanted Preuilly as the fifth daughter house of Citeaux.\textsuperscript{127} Another confrontation over ranking arose between Furness and Waverley and was not settled until 1232 when both houses assumed leadership as separate heads over their respective English foundations on the basis of pre-Cistercian ranking: \textsuperscript{128} Furness over Savigniac and Waverley over Cistercian houses.

The unification of the two Orders was resisted and even disregarded by several English Savigniac houses,\textsuperscript{129} notably Furness.\textsuperscript{130} Consequently, the

\textsuperscript{125} It is unlikely that Savigny was head over all Savigniac houses before 1147, so this clause may have given them firmer control than they had held under Geoffrey’s administrative system. See note 50. For further discussion of Savigniac exemptions after and before the merger, see Chapter II, Section “Purported Differences,” 48-51.


\textsuperscript{127} Dimier, “Savigny et son affiliation,” 351-58.


\textsuperscript{129} Terrence M. Deneen and Francis R. Swietek, “The Roman Curia and the Merger of Savigny with Citeaux: The Import of the Papal Documents,” \textit{Revue Bénédictine} 112 (2002): 335-
declaration of union was promulgated again at the Council of Rheims in 1148, and on April 10, 1148, Eugenius III issued the bull, *Apostolicae sedis,* in which he called upon all Savigniac houses to accept the union and placed all the English Savigniac houses under the authority of Savigny.

Furness Abbey opposed the transition to Cistercian customs because these customs would suppress the supremacy Furness held over other English Savigniac houses. After the 1148 Council, Furness appealed to Rome

---

344; see also Hill, *English Cistercian Monasteries,* 100, 105, Walter Daniel, *The Life of Ælred of Rievaulx,* ed. Frederick M. Powicke (London: Nelsons, 1950) lxiii-lxiv; John H. Round, *Calendar of Documents Preserved in France 918-1206,* vol. 1, 819 (London: H. M. S. O., 1899) 297. The Papal *acta* following the union in 1147 are often associated with the Furness dispute, on the grounds that more English houses than Furness resisted on the assumption that all Savigniac houses were directly placed under Savigny. While there was tension in the Congregation, there was no confirmation that the union of the two Orders created a widespread rebellion. Furness, however, still disputed with other Savigniac monasteries. One such dispute was challenging its superior, Savigny, for jurisdiction over Byland in 1154. Ultimately, Furness submitted to the verdict of Cistercian judges from Garendon and Rievaulx on that case.


131. Paris, Archives nationales L 966, no. 7. See also Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum romanorum,* 9235 (6418).


against the merger, but the pope was unrelenting. Abbot Peter of Furness was forced to submit. He relinquished his office, but the monks of Furness persisted in their claim. Hugh, Bishop of Rouen, sent a letter to Furness demanding that the monks submit to the merger or be excommunicated. Faced with this ultimatum, the Furness monks capitulated. Their former abbot Peter was replaced by Richard of Bayeux (71148-1152/3), a monk of Savigny. Richard’s abbacy was short, and his successor, John of Cauncefield

---


136. Eugenius III referred the matter over to a tribunal on Michaelmas (Sept. 29, 1148) presided over by Hugh, bishop of Rouen, and Arnaulf, bishop of Lisieux. Peter was able to defer the case until Martinmas (Nov. 11, 1148), but was not present at the proceedings. [Deneen and Swietek, “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 15; Deneen and Swietek, “A Savigniac Forgery Recovered,” 372-4]

137. Peter delivered the letter of postponement to Savigny and, as the Furness Coucher Book states, may have been detained there and stripped of his abbacy. [Deneen and Swietek, “A Savigniac Forgery Recovered,” 373-4; Furness Coucher Book, ed. Atkinson, vol. 1:1: 8-9]. Peter may have submitted amicably as he was soon entrusted as the abbot of Quarr, another Savigniac-Cistercian house. [Powicke, “The Abbey of Furness,” VCH, 15; Furness Coucher Book, ed. Atkinson, 1: 8-9; Beck, Annales Furnesienses, 129.]


(1153-70?), a monk of Furness, seems to have returned to independent behavior, which can be seen by his conflict with Savigny over filiation rights to Byland.142

The English Savigniac houses did not acquiesce quickly. Serlo first sent his prior, Guido, to visit all the English houses with the 1148 bull of Eugenius III in order to make them conform to the Cistercian rule,143 and then on October 21, 1149, Serlo received papal permission to excommunicate those who did not comply during his visitation of the congregation the following year.144 Emboldened by his new authority, Serlo took direct action toward securing the loyalty of the English houses and effectively ending Furness’ bid for independence.145 Nonetheless, the Cistercian abbots at the end of the century were still attempting at the General Chapter to make Savigniac monasteries conform to their customs.146 At the same time, however, some English Savigniac

Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 100-08.


143. Deneen and Swietek, “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 15; Beck, Annales Furnesienses, 76 and the bull is noted in note 129.


146. Dimier, “Savigny et son affiliation,” 351-358; Waddell, ed. Twelfth-century Statutes: There are many instances in the statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter where Savigniac monasteries are cited for neglecting their duty of attendance (1195/11, 313-14; 1198/15, 407;
houses were being trusted by the General Chapter with the oversight of various tribunals. Furness eventually submitted to Cistercian customs and even restructured the architecture of their abbey to conform to Cistercian models. Savigny as the Cause of the Supposed “Corruption” of the Cistercians

Some scholars have considered the assimilation of Savigny into the Cistercian Order a source of the future relaxation of Cistercian ideals. Jacqueline Buhot claimed that, although the Savigniac Order was easily assimilated because it, like Citeaux, was modeled on reforms based on eastern eremitic ideals, the Savigniacs contaminated the Cistercian Order by continuing to practice Savigniac customs after the merger. Bennett Hill

1198/40, 416, etc.). Savigniac abbots had been admonished for misconducts as well (1194/51, 300-301 and 1200/19, 460-61).

147. Waddell, ed. Twelfth-century Statutes had these statutes Byland in Lil 1196/28, 361; Buildwas Lil 1195/70, 342-3 and Lil 1199/21, 429; Quarr Lil 1192/35, 249.

148. Furness altered the abbey church apse and transepts, the chapter house, the cloister and most notably the refectory, all according to Cistercian statutes. The abbey church had apsidal chapels before the merger (noted by John Hope); this was altered to square ends formed along the lines of the original apsidal forms. The refectory was first constructed along the east/west axis, and was changed to the Cistercian standard of north south, which also made room for a warming house and separated laybrothers from choir monks. [Harold Brakspear, “On the First Church at Furness,” Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, vol. XVII (Manchester: Richard Gill, 1901), 84-5; W. H. St. John Hope, “The Abbey of St. Mary in Furness, Lancashire,” in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, vol. 16 (Kendal: T. Wilson, 1900), 221-302; Stuart Harrison, “Tour of the Abbey,” in Furness Abbey (London: English Heritage, 1998), 3-21.]


151. The letter of Alexander III (?1166-1179) indicates that at least Furness and her
viewed the union as a complete disaster. It brought corruption to the
Cistercians, he argued, because Savigny’s model had been based on the Cluniac
system. Hill also insisted that reception of tithes and property disputes lay
behind the Savigniac corruption.

Others have argued that these issues were a problem for many Cistercian
as well as Savigniac houses during the twelfth century. Alice Cooke reasoned
that the relaxation of Cistercian ideals was due, not to the union, but to the rapid
spread of Cistercian settlements in England. Cooke granted that the Cistercian
Order expanded with the absorption of the Congregation of Savigny, but
conversely held that Cistercian growth itself was too rapid to allow the

daughter-house, Swineshead, still did not observe all Cistercian customs. Walter Holtzmann,
ed., Papsrkunden in England, in Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in
Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse (Berlin:1956-1952): 2.366, n. 174. See also Hill, English

152. Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 109-111; there is no concrete evidence as of yet to
Hill’s claims, see Chapter II, Section “Purported Differences,” 48-51.

153. Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries, 109; however, Long and Bouchard prove that
some Cistercian houses also have tithes and property disputes before the merger [see note 91].

“1147 Rejected. A Study of Cistercian and Savigniac Possessions in England and Wales, 1127-
1176,” see note 91.


156. Cooke, “The Settlement of the Cistercians in England,” 668-676: Cooke also shows
proof that the English Savigniac houses were still seen as separate from the English Cistercians
as late at 1205, maybe even 1264 [Charter of John in 1208 to the monks of Neath, calling them
Savigniac (Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum, 5: 259, Append. III and see also p. 226 for a letter of
the abbot of Savigny (1264) to Furness and Byland: ac antversis generationis Savigniacensis
cobbatibus per Angliam et Walliam constituitis.
Cistercians to maintain their original ideals.\textsuperscript{157} Finally, Robin Donkin suggested that the merger did not impinge on Cistercian ideals but that a changing economy and rapid growth led the Cistercians to modify their original ideals as they were, however reluctantly, drawn into ecclesiastical and economic affairs.\textsuperscript{158}

Recent research suggests that the early ideals of the Order of Cîteaux had declined before the merger occurred.\textsuperscript{159} Constance Bouchard argued that the Cistercians had always been involved in such “activities” as gifts, rents, and mills,\textsuperscript{160} and considers these, not as a sign of “corruption,” but as evidence that the Cistercians were an important part of the twelfth-century economy.\textsuperscript{161}

\textsuperscript{157} Cooke, “The Settlement of the Cistercians in England,” 676. Savigniac house spread just as rapidly a decade before the Cistercians in England; however, the Savigniacs did not have the benefit of a strong administration [see Chapter II, Sections “Savigniac and Cistercian Growth,” 40-46 and “The Congregation of Savigny’s History,” 37-40].


\textsuperscript{161} Bouchard, “Cistercian Ideals versus Reality,” 218.
Jeffrey Long has stated that the “corruption” was simply a reaction to the increasing cash economy and the monks’ rising popularity, which led to an overpopulation of *conversi* and rising fiscal accountability. As Cistercian granges prospered, monetary transactions led to commercial trade, which could not be avoided in the emerging European mercantile economy. These economic changes had begun long before the union with Savigny—starting in 1128, leveling off mid-twelfth century, then growing again into the thirteenth century. By comparing and calculating Cistercian and Savigniac abuses, both before and after the merger, Long concludes that neither Order had significantly more success than the other in being free from secular possessions.

Contentions in the Incorporation of Savigny

Contention over the union of the two Orders was focused on Savigniac privileges. English Savigniac houses openly contrived to keep their


163. Ibid., 122.

164. Ibid., 121-124.

165. In “1147 Rejected,” Long concludes that, before 1147, the Cistercian abbeys in England and Wales were eight percent more likely to acquire gifts prohibited by the Cistercian Order in proven cases. If all non-proven cases were included, Savigniac abbeys were then fifteen percent more likely than Cistercian, but held to a standard for which they did not have statutes.

166. Savigny’s privileges had been granted in two bulls issued by Pope Lucius II on December 5, 1144: *Desiderium quod* and *Quia igitur*. *Desiderium quod* confirmed Savigny’s possessions; *Quia igitur*, emphasized Savigny’s direct papal protection and defined Savigny’s supremacy within the Congregation. Anomalies in the second bull, however, indicate that Savigny had, in fact, forged *Quia igitur*. [Deneen and Swietek, “Pope Lucius II and Savigny,” 3-25 and Deneen and Swietek, “A Savigniac Forgery Recovered,” 363-387.]
exemptions after their absorption into the Cistercian Order.\textsuperscript{167} Savigny is thought to have kept its privileges and claimed papal exemption as a condition of the union, thereby creating controversy after the merger.\textsuperscript{168}

Bernard of Clairvaux’s position against diocesan exemption for the Cistercian houses, including the Savigniacs, is widely known.\textsuperscript{169} Many scholars have indicated that the Savigniacs had full exemption before the merger and retained this status.\textsuperscript{170} These conclusions are based on the phrase in papal confirmations \textit{salva apostolicae sedis auctoritae},\textsuperscript{171} yet many bulls contained the phrase \textit{salva apostolicae sedis auctoritae et diocesanorum episcoporum canonica}


\textsuperscript{170} Auvry and Hill are both adamant that Savigniac exemption existed since its foundation [Laveille, \textit{Histoire de Savigny}, 1: 204; Hill, \textit{English Cistercian Monasteries}, 90-104]. Buhot and Suydam insist that exemption was not granted until the bull of Lucius II (\textit{Desiderium quod}) on Dec. 9, 1144 [Suydam, “Origins of the Savigniac Order;” 97-98. Buhot, “L’Abbaye normande de Savigny,” 107.]

\textsuperscript{171} Deneen and Swietek, “The Episcopal Exemption of Savigny, 1112-1184,” 290-1. The first extant record of this phrase is in \textit{Desiderium Quod} by Lucius II. Popes Athanasius IV and Adrian IV also issued bulls with this phrase.
Savigniac houses’ actual exemption was indeterminate until 1184, when Savigny obtained exemption as a Cistercian house.

Recent scholarship has indicated that Pope Eugenius III did not grant Savigny exemption from Cistercian restrictions on *spiritualia*, revenues from parochial churches and lay tithes, as had previously been thought. If it had, Savigny would not actively have sought protection from secular magnates and local bishops who continued to defend the monastery’s *spiritualia* in litigation before diocesan and secular courts. In fact, no pope before Alexander III (1159-1181) had granted exemption for *spiritualia* to Savigny, and this he limited to those grants acquired before the merger. The privileges of Eugenius III, Anastasius IV, and Hadrian IV on behalf of Savigny all omit mention of

172. Ibid., 290-298: bulls from Eugenius III and Alexander III included *salva apostolicae sedis auctoritae et diocesanorum episcoporum canonica iustitia* in their bulls. Athanasius IV, Adrian IV, and Lucius III all included this phrase in some of their bulls.

173. Ibid., 298. For a full account see Deneen and Swietek, “The Episcopal Exemption of Savigny, 1112-1184,” 285-298. Until 1184, depending on the pope as indicated above, the wording could change, however Savigny gained undisputable exemption by 1184 as a Cistercian house.


176. Ibid., 15-16. Deneen and Swietek mention charters from Henry II to Savigny and charters from the Cartulary of Savigny by Bishop Herbert of Avranches, Henry of Fougères, and Ralph II of Fougères.

177. Ibid., 26.
spiritualia, while confirming all other income.\textsuperscript{178} It was not until 1188 that Clement III, followed by Celestine III, actually permitted Savigniac monasteries to acquire spiritualia;\textsuperscript{179} however, this exemption did not apply to Cistercian houses.\textsuperscript{180}

The Congregation of Savigny did not change its customs immediately after the General Chapter of 1147 or even after the decree of Pope Eugenius; the Congregation assimilated steadily to the Order of Citeaux.\textsuperscript{181} Yet, although incorporated into the Cistercian Order, the Congregation never fully assimilated; Savigniac houses became peculiarities within the Cistercian Order.\textsuperscript{182}

**Rushen Abbey**

Rushen Abbey was not widely thought to have been a Savigniac house until the publication “The Monastic Orders of Rushen Abbey (Savignian and

\textsuperscript{178} Ib. \\

\textsuperscript{180} Deneen and Swietek, “Ab antiquo alterius ordinis fuerit,” 27.


\textsuperscript{182} Buhot, “L’Abbaye normande de Savigny,” 189, 249-264, see note 34; Dimier, “Savigny et son affiliation,” 351-358, see note 90.
Cistercian” by Glen Taylor in 1927,\textsuperscript{183} even though its filiation as Furness’ daughter house was known. Because Rushen had been thought of only as a Cistercian abbey by scholars until the early twentieth century, most historical accounts generically compare the abbey only to Cistercian monasteries.\textsuperscript{184} Having been founded as a Savigniac monastery by Furness thirteen years prior to the merger, Rushen, however, should be analyzed as both Savigniac and Cistercian.

Rushen Abbey will here be examined according to its customs, both before and after the merger, to determine its level of conformity to the Cistercian Order. A better understanding of Rushen’s place as a Savigniac-Cistercian Abbey will be gained by investigating the foundation of Rushen, allocations (especially those considered illegal for Cistercians), its architectural layout, and the statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter after 1147, as well as synodal statutes of the Bishopric of Sodor.

\textsuperscript{183} A. Glen Taylor, “The Monastic Orders of Rushen Abbey (Savigniac and Cistercian),” in \textit{Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society} vol. 3 (Douglas: 1927), 250-57.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND OF THE POLITICS AND EARLY HISTORY OF RUSHEN
ON THE ISLE OF MAN FROM THE FIRST VIKING ARRIVAL
TO THE END OF THE CROVAN DYNASTY (1079-1265)

Rapid Conversion of Viking Settlers to Christianity:
First Viking Age in the Isle of Man

This chapter will first explore the Viking history of the Isle of Man and
Christianity’s survival through the Viking Age, and then detail the history of
Rushen Abbey. Cognizant of the political history of the Isle of Man and
Rushen’s background, the reader will be able to put the remaining chapters of
the dissertation into context.

The first Viking ruler of the Isle of Man is thought to have been Godred
MacFergus, who ruled Ireland around 850 AD.1 Thirty years later another
Viking ruler, Harald Finehair (880-940), ruled in Norway. At the beginning of
his reign, Harald consolidated the warring clans in Norway, giving the Norse a
strong government in the North and allowing them to reach further abroad than
previous kings.2 There were two main Viking clans settling within the Irish Sea
region, the Haraldsons and the Olafsons.3

1. Benjamin Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes (Oxford: Oxford University Press,
2005), 11; David W. Moore, The Other British Isles (Jefferson: McFarland & Co., 2005), 69, 99; Ronald
Williams, The Lords of the Isles: The Clan Donald and the early Kingdom of the Scots (London: Chatto
and Windus, 1984), 63; R. Andrew McDonald, The Kingdom of the Isles: Scotland’s Western Seaboard c.
1100-1336 (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 1997), 30-1. Williams claims Godred MacFergus was an
ancestor to Somerled, who later comes in conflict with the Crovan dynasty. Hudson dismisses the
account of MacFergus as being mostly fictitious rather than historic.

Hjaltalín and Gilbert Goudie, ed. Joseph Anderson (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1873),
During this early era, the two clans fought for portable loot and small farms for estates. The Haraldsons were more connected with the Isle of Man at this time. By the late eleventh century, the two clans were still fighting, but for control of trade routes and lordship of the Isles. The conflict eventually resulted in 1060 AD in the Isle of Man being under the rule of Dublin, with Godred Sitricsson installed in Mann as a tributary king under Murchad mac Diarmait, ruler of Dublin (1052-1070).

The Survival of Christianity in the First Viking Age

Stone Crosses

The most noticeable evidence of medieval religion on the Isle of Man is the remains of stone cross slabs that are found throughout the entire island. Depicted on them are scenes from both Norse mythology and symbols of Christianity. The Manxmen were already constructing Christian stone crosses


before the Vikings arrived on Mann. The Viking settlers incorporated features similar to those of the Manxmen into their own memorial stones and began to chisel memorial stones with patterns unique to the Scandinavians, though some continued to show Irish influence, resulting in a ringchain motif unique to the Isles.

Some cross slabs have an inscription that includes the name of the remembered dead, and often of the surviving relatives. Norse names appear frequently on the stones, but many Celtic names are also found. This implies that the natives and the settlers lived alongside each other peacefully, intermarried, and assimilated.

Many of the stone crosses of the Viking Age in Mann display scenes from the Norse sagas. Of these scenes, most depict events told about Ragnarök, a saga foretelling the apocalypse of their pagan gods. The very conspicuous apocalyptic imagery may well be a visual representation of the rapid Viking conversion to Christianity, the end of their old beliefs, and their acceptance of a

---


11. There are twenty-three Norse names and seventeen Gaelic and non-Norse names found on the stones. Gaelic male names appear 50 percent less often than Norse male names in runic inscriptions; the ratio of Gaelic to Norse female names is the same. [Heather Rose Jones, “Early Medieval Manx Names,” 2006. http://heatherrosejones.com/names/manx/earlymanx.html.

new religion.\textsuperscript{13}

\textbf{Viking Age Burials}

The continuity of Christian faith within the early Viking settlements has been shown by the examination of these stone monuments. Small churches (keeills) were built, and by around 1000 AD pagan symbols had disappeared. As the stone crosses indicated, the early Viking settlers became Christian sometime in the early tenth century and initiated burial changes.\textsuperscript{14} Like Christian burials, these burials were lintel and faced east, and almost all later burials were within parish churchyards.\textsuperscript{15}

Grave goods became extremely rare as conversion took hold, for in the Christian faith, the dead are buried close to the Church (i.e., to God), and there is no need to take earthly goods into the afterlife.\textsuperscript{16} This is different than the pagan burial practice of placing goods in the grave to be taken with the dead to the afterlife, or the isolated burial on a personal estate.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{flushright}
13. This could possibly be how the Viking settlers considered the conversion that death had come to the old gods and beliefs, and now a new greater god was to be worshipped.


16. The closer the person was buried to the church, the more pure of spirit; i.e., medieval archaeology showed babies were found really close to church walls.

17. Wilson, \textit{The Viking Age in the Isle of Man}, 27.
\end{flushright}
Second Viking Age: The Beginning of the Crovan Dynasty

Godred Crovan, the son of Ivar Haraldson,\textsuperscript{18} fought with the Norwegian invader Harald Hardrada against the English king, Harold Godwinson (Jan. 6, 1066–Oct. 14, 1066), at Stamford Bridge in 1066.\textsuperscript{19} He escaped and sought refuge under Godfrey Sytricson, the King of Man (>1066–1070), who “received him with great honor.”\textsuperscript{20} In 1070, Godfrey Sytricson’s son Fingal (1070-1079?) succeeded him and fended off many raids on the island from Ireland.\textsuperscript{21} Probably after Fingal’s death, Godred Crovan made three attempts to conquer Mann, succeeding in his third in 1079 and remaining in power there until 1095.\textsuperscript{22} From

\textsuperscript{18} Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 53-4, 83, 170-1. Ivar Haraldson (King of Dublin, 1038-46) was the grandson of Olaf Cuaran (King of Northumbria 941-943/944; King of Dublin 952–980); following the lineage of the Olafsons.

\textsuperscript{19} Chronicle of Man, f. 32 v. See also Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 154, 171; Moore, The Other British Isles, 100; Williams, The Lords of the Isles, 104; McDonald, The Kingdom of the Isles, 33.

\textsuperscript{20} Chronicle of Man, f. 32 v. et honorificae susceptus est ab eo. See also Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 171; Williams, The Lords of the Isles, 104; Moore, A History of the Isle of Man, 96. Hudson states that Godred Sytricson was probably a distant cousin of Godred Crovan, another great grandson of Olaf Cuaran.

\textsuperscript{21} Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 172. The raids were from the Haraldson clan attempting to regain Mann, though the identities of the leaders were not named as they were unsuccessful.

\textsuperscript{22} Chronicle of Man, f. 32 v. See also Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 171-2; Moore, The Other British Isles, 100-1; Moore, A History of the Isle of Man, 97-8; McDonald, The Kingdom of the Isles, 32-4; Williams, The Lords of the Isles, 105. Godred gave his Viking followers a choice of taking plunder or settling the island: he then granted the southern half of the island to his fellow Vikings and the northern part to the natives. [Chronicle of Man, f. 33 r. See also Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 172; Williams, The Lords of the Isles, 105; Moore, A History of the Isle of Man, 96: McDonald, The Kingdom of the Isles, 34.] After Godred’s triumph in Mann, he “subdued Dublin, and a great part of Leinster, and held the Scots in such subjection that no one who built a vessel dared to insert more than three bolts” [Chronicle of Man, f. 33 r and v. Igitur godredud subiugavit sibi dubliniam et magnam partem laynestir. Scotos vero ita perdomuit ut nullus qui fabricaret navem vel scapham ausus esset plusquam tres clavos ferreos inserere. See also Moore, A History
1091-1094, Godred Crovan also ruled Dublin until he was driven out by an Irish coalition under Muirchertach and Diarmait.\(^{23}\) Ruling Dublin and Mann, Godred mainly resided in Dublin, and his eldest son Lagman probably ruled the Isles in his name.\(^{24}\) In 1095, Godred died of the plague on Islay, and Lagman (1095-1098) became the next King of Man.\(^{25}\)

In 1098, Magnus Barelegs led a large fleet to the Sudreys to claim the Isles for Norse suzerainty.\(^{26}\) After his short reign, Lagman reclaimed the throne but faced opposition from his brother Harald, whom Lagman eventually blinded and mutilated.\(^{27}\) Lagman repented in grief and voluntarily resigned his

---

\(^{23}\) Moore, *A History of the Isle of Man*, 104; Hudson, *Viking Pirates and Christian Princes*, 177-80; Williams, *The Lords of the Isles*, 105; Moore, *The Other British Isles*, 101.] This limitation was decreed so that Dubliners could not build bigger ships that could compete with Manx fleet.


\(^{25}\) Hudson, *Viking Pirates and Christian Princes*, 189. Godred Crovan was the only Crovan king to rule Dublin and Mann, as hold on Dublin was tenuous during his lifetime.


kingdom, leaving his youngest brother Olaf as his heir. In 1112/3, the Manxmen sent for Godred Crovan’s son, Olaf I (1112/3 -1153), who had been raised in the English court. For forty years, Olaf’s rule was “peaceful.”

In 1153, Olaf was betrayed and killed by his nephews, sons of Harald Godredson. However, Olaf’s son, Godred II (1154-1158 and 1164->1188), hearing of the betrayal while in Norway, came back to Mann to punish his cousins and took his place as King of Man. Somerled of Argyll (1158-1164) took the island from him by force, but Reginald Olafson (1164), brother of

28. Ibid. The Manx Chronicle states that Lagman “took the cross, and went to Jerusalem, where he died.” Chronicle of Man, f. 33 v. et signo crucis dominicae insignitus iter ierosolimitatum arripuit quo et mortuus est. Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 198-99. Hudson believes that Lagman ruled after Magnus from 1102-1108, then joined King Sigurd on his pilgrimage. Since Olaf was too young, he was fostered at the English court, in 1111/2. The chiefs (þangs) of the Mann sent word to Muirchertach, entreating him to appoint a ruler of royal race as regent in Mann until Olaf was old enough to take his inheritance. Muirchertach agreed and sent Domnall mac Tadc, who did not listen to the High King’s orders and abused his power in Mann. After two years, the Manx þangs drove him from the island. [Chronicle of Man, f. 33 v. - f. 34 r. See also Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 199-200; Moore, A History of the Isle of Man, 104-5; Williams, The Lords of the Isles, 105.]


30. Chronicle of Man, f. 35 v. Olavus filius Godredi Crovan cepit regnare super omnes insulas, regnavit que xl annis, erat autem vir pacificus...

31. Chronicle of Man, f. 36 r. and f. 36 v. No source gives information on them other than they resided in Dublin, were the sons of the blinded and mutilated Harald, and the one who wielded the weapon to kill Olaf I was the middle son, Reginald Haraldson. No other brothers were named.

32. Chronicle of Man, f. 36 v.

33. Chronicle of Man, f. 37 v. and f. 39 r. While Godred II was King of Man, he battled Somerled of Argyll from 1156-1158, for control of Mann. Somerled forced Godred II to leave the island, and ruled from 1158-64.
Godred II, regained the Olafson kingdom in 1164.\textsuperscript{34} Four days later, Godred II landed with support from Norway and seized his birthright.\textsuperscript{35}

Godred’s heir was his second son Olaf II, who was born in wedlock, unlike his other children, yet his first son, Reginald (1188-1226) ruled over Mann, but only with the support of the Manxmen, because Olaf II was too young.\textsuperscript{36} Reginald eventually fell out of favor with the Manxmen, and Olaf II (1226-1237) recovered his inheritance through civil war.\textsuperscript{37} Harald (1237-1249), Olaf II’s son, was officially made king of Mann in Norway in 1242.\textsuperscript{38} He drowned in 1249, coming back from Norway, and his brother Reginald II became king for a month (May 1249) before being murdered by a Manx knight named Ívarr and his accomplices.\textsuperscript{39} Seizing the opportunity, Harald II (1249-1250) took over rule of Mann.\textsuperscript{40} In 1250, Magnus (1252-1265), son of Olaf II, attempted to claim his inheritance, but was thwarted by another kinsman’s

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{34} Chronicle of Man, f. 39 r. and f. 39 v.
  \item \textsuperscript{35} Chronicle of Man, f. 39 v. Reginald Olafson probably was not labeled the first because he was considered a usurper, like Somerled, and also ruled only four days. Godred II castrated and blinded him.
  \item \textsuperscript{36} Chronicle of Man, f. 40 v. When Olaf II came of age, he requested land from his brother in lieu of his birthright. [Chronicle of Man, f. 41 v. and Chronicle of Man, f. 43 r.]
  \item \textsuperscript{37} Chronicle of Man, f. 43 v.
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Chronicle of Man, f. 46 r.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Chronicle of Man, f. 47 r.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Chronicle of Man, f. 47 v. and f. 48 r. Harald II was the son of Godred Don and grandson of Reginald Olafson. He was summoned by the King of Norway and deposed as a usurper.
\end{itemize}
attempt to usurp the island; he finally gained kingship in 1252, the last acknowledged Viking ruler of Mann.

**History of Rushen Abbey**

**Foundation of Rushen Abbey (1134)**

Godred Crovan’s son, Olaf I, founded Rushen Abbey in 1134, twenty-one years after becoming King, and all records identify Furness as its

---

41. Harald and Ívarr allied themselves against Magnus; Magnus was ultimately successful with the backing of Norway.

42. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 48 r. - f. 49 v.

motherhouse.44 According to the *Manx Chronicle*, however, the land for the new monastery had first been given in 1134 by Stephen of Blois to the Abbey of Rievaulx.45 The Chartulary of Furness states:

Certain land in Mann was given to the Abbey of Rievaulx for the foundation of Rushen Abbey, but afterwards it was given to Furness Abbey to found one of the Cistercian Order there where it is now situated, and so it issued not from Rievaulx but from Furness.46

Rievaulx had been founded only in 1131, and building there began in 1132.47 It seems unlikely that the Cistercian Yorkshire abbey would have been capable of undertaking a new foundation so far away, only three years after its own foundation. Rievaulx’s first daughter house was founded only in 1135.48

---


44. Ibid.


48. Colin Platt, *The Abbeys and Priories of Medieval England*, 2nd ed (London, 1995), 40-42. The first daughter house of Rievaulx was Warden Abbey, Bedfordshire, founded 1135. Other early foundations were Melrose Abbey, Scotland, 1136; Dundrennan Abbey, Scotland, 1142; Revesby Abbey, Lincolnshire, 1143.
Furness Abbey Donation

Since Rievaulx could not make use of the land, Olaf invited Eudo, the Abbot of Furness, to the Isle of Man in 1134.49 however Olaf Godredson, the King of Man, according to Furness it was granted to the abbot of Rievaulx first, then at his suggestion it to Furness, so that he might build a monastery of the Savigniac Order there.50

The King of Man desired a more stable religious organization for his realm, and discussed with Abbot Eudo the means by which he might establish a bishopric on the Isle of Man for the propagation of the gospel in a Roman context.51 Conferences between the Manx king and the abbot of Furness on aligning the church on Mann with the greater European church brought monastic life and episcopal oversight to the Isle of Man.52 Simultaneously, a new bishopric was established, seated on St. Patrick’s Isle within the archdiocese of


York. The abbot and prior of Furness were the first to sign the charter as witnesses, along with some prominent Manx chieftains (called þangs). This likely indicates that both the abbot and the prior were on the Isle of Man when the charter was issued by King Olaf.

O[la]f king of the Isles, to all the sons and faithful of the Holy Church of God, both future and to come, greetings. Since an earthly kingdom is never managed well unless Catholic way of the king of heaven be observed there. Therefore, I, Olaf with the assent of good and wise men in counsel, have decreed and decided so that the Christian religion in my kingdom shall be preserved only under its own bishop rather than rendered desolated under foreigners and mercenaries so to speak, naturally for their own complaints and not his lords. Know, therefore and give testimony to the truth, that in regard of this discretion, I have committed in admiration and granted forever the holy church of St. Mary of Furness, because of the proximity of the place, nay more on behalf of the good life of their inhabitants, but also on the authority of the episcopal election and observe my whole law of Christianity, saving always the reverence for the apostolic see. And in order that the same may be more perfect and more strongly represented, I donated in free and perpetual alms a certain part of my land for the construction of an abbey by the aforementioned church, just as another charter witnesses. These witnesses: Eudo, the abbot; Gill, the prior; W., monk; William and Hugo, priests; Turkill, son of Fohgel; Jol, son of Macmars; Gill; Fin; Snetol, son of Cutell, and many others without whom the matter may be conducted. At How Ingren.


The original charter for the land donated to Rushen Abbey by Olaf to Furness Abbey disappeared over the years, if indeed there ever was one earlier than the 1134 charter. Foundation rights were clearly given to Furness in the 1134 charter, however, and they are referred to in another charter issued by Olaf to Thurstan, archbishop of York, in 1134. It granted the right of election of the Bishop of Sodor and Man to the Abbey of St. Mary of Furness. The lands for the abbey were not the only grants Olaf made to the Abbey of Furness; he also gave additional lands in Mann, privileges and immunities. Beyond this, not much is known of the original donation. The date at which settlement actually began at Rushen is also difficult to determine. Peter Davey agrees with the Furness

catholice serviatur, iccirco ego Olaph, sapientium consilio et bonorum assensu decrevi et statui ut iu regno meo christiana religio a suo potius Episopo in unum conservetur quam sub advenis et tanquam mercenariis sua quippe et non Domini querentibus, divisa desoletur. Scilote itaque et testimonium veritati perhibete quod hoc discretionis intuiu commisi et in perpetuum concessi ecclesie Sancte Marie de Furnesio, propter loci confinium immo pro bona vita inhabitantium ipsius, episcopalis electionis dignitatem set et totius juris mei Christianitatis observantiam, salva semper sedis apostolice reverentia. Quod etiam ut melius fieret et firmius teneretur quandam partem terre mee ad abbatiam construendam, predicte ecclesie, sicut alia testatur cartula, in perpetuam elemosinam erogavi liberrimam. Testibus hiis: Eudone, abbate; Gill., priore; W., monacho; Willelmo et Hugone, presbiteris; Turkillo, filio Fohgel; Joh., filio Macmars; Gill.; Fin; Snetol, filio Cutelli, et multis aliis sine quibus res agi potest. Apud How Ingren.

[How Ingren is the site of Lorne House, Castletown.]


Coucher Book and Glyn Coppack that building and settlement may have begun close to 1138.\textsuperscript{58}

The reputation of your sanctity spread throughout the whole world, which both the illustrious renown of your predecessors and your own virtue in private as well as public acts do not allow to remain hidden, has in no small degree rejoiced us. We praise therefore the wonderful works of the almighty king, giving him thanks, and we glorify the Lord for what he has done for you, who has exalted you in dignity and sanctity above all our neighbors. For the rest, we signify to you, that the lord Eudo, abbot of the monastery of Furness, from whose boundaries we are not far distant by sea, at our tripartite petition and persuasion, the fame of the religion of the said place having been reported to us, entered with confidence upon the arduous undertaking, and has come to us at great labor for the fruitful occupation of extending the church, under the inspiration of the almighty. Finally, it has been determined among us, both by our decree, and the solemn advice of the people, that a chief bishop should be chosen from among his people, who may direct the spread of Christianity through the Isles. Therefore we call upon you, and humbly implore the grace of your benevolence to ratify by the imposition of your hands, that which by common diligence has been so providentially procured to be done, to the honor of God and the salvation of our souls, namely, that our bishop may be promoted under the authority of your seal, as soon as possible, to the rank of bishop, for the love of God and of us. The lord Abbot therefore relating to us such wonderful and holy things of you, and saying that he was unwilling and unable to go to any other pious [archbishop], but to you, his father, filled with great joy for all things, we have rendered thanks to God as far as we are able.\textsuperscript{59}


80
This grant, directed to T--- (probably Thurston, archbishop of York [1114-1140]),\(^6^0\) states that Olaf, king of Man, gave to Eudo, abbot of Furness, land on which to build a monastery in a place called Rushen; this agrees with the Chronicle of Man.\(^6^1\) The connection of the Isle of Man with England is not altogether surprising as Olaf I’s father, Godred Crovan, as King of Dublin and Man, had given canonical obedience to Canterbury and Olaf, himself, was raised at the English court.\(^6^2\) Olaf seems, on the advice of Eudo, to have established his bishopric under the metropolitan of York, in whose province

---

\(^6^0\) Brownbill, The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey, 2:3, no. 2, 709; West, The Antiquities of Furness, 125. Moore, Diocesan Histories, 59. Thomas II died as Archbishop of York in 1114 and Thurstan was consecrated in 1119, staying archbishop till 1140. Thus it stands that the “T” in the charter of Olaf I refers to Thurstan since Olaf I was only King of the Isles during Thurstan’s reign as archbishop.


Furness was located. The ramifications of this switch in archiepiscopal obedience will be further explored in Chapter VI, which will examine the secular relations of Rushen Abbey.

Early Records of Rushen

Earliest Site

Rushen is a name derived from the Norse “rhos” meaning headland or woodland. Basil Megaw has suggested that Rushen was initially located near Scarlett, yet newer research by Davey and Roscow on the 1540 Computus revealed that the abbey farms were grouped in treens and that the block of land between Castletown and Ballasalla constituted the Treen of Rushen.

Rushen Abbey was built on the western bank of the Silverburn river, in the parish of Malew, the Sheading of Rushen, about two miles north of Castletown and close to the village of Ballasalla. The land had previously been

63. Chronicle of Man, fol. 35 v. Oliver, “Letter of Olave I to the Archbishop of York. A.D. 1134,” Monumenta de Insula Manniae, vol. 2, 4-6; Brownbill, The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey, 2:3, no. 2, 709; Beck, Annales Furnesienses, 123. This will be fully examined in Chapter VI.


unplowed meadowland.68 The river provided a water supply for mill-power and a drainage system. To the north and south, rising ground gave shelter from the winds and included a good quarry for limestone building material.69 It was an ideal secluded rural place for a monastery.

The site of Rushen Abbey was long believed to have previously been the site of a Celtic monastery or keeill.70 Recent archaeological digs exposed a large number of Christian lintel graves dating from pre-Norman times.71 This discovery confirms that a monastery or keeill had pre-dated the building of Rushen Abbey.72

Janauschek wrote that in 1098 MacMarus had built a monastery in that same place.73 This seems to reflect a later tradition and it is doubtful that

---


MacMarus had in fact founded a monastery there, although his son may have donated to Rushen later or given Rushen a small keeill that was on his father’s lands.\textsuperscript{74} Documents from Furness mention a monastery of St. Leoc,\textsuperscript{75} an early Celtic local saint, and indicate when the parish of Malew received its name after the ninth century.\textsuperscript{76}

**Foundation from Furness**

The status Rushen Abbey had in relation to its motherhouse Furness remains one of the vaguest matters in ancient and modern sources.\textsuperscript{77} William of Worcester mentions Rushen Abbey in his fifteen-century *Itinerary* as “the monastery of Rushen with three monks.”\textsuperscript{78} Grose (1772-1776), in his *Antiquities*, made it clear that he believed that Furness had held full power over all lands

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{74} This is my theory as MacMarus’s son, Jol, is a witness of the Rushen foundation charter name. “Charter of Olave,” *Cartae Miscellaneae*, in the office of the Duchy of Lancashire, vol. I., fol. 30. John Robert Oliver, “Charter of Olave, King of the Islands, A.D. 1134,” in *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, 1-3; Brownbill, *The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey*, 2:3, no. 1, 70.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Kniveton, *Rushen Abbey: A History and Guide*, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{78} William of Worchester, *Itinerarium*, 312. *Castrum monasterii de Russyn cum iii monachis*.\end{itemize}
and rights given by the Kings of Man. He specifically labeled Rushen “a cell dependent on the abbey of Furness.” In 1893, Moore stated that the entire Manx church had been subjugated to Furness. While these authors viewed Rushen as a mere cell of its motherhouse, James Gell could find no evidence that Furness held anything except patronage and filiation as the motherhouse over Rushen, not total authority over the abbey or any of its temporalities other than that given by the Carta Caritatis.

In the Isle of Man section of the eighteenth-century Magna Britannia, Thomas Cox insists that Rushen was the chief monastic presence on Mann, and from the first consisted of the regular abbot and twelve monks. The Annales Furnessienses mentioned that one of the first monks, Wimund, and other brethren moved into the new foundation in 1134 and that shortly afterward (sometime between the foundation 1134 and 1140) Wimund became the first bishop of the Isles at Olaf’s new See. This certainly implies that there were

80. Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, “Grose’s Antiquities,” 162.
81. Moore, Diocesan Histories, 34.
82. Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux, ed Waddell, II, 261-81 and B, 422-52. See also Gell, Introduction to Parr’s Abstract, 3.
84. Beck, Annales Furnesienses, 140, see also William of Newburgh, Historia rerum anglicarum, lib. i. cap. xxiv. ed. Hans Claude Hamilton (London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1856), 64-7; Richardson, History and Antiquities of Furness, 62; Alan O. Anderson, “Wimund, Bishop and Pretender,” Scottish Historical Review 7. 25 (1909): 29-36; Donald Elmslie Robertson Watt,
more than three monks at Rushen at its foundation, making it unlikely that it had been a mere cell. In addition, Furness founded another daughter house in the same year as Rushen, 1134, at Calder in Cumbria.85 The monks sent out to Calder were the normal abbot and twelve brethren.86 If this was Benedictine common practice87 in the Savigniac tradition, then it is only logical that Rushen would have had the same regular number of founding monks according to the Rule. Rushen must have been a full monastic house with an abbot and twelve monks, as there were definitely enough monks to send out to preach at parishes and to go out to Mirescoge, a northern large satellite. The archaeology shows dormitories large enough to house a complete small monastery with laybrothers. More than three monks of Rushen were witnesses in one document in the Furness Coucher Book in 1217. This indicates that more monks were present, as all monks would normally not have signed. There were six monks at

---


86. Richardson, History and Antiquities of Furness, 59 and West, The Antiquities of Furness, 112.

Rushen’s dissolution in 1540, and because it was the last Cistercian monastery in the English realm to be dissolved, no new monks would have been taken in during these last years (after Furness was dissolved in 1537 and fate loomed) to replace any who died or left of their own accord.

Privileges Enjoyed by Rushen

In 1153, the generosity of Olaf I to the abbey was recognized by Pope Eugenius III, who confirmed all the gifts placed in the hands of Furness Abbey.88 These included vast lands and even villas, which were not allowed by the Cistercians, but were by the Savigniacs.89 These grants were confirmed by a bull issued by Urban III in 118690 and another by Celestine III in 1194.91 The Kings of Man, descendants of Olaf I, over the years renewed and added to the previous royal grants. Often one of the first acts of the new king would be to confirm his predecessors’ grant to Furness and Rushen. Godred II, Reginald II,


and Harald all expanded the lands of Rushen Abbey.92 Rushen quickly became the most powerful landowner in Mann besides the king himself.

The abbey of Rushen, like that of Furness, held great secular power in Mann; the Bishop of Sodor was chosen usually from one of the abbey’s number.93 The abbots of both were frequently upper class citizens before they entered monastic life, coming from families of wealth and power.94 Even though every monk had a voice in the chapter on the election of a new abbot, the election was often influenced by familial patronage interests.95

After the Merger with the Cistercians

When, in 1147, the Savigniac abbeys were absorbed into the Cistercian Order in the filiation of Clairvaux, the monks of Furness vocally protested the merger but submitted in 1148.96 Rushen may have sympathized with Furness in


94. West, The Antiquities of Furness, 120.


this debate; nevertheless, Rushen would also have accepted the practices of the Cistercian Order by or before 1148.

The lands Rushen owned in Mann were vast: there were numerous large farms or granges, which were probably managed by lay brothers. There were also smaller granges that were visited by monks of Rushen. The name grange can still be seen in modern place names, such as the Ballagranges.

All sources agree that the entire community of Rushen Abbey transferred to Douglas in 1192 and remained there for four years before returning to Rushen. The purpose will be discerned below in Chapter IV. Cubbon, Cumming, and A. W. Moore suggest that the buildings at Rushen were being enlarged during these years. Some buildings had to have been at Rushen at their arrival at the site, so whether this relocation was to enlarge those

97. Cubbon, “Cistercian Order and its influence in the Isle of Man”; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 358. The main labor on granges was provided by laybrothers.

98. Ibid.


accommodations or to make them conform to Cistercian guidelines is not clear.\textsuperscript{103} There is no reason given in any extant document for the short-term move and no indication that the Rushen site had suffered from a natural disaster or raid.

**Rushen: Royal Mausoleum?**

Rushen Abbey, specifically the north transept of the abbey church, became the burial site of the Manx royal family.\textsuperscript{104} Skeletal remains of persons of all ages and both genders were discovered in the north transept, buried in a common grave.\textsuperscript{105} Carbon-dating and stratigraphy indicate a mass grave of noble family members at Rushen Abbey in the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{106} This grave is currently thought to belong to Olaf I, the founder of Rushen, and his close family.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{103} Calder had enough construction completed within four years of its foundation, that the monastery was said to be devastated by Scottish raiders in 1138. If Calder, another daughter house of Furness had such buildings in so short a time, it only seems logical that Rushen would have some permanent buildings within fifty-four years since its inhabitance. Knowles and Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales*, 112, 117; Richardson, *History and Antiquities of Furness*, 59; West, *The Antiquities of Furness*, 112, 129-30.

\textsuperscript{104} Coppack, “The Planning of Cistercian Monasteries in the Later Middle Ages,” 197-209.

\textsuperscript{105} Cubbon, *Rushen Abbey, Isle of Man: A short sketch*, 9, 14.


\textsuperscript{107} Cubbon, *Rushen Abbey, Isle of Man: A short sketch*, 8-14; Davey, *Rushen Abbey: First Archaeological Report*, 64-5: the remains were carbon dated to approximately 1160; King Olaf died just before in 1153. He was assassinated by his nephews, and to secure the throne the usurpers would have tried to dispatch the entire family. The coup did not prevail as Godred II, Olaf’s son, was in Norway at the time. [*Chronicle of Man*, fol. 36 r.-v.] The monks probably collected the bodies of the slain from the Tynwald site and interred them within the north transept of the abbey.
Females and children were buried within the Cistercian church, although the Cistercians did not ordinarily allow women, alive or dead, within their churches. These women must have been the family of a significant patron to have been interred there. The children were laid out tenderly on stone pillows with purple quartz placed over their tiny bodies.

The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys mentions that royal and noble figures were interred within the abbey, which acted as “the Westminster Abbey of the Irish Sea,” a royal mausoleum. Reginald, bishop of Sodor and Man, nephew of Olaf I (1225); Olaf II (1237) and his son, Reginald (1249); the Norwegian Jarl Gospatrick (1240); and the last Norse King of Man, Magnus (1265) were all buried within Rushen Abbey according to the Manx Chronicle. This tradition indicates that the kings were respected by the monks and recognized as the abbey’s patrons and benefactors.

ch. However, it is not known whether the grave site was part of the abbey church at that time, as the abbey was enlarged in 1192. [Cumming, “Notes on Rushen Abbey,” 434.]

108. “That women may not even come inside the monastery gate,” in Capitula XVII in Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell, C, 411, Quod nec ingrediuntur portam monasterii and Capitula XVIV, C, 412, Those whom we receive for confession, for Communion, for burial, in, ad sepulturam, neminem extraneum praeter hospites et mercenaries nostros intra monasterium videlicet morientes recipimus, sed nec oblationem ad missam in conventu.


Later Rushen

The Growing Power of Rushen

Rushen Abbey, like its motherhouse, became well accustomed to the various industries and trade of the Cistercian Order. There were many small roads connecting abbey lands with major ports at Ronaldsway, Douglas, and Castletown, as well as two longer roads, one leading through St. Johns (Tynwall Hill) to Peel and the other through St. Mark’s, the Braaid, and Marown, to the port of Ramsey (near Maughold monastery).\(^{111}\)

Furness and Rushen were well respected in Mann and given landed baronies.\(^{112}\) The only people allowed to allocate holdings of lands were the Bishop of Sodor and the Isles and the abbots of the various monasteries which had been granted land on Mann.\(^{113}\) The Abbot of Bangor and Saball in Ireland, the Prior of Whithorn, and the Prior of St. Bee’s in Cumberland held baronies in Mann as well, as will be described in Chapter V.\(^{114}\)

\(^{111}\) Moore, *A History of the Isle of Man*, 78.


\(^{114}\) Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 90. See Chapter V,
According to the *Chronicle of Man*, the abbey church of St. Mary of Rushen Abbey was not consecrated until 1257 by Richard, Bishop of Sodor and Man, with King Magnus in attendance. The abbey church had been started at least 130 years earlier with its first stone structure in 1192; building continued throughout the thirteenth century and the final dedication was not celebrated by the bishop until the final expansion was finished. The *Furness Coucher Book* corroborates this by stating that the abbey was founded by 1138, the same date as Calder, and the church was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin in 1257.

In 1266, the Treaty of Perth gave the King of Scotland jurisdiction over Mann and the Isles, ending Norse rule. Politics were then uncertain in Mann for over a century, with Scottish and English powers vying for control of the island. It is clear that the Manx people preferred their previous connections with England, which had started with Olaf I, because in 1290 in a letter composed at

---

Sections “Galloway,” and “England,” 147-150.


Rushen Abbey, the people of Man declared themselves subjects of Edward I, King of England.\textsuperscript{120} Eventually, politics also favored England and the Isle of Man came under the control of the Stanleys, Lancastrian governors of Mann installed by Henry VI in 1406.\textsuperscript{121}

**Dissolution**

On April 9, 1537, Abbot Robert of Furness surrendered the monastery of Furness to Henry VIII during the dissolution of the monasteries throughout the realm.\textsuperscript{122} The Isle of Man was unaffected while there were still monastic houses being disbanded in England during the next three years, until June 24, 1540, when the abbot and six remaining monks were expelled from Rushen Abbey.\textsuperscript{123} Rushen had therefore had to fend for itself for three years, without help from its motherhouse, and with the knowledge of impending doom. Rushen Abbey was the last Cistercian house in the English realm to be dissolved; its revenues were disbursed by the Court of Augmentations in London.\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[120.] Oliver, “A letter from the inhabitants of the Isle of Man to Edward I. A.D. 1290,” *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, vol. 2, 110-1; Cubbon, “Cistercian Order and its influence in the Isle of Man.”
  \item[121.] Oliver, “Charter of Henry IV to Sir John Stanley. A.D, 1406,” *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, vol. 2, 235-246; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 359. The Stanleys were a great family name in England, whose houses were in Knowsley and Lathom, southwest Lancashire. Sir John Stanley and his heirs were given lordship of Man by Henry VI for two falcons a year.
  \item[124.] Various primary sources exist in the Augmentation Office Documents, Carlton Ride, London and a transcript at the Clerk of the Rolls, Isle of Man. PRO Roll of Accounts (Isle of
\end{itemize}
chosen to oversee the dissolution of both Furness and Rushen, acquired from Rushen land valued at £122 16 11, worth six pence an acre with over 4,900 acres, and £37 8 8 in silver.125 Rushen Abbey was definitely not an impoverished Cistercian house before the dissolution.

With this background on the political and religious situation in the Isle of Man and its connection to the wider medieval world, the following chapters seek to pose fact-based theories concerning Rushen Abbey’s religious and secular relationships. The next chapter examines the extent to which Rushen can be classified as Cistercian, Savigniac, or both.

125. Cumming, “Notes on Rushen Abbey,” 438; Cumming, “Rushen Abbey in the Isle of Man,” 37 and “Appendix B,”; Cubbon, “History of Rushen Abbey,” 108; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 369. Cumming noted that the following items were taken from Rushen Abbey at its dissolution: “four chalices, one cronche (abbot’s pastoral staff), one censer, one cross, two little headless crosses, one navicula (ship), one hand and one byshope’s head (reliquaries), four cruets, eleven spoons, two standing cups, two pocula (ale-pots) with covers, one Fiat pece, one salt, two masers (silver mounted wooden drinking cups), and one pix of silver.” Cumming cites no document details other than that the document was from the Record Office Rolls of Henry VII.
CHAPTER IV
RUSHEN ABBEY AS A CISTERCIAN/SAVIGNIAC HOUSE

The Impact of Twelfth-Century Reformed Monasticism in the Irish Sea Province

Gregorian Reform

In the eleventh century, a thorough reform of the Roman Church was instituted by Pope Gregory VII (r. 1073-1085) as a program of action to bring papal sovereignty over the affairs of the entire Latin Christian community\(^1\) and the reforms specifically addressed simony, clerical marriage, and lay investiture.\(^2\) Hayden White states that the Gregorian Reformation reorganized the Church, giving it an ordered, disciplined administration rather than the patrimonial arrangement of the Church before the Reformation.\(^3\) The pope was declared the supreme leader of the Church\(^4\) and considered the juridical and governmental

---


head of the Christian community. The pope’s claims to be the head of the Church and the vicar of Christ on earth led the papacy to see itself as the supreme temporal and spiritual state. The Church was seen by Rome not only as the body of Christ and the Roman See as descendant of St. Peter, but as an institution more authoritative than any secular state, for the Roman Church comprised all Christian society as the papacy represented divine will.

The College of Cardinals, who after 1059 selected, advised, and aided the pope, and canon lawyers instituted the reforms (1075-1076). These reforms were enumerated in the Dictatus Papae of 1075 and inscribed in the papal registers. The document placed the bishops under the authority and scrutiny of papal legates and also allowed ecclesiastical courts to be bypassed in cases of direct appeals to Rome. Gregory VII introduced canon laws to solidify papal


6. White, “The Gregorian Ideal,” 325; Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 104-5. See also M. Maccarrone, Vicarius Christi: storia del titolo papale (Lateranum, nova series, xviii, 1952).


sovereignty: the pope alone “could make new laws, ... set up bishops”; “the pope can be judged by no one”; “he alone can translate bishops”; “he can absolve subjects from their allegiance”; and “his legates, even though inferior in Orders, have precedence over all other bishops.”

Gregory and his supporters claimed to be restoring perfection in the apostolic church, giving himself papal authority and liberating bishops from lay rulers.

The Gregorian reforms succeeded in placing the papacy in the supreme position of leadership in Latin Christendom. This brought even more litigation and bureaucracy to Rome as the pope claimed the right to dispense justice and benefits in all areas of Christian and clerical life. The papal bureaucracy increased throughout the next two centuries, as measured by the number of general councils, (papal) legatine councils, and papal letters. By 1140-1150, the

12. Gregorii VII Registrum, M.G.H., Epistula Selectae, ii, ed. E. Caspar, 201-08. See also Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 101-3 and Uta-Renate Blumenthal, The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988). Naturally, those in power, such as the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry IV, opposed these laws openly and in 1176 was excommunicated. Henry IV was so overwhelmed by scheming barons and opposition that he begged for forgiveness the next year. Even though restored in faith, the revolt against him continued so he renewed his feud against the church instituting the line of anti-popes through his divine right as emperor. The “Investiture Controversy” died out with his son, Henry V, returning his support to the Roman papacy (though he installed one anti-pope, Gregory VIII, Henry V abandoned his father’s ways at the Concordant of Worms).


14. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 109-111, 117.

15. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 108-109. General councils called for and presided for by the pope increased (esp. from 1123-1312). In looking at England,
reforms created a comprehensive system of canon and “papal justice emerged in
everyday European life.”

Bernard and the Gregorian Reform

The Gregorian reforms were still being contested long after Pope Gregory’s death in 1085 and the “Investiture Controversy” ostensibly ended in 1122. Reforming Orders of the New Monasticism, such as the Cistercians (1098) and Savigniacs (1112/1115), Carthusians (1184), and Premonstratensians (1135), arose in the wake of Gregorian reforms. During the lifetime of St. Bernard (abbot of Clairvaux, 1115-1153), Gregorian reforms resulted in the expansion of papal curialism, legalism, and bureaucratic administration, which were all scrutinized under the disapproving eye of Bernard’s personality. The abbot of Clairvaux argued that Christian charity should be the ultimate source of order and unity within the Church.

---


17. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 101-3 and Uta-Renate Blumenthal, The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).


Bernard, however, recognized aspects of the Gregorian Reformation as useful and practical: canonical jurisdiction and continuity in administration with regular leadership.21 “St. Bernard intervened in English ecclesiastical difficulties at least twenty-five times between 1120 and 1150, concerning himself with matters directly related to the issue of the program of reform.”22 Bernard objected to the College of Cardinals23 and the universal immediate jurisdiction of the pope,24 yet most resistance to the reforms departed with Bernard’s death in 1153.25 As Southern astutely observed, Rome was owed an undefined obligation because, before the Gregorian Reformation, it was recognized as the Church’s center of “spiritual power,” but afterwards as the “center of ecclesiastical government.”26

attacked curialism, legalism, and secular bureaucracy.


26. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, 136; Gray, “The Problem of Papal Power,” 14; White, “The Gregorian Ideal,” 348. The authority of the Gregorian system was furthered after the papacy’s disputes with Barbarossa (Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I), which required him to defend the papacy of Pope Eugenius III in exchange for his coronation in 1153 during the Treaty of Constance. His reign was troubling through the tenure of a few popes, and he died on amiable terms under the tenure of Gregory VIII.
Gregorian Reform Introduced to the Irish Region

A look at Irish Cistercian reforms can give insight into how Olaf I reformed the church on the Isle of Man. Reform was brought to Ireland by Malachy (Mael Maedoc), Bishop of Down, who returned the rites of penance and confirmation to Irish practice. These were important reforms needed according to St. Bernard in the Life of Malachy:

[Malachy] had been sent not to men but to beasts. Never before had he known the like, in whatever depth of barbarism; never had he found men so shameless in regards of morals, so dead in regards of rights, so impious in regards of faith; so barbarous in regards of laws; so stubborn in regard of discipline, and so unclean in regard of life. They were Christian in name, pagan in fact, throughout the whole of Ireland, all that subversion of ecclesiastical discipline, that weakening of censure, that abandonment of religion of which I have spoken already; hence everywhere that raging barbarian replaced Christian kindness, nay a sort of paganism brought in under the name of Christ.

In 1139, Malachy went to Rome to receive the pallium, the symbol of an archbishopric, as the archbishop of Armagh and Cashel in Ireland.

---

27. Daphne D. C. Pochin Mould, The Irish Saints (Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, 1964), 224. See also Robert T. Meyer, “Introduction,” in The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1978), 4; Bernard of Clairvaux, The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman, ch. X.19-XIV.31, p. 37-47; Malachy had been given and assumed the title of Archbishop of Armagh, but abdicated and left to be bishop of the small diocese of Down to have a monastic life.


journey to Rome, he stayed at Clairvaux and met St. Bernard. In Rome, Pope Innocent II approved Malachy’s intended reforms in Ireland and appointed him papal legate to Ireland, but stated that the request for the pallium must come from a general synod of the Irish clergy. On his trip home, Malachy again stopped at Clairvaux and left four of his brethren behind; in 1142, they returned to Ireland with other monks of Clairvaux to found Mellifont Abbey, northwest of Drogheda.

An Irish foundation of the Savigniac Order may have predated Mellifont. Erenagh Abbey, called “Carrig,” was founded in 1127. Erenagh is thought to have been founded by Niall, King of Ulster, at Malachy’s instigation, and by the Savigniac monks of Furness who were then at Tulketh, near Preston, Lancashire. Malachy formally requested the pallium again in 1148, with the


34. Bernard of Clairvaux, The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman, ch. XVI. 39, p. 53. See also Meyer, “Introduction,” 5; Mould, The Irish Saints, 225. Janauschek states there had been claims that Mellifont was founded in 1140, 1142, and 1146. Cottineau lists 1142 as the foundation date. However, Bernard is a primary source and as Malachy is called “venerated founder” in Janauschek, Malachy probably founded the abbey having been influenced by Bernard. [Leopold Janauschek, Originum cisterciensium Liber Primus (Vienna, 1877; rpt. Ridgewood: Gregg Press, 1964), 70; Laurent Cottineau, Repertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieures (Macon: Protat freres, 1939), 1813.]


support of a general synod of bishops held at Inispatrick, to bring Ireland under Roman canon law.\textsuperscript{37} Although Malachy died at Clairvaux on his second journey to receive the pallium from Pope Eugenius III, the request was granted, but the pallium was not conferred on Malachy’s successor until the 1152 Synod of Kells, when the papal legate, Cardinal Papano, granted four pallia to the Irish Church.\textsuperscript{38} The pallium was conferred upon the archbishops of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Turam.\textsuperscript{39} Malachy must have been known to the monks at Rushen Abbey, for they recorded his death in the \textit{Chronicle of Man}.\textsuperscript{40} In Mann, however, it was not a bishop but a king, Olaf I, who saw benefit in placing his realm under Roman ecclesiastical law.

\textbf{New Monasticism and Reform in the Isle of Man}

Isle of Man as an Ideal Region for New Monasticism

The twelfth-century introduction of reformed monasticism to the “Irish Sea Region”\textsuperscript{41} coincided with the reemergence of Viking control of the Isles in a

\textsuperscript{37} Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman}, ch. XXXIII, p. 84-86. See also Meyer, “Introduction,” 4-5; Mould, \textit{The Irish Saints}, 227.

\textsuperscript{38} Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{The Life and Death of Saint Malachy the Irishman}, ch. LXVII-LXXV., p. 117-130. See also Meyer, “Introduction,” 4-5; Mould, \textit{The Irish Saints}, 227.


\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 36 r. \textit{obitt sanctus Malachias episcopus et legatus yberniae apud claram vallem sepultusque est in oratorio beatae virginis mariae in quo sibi bene complacuit}.

\textsuperscript{41} Hudson, \textit{Viking Pirates and Christian Princes}, 4.
“Second Viking Age” and During this period, the unstable position of territories in the Irish Sea region caused both new and continuing lords and kings to found monasteries of the reformed Orders to enhance their status amongst their peers and in the sight of God, and founding a religious house was seen as a stabilizing force. This temporary security in a frontier region created fertile ground for the establishment of the reformed Orders. In creating influence for their kingdoms and taking charge of lordships, many rulers in the Irish Sea region actively founded monasteries, especially those of the reformed Orders, which formed an organized religious power that could assist the lords in maintaining order in the secular realm. Monasteries were built not only as status symbols to show the lords’ power and position amongst their peers, but also because it was socially and politically advantageous to be associated with the reformed Orders. A reformed house was seen as a force that could stabilize

42. Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes, 4.


the lords’ realm by monastic discipline.\textsuperscript{48}

Rulers of the geographical areas surrounding the Irish Sea had many reasons for establishing and endowing monasteries in their region, other than a desire for purely spiritual benefits. Royal patronage brought wealth, influence, and power to endowed monasteries, while patrons received both spiritual benefits of prayers and recognition as a Christian ruler.\textsuperscript{49} A patron might be compensating for a transgression,\textsuperscript{50} and/or guaranteeing a place in the prayers of the monks,\textsuperscript{51} and safeguarding his land by giving it to the church, or he might simply be promoting his status and enhancing relations with neighboring nobles.\textsuperscript{52} There was a realistic “functional reciprocity” in the founding of a monastery.\textsuperscript{53} The patron had rights of confraternity (which has various definitions, but conveys the notion that the patron in some way could join the monastery before death).\textsuperscript{54} The patron might be allowed to take the habit in the future if he should desire to become a monk or to be buried in the monastic

\textsuperscript{48} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 1000-1300, 210.

\textsuperscript{49} Janet Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 1000-1300 (1994; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 210-228.

\textsuperscript{50} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 217-8 and Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries and their Patrons in the Twelfth Century, 54.

\textsuperscript{51} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 216-7.

\textsuperscript{52} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 215-219; Bennett Hill, English Cistercian Monasteries and their Patrons in the Twelfth Century (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1968), 54-5.

\textsuperscript{53} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 211.

\textsuperscript{54} Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 216-7, 221.
grounds. He also had the right to enjoy the hospitality of the monastery as a guest or to have a family member granted entry into the community. There were also material gains for the patron: for example, better livestock by interbreeding with the monks’ herd and using dung left by the monks’ sheep on their land for fertilizer. For all this, it was the duty of the patron to provide lands for the monastic house and to provide protection against physical assault. In Chapter VI, the prominent patrons of Rushen and Furness will be identified and discussed. Here we point out that the mutual benefits to patron and monastery promoted the spread of the reformed Orders as the lords around the Irish Sea region continued to found monasteries, increasing their status in the eyes of other nobility and further bringing stability to their lands.

Monks as Frontiersman in the Irish Sea Region

Richard E. Sullivan applied to the medieval monk the frontier paradigm used by Frederick Jackson Turner of the American West. As a frontiersman, the

59. See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen Abbey,” 164-171.
monk was separated from the mainstream of life, living in a unique environment “different from which migration occurs chiefly by virtue of the fact that a place is empty of most of what had existed in the setting left behind.” Sullivan identified four principal frontiers for the medieval monk: (1) a distant uninhabited environment, (2) a close uninhabited environment, (3) a frontier region, and (4) The cloister. The reformed monasteries of the twelfth century were usually of the second category. The monks settled in uninhabited areas, isolated from proximity to the world: monasteries on islands like Iona, on mountains like Monte Cassino, in barren spots like Cîteaux, and in caves like Marmoutier. The environment could be dramatically different from more densely inhabited areas, even if travel to such places was short in distance. The Irish Sea region, as well as forests of Yorkshire and isolated areas in Cumbria, were frontier areas of the third category: monks moved to a borderland or a region where they came into contact with people of a culture or sometimes with ethnic customs different from their own, and then often experienced raids, which

63. Sullivan, “The Medieval Monk as Frontiersman,” 29. (1) the uninhabited/barely habited environment, considerably distant from normal inhabited areas such as thick forests, deserts, and barren plains; (2) the uninhabited locales in proximity to the habited worlds but still isolated such as islands, barren areas, and caves; (3) the frontier region was inhabited with a different local culture and ethnic religious traditions; (4) the frontier created by the cloister as it is defined as a place physically apart from the world.
fits into the category most similar to the conventional idea of a frontier setting.

Karen Billings stated that the frontier paradigm could also be applied to Furness, which was located on a very isolated peninsula in Cumbria. Rushen, also located in an isolated area but on a large island in the Irish Sea, and Furness both met Sullivan’s category two. The two monastic houses also fit category three: both were founded in borderland territory, and Rushen was extremely isolated in an environment of an unfamiliar culture, the Manx and Viking. The unstable situation of the Irish Sea region, often raided by neighboring kingdoms and "pirates," led to its being considered an uncivilized place, apart from Roman Christendom. As rulers of a frontier region, kings and lords looked to secure their lands quickly and to provide stability for their kingdoms. This often meant forming political alliances with the surrounding lords through marriage and trade, and in this situation the religious patronage of renown Orders was


67. See note 63.

68. Hudson, Viking Pirates and Christian Princes. The title of Hudson's book refers to Viking raiders as 'pirates.'
seen as a civilizing force. The frontier setting allowed the monks to be viewed as leaders who provided security to the realm.

**Church Reforms on the Isle of Man**

Although Godred introduced Gregorian religious authority to the Isle of Man in the late eleventh century, it was his son, Olaf I of the Crovan dynasty, King of Man (1111-1154), who developed the Manx ecclesiastical system on the model he had seen at the court of England in 1134 and conveyed it back home. Rushen Abbey was also founded by Olaf I at this time. This new Viking dynasty on the Isle of Man considered the benefits of monastic patronage advantageous to themselves, and monastic foundations consequently held great prominence as the center of the new ecclesiastical system within the Kingdom of Man and the Isles.

Olaf I had friendly relations with the abbot of Furness. He had heard of the goodness of the new monastic Orders, and specifically of Furness’ reputation for sanctity. In 1134, after consulting with Yvon, the abbot of Furness, Olaf I

---


73. As mentioned above, the patrons would benefit spiritually and materially as well as provide a symbol of stability to the realm.

requested a new bishop of Sodor and Man to be elected from the Furness community.\textsuperscript{75} Sometime between 1134 and 1140, he sent a letter to Thurstan, archbishop of York, requesting approval of these measures.\textsuperscript{76} Until 1247, Furness had the unusual prerogative of nominating the Bishop of Sodor and Man.\textsuperscript{77} In its own right as well as motherhouse of Rushen Abbey, Furness in this way could directly influence religion on the Isle of Man.

In the charter Olaf I issued to Thurstan, his main goal was to reform and unite Christianity on Mann in accord with the organization of the Roman


Church. Olaf I recognized the Savigniac abbey as a renowned religious house of the new monasticism. Furness had an independent nature, probably from being in a secluded frontier region with very few other monastic houses nearby, and it garnered a powerful position for itself to survive in the frontier. Furness, along with Rushen’s sister house, Calder, lay in close proximity, being separated from Rushen by only a short sea voyage on the Irish Sea. Communication between the abbeys for the most part would have been quick and easy.

Olaf’s charter and letter were confirmed by a bull of Celestine III issued to Furness on July 10, 1194:

In choosing a Bishop of the Isles we do, by our apostolical authority, confirm the liberty, which the Kings of the Isles, Olaf and Godred his son, vested in your monastery, as it is expressed in their original grants Dated at Rome, the 10th of the Calends of July, and the fourth year of our pontificate. 


Savigniac Order

Cistercian-Savigniac Affiliation in 1147 and its Effects

When, in 1147, Savigniac abbeys were absorbed into the Cistercian Order in the filiation of Clairvaux, the monks of Furness vocally fought against the merger, but submitted in 1148. On the relationship between Furness and Rushen, Peter Davey has stated that there is “evidence for a close collaboration and co-operation over many issues.” Davey stated that Rushen would have sided with Furness in this protest, for Rushen would have allied with Furness in any case of outside dispute, taking its cue from its motherhouse because of its close filial relationship. Rushen would have adopted the constitution of the Cistercian Order by 1148.

By the late twelfth century, English formerly Savigniac houses were entrusted by the General Chapter with the oversight of jurisidictional Cistercian disciplinary cases, and Furness’ submission to Cistercian customs led eventually to its restructuring of the architecture of its abbey to conform to

81. See Chapter II, Section “Controversy over Merger, particularly with English Houses,” 54-59.


83. Waddell, ed., Twelfth-century Statutes: Byland (1196/28); Buildwas (1195/70, 1199/21); Quarr (1192/35).
Cistercian regulations. Furness became well known within the Cistercian Order, and during “the Mellifont Conspiracy” of 1228 was entrusted as one of the houses to which the Mellifont filiation’s member houses were reassigned. In the same interval (1147-1228), Rushen would also have become “cistercianized,” and it would probably have been easier for Rushen’s monks than for Furness’ since the abbey had been settled just over ten years before the merger.

Relationship between Rushen and Furness

The exact relationship between Rushen Abbey and its motherhouse, Furness, cannot be conclusively determined, yet their association must have been close. Rushen Abbey was recognized by Furness Abbey in its Coucher Book as an autonomous daughter house and Cistercian monastic house many times.

84 Furness altered the abbey church apse and transepts, the chapter house, the cloister and most notably the refectory, all according to Cistercian statutes. The abbey church had apsidal chapels before the merger (noted by John Hope); this was altered to square ends formed along the lines of the original apsidal forms. The refectory was first constructed along the east/west axis, and was changed to the Cistercian standard of north south, which also made room for a warming house and separated laybrothers from choir monks. [Harold Brakspear, “On the First Church at Furness,” Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society, vol. XVII (Manchester: Richard Gill, 1901), 84-5; W. H. St. John Hope, “The Abbey of St. Mary in Furness, Lancashire,” in the Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, vol. XVI (Kendal: T. Wilson, 1900), 221-302; Stuart Harrison, “Tour of the Abbey,” in Furness Abbey (London: English Heritage, 1998), 3-21.]

85 Stephen of Lexington, abbot of Stanley, visited Mellifont to set affairs straight in Ireland in 1228 after Mellifont and the abbey’s daughter houses were reported to have been lax in Cistercian custom. Stephen was not an admirer of the Irish houses, and the Gaelic monks resented him: he replaced their abbots with English and continental monks. This was called the “Mellifont Conspiracy.” Stephen disassembled the Mellifont affiliation under Furness, Margam, Buildwas, Fountains, Clairvaux, and Lexington.

86 It seems that Rushen should have had some sort of (probably wooden) first buildings at the site that the monks moved between 1134-1140, just as the first community of Calder had buildings when their monastery was burnt by Scottish raiders in 1148. Also in the early years of their foundation, one of their founding members, Wimund, was named the first Bishop of Man, which leads us to suspect that Rushen was a small well-formed house from its foundation.
throughout the years. The Cistercian abbot of Furness, as Rushen’s father immediate, would have been obliged to visit Rushen once a year, either personally or by sending a delegated fellow-abbot (visitator), as stipulated in Carta caritatis prior Cap. V, Institutæ c. 1180/84, and Carta caritatis posterior 16. Since Furness was never admonished at the General Charter for not visiting Rushen Abbey, the abbots can be assumed to have maintained a strong connection and fulfilled their duty every year. The reverse was also true: the abbot of the daughter was to visit the motherhouse once a year.


90. Carta caritatis posterior 16; in Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell, V, 382 and D, 501. Semel per annum visitet abbas maioris ecclesiae, vel per se vel per aliquem de coabbatibus suis, omnia coenobia quae ipse fundaverit; et si fratres amplius visitaverit, inde magis gaudeant.

91. No citations were found for Rushen in either Twelfth-century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2003) or Statuta Capitoliorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ad annum 1786, 8 vols. ed. Joseph Canivez (Louvain: 1933).

92. Ibid.

Moreover, as Furness nominated the bishops of Sodor and Man, a number of these bishops came from the ranks of the abbots of either Furness or Rushen. Rushen was also involved in the elections of bishops by confirming or disapproving Furness’ choice, almost as an extension of Furness itself.94

Characteristics of Rushen Not in Accord with Cistercian Ideals

Privileges

Like many Savigniac houses, both Rushen and Furness enjoyed immunities granted to them before the 1147 merger.95 The abbey lands included not only territory Olaf I had given to the abbey of Furness in Malew, but also lands in other parishes on Mann96 that included vast lands and villas.97 After the

\[ \text{ecclesiam per abbatem suum, si sanus fuerit, visitet, filia.} \]


96. Ibid. See also Harrison, *The Old Historians of the Isle of Man*, Dugdales’ *Monasticon Angelicanum*, p. 46 and “Grose’s Antiquities,” 162; West, *The Antiquities of Furness*, 126; Richardson, *History and Antiquities of Furness*, 59; Moore, *Diocesan Histories*, 34-5; Cumming, *The
merger, successive popes confirmed these immense lands and privileges to Furness: Eugenius III in 1153, Urban III in 1186, and Celestine III in 1194.

Olaf I’s descendants, as kings of Man, renewed and added to their predecessor’s royal grants. One of the first acts of a new king was often the confirmation of all the previous grants to Furness and Rushen. Godred II in 1154, Reginald II in 1188, and Harald in 1205 all did so and also added to the lands of Rushen Abbey. In this manner, Rushen quickly became the most important landowner in Mann after the king himself. By Cistercian rules, the grants made after the merger were not supposed to be accepted; however, not only Rushen but many former Savigniac and other Cistercian houses without Savigniac roots


accepted forbidden gifts, such as mills, churches, tithes, peasants, lordships, and payments, before and after the merger, as Jeffrey Michael Long has shown.103

Bishopric of Sodor

The abbot of Rushen, like the abbot of Furness, wielded great secular power in Mann, another thing that was contrary to both Orders’ ideals. The one obligation that set Furness and Rushen apart from other Savigniac and Cistercian abbeys in Britain was Furness’ unique right to nominate the bishops of Sodor and Man. According to the original grant by Olaf I and by its confirmation by his successors, Furness and Rushen had the sole advowson or right to nominate, and the King and the people of Mann had the right to accept or reject their nominee.104 The bishop of Sodor was usually chosen from either Furness’ or Rushen’s community, which Olaf I also requested from the first grant.105 Every professed monk had a vote in electing a new abbot;106 the episcopal election


106. West, The Antiquities of Furness, 120. See also Janet Burton, Monastic and Religious
required approval first by the archbishop of York,107 and then by the pope.108 The reformed papacy took a keen interest in seeing that the episcopal nomination remained in Furness’ and Rushen’s control, and they admonished kings of Mann who interfered in the election.109 In 1253, the pope took over the right of election himself to avoid conflict with the lords and royalty over the election. This will be thoroughly explored in Chapter VI.110

Cistercianizing Rushen Abbey

Cistercian Statutes

Cistercian and papal sources have to be carefully sifted for any mention of Rushen Abbey after the merger of 1147. For example, Originum Cisterciensium of

---


110. “Innocent IV. to the Abbot of Iona; granting the use of mitre and ring to him and his successors,” in no. 21, “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 312-12; Theiner’s Vetera Monumenta Hibernorium et Scotorum, 309-10. See also: Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man. In 1253, the Archbishop of Nidaros was in Rome to receive the pallium, and the pope seized the occasion to name Richard, an Englishman, the next Bishop of the Isles. See Chapter IV, Section “The Effects of the Civil War on Election Rights,” 199-204.
Leopold Janauschek considered Rushen simply as a Cistercian house without reference to its Savigniac past and made only three references to the abbey. The first mention was “Sept. XVII: Russinium, Rushen Abbey, in Mannia insula Angliae et dioec. Sodorensi ... filia Furnesii lineae Claravall.”\textsuperscript{111} The second mention occurs under “Furnesii filia”: “2. Russinhim, Rushen Abbey, in Mannia ins. Angl. et d. Sodor., XVII Sept. 1147.”\textsuperscript{112} Here, Janauschek carefully laid out the filial lineage of Rushen, its sister houses, and its motherhouse Furness, and placed them with other Savigniac houses within the filiation of Clairvaux.\textsuperscript{113} Janauschek’s third mention of Rushen identifies the abbey as the motherhouse of Saddell Abbey in Scotland: “Russinii filia: Sandallum, Saund/e, in Scotia ed d. Dunkeld, 1220.”\textsuperscript{114} However, there is no corroborating record of Saddell Abbey having been founded by monks of Rushen.\textsuperscript{115} The likelihood is that Saddell Abbey was founded from Mellifont, in Ireland.\textsuperscript{116}

The Cistercian Carta caritatis posterior required that “all the abbots of our Order, having set aside every excuse, assemble yearly for the Cistercian General

\textsuperscript{111} Leopold Janauschek, Originum cisterciensium, CCLIII, 292.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid, 313.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid. This seemed to Janauschek to be a daughter house of Rushen Abbey,\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{115} No scholarly source other than Janauschek, especially primary sources indicate any filiation between Rushen and Saddell Abbey.

Chapter; those only are excepted who are restrained by bodily infirmity”\textsuperscript{117} and “those dwelling in remote regions; they should come within the timeframe established for them in Chapter.”\textsuperscript{118} The penance assigned for an absence was ordinarily noted in the minutes of the General Chapter of any year in which the abbot failed to attend. In 1190, for instance, the penance assigned to the English abbots of Quarr, Stanley, and Forde for absenteeism was a diet of bread and water.\textsuperscript{119} While Rushen had to attend the General Chapter only once every four years because of distance, the abbot would still have been mentioned in the records from any year he missed and no extant record of disciplinary action exists for Rushen.

**Abbey Industries**

Like its motherhouse, Rushen quickly amassed wealth through the monks’ industry in nearly every Cistercian industry while continuing the modes of economic support they had previously employed as Savigniac houses. The abbey drew income from herding, farming, and mining.\textsuperscript{120} Rushen also had

\textsuperscript{117} Carta caritatis posterior, in Narrative and Legislative Texts, ed. Waddell, D, lines 73-75, 501 (English, lines 84-87, 501-2). Sed omnes abbates de Ordine nostro singulis annis ad Generale Capitulum Cisterciense, omni postposita occasionem convenient, illis solici exceptis quos corporis infirmitas retinuerit.

\textsuperscript{118} Carta caritatis posterior, in Narrative and Legislative Texts ed. Waddell, D, lines 77-79, 501 (English, lines 89-91, 502). Et illis item exceptis qui in remotioribus partibus habitantes eo termino venerrint, qui eis fuerit in Capitulo constitutus.

\textsuperscript{119} Statute Lil 1190/25 in Twelfth-century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2003), 200-1.

ownership of fisheries, and grain, dairy, and wool production.\textsuperscript{121} At the ford of the Silverburn River at Rushen Abbey, they even had a Vitruvian mill.\textsuperscript{122} Cistercians frowned upon holding fairs and markets and had strict rules against attending them,\textsuperscript{123} yet Furness and undoubtedly Rushen violated them.\textsuperscript{124} There is, as we have seen, reason to believe that some Cistercian houses also accepted resources forbidden by their own regulations.\textsuperscript{125}

Rushen owned land in every parish on the island, and established granges in many of them.\textsuperscript{126} The labor on these farms was provided by laybrothers, \textit{conversi:}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{122} Kniveton, \textit{Rushen Abbey}, 13; Cistercian law forbade revenues to come from mills which Savigniacs had not (\textit{Twelfth-century Statutes}, Waddell, ed., Dij 2, Lao 129, Lis 110-111 in C Statuta to Series 1159 – 1179, 603-604; as well as in \textit{Narrative and Legislative Texts}, ed. Waddell, C, Cap. XXIII, 412 and A, EP XV. 14, 324.) A vitruvian mill is purely mechanical with water as a power source. The wheel is placed vertically in the stream (at Rushen, the Silverburn River) with the introduction of gears between the wheel and millstones.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{125} Constance Bouchard, “Cistercian Ideals versus Reality: 1134 Reconsidered.” \textit{Citeaux} 39 (1988): 217-230 and Jeffrey Michael Long, “1147 Rejected. A Study of Cistercian and Savigniac Possessions in England and Wales, 1127-1176.” (M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1993), 121-4. Long supports his claims with the surviving documentary evidence of mills, altars, tithes, vills, peasants, payments, lordships, markets, etc., having belonged to both Cistercian and Savigniac monasteries before 1147 (even before 1134) from surviving twelfth-century documents, mainly cartularies of the particular monastic houses. Bouchard claims that the fact that the only Burgundian house for which these types of gifts were not represented in this early time was Clairvaux signifying that Bernard was probably the leading influence behind the legislation of 1134 and strict observances proceeding from it.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Limites terratum monachorum}, f. 54 r. “The tenants of the abbey lands of the monastery
\end{flushright}
Rushen and Furness both had laybrothers before the 1147 merger, just like the Cistercians.127 The west range of their abbeys served two functions: it provided living space for laybrothers and storage as a cellarium.128 Among the earliest Savigniacs, the need for laybrothers is doubted, as St. Vital’s Savigny started as a hermitage. It was not until the tenure of the second abbot of Savigny, Geoffrey (1122-39), that Savigny in 1222 expanded into a cenobitic community.129 This may have been the time when Savigny began accepting laybrothers in newly founded houses. Archaeological evidence makes clear that from its foundation Rushen housed laybrothers, just as Rushen’s motherhouse, Furness, had housed laybrethren even before the merger with the Cistercians.130 Archaeological remains show that the west range had a few ground floor rooms, probably a day room and refectory for the conversi, as well as the abbey cellar with their dormitory above it.131

---


Rushen also owned churches, appointed vicars, and provided chaplains to parishes on the Isle of Man. All this was contrary to Cistercian practice and its ideal of disentangling themselves from worldly affairs. Yet preaching had been a key obligation in the foundation of the Savigniac Order.

Architecture and Layout of Rushen’s Precinct

To ascertain the layout of Rushen Abbey, the Centre for Manx Studies excavated the abbey ruins in 1998 and 1999. Their findings showed that the abbey had been very small: the smallest Cistercian abbey in the British Isles and perhaps even in Europe. Rushen Abbey, therefore, was a very modest edifice when compared to its motherhouse, Furness. In fact, Manx churches were all very small and simple in style: only some sixty to seventy feet long and sixteen to twenty feet wide. The cloister was only some ten meters square; normally

---

132. Rushen Abbey held the advowson of the vicarages of Lonan, Santon, Arbory, Rushen and Malew; with Rushen, the parish church, vicarage and glebe were all within the abbey’s demense. Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 353.

133. Burton, Monastic and Religious Orders in Britain, 65.


Cistercian cloisters were three times as large.¹³⁹ Yet, St. Mary’s church at Rushen Abbey was the largest medieval house of worship on the Isle of Man except for St. German’s Cathedral in St. Patrick’s Island near Peel.

Like most Cistercian abbey churches, the abbey church at Rushen was constructed on a cruciform plan and local limestone was utilized for most of its structure.¹⁴⁰ The nave had no aisles, which is unusual for a Cistercian church but commonplace in medieval Manx churches. No churches on Mann, not even the cathedral, had aisles.¹⁴¹ The choir was paved with a pattern of yellow and dark green tiles.¹⁴²

The monastery ruins provide evidence of construction in the late twelfth century, which coincides with the time the monks transferred to Douglas (1192 to 1196).¹⁴³ As pointed out in Chapter III, there are two points of view on why the monks relocated to Douglas for four years.¹⁴⁴ Basil Megaw has put forth an

---

¹³⁹. Ibid.


¹⁴⁴. See Chapter III, Section “After the Merger with the Cistercians,” 88-90.
argument, based on place name evidence, that Rushen’s original site was in Scarlett, near Castletown, and that the monks were forced to move temporarily in 1192 because the King required the land in Castletown for the construction of Castle Rushen, and that only four years later the community resumed habitation in the south, but at a new location at Rushen.145 The *Chronicle* does not suggest this and only states, “In the same year (1192), the abbey of St. Mary of Rushen was removed to Douglas. After remaining there four years the monks returned to Rushen.”146 Scholars have suggested that the accommodations the Rushen monks used in Douglas later became the Douglas nunnery associated with the Cistercians.147 Archaeological evidence suggests that the abbey buildings at Rushen were enlarged during these same years, which would imply that the monks had indeed lived in the location before.148 The monks may have taken this opportunity to alter the abbey buildings to conform to Cistercian guidelines, yet it seems Rushen had already been in line with Cistercian practice as there had been no significant change in the abbey buildings after the merger.149 However,


146. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 40 r. *Eodem anno Abbatia Sanctae Maniae de Russin translata est ad Dufglas, ibique per quatuor annos habitantes iterum ad Russin reversi sunt.*


149. Calder had enough construction completed within four years of its foundation, that
Furness changed its original rounded apse to the normal Cistercian square apse just after the merger.\textsuperscript{150}

In the British Isles, most Cistercian churches built or rebuilt after 1200 AD had an inlaid floor of glazed tiles.\textsuperscript{151} They were usually three inches square and laid in patterns of only two colors, a yellow and a tint that varies between black, brown, and green.\textsuperscript{152} Evidence of a local kiln on the island is indicated by two unique tiles at Rushen that were similar to others at Castle Rushen but unknown elsewhere.\textsuperscript{153} The majority of the tiles found at Rushen have similarities to marigold tiles found beyond Mann in Drogheda in Ireland, and to various tiles in Chester, although the fabric and two designs are definitely Welsh.\textsuperscript{154}


\textsuperscript{152}Helen Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey compare with those from other Religious Houses in the Irish Sea Area?” (M.A. in Manx Studies, University of Liverpool, 2005), 6, 59. There are at least two floor tile ruins unique to the Isle of Man and maybe as many as five others. They are like tiles at Rushen Castle. MC 13 and MC 24 are both line impression two-colored tiles, which are not found anywhere other than the Isle of Man.

\textsuperscript{153}Helen Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey compare with those from other Religious Houses in the Irish Sea Area?” (M.A. in Manx Studies, University of Liverpool, 2005), 6, 59. There are at least two floor tile ruins unique to the Isle of Man and maybe as many as five others. They are like tiles at Rushen Castle. MC 13 and MC 24 are both line impression two-colored tiles, which are not found anywhere other than the Isle of Man.

\textsuperscript{154}Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 59-61. MC 9 design is known from Bangor Cathedral, MC 14 design is identical to Montgomery Castle, Wales; MC4 and MC 9 both have the unusual red tile body fabric from Bassignwerk Abbey. This could, as Skillan says, indicate that Wales may have been the source of manufacture for the Manx collection of tiles, or, as I think, these tiles particularly indicate that trade of tiles was influenced
In a recent excavation, tiles were found throughout the abbey, though mainly in the church, as they likely covered the entire church floor.\textsuperscript{155} Five different types of tiles were found \textit{in situ} in the church area.\textsuperscript{156} Tiles with quatrefoil designs paved the church choir and the north transept, while large plain tiles were found in the nave and choir area; others with marigold designs or with fleur-de-lis in relief were found in the south transept.\textsuperscript{157} There were eighty tiles unearthed with a local oak-leaf and acorn pattern that paved the northwest quadrant of the north chapel in the south transept \textit{in situ}, and patched parts of the choir and the nave, while a few were discovered in various places all over the abbey.\textsuperscript{158}

Similar tiled floors were first used mainly in the Cistercian abbeys of Northern Britain.\textsuperscript{159} Some abbeys used decorative tile designs, which conflicted with the simple Cistercian ideal to the point that the Cistercian General Chapter had to legislate against the inappropriateness of some tiled floors. In 1205, for instance, the Chapter disapproved of the variegated floor tiles of Pontigny, on the building material. I noticed that as far away as Byland Abbey there is a tile parallel with Rushen, MC 19 and that there are at least twenty other monastic sites with similar tiles.

\textsuperscript{155} Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 6-9

\textsuperscript{156} Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 6-9.

\textsuperscript{157} Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 6-9, 34-36. 1. MC 1 and MC 2 (quatrefoil designs); 2. MC 12 (plain tiles) 4; MC 3 (marigold designs); MC 9 (fleur-de-lis in relief) 5; MC 10 (oak design – see note 158).

\textsuperscript{158} Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 6-9, 34. MC 10 (oak design).

\textsuperscript{159} Beaulah, “Thirteenth Century Square-Tile,” 3-4.
which used four colors in a single pattern, something seen as superfluous.\textsuperscript{160} Plain square, single colored tiles usually placed in a mosaic were the most numerous kind found at Rushen Abbey; these were early styles from the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{161} Detailed tile floors came in the fifteenth century at Rushen, when they appeared after those in English houses.\textsuperscript{162}

Although most of Rushen Abbey is now in ruins, excavations have revealed that the buildings were sound structures built from local limestone using simple construction methods. A finer detail in arches, doorways, and window heads, all carved from imported red sandstone, was found only in the décor of the buildings themselves.\textsuperscript{163} The church was very simple, plain, and probably more in conformity to the Cistercian ideal than many continental and British Cistercian houses.\textsuperscript{164}

Meredith Lillich states that the identification of a Cistercian building rests on three elements:

\begin{itemize}
\item[161.] Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 17-18.
\item[162.] Skillan, “How do the Medieval Floor Tiles from Rushen Abbey,” 17-19. The highly decorative designs started to appear at Rushen in the fifteenth century: two-design, counter-relief tiles in the fifteen or sixteenth century; a fleur-de-lis pattern relief tile appeared in the fifteenth century; a blue-white tin-glaze Spanish cuencatile in the sixteenth century.
\item[163.] Butler, A Guide to Rushen Abbey, 10.
\item[164.] Butler, A Guide to Rushen Abbey, 16-17.
\end{itemize}
Rib vaults and pointed arches allowed “heavenly” light to come into the church. Cistercian churches usually had aisle-less naves, short towers, square-ended chapels and presbyteries, short transepts, and small cloisters. There was a simple 1:2 ratio reaching up to the heavens with a functional purpose and no superfluous ornamentation; it was a style universal for all houses of the Cistercian Order. Combination of quality and workmanship with unpretentious materials mark these works as “Cistercian.”

Rushen Abbey was nothing if not simple and functional in design. The abbey’s proportions fit each of Lillich’s indicators of a Cistercian monastery. It had pointed arches, meaningful proportions, and the typical variety of bi-colored tile patterns. Local preferences are certainly seen in the aisle-less nave of St. Mary’s Church, the simplicity of overall design, and the use of local materials.

---


which characterized all Manx churches. On all counts, according to Lillich’s characteristics, Rushen Abbey exhibits the three elements that categorize it as “Cistercian” building.

**Conclusion: Adaptations and Effects of the Savigniac-Cistercian Affiliation on Man**

As a new foundation in a remote area, Rushen Abbey, founded in 1134, just fifteen years before its motherhouse submitted to the Cistercian merger, did not have to do much, if anything, to alter its buildings to the Cistercian standard. In that time, the community of monks at Rushen had amassed many privileges, lands, and a role in the election of the Bishopric of Sodor. Although privileges, rights, and more land were given by Olaf I and his descendants, these original privileges were confirmed by papal bulls. Contemporary Cistercian monasteries had used most of these means to wealth and land as well, despite their being theoretically un-Cistercian. No record of censure against Rushen by the General Chapter has survived and the regulations of duty as a motherhouse and daughter house according to the *Carta caritatis* were not neglected, showing

---


Rushen and Furness maintained close relations.\textsuperscript{172} Architecturally plain, Rushen Abbey was recognized throughout the \textit{Furness Coucher Book} as a daughter house of Savigniac foundation\textsuperscript{173} and was clearly made into a Cistercian monastic house by 1148 when its motherhouse submitted to the merger.\textsuperscript{174}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{172} \textit{Carta caritatis posterior} 16, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell, D, 501 and V, 382.


\textsuperscript{174} Rushen is recognized as under Furness, which submits in 1148, after which they would have been placed in the Clairvaux family under the auspices of Savigny.
CHAPTER V

RUSHEN ABBEY’S RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER MONASTIC HOUSES
IN THE IRISH SEA REGION

Other Monasteries on the Isle of Man

Religious Houses Other than Rushen Abbey Founded on Mann

Five monasteries existed on the Isle of Man during the medieval period, c. 600-1540. Three of these were Celtic monasteries already in existence before c. 600: St. Leoc’s at Malew,1 St. Maughold’s at Ramsey,2 and St. Patrick’s on Peel Island.3 Two other religious houses were founded after Rushen’s foundation: the Priory of Douglas, Cistercian nuns;4 and the Friars Minor at Brinnaken.5


3. McNeil, Saints and Sites, 19; Kniveton, Rushen Abbey, 3; Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 5; Salter, Castles and Old Churches, 16-17, 102-111.


5. Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 30; McNeil, Saints and Sites, 19; Caine, “Notes on the Manx Monasteries,” 55; Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 197; Salter, Castles and Old Churches, 30.
St. Leoc

Rushen itself was founded near the site of St. Leoc. The first Celtic abbot of the monastery of St. Leoc has been identified as Conanus, who lived sometime in the ninth century, though it is possible Conanus may have been confused with the Abbot Conanus of Maughold Monastery. If accurate, this would date the monastery at least two centuries before Rushen. Various scholars have claimed that there had formerly been a monastic site at Rushen, founded in 1098 by MacMarus, a chieftain (hang) of southern Mann after the death of Godred Crovan. Archaeological work has uncovered a large number of Christian lintel graves and buildings one hundred and ten yards south of Rushen’s church


tower, suggesting the existence of an early monastic site there.\textsuperscript{11} Three layers of burials have been discovered superimposed over one another; in each case the graves were oriented to the east as is customary among Christians,\textsuperscript{12} and so indicating that this was indeed a Christian site.

The 1153 Bull of Eugenius III mentions a monastery of St. Leoc near Rushen: “In Mann, by gift of the noble man, Olaf, King of the Isles, the lands of Carneclet as far as the monastery of St. Leoc with all its appendices.”\textsuperscript{13} This gives the impression that the land Rushen was built on was known by the previous monastic name, the Celtic foundation of St. Leoc. The reference in the Bull of Eugenius III was probably to the site and not to the monastery itself, which may already have died out.\textsuperscript{14} Secondary sources refer to the monastery dedicated to an early Celtic missionary, St. Leoc, mentioned in Eugenius III’s bull, and from

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Cubbon, \textit{Rushen Abbey, Isle of Man}, 7; Butler, \textit{A Guide to Rushen Abbey}, 3; C. Cubbon, 1958, 5.
\item \textsuperscript{14} “Bull of Eugenius III to Furness Abbey. A. D. 1153,” in \textit{Monumenta de Insula Manniae}, ed. John Robert Oliver, vol. 2, Manx Society 7 (Douglas: Manx Society, 1861), 8-12. There is no reference anywhere else to a St. Leoc monastery. If the site was still functioning, it would have been mentioned in the charters by Olaf given to Furness. The logical reasoning is that this reference is to the place as there had been a monastic presence there at one point.
\end{itemize}
which the parish Malew took its name.\textsuperscript{15}

**St. Maughold’s Monastery**

The earliest monastery on Mann, dedicated to St. Maughold, was still in existence when Rushen Abbey was founded in 1138. Two primary sources detailed on cross slabs near Maughold\textsuperscript{16} provide irrefutable evidence that St. Maughold’s still existed around 1200.\textsuperscript{17} Both stones were carved by Juan, a priest in Maughold parish.\textsuperscript{18} One states simply that Juan cut these runes;\textsuperscript{19} the other, found near Keeill Woirrey (also called Corna Keeill) in a remote part of the parish, identifies Juan,\textsuperscript{20} the parish priest, as being from the monastery of St. Maughold.\textsuperscript{21}

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}


\item \textsuperscript{17} Manx Museum Classification no. 144 and no. 145. Kermode, *Manx Crosses*, 212-214, and Megaw, “The Monastery of St. Maughold,” 173.

\item \textsuperscript{18} Ibid.


\item \textsuperscript{21} Kermode, *Manx Crosses*, 213; Megaw, “The Monastery of St. Maughold,” 170, 173;
\end{itemize}
By the thirteenth century, a church of St. Michael was erected next to St. Maughold’s Romanesque abbey church, built around the eleventh century. The eleventh-century abbey church was not the first on the site, but indicated a thriving community whose members improved their abbey church. Maughold was gradually drawn more and more into Roman customs and farther from its Celtic traditions. Neighboring peoples, however, continued to follow the old ways by using old Corna keeill and its graveyard.

Two primary sources mention Maughold monastery during the twelfth century: Jocelin of Furness’ *Life of St. Patrick* and the *Chronicle of Man*. The *Chronicle of Man* reported the abbey was still flourishing in 1158. Jocelin of Furness, writing circa 1185, stated that the early ruins of the great monastic city Maughold could still be seen. The Celtic monastic city may have been viewed as obsolete, since Maughold lacked the discipline of the new reformed Orders, yet the monastic city survived for some time after Rushen’s arrival on the Isle of

---


25. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 37 v. - f. 39 r. Mentioned below in miracles section for full synopsis as it takes many folios. *Eo tempore cum adhuc sumerledus esset in mannia in portu que (sic) vocatur ramso, nuntiatum est exercitui eius ecclesiam sancti machuti pecuniis esse refertam.*

Man, as will be shown below.27

St. Patrick’s Island, Peel

St. Patrick’s Island, off the coast of Peel in west Mann, developed into a religious center during the years of the Viking settlements.28 With a rich religious background, the grounds had been used in the seventh and eighth centuries for Christian burials.29 Excavations have shown a few tenth-century pagan burials overlaying the earlier Christian graves, indicating that the Vikings used the early Christian graveyard for their burials.30 Around c. 1000, a church dedicated to St. Patrick was built on the western part of the small island and a keeill was erected to the north of the burial grounds.31 A round tower showing Irish influence was constructed forty feet west of St. Patrick’s church, which indicates fear of foreign pillaging; the Celtic monks at St. Patrick’s Island, having quickly converted the Viking settlers, did not, however, need to defend their possessions from local

27. See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the late Eleventh Century,” 143-147.


The large church, the tower, and the keeill on St. Patrick’s Isle, all built between 950 and 1050, was the last large Celtic monastic city founded on the Isle of Man. Dugdale suggested that the Céli Dé established this monastery under the patronage of the newly converted Viking rulers who had had contact with Christian Norway, Dublin, and York, and that the Céli Dé were instrumental in providing the priests, who maintained the keeills around the island.

Cistercian Houses during the Manx “Second Viking Age”

Mirescoge

After the establishment of Rushen Abbey, other monastic sites were founded on the island. In 1176, the first grant of land for a religious house was given to Sylvanus, Abbot of Rievaulx. The land was given by Godred II, King of Man, after Godred II and his wife, Fingulas, granddaughter of the Irish high king Muircheartach MacLochlainn, were married by Sylvanus according to the

32. Moore, The Other British Isles, 104; Salter, Castles and Old Churches, 16; Wilson, The Viking Age in the Isle of Man, 128; Dugdale, Manx Church Origins, 104-5, 109-10. Round towers were popular in Irish monasteries between 900-1200. They were usually 100 ft high, tapering at the top, and around 40-60 ft in circumference. The round tower at Peel is cylindrical not tapered and measures about 45 ft on the outside with a diameter of 6 ft inside. There are four windows 35 ft up which indicate the original top story. Peel tower does not have much in common with Irish towers except that its door faces the west gable of St. Patrick’s Church and is 7 ft above ground.

33. Dugdale, Manx Church Origins, 109-10.

Roman rite. This wedding occurred because the Apostolic Legate to Pope Alexander III, Viranus, had paid a visit to the Isle of Man in 1171 and noticed that the king was not canonically married to his own wife and was thus, in Roman eyes, living in sin.

Little is known of the location of the first gift to Sylvanus except that it lay on lands near Mirescoge. When released by Rievaulx, the land and its estates were transferred to Rushen Abbey, although the date of this occurrence remains unknown. By 1280, the land holdings of Mirescoge, mentioned in the Limites terrarum monachorum, had already been given over to Rushen and included nine quarterland farms referred to as abbeylands. Rushen may have used these farms as granges, and early building remains indicate that they may have used the monastic site itself as a large grange, now called Grange Farm. As Cistercian regulations in 1151 stated that granges had to be at least two leagues away from each other and abbeys ten, it seems more likely that Mirescoge was a

35. Muircheartach Mac Lochlainn was king of Ireland from around 1156, following Toirdhealbhach Ua Conchobhair whom he opposed until his death in 1166. He was succeeded by his opponent Ruidri Ua Conchobair. Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 196; Chronicle of Man, f. 40 r.; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 351.

36. Chronicle of Man, f. 39 v. - f. 40 r.


38. Limites terrarum monachorum, in Chronicle of Man, f. 53 r. - 54 v.

39. Limites terrarum monachorum, f. 54 r. Written around 1280. Et terram monachorum de Myrosco lacu qu dicitur Hescu na appayse et ascendit per sic scetum directe a loco qu dicitur munernyrzana per Boscum qui dicitur Kor.

satellite of Rushen than used as a “large grange.”⁴¹ Cistercian regulations on
distance notwithstanding,⁴² Mirescoge may be seen as simply a very large grange
at a good distance from the monastery, yet even Easson records it as a monastic
house transferred to Rushen.⁴³

Cistercian Nunnery at Douglas (Douglas Priory)

Although its exact foundation date is unknown, a Cistercian nunnery
(often incorrectly identified as Brigittine)⁴⁴ was founded sometime between 1187-
1228 at Douglas, on the east coast of Man, during the reign of King Reginald.⁴⁵
The Douglas Priory was contemporary in architecture with the thirteenth-
century cathedral of St. German on Peel Island.⁴⁶ The nunnery was clearly in

---


⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 196.

⁴⁴ Older Manx scholars have associated a Brigitine tradition with the nunnery: McNeil, Saints and Sites, 19; Salter, Castles and Old Churches, 31; Caine, “Notes on the Manx Monasteries,” 54. Easson and Davey both place the house of nuns as Cistercian: Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 197; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 349.

⁴⁵ Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 197, 238; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 362. In 1192, the monks of Rushen went to Douglas for four years; however, this was too close to Rushen to build a monastery. It has been put forth that this may have been an intention to cause confrontation with the new house at Mirescoge, or that their dwellings were converted to the Cistercian nunnery. Yet neither of these hypotheses can be confirmed and the former seems unlikely as Rushen did obtain the lands at Mirescoge around that time.

⁴⁶ Joseph Train, An Historical and Statistical Account of the Isle Man, from the earliest time to the present date with a view of its ancient laws, peculiar customs, and popular superstitions, vol. 2 (Douglas: Quiggins, 1806), 50.
existence by 1230 as a stone monument on its lands was inscribed:
“Cartesmunda, Virgo immaculata, A.D. 1230.”

As is true of a number of British nunnerys that claimed to be Cistercian, documentation on the Douglas nunnery is scarce. Some of those houses of nuns claimed membership and followed strict Cistercian customs in order to obtain Cistercian privileges yet were never recognized by the General Chapter. Yet Douglas enjoyed the support of the bishops and royal family and was built at a time when Hill and Burton state that Cistercians began to enroll nuns. The house of nuns, like all Cistercian monasteries, was dedicated to St. Mary and is described as Cistercian in 1414. Its visitor may have been the Bishop of Man and the Isles, or, given its close relationship to Rushen, the abbot of Rushen probably sent a monk-priest or parish priest to the house, as was appropriate for a recognized Cistercian monastery of nuns.

47. Ibid.


53. The prioress was noted to have gone to Rushen Abbey to sign official documents, although no woman was supposed to step foot in a Cistercian monastery. This seems to suggest that there were ties between Rushen and the house of nuns and that, at least within the precinct,
Robert the Bruce was said to have accepted the hospitality of the nuns of Douglas in May 1313, before he attacked Castletown in the south of Man the following day. A prioress is first mentioned by name in 1408, when Christina signed a document at Rushen as prioress of Douglas. She was considered a Baron of Man, and as such held the same temporalities as other barons. The house of nuns obtained the advowson of the church of St. Conchon from Antony Beck, Lord of Man (1298-1310), and thereafter received one-third of the tithes of that parish and appointed its priest. The prioress must have been one of the most powerful women on the Isle of Man. At the dissolution, the prioress, Eleanor Calcotte, and three or four sisters were expelled from Douglas and pensioned off on the same day as the Rushen monks.
Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the Late Eleventh Century

Cult of Saints and Miracles

Cults of Celtic saints and remnants of Celtic practices were widespread in areas of the British Isles; one of the places where this was true was the monastic city of Maughold. The Chronicle of Man makes reference to the monastic city, which had been a safe refuge during the invasion of Somerled in 1158.\textsuperscript{59} Gilcolm, a chieftain (\textit{þang}) in Mann, had wanted to drive off Maughold’s cattle to supply his army. That night, Saint Maughold appeared in a dream to Gilcolm and pierced his heart with a staff. Gilcolm awakened and ordered his men to go to Maughold and have the priests bring the staff, a relic of their patron saint, so that they might intercede and absolve him of his sin. The monks of Maughold rejoiced and sent clerks with the staff, preventing Gilcolm by the power of the saint from attacking the monastery’s property.

Jocelin of Furness wrote of miraculous events occurring in the cemetery of Maughold, where, he stated, there was a stone from which flowed a spring of water \textit{ad infinitum}.\textsuperscript{60} Within the monastic city, a Manx stone cross had been carved with an inscription to commemorate the finding of the “eternal well” by

\textsuperscript{59} Chronicle of Man, f. 38 r. – f. 39 r. The staff, whether genuine, is one of the only Manx reliquaries. See also Megaw, “The Monastery of St. Maughold,” 174-5; Dugdale, Manx Church Origins, 116-118; McNeil, Saints and Sites, 17-18.

\textsuperscript{60} Jocelin of Furness, The Life and Acts of St. Patrick, ciii, 170. See also Megaw, “The Monastery of St. Maughold,” 176-7. Jocelin states that King Magnus Barelegs tried to have the stone, which miraculously produced an everlasting source of water, removed. However, his attempt was unsuccessful as the stone well could not be damaged.
someone named “Branhui.”

Survival of Celtic Christianity on Mann

Peter Davey has recently declared that the persistence of pre-Roman Christianity after the Viking raids on Mann cannot be decisively proven. Some estimate, however, that Celtic Christianity can be determined through archaeology and documentation of the monastic communities at Maughold and Peel, which continued after the raids and into the period of Norse settlement on Mann. The dating of architectural finds at Maughold to the thirteenth century, as well as primary sources from runic inscriptions of the twelfth and thirteenth century, should be sufficient proof of their continuance.

What is uncertain is how long the Celtic community at Peel lasted, but it was surely extinct by the Norman Age. St. Maughold’s monastery seems then to have existed well into the twelfth century and was certainly viewed as a holy site by the monks at Rushen. Why did one Celtic community survive and flourish, while little of the other remained but ruins? Under the Crovan dynasty,

---

61. Manx Museum Classification no. 169: Branhui’s Cross references this well. A. M. Cubbon, The Art of the Manx Crosses (repr. Douglas: Manx National Heritage, 1996), 9; Dugdale, Manx Church Origins, 115. It is said that Branhui found water at this place at the sarcophagus of Maughold, also called a holy well, and archaeological traces of a stone-lines conduit found have been in this location. The stone is of the late eighth to early ninth century.


63. Dugdale, Manx Church Origins, 103.

as mentioned, the kings of Man brought Christian observances under the authority of the Roman Church.\textsuperscript{65} St. Patrick’s on Peel, established by Celí Dé, failed to survive, perhaps because Celtic monastic customs seemed too unorganized to the monks of the new Orders.\textsuperscript{66}

If Dugdale is correct in suggesting that St. Patrick sent out itinerant monks to keeills,\textsuperscript{67} this diffusion would have infringed upon the lands of the new bishopric and of Rushen. There would likely have been little desire for a site that might cause conflict with the new Roman Christian authority after Olaf I brought hierarchical oversight to Mann, and he may have disbanded the monastery himself. On the other hand, St. Maughold’s had strong ties to the cult of saints, which still existed throughout the island. St. Maughold, patron of the older site, enjoyed as much veneration on the island as did St. Columba.\textsuperscript{68} Furthermore, at least two miracles were associated with Maughold,\textsuperscript{69} and if there was anything that confirmed a site’s sanctity, it was miracles. Thus, St. Maughold’s remained

\textsuperscript{65} See Chapter IV, Section “Church Reforms on the Isle of Man,” 109-111.


\textsuperscript{67} Dugdale, \textit{Manx Church Origins}, 108-110.


\textsuperscript{69} See Chapter V, Section “Cult of Saints and Miracles,” 143-144.
and was in fact revered by the monks of the new Orders.\textsuperscript{70}

By the fourteenth century, as seen in the \textit{Furness Coucher Book}, the monastery had been turned into a parish church.\textsuperscript{71} I propose that Rushen profited from Maughold’s connection to the saints, as a Rushen eyewitness miracle was recorded, conveniently, soon after the mid-twelfth century account of Maughold’s miracle.\textsuperscript{72} Harald, son of Godred Don, forced the Manx chieftain (\textit{þang}), Donald, to escape persecution by taking sanctuary in the Abbey of St. Mary at Rushen. The king, however, lured him away with a promise of safe conduct, but imprisoned Donald in a prison near Mirescoge. Donald prayed to the Virgin Mary, and through her intercession, the guards became inattentive and his chains fell off immediately. He escaped and returned to the monastery of Rushen again, praising Mary and God. This account is recorded in a different hand than the main scribe, but the scribe recorded it as Donald himself told it: “This we have written just as we learned it from [Donald’s] mouth.”\textsuperscript{73} Once Rushen had a miracle story of its own recorded in the \textit{Manx Chronicle}, it allowed St. Maughold’s monastery to be closed and the building converted into a large

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{70} Chronicle of Man, f. 38 r. – f. 39 r; Jocelin of Furness, \textit{The Life and Acts of St. Patrick}, clii, 170.
\bibitem{72} Miracle at Rushen, \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 47 v. - f. 48 r. (1242.) See also Miracle of St. Maughold, \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 38 r. - f. 39 r, Chapter V, Section “Cult of Saints and Miracles,” 143.
\bibitem{73} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 48 r: \textit{Hec sicut abore eius didicimus scripsimus}. Broderick, \textit{Chronicle of Man}, ix: A second scribe wrote this section.
\end{thebibliography}
parish church, leaving Rushen as the preeminent monastery on the Isle of Man.

Monastic Houses Outside the Isle of Man

Galloway

The founder of Rushen Abbey, Olaf I, was married to the daughter of Fergus, Lord of Galloway.\textsuperscript{74} This Scoto-Norse lord had founded many reformed monasteries in his lands,\textsuperscript{75} some of which had received endowments from a few nobles of Mann.\textsuperscript{76} A case has been made that Fergus sponsored the foundation of the Cistercian monastery of Dundrennan in 1142 by monks of Rievaulx.\textsuperscript{77} Fergus is also given credit for first establishing the Premonstratensian Order in Scotland, when he founded the community at Soulseat in 1172.\textsuperscript{78} The ancient bishopric of Galloway, Whithorn, was revived in 1128 under the influence of Fergus,\textsuperscript{79} who

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{74} Chronicle of Man, f. 35 v.; William Sacheverell, “Barony of Saint Trinian in Kirk Marown,” in Journal of the Manx Museum IV, no. 60 (1940) 175-176.
\item \textsuperscript{76} Stringer, The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria, 42-48. Reginald; Bishop Nicholas of Meaux; Bishop Simon; Olaf II: their charters can be found in Stringer’s appendix.
\item \textsuperscript{77} Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 74-5; McDonald, “Scoto-Norse Kings and the Reformed Religious Orders,” 197. Eassons states that David or Fergus could have founded Dundrennan, while McDonald makes a case for only Fergus.
\item \textsuperscript{78} McDonald, “Scoto-Norse Kings and the Reformed Religious Orders,” 197; Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 102; Laurent Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés (Mâcon: Protat frères, 1939), 3070.
\end{itemize}
also eventually founded a reformed house of Augustinian canons there, which in 1175 became a Praemonstratensian abbey.\(^{80}\) In his preference for reformed Orders, Fergus may have been influenced by current waves at court, by Ælred of Rievaulx, or even by marital connections with his son-in-law Olaf I, who had also given land for Rushen Abbey.

When the bishopric of Whithorn was first revived in 1128, the Bishop of the Isles, Wimund from Furness, may have felt his authority was being encroached upon.\(^{81}\) Although, as the bishopric of the Isles was created later, this seems likely that he needed an excuse to invade Scottish lands. Wimund’s claim that he was the earl of Moray’s son led to a series of expeditions into Southern Scotland.\(^{82}\) Wimund demanded tribute from the bishop of Whithorn, Gille Aldan, and when he did not receive it, attacked Whithorn. Gille Aldan prevailed and Wimund was captured, mutilated, and sent to Byland Abbey, an estranged daughter house of Furness.\(^{83}\)

Further associations between the two regions proved more hospitable.


\(^{81}\) Richard Oram, The Lordship of Galloway, (Edinburgh, 2000), 164-76.


\(^{83}\) William of Newburgh, Historia rerum anglicarum, ed. Howlett, 1.24: “Of bishop Wimund, his life unbecoming a bishop, and how he was deprived of his sight.”
Grants of land and fishing rights passed from the Isle of Man to Whithorn.\(^8^4\) Between 1210 and 1247, Manx kings and bishops granted or confirmed grants to Whithorn Priory, of St. Ninian’s church of Ballacgniba (later named St. Trinian), about one hundred and forty acres in the parishes of Kirk Marown and Kirk German, the Hospital at Ballacgniba, Balhamer, and St. Ronan’s (the old church of Kirk Marown).\(^8^5\) These grants of churches in the Isle of Man forged strong ties between Galloway and the Kings of Mann.

**England**

Manx kings gave lands and privileges to monastic houses in England other than Furness Abbey. Henry, the son of David I of Scotland, founded the Cistercian monastery of Holm Cultram near Carlisle, in Cumbria, in 1150.\(^8^6\) Between 1154-1260, the Manx kings Godred, Reginald, Olaf II, and Magnus issued many grants and confirmations of commercial rights and privileges to Holm Cultram.\(^8^7\) Holm Cultram’s monks also enjoyed freedom from tolls and

---


fishing rights in the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{88}

Godred granted lands at Eschedale and Asmundertofes to the Benedictine Priory of St. Bees on St. Bees Head, the geographically closest English land to the Isle of Man. In exchange for the land of Euastad, near Ballure, and the church of St. Olaf at Lezayre (both together on a narrow piece of land in Ramsey area), Godred gave the monks the lands of Eschedale and Ballelin (both larger lands in the south Ramsey area).\textsuperscript{89} King Reginald of Mann confirmed these lands c. 1154, and added to them half of the lands of Ormeshan (near Port Cornaa).\textsuperscript{90} Olaf II granted the monks of St. Bees license to purchase in Mann each year sixty oxen (or the equivalent in sheep or pigs).\textsuperscript{91} St. Bees also held land near Maughold Head, within sight of St. Bees on a clear day.\textsuperscript{92} Although in England, this priory held an important position in the Isle of Man as a landed Baron because its land holding gave it a monastic presence.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{89} The Register of the Priory of St. Bees, ed. J. Wilson (Durham, Surtees Soc. 126, 1915), no. 43, 497. See also Caine, “Notes on the Manx Monasteries,” 60; McDonald, Manx Kingship in Its Irish Sea Setting, 196.

\textsuperscript{90} The Register of the Priory of St. Bees, ed. J. Wilson, no. 44, 497. See McDonald, Manx Kingship in Its Irish Sea Setting, 196.

\textsuperscript{91} The Register of the Priory of St. Bees, ed. J. Wilson, no. 45, 497. See also McDonald, Manx Kingship in Its Irish Sea Setting, 196; Stringer, The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria, 26.

\textsuperscript{92} Stringer, The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria, 26.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid.
Aruggil

Another prominent Gaelic-Norse figure, Somerled of Argyll (c. 1115-1164; r. 1158-1164), had an impact on the monasteries of the Irish Sea. Somerled began a resurgence of Iona’s religious community based on traditional Irish monastic customs. While Somerled was a traditionalist, his son Reginald founded monasteries of the new reform Orders. Reginald placed Benedictine monks in the monastery at Iona and also founded a house of Augustinian canonesses there. He installed his sister, Beatrice, as the first prioress there. Somerled and his son may have desired to return Iona to its ancient position of authority. If so, their hope came close to materializing when the bishopric of Man and Sodor was vacant after the drowning of bishop-elect Laurence in 1247, when the abbot of Iona gained control of the bishopric. Innocent IV decreed that Iona

---

94. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 35 v. Somerled, Ruler of Argyll, and for a short time the Isles (1154-1164). He married a daughter of Olaf I, King of Man, and had four sons by her: Dougal, Reginald, Angus, and Olaf. The *Chronicle of Man* calls this marriage the cause of the collapse of the entire Kingdom of Man (*que fut causa ruine to tius regni insularum*).


govern during this time and temporarily authorized “the abbot of the venerable monastery of St. Columba in the Sodor diocese” the “use of the mitre and ring.”

In 1207, Reginald provided a site for the foundation of Saddell Abbey above Carradale bay in the Kintyre peninsula of Scotland. This abbey, the only Cistercian house founded in the west highlands, had connections with Rushen and was once mistakenly thought to have been colonized by monks from Rushen Abbey. Its relations with Mellifont in Ireland, especially Mellifont’s right of confirming Saddell’s abbot, give modern scholars reason to affirm that its motherhouse was in fact Mellifont.

Ireland

Relations between the nobles of the Irish Sea led to the foundation of

100. “Innocent IV” in Arch. See. Vatican Epistulae 55 trans. in Chronica Rogum Mannia, et Insularum ed. P. A. Munch (Douglas: Manx Society, 1874); A. MacQuarrie, Iona through the Ages (Society of West Highland & Island Historical Research, 1983), 15.


102. Ibid.


several monasteries in Ireland, in addition to those of Galloway and Argyll. Reginald of Argyll granted protection to the monks of St. Mary’s Abbey in Dublin, both on land and on sea, wherever he ruled. St. Mary’s was originally founded in 846 as a Benedictine house and became a Savigniac house in 1139 under the influence of St. Malachy and in 1147 became Cistercian. Bangor and Sabal (two abbeys in Co. Down, Ireland, which are usually united in Manx ventures) held a barony in the Isle of Man which consisted of land, originally seven quarterlands, in Kirk Patrick.

Affreca, the daughter of Godred II, king of Man, married John de Courcy, the Lord of Ulster, in 1180. Legend has it that while she was crossing the Irish Sea to Ireland, a storm arose and put the ship in danger. Affreca prayed that if they survived she would found a monastery in Ireland, and in 1193, she founded Grey Abbey in County Down. The abbey was


107. Caine, “Notes on the Manx Monasteries,” 60

108. *Chronicle of Man* f. 39 v., f 41 r. John de Courcy was an English lord and friend to Kings of Man, Godred II and his successor, Reginald. He married Godred II’s daughter, Affrica, and they resided in Co. Down, Ireland.

109. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 41 r.


colonized by Cistercian monks from Holm Cultram in Cumbria and was its only
daughter house.\textsuperscript{112} Grey Abbey became a significant source of affluence for its
motherhouse and other monasteries on the Irish Sea, spiritually as well as
economically. Twice, Grey Abbey supplied Holm Cultram with an abbot.\textsuperscript{113}

John de Courcy founded Inch Abbey on Strangford Lough for the few
remaining monks of Erenagh (Iniscourcy, the Celtic monastic house) in 1180,\textsuperscript{114}
the same year in which he married Affreca. Inch may have influenced his
decision to invite Furness Abbey to build its monastery and to supply additional
inmates.\textsuperscript{115} Furness soon replaced the Irish religious community with reformed
English monks and refused to accept Irishmen into their ranks.\textsuperscript{116} Apparently the
prohibition was not observed, as the early rules at Inch Abbey seem, at the least,
to have been lax, for in 1228, Stephen of Lexington, the Cistercian appointed
visitor of Ireland, visited Inch and mandated that no Gaelic abbot be appointed,

\textsuperscript{112} L. McKeown, \textit{The Monastic Houses of Co. Down}, 3; Gwynn and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland}, 134; Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 37


\textsuperscript{115} Gwynn and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland}, 132 and Carville,
“Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 37.

\textsuperscript{116} “Inch Abbey,” at \textit{The Cistercians in Yorkshire}, accessed April 14, 2008,
no meat be eaten, lay brothers not converse with monks, lay people not be allowed within the enclosure, and no monk speak to a woman at the monastery gate.\textsuperscript{117} If true, these were all were serious infractions of the Cistercian Rule. Stephen did submit Suir (Inishlounaught), Waterford, to the oversight of Furness Abbey,\textsuperscript{118} installing a Furness monk as abbot but not expelling the Gaelic monks.\textsuperscript{119} This must have caused some conflict as the prior was banished by August\textsuperscript{120} and the new abbot warned by Stephen to keep calm.\textsuperscript{121}

The Relationship amongst Reformed Monasteries in the Irish Sea Region

Political Patronage

The friendly relations between the monasteries surrounding the Irish Sea did not result only from ties of filiation: otherwise, a Cistercian monastery like Rushen would not have donated land and bestowed favors on a Augustinian

\textsuperscript{117} Ward et al., \textit{Inch Abbey}, 37. She does not mention her source for Stephen and I could not find within his letters, my references found are to Inishlounaught.

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Stephen of Lexington: Letters from Ireland 1218-1229}, trans. and ed. Barry W. O’Dwyer (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1982), no. 6, 24-5 “we transfer to the house of Furness the full possession of whatsoever rights and powers are known to obtain in relation to a daughter house according to the rules of our Order.” See also Gwynn and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland}, 135.

\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Stephen of Lexington}, n 15, 34-6. “You should not be surprised that we did not apply ourselves to expel the Irish...it would be against your interests and that of the Order. For it is necessary that we eradicate them little by little and in stages lest perchance the beasts of the field increase in number against us.”

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Stephen of Lexington}, n 66, 130-1. “Do not receive Brother D, who was prior into your house in the future. If you consider it advantageous and if it will be for your peace, place old Brother J. in charge of the guest service.”

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Stephen of Lexington}, n 66, 130-1. “Do not disparage... and to not allow them [Justicar and Irish] to be disparaged in your hearing, no matter what they say or do, lest perhaps they be incensed against you or yours on this account; but armed always with patience and kindness.”
(later Premonstratensian) house like Whithorn or with a Benedictine priory such as St. Bees. Their shared noble patrons contributed to their association. Viking rulers had many reasons for establishing and endowing monasteries in the Irish Sea region beyond spiritual benefits. The twelfth-century revival of monasticism coincided with the reemergence of Viking control of the Isles in the “Second Viking Age” and created fertile ground for the establishment of the reformed Orders who thrived in frontier regions.

The foundation patterns and connections between patrons demonstrate the close political relationships amongst the leading aristocracy of the Irish Sea region. Either Rushen in 1134 or Whithorn priory, if the Whithorn Augustian priory was indeed founded around the time the Whithorn bishopric was revived in 1128, was the first of the new monastic houses to be founded by a regional king. The first political relationship was formed between Fergus and Olaf I when Olaf wed Fergus’ daughter, Africa. However, Fergus had known Ælred of Rievaulx from the court of David I, which Ælred left in 1134 to enter the

---

122. See the section on Galloway and England above, 144-47.

123. There is no reference to the date of foundation to the Augustinian priory. A few secondary sources date 1144 but that is non-conclusive without primary sources. Archibald Duncan, Scotland: Making of the Kingdom, The Edinburgh History of Scotland 1 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd), 268; Barrow, Kingdom of the Scots: Government, Church and Society from eleventh to the fourteenth century (Edinburgh: Edward Arnold), 196-7; William Croft Dickinson, A Source Book of Scottish History: Form earliest times to 1424 (London: Nelson, 1952), 45. Easson only includes it under Praemonstrastensien but mentions an unknown dated Augustian past. Easson, Medieval Religious Houses Scotland, 101.

monastery of Rievaulx,\textsuperscript{125} and this connection was almost certainly known to Olaf. The land for Rushen was first given to Rievaulx,\textsuperscript{126} probably for the same reason it was given to Furness: because the “reputation of your sanctity spread throughout the whole world.”\textsuperscript{127} Just like Bernard of Clairvaux on the continent, Ælred may have influenced the prominent regional lords around the Irish Sea.

**Trade among Irish Sea Monasteries**

Many of the monasteries located on the coast of the Irish Sea had filiation ties with houses in England, which fostered economic relations between these monasteries: Rushen and Inch from Furness,\textsuperscript{128} Grey from Holm Cultram,\textsuperscript{129} and Dundrennan from Rievaulx.\textsuperscript{130} The Cistercians frequently traversed sea routes between England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, and the Isle of Man to import and export goods.\textsuperscript{131} Inter-monastic trading on a similar scale and the commercial


\textsuperscript{129} Gwynn and Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland*, 135


exploitation of donated lands had not been seen before in the Irish Sea region: no secular trade in the Isles was as extensive as that of the White Monks.132

Importing and exporting across the Irish Sea was a perilous venture; there was the sea itself, with its treacherous winds and waves, and rocky shores that could sink a straying vessel, not to mention the main danger, pirates.133 The Manx monks had to request the permission of the Crown to import or export certain goods from or to England.134 They also required safe conduct (a convoy or guard) or protection (a writ or passport) from the crown.135 Owing to the omnipresent threat of piracy, many travelled in a convoy with two of their own ships.136

**Imports from Ireland**

Extant lists of trade goods reveal the items that monastic houses of Britain and Scotland imported from Irish ones. Furness and Holm Cultram imported from Ireland such edibles as wheat, corn, and flour.137 Whithorn and


133. Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 44.


136. Ibid, 44-47. The ships of the abbey were galleys of either forty or sixty oars. (Carville, 44).

Dundrennan both also imported Irish wheat.\footnote{Stringer, \textit{The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria}, 30-1.}

There were three main centers of medieval monastic trade in Ireland: Strangford Lough, Dublin, and Drogheda. Strangford Lough was the most active area of commerce, importing food, and then Drogheda, located near an emporium importing items such as yarn, hides, cloth, pottery, and metals. From what is seen in extant documents, St. Mary’s, the Savigniac/Cistercian house in Dublin, seems to have been the least of these, importing only fish.\footnote{Gwynn and Hadcock, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: Ireland}, 130; Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 53.}

Three Cistercian monasteries existed on the banks of Strangford Lough (probably in violation of the regulation of the Order that monasteries were to be at least ten miles apart):\footnote{“The Instituta General Capituli,” in \textit{Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Citeaux}, ed. Waddell, C, 469. XXXIII De vicinitate abbatiaiarum. See note 41.} Grey, Inch, and Comber. It was demonstrated above\footnote{See Chapter V, Section "Ireland," 152-155.} how important political matters were in the foundation of an abbey of the new Orders at Strangford Lough; below we shall show how the new Orders were also connected with the Cistercian trade routes. To reach the Lough from England by sea could take only one day, and from Mann only six hours.\footnote{Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 41.} The three monastic houses all supplied English houses with a vast resource of fish and salt
Drogheda was more associated with commerce such as tile exports, but also imported wheat and other victuals.\textsuperscript{144}

**Exports from England and Mann**

It is more difficult to ascertain the commodities that the English and Scottish monastic houses sent to Ireland and Mann; most evidence has been found through archaeological discoveries, and although there are a few documents that recorded the manifests of a galley storage-hold, it is known that Furness sent iron ore and building stone along with masons to Ireland.\textsuperscript{145} Furness owned two furnaces for the smelting of iron ore, which was one of their principal commodities along with decorated building material,\textsuperscript{146} and was granted use of mines in Mann.\textsuperscript{147}

St. Bee’s and Holm Cultram also had a good trade economy in Mann.\textsuperscript{148}

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid, 54-57. The archaeological remains of medieval nets show that vast catches of fish were pulled from the Lough, giving the monks a large supply. Environmental archaeology shows that a fringe of salt marsh supplied them with boundless salt.

\textsuperscript{144} Furness Abbey held lands in Ireland at Drogheda south of the River Boyne: Beymore, Bey Beg, Colp West, Colp East, Donacarney Little, Donacarney Great, and Morington. Walter de Lacy, the Lord of Meath, granted ninety acres to Furness with a tower, a mill, and fishing boat at Morington. Furness also owned shops within the walls of the medieval city of Drogheda, which shows their commercialism. Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 60 and Stringer, *The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria*, 31-35).

\textsuperscript{145} Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 49. Some masons’ marks at Inch and Furness are identical.

\textsuperscript{146} Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 38, 49-47.


\textsuperscript{148} Stringer, *The Reformed Church in Medieval Galloway and Cumbria*, 25.
Their exports would most likely have been in fish; Stringer states that no fewer than five kings of Man gave fishing rights and protection to these two abbeys. That Rushen, being local, had this right as well, may have caused some friction, except that St. Bees and Holm Cultram probably would have used Ramsey port, which was closer to their Manx lands rather than Ronaldsway, Peel, or Douglas used by Rushen, and would have been more in conflict with each other. Rushen Abbey controlled a lead smeltry near Ronaldsway, a southern port on Mann. Rushen also had a lively economy in agriculture and livestock as well as its stone quarries and lead and iron mines. Being placed strategically in the middle of the Irish Sea trade routes, Rushen probably had a more lucrative emporium than others in the area.

**Rushen Abbey’s Relationship with Geographically Close Monastic Houses**

On the Isle of Man, Rushen Abbey was the most important religious house. Its foundation marked the end of Celtic religious communities such as the Céli Dé kēeills that had spread across the island. Foundations, for instance, the Céli Dé center on St. Patrick’s on Peel Island and St. Leoc’s in Ballasalla, died out or may have been suppressed in favor of the Roman tradition. St. Maughold’s

---

149. Ibid, 26. Stringer does not give the charters for the five kings.


152. See Chapter V, Sections “St. Leoc,” 133-135 and “Survival of Celtic Christianity on Mann,” 144-147.
was the exception and survived because of its connections to the cult of saints and its two recorded miracles, both of which continued to be revered at least until Rushen had its own miracle. Rushen increased its influence by acquiring lands at Mirescoge and assisting the establishment of the Cistercian house of nuns at Douglas. From its foundation, Rushen held a strong position on the Isle of Man, which only increased throughout the Crovan dynastic period.

Rushen and trade relations, filial ties, and common regional noble patrons placed Rushen Abbey within a friendly monastic network. Of these, patronage and trade were especially important to the frontier monasteries founded in the Irish Sea region in solidifying their position as an influential establishment. The close relationships of royal patrons to their monastic houses often led to further endowments and to the establishment of local monasteries as well as the foundation of houses throughout the Irish Sea region. The close ongoing connections between Manx and the border reformed monasteries encouraged a regional trade system spanning the Irish Sea. These connections benefited

153. See Chapter V, Section “Cult of Saints and Miracles,” 143-144.
154. See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Christianity on Mann,” 144-147.
156. See Chapter V, Section “Political Patronage,” 155-157.
157. Ibid.
158. See Chapter V, Section “Monastic Houses outside the Isle of Man,” 147-155.
159. See Chapter V, Section “Trade among Irish Sea Monasteries,” 157-161.
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Rushen Abbey and the other Irish Sea monasteries by giving more economic stability to their houses in a frontier region.
CHAPTER VI

RUSHEN ABBEY’S RELATIONSHIP WITH SECULAR POWERS

Patrons of Rushen Abbey

Royal Patronage and Land Grants

Land gifts and privileges given to Rushen and its motherhouse Furness are recorded in The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys as the “dona,” one of the Latin words for gifts or grants. The monks used this particular term to signify lands that had been donated. King Olaf I of Man initiated the royal patronage of both Rushen and Furness by donating to Furness land on Mann for Rushen Abbey and simultaneously establishing the bishopric of the Isles. Olaf I gave land to Furness to found Rushen in free and perpetual alms, commonly referred to as “dona.”

1. See Appendix Table 1, p. 245 and Figure 2, p.249.


to by the term *frankalmoigne*. This gift was the keystone of Olaf I’s religious reforms, and in giving it he explicitly stated that his foundation would allow the Catholic faith to “be more perfectly and more strictly observed.” A bull of Pope Eugenius III in 1153 describes the area of land in Mann which had been given by Olaf I to Furness as “the lands of Carneclet as far as the monastery of St. Leoc, with their appurtenances, the village of Thorefil Asser, the village of Great Melan, the village of St. Melii, the village of Narwe, Stainredale, with their appurtenances, the land of St. Corebric and Fragerw.” How much of this land was initially given to Furness and later transferred to the established Rushen Abbey is not known, because the Celtic St. Melii and St. Leoc were within Rushen’s boundaries as described in the papal bull. It is probable, given the

---

4. *Frankalmoigne* comes from the Norman French *fraunch aumoyne*, “free alms,” meaning giving land in free and perpetual alms; sometimes called tenure by free alms, this was a tenure held in perpetuity on the promise by a religious organization holding lands given to them and their successors forever usually in compensation of praying for the soul of the donor and his heirs.


8. Olaf I granted the lands of “Carneclet as far as the monastery of St. Leoc with all its appendices” in “Bull of Eugenius III to Furness Abbey. A. D. 1153,” in *The Coucher Book* 1:3, 591-5. The parish Malew begot its name from an early Celtic missionary, St. Leoc: Thomas West, *The Antiquities of Furness; or, An account of the Royal Abbey of St. Mary, in the vale of Nightshade, near Dalton in Furness, belonging to the Right Honourable Lord George Cavendish* (London: T. Spilsbury,
bull’s date of 1153, that at least some of the above mentioned land, if not most, was granted at Rushen’s foundation.

The first act of Godred II on his accession in 1154 was to confirm the charter of his father, Olaf I, for “it is the duty of good children to follow in the footsteps of religious parents.”9 In addition to confirming the land gift to Rushen, Godred II granted Furness land at Escedala, on the outskirts of Onchan near Douglas.10 Once his throne was secure, Godred II married Fingola,11 the daughter of MacLoughlin, son of Muirchertach, King of Munster.12 He had already been living with her for many years and they were most likely married in a Celtic “handfasted” fashion, which did not require a priest and so was not acceptable to the reformed Church.13 Handfast marriages in which couples were


12. Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 78. MacLoughlin, son of Muirchertach (c. 1050 – c. 10 March 1119), King of Munster and later self-declared High King of Ireland, was the great-great-grandson of Brian Boru.

betrothed for one year and a day were common, even among royalty, before the general acceptance of Roman customs. In 1176, Vivian, the Cardinal Legate of the Apostolic See under Alexander III, while on his way to Ireland, spent a fortnight in Mann and learned of this “illicit” union. Therefore, in 1176, Silvanus, Abbot of Rievaulx, joined the two by the sacred rite of matrimony. On the day of the wedding, Godred II gave Abbot Silvanus a piece of land at Mirescoge, which was later given to the abbey of St. Mary at Rushen.

Reginald, eldest son of Godred II, also confirmed Olaf I’s charter and its land grants and privileges. In a charter of 1188, Reginald granted to Furness the lands of Ormeshan, and in return for the grant, he declared he desired the “salvation of my soul, and of the souls of all my kindred and friends.” Later,


15. Chronicle of Man, f. 40 r. See also Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 78.

16. Chronicle of Man, f. 40 r. See also Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 78.


other kings had similar requests for salvation of the soul in mind for their grants to Furness and Rushen. In 1219, following the 1213 surrender by John King of England of Kingdom of England to the pope in fee for 1000 marks, Reginald of Mann presented the Kingdom of the Isles and Man to the pope as a fief. Pandulph, bishop of Norwich, Honorious III’s legate, oversaw the transaction. By the terms of this letter, Reginald and his heirs were to hold the Isles in fee from the Holy See in perpetuity for the rent of twelve marks sterling to be paid Furness Abbey every year on the feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary.

Reginald and Olaf II, the youngest son of Godred II, vied for kingship in the early part the thirteenth century. Olaf II claimed to be the rightful heir of the Kingdom of the Isles and Man, on the grounds that his parents had been married in the Church and that he had been publically proclaimed as heir apparent. How much truth there was in these claims is uncertain; the Manx Chronicle may have stated this to assert the legitimacy of the lineage descended


25. Chronicle of Man, f. 40 r. - f. 44 v.
from Olaf II because the person who commissioned the Manx Chronicle perhaps belonged to that line. When Godred II died, Olaf II was still young, and Reginald became king by acclamation of the consent of the Manx people. As king, Reginald strengthened his political ties with the Church, issuing grants to parishes, abbeys, and the papacy. Reginald’s brother, Olaf II, after civil war, began to co-rule with Reginald in 1223 and was often at odds with Furness Abbey. He did not renew the charter of the first Olaf and showed disrespect for the Church outright on at least one occasion. Olaf II was brusque and even threatened the dean and chapter of York in an attempt to get his bishop-elect consecrated, but was not successful. Yet at his death, Olaf II was buried at

26. George Broderick, Chronicle of the Kings of Man and the Isles (Douglas: Manx National Heritage, 1996), vii-ix and R. Andrew McDonald, “Rognvldr, Olaf and the Manx war: family, succession, and kin-strife in Man and the Isles,” in Manx Kingship in its Irish Sea Setting 1187-1229 (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 99-100. If a Manx King commissioned the chronicle, Godred II is the only plausible person to have commissioned it sometime before his death in 1187. (The monks would never have spoken of Reginald’s wife as seminatrix if Reginald commissioned it and Olaf II is too late as there are eyewitness accounts through the Reginald and Olaf strife, during which Reginald controlled Mann.)

27. Chronicle of Man, f. 40 r.

28. Chronicle of Man, f. 43 r.

29. Olaf II attempted to elect his own bishops without referring to Furness or Rushen, even when his brother Reginald was King. See Chapter VI, Sections “A Tale of Two Bishops,” 189-193 and “Civil War” below, 193-199; and notes 134; 149; 152.


Rushen Abbey; no doubt the monks still considered burying the king a duty owed to their original founder and the royal family.32

The next king, Harald, in 1245 reconfirmed earlier confirmations of the abbey charters and made it known that he was the protector of all the “religious and secular people”33 and goods of the abbey. The next year, he issued another charter of renewal for “the salvation of my soul, and of those of all my ancestors and successors, for a free, pure, and perpetual alms.”34 This charter also authorized the use of “all kinds of mines” and “free transit” throughout the Kingdom of the Isles with no taxation, but “free from toll and all other custom.”35

The renewal of the extraordinary mine grant made by Harald in 1246 is the only other extant grant to Furness or Rushen from the Crovan kings. Magnus, last of the Crovan line, followed Harald as king of the Isles for a short time and made a grandiose grant to the bishopric, yet no extant charter records any gifts to the abbeys. Magnus’ presence at the dedication of St. Mary’s Church of Rushen Abbey in 1257 does, however, suggest that the royal family continued


to patronize the abbey, or at least visit on formal occasions.

The Bishopric and Its Connection with Rushen

Olaf I, King of Man, began Manx royal patronage of both Rushen and Furness and simultaneously established the bishopric of the Isles in 1134.\textsuperscript{36} Having been raised in the English court,\textsuperscript{37} Olaf I desired a complete reform from the Celtic belief system of the Isles to the organized religion of the Papal See.\textsuperscript{38} He also wanted an episcopal see situated in his domain and Wimund, as the first bishop, was chosen from amongst the inmates of Furness and Rushen to spread the Catholic faith amongst the inhabitants of the Kingdom of the Isles.\textsuperscript{39}

The charter of Olaf I, which established the bishopric of the Isles, gave the abbot and chapter of Furness a unique electoral right.\textsuperscript{40} The abbot and his prior


\textsuperscript{37} Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in The Story of Rushen Castle, 51; Benjamin Hudson, Irish Sea Studies, 900-1200 (Dublin: Fourt Courts Press, 2006), 226; Chronicle of Man, f. 35 r.


journeyed to Mann to consult with the king concerning the new bishopric and there received Olaf’s grant of land enabling Furness to found Rushen Abbey on Mann.\textsuperscript{41} The abbot and prior of Furness are the first witnesses listed at the end of the charter and likely represented “the wise and ... the good” whose assent Olaf I sought in writing his charter.\textsuperscript{42} The lands were given in “free and perpetual alms” with no written request for recompense, although the royal family was already in the monks’ prayers as benefactors.\textsuperscript{43} It seems that Furness asked Rushen’s approval of their elect, and in 1217 the abbot, prior, and seven monks of Rushen, as well as the archdeacon of Man, testified that they approved of Nicholas of Meaux’s election.\textsuperscript{44} In later years, the abbot of Rushen was sometimes also elected as the Bishop of the Isles.\textsuperscript{45}

Furness’ right of election was royally confirmed by Manx kings Godred II Sodor,\textsuperscript{41}\textsuperscript{42}.


\textsuperscript{45} This occurred with the first bishop of Man, Wimund, sometime between 1134-40, then Nicholas of Meaux in 1217 and in 1348 with William Russell. Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v and 51 v. See also Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in The Story of Rushen Castle, 53 and “Introduction,” in The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey, ed. Brownbill, 2:3, xii.
in 1154 and Reginald in 1188, and by Pope Eugenius III in 1152, and re-confirmed by bulls of Urban III in 1186 and Celestine III in 1194. The election right was exercised by Furness Abbey with papal approval, therefore, during the civil war between Reginald and Olaf II, which increased political instability that threatened to infringe on Furness’ election rights.

**Elected Bishops during Crovan Dynasty**

A monk of Furness Abbey, Wimund (c. 1134-c. 1152), moved to the Isle of Man to work on the foundation of Rushen. He was chosen to be bishop by Furness, Olaf I, and the people of Man, and was accordingly consecrated by Archbishop Thurstan of York as the first of the Bishop of the Isles.

As bishop, Wimund changed his name to Malcolm MacHeth for his own

---


48. See Appendix Table 2, p. 246 and Table 3, p. 247.

49. The date of Wimund’s tenureship is unknown. Consecration occurred after the 1134 charters, while a new bishop was denied while he was still in office in 1148, and in 1152.

50. Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 116; Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in The Story of Rushen Castle, 53; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 115. It is uncertain if Wimund was the first abbot of Rushen or just one of the twelve founding monks.

purpose.\textsuperscript{52} Upon entering the bishopric, Wimund, as the earl of Moray’s son, claimed the earldom as his birthright.\textsuperscript{53} As a bishop and a nobleman, he gathered a host of men from the islands and led a series of expeditions to the southern lands of King David I.\textsuperscript{54} Bishop Wimund (Malcolm MacHeth) won some southern land and ruled it for a short time before he was seized by his own subjects, mutilated, and blinded.\textsuperscript{55} Exiled to the monastery of Byland, he told his story to William of Newburgh.\textsuperscript{56}

While completely absorbed in his quest for Scottish lands, Wimund undoubtedly neglected his insular diocese. Olaf I could hardly have been pleased with his new bishop.\textsuperscript{57} Furness and Rushen were probably mortified at the want of propriety of one who was their own monk and appointee. Olaf I appears to have attempted to procure a new bishop, yet his petition was rejected by the

\textsuperscript{52}Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 116; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 111.


\textsuperscript{54}William of Newburgh, Historia Rerum Anglicarum, ed. Howlett, 1:24. See also: Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 116; Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 65; Moore, History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man; Watt, "Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 111.


\textsuperscript{56}William of Newburgh, Historia Rerum Anglicarum, ed. Howlett, 1:24. The chronicler William of Newburgh gives a very detailed account of Bishop Wimund’s life.

\textsuperscript{57}Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117.
archbishop of York: Olaf’s nominees were a certain Nicholas (1148)\textsuperscript{58} and John (1152) to no avail and of whom nothing is known. Gamaliel (1154) became the first recognized bishop of the Isle after Wimund’s infamous episcopacy.\textsuperscript{60}

Bishop Reginald I (c. 1154-1170) was elected around the time Godred II became king. Reginald was a Norwegian and may have been named bishop by Godred II when Godred set sail from Norway to avenge the murder of his father, Olaf I.\textsuperscript{61} Reginald I was the first bishop to serve under the recently instituted metropolitan see of Nidaros and the first to recognize Norwegian suzerainty.\textsuperscript{62}

Reginald I is credited with starting the building of St. German’s Cathedral on St. 

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Dugdale, Monasticon Angelicanum, in ed. William Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 116. Two documents, both undated. The first, from Olaf I to “T, Archbishop of York,” states that he and the people had decided to elect a bishop from the Furness community and in the second from Olaf I to the Dean and Community of York, he makes threats if “Nicholas, our bishop elect,” is not “consecrated by the hands of your Archbishop.”
\item Roger of Wendover, Flowers of History 1237: A.D. 1151; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 116-7. Not known to have possessed his See. He was probably a candidate of the Archbishop of York who proved unacceptable to King Olaf. Roger of Wendover stated that John, a monk of Seez, was declared the 2nd Bishop of the Isles in 1151; which, in itself, is interesting since if Furness and Rushen were choosing the Bishop they would have chosen one of their own inmates. If this is to be believed at all, John would have had to be the king’s choice only, which would be a reason for York to disagree.
\item Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v. Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 117.
\item Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v. Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 117-8. The Norse bishop may have been placed in office by Godred II, who was a vassal of the King of Norway from 1152-53. Watt, bishops in the isles, 111
\item Early Sources of Scottish History, 500 to 1286, ed. A. O. Anderson, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1922), 381-2; O. Kolsrud, Den Norske Kirkes Erkebiskope og Biskoper indtil Reformationem (DN, xvii B, I Christiania, 1913), 321-2; Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v.: he was the first bishop of the Isles mentioned in Islandic Annals. See also Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 117-8.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Patrick’s Isle. It is also said that he instated a tithe to the bishopric. His successor, Christian (1170-1190), was consecrated at York, not Nidaros. Michael (c. 1194-c. 1203) followed Christian in being consecrated at York. At the same time, according to the Manx Chronicle, Nicholas of Argyll (1194-1217) was elected by the clergy and people of Mann despite the protests of the monks of Furness and Rushen and was consecrated by the archbishop of Dublin. The counterclaims of the two bishops caused the first major disturbance in the bishopric of the Isles; later this will be discussed at length. Nicholas was referred to in Icelandic annals as Koli. When Furness’ candidate, Michael, died, Nicholas de Meaux (c. 1217-c. 1226), the abbot of Furness, was elected by the monks of Furness in a bold assertion to assure their right of election would continue.

63. Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 77; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 117-8. It is unknown what size or type of cathedral or church this was, except that it was built in the same place as the St. Germans that Bishop Simon expanded during his term.

64. Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v. See also Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 77; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 117-8. The tithe was set in a three part division; one third went to the Monks of Rushen Abbey for education and the poor, one third to the bishop, and one third to the parish priests.

65. Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v. See also Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 118. Annals only mention Nicholas of Argyll and Bishop Reginald.


67. Chronicle of Man, f. 51 r. See also Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117 (28); Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 78. The discussion is continued below in Section “A Tale of Two Bishops,” 184-88.


By Reginald’s reign (1188-1226), the bishopric was almost as powerful as the king. In 1217, Bishop Reginald, nephew to Kings Reginald and Olaf II, was consecrated by the archbishop of York.\(^{70}\) Soon afterwards, Bishop Reginald (1217-1226) made a visitation of the churches of the Isles.\(^{71}\) Olaf was glad to greet him, his sister’s son, and ordered a feast to be prepared for him.\(^{72}\) At the time, Bishop Reginald declared that he would not eat with his uncle until the church dissolved Olaf’s unlawful marriage.\(^{73}\) Bishop Reginald asked his uncle, “Know you not that you lived long with the cousin of her whom you now have as your wife?”\(^{74}\) Olaf replied that he knew he was sleeping with his wife’s sister; Bishop Reginald canonically separated Olaf from Lauon.\(^{75}\)

The next Bishop of the Isles, Simon of Argyll (1229-1244), upon his consecration secured amiable relations between Norway and the King of Man, and enjoyed a peaceful episcopal tenure.\(^{76}\) Simon is best known for holding a diocesan synod at Kirk Braddan in 1229, at which thirteen canons dealing with

---

70. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 51 r.

71. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 42 r.

72. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 51 r.

73. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 42 r.

74. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 42 r. – f. 42 v. *Non communicabo tecum frater, donec ab illiciti matrimonii vinculo canolonice catholica te soluat ecclesia. Et addidit, An ignoras qua consobrinam mulieris quam nunc habes uxorem ante habuisti?*

75. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 42 r – f. 42 v.

76. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 51 r. See also Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 82.
wills and clergy dues were enacted.\textsuperscript{77} The only canon that affected Rushen was that “Of Vicars of the Religious,” which decreed that vicars were to be appointed by religious houses to the parishes churches they owned.\textsuperscript{78}

By Simon’s time, the bishopric was centered at two locations in Mann: St. German’s Cathedral on St. Patrick’s Isle and Bishopscourt, just north of Peel. Simon rebuilt or perhaps expanded the Cathedral of St. German on St. Patrick’s Island near Peel, which was considered the episcopal seat.\textsuperscript{79} The bishop’s residence, however, was at Bishopscourt in Kirk Michael, because it was “so well situated that it is possible to visit any part of his diocese and return the same day.”\textsuperscript{80} Bishop Simon also established the first cathedral chapter in the Isles because the arrangement with Furness had previously made a cathedral chapter a point of contention, which will be discussed more below.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{77} William Dugdale, ‘Rushen Abbey’ in Monasticon Angelicanum, vol 5. ed. Caley, Ellis, and Bandinel (London: 1825), 253-6; Oliver, Chronicon Manniae et Insularum in Monumenta de Insulas Manniae, vol. I. Manx Society 4 (Douglas: Manx Society, 1860), 175-201. See also Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 82; Moore, History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man. Most of the ecclesiastical statutes dealt with: (1) the fee for proving a will; (2) the effects of intestates; and (3) mortuary dues. There were also tithes on livestock, grain, beer, and woven cloth.

\textsuperscript{78} Dugdale, Monasticon Angelicanum, in ed. William Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 180; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man. This statute employs Alexander III’s “ad audientiam” in which it is directed that if the rector of the mother church neglected appointing a proper curate to the subject church, then the bishop must provide one. This statute only indicates appropriated churches.

\textsuperscript{79} Chronicle of Man, f. 50 v. Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 17; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man, 172.

\textsuperscript{80} Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 18; Moore, History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man. Both Ashley and Moore take the quote from Bishop Wilson's history: Bishop Wilson, ‘The History of the Isle of Man’ in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, Manx Society 18 (Douglas: Manx Society, 1871), 106.

\textsuperscript{81} “The Bull of Pope Gregory IX, 1231,” in Appendix, Proceedings of the Isle of Man
Secular Disputes Concerning Rushen Abbey

Metropolitans

York over Canterbury

When Olaf I founded Rushen Abbey, he also noted in the foundation charters his desire to establish a bishopric of the Isles on Mann under York. When Olaf I founded Rushen Abbey, he also noted in the foundation charters his desire to establish a bishopric of the Isles on Mann under York. The original charter petition establishing the bishopric of the Isles was sent to Thurstan, archbishop of York. Why Olaf would choose York over Canterbury, especially in light of his father’s, Godred Crovan, supposed oath of “canonical obedience to Canterbury” is not fully understood. Having been brought up at the court of William Rufus in England, Olaf I would have known of Canterbury’s historic primacy over York.

In 1070, the Norman Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury raised the issue of primacy for Canterbury over York and the entire English church after Thomas Natural History and Antiquarian Society, vol. 5, no. 1 (1948): 14. “Moreover, that which by the common consent of your Chapter, or the more sensible (sanioris) section of the Council, shall have been canonically ordained by you or your successors in your diocese, we wish to remain ratified and secure.” This will be further explored later in Chapter VI, Section “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207.


85. Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in The Story of Rushen Castle, 51; Chronicle of Man, f. 35 r.
of Bayeux had sought consecration as archbishop of York and claimed jurisdiction over the dioceses of Dorchester, Worcester, and Lichfield, all within Canterbury’s jurisdiction.\(^\text{86}\) The two archbishops traveled to Rome to consult Alexander II, who referred the matter back to England.\(^\text{87}\) Lanfranc made friends with King William the Conqueror, who held a council at Winchester in the presence of the papal legate on Easter 1072 and declared in favor of Lanfranc, ordering Thomas of York to make canonical profession to Canterbury, though Thomas avoided any reference to successors in his archbishopric having to vow obedience.\(^\text{88}\) In 1120, Callixtus II sent a bull to Archbishop Thurstan declaring that York did not owe canonical profession to Canterbury.\(^\text{89}\) Yet, still there was debate as Becket was able to procure a bull stating Canterbury’s primacy from Eugenius III.\(^\text{90}\)

Evidence for the choice of York is found in the words of Olaf’s letter to Thurstan:

The reputation of your sanctity spread throughout the whole


\(^{88}\) Thoyras, The History of England, 313; Cowdrey, Pope Gregory VII, 64.


\(^{90}\) Jaffé, Regesta pontificum romanorum, vol. 2, n. 11286.
world, which both the illustrious renown of your predecessors and your own virtue in private as well as public acts do not allow to remain hidden, has in no small degree rejoiced us. We praise therefore the wonderful works of the almighty king, giving him thanks, and we glorify the Lord for what he has done for you, who has exalted you in dignity and sanctity above all our neighbors. For the rest, we signify to you, that the lord Eudo, abbot of the monastery of Furness, from whose boundaries we are not far distant by sea, at our tripartite petition and persuasion, the fame of the religion of the said place having been reported to us, entered with confidence upon the arduous undertaking, and has come to us at great labor for the fruitful occupation of extending the church, under the inspiration of the almighty. Finally, it has been determined among us, both by our decree, and the solemn advice of the people, that a bishop should be chosen from among his people, who may direct the spread of Christianity through the Isles. Therefore we call upon you, and humbly implore the grace of your benevolence to ratify by the imposition of your hands, that which by common diligence has been so providentially procured to be done, to the honor of God and the salvation of our souls, namely, that our bishop may be promoted, as soon as possible, to the rank of bishop under the authority of your seal, for the love of God and of us. The lord Abbot therefore relating to us such wonderful and holy things of you, and saying that he was unwilling and unable to go to any other pious archbishop, but to you, his father, filled with great joy for all things, we have rendered thanks to God as far as we are able.

Olaf I first states that he has heard of the renown of Thurstan and York and

---

91. “Letter of Olave I. To the Archbishop of York,” in Monumenta de Insula Manniae, ed. Oliver, vol. 2, 4-6. Fama sanctitatis vestre orbem terrarum circumquaque pertingens, quam et majorum vestrorum insigne preconium et virtus vesta cum privatis turn publicis actibus illustris in abscondito latere non sinunt, nos quoque non parum letificavit. Collaudamus igitur Regis omnipotentis magnalia, gracias agentes ei, quia magnifica vit dominus facere vobiscum, qui vos super omnes vicinos nostros dignitate atque sanctitate exaltavit. De cetero significamus vobis, quod dominus abbas Eudo Furnensis cenobii a cujus finibus non longe per mare distamus, audientibus nobis famam religionis ejusdem loci, tripartita petizione, persuasioneque nostra iten quamvis arduum tarnen confidenter aggressus, compensato itaque et itinerandi onere laborioso, et labore super ecclesia dilatanda fructuoso, Domino aspirante, ad nos usque pervenit. Denique et nostro decreto et plebis consulti sanctum est inter nos, ut ex suis pontifex eligenter, qui christianitati per insulas gentium propagande preficeretur. Quapropter ad vos clamamus, vestrae que benignitatis graciarn humiliter implorarnus, quatius imposizione manuum vestrarum ratum fiat quod communidiligencia tam provide procuratum est sieni, ad honorem Dei, et salutem animarum nostrarum, scilicet, ut episcopus noster ad episcopi gradum sub auctonitatis vestre signaculo pro Dei amore et nostri, quam cicius sieni potest permoceatur. Narrante nobis igitur domino Abbate tam mira, tamque sancta de vobis, dicenteque se nolle nec posse ad alium quem piam ire, nisi ad vos patrem suum, gudio magno repleti pro universis, gracias Deo nostro prout potuimus, persolvimus.
closes the letter by identifying his source, Abbot Eudo of Furness, who had pressed him to seek the oversight of York rather than that of Canterbury. We can hypothesize that Eudo of Furness influenced the decision by refusing to accept anyone other than “his father,” Thurstan, of York. Olaf I was prudent enough to see that a connection that was beneficial for Furness Abbey would also benefit his kingdom; York was closer to the Isles than Canterbury and, being situated in North England, better equipped to handle the frontier region, and being near the border with Scotland also had to deal with situations similar to those faced by Olaf.

The Archbishopric of Nidaros

Toward the end of Olaf’s reign, the English civil war between Stephen and Matilda deprived Mann of its most powerful protector, the King of England. As a result, Olaf I’s upstart relations from Dublin with pretensions of gaining control of the kingdom were able to threaten the Isle of Man. This led Olaf to contact Norway in 1152 and send his son, Godred II, to do homage there to Inge Haraldsson. The disruption in politics interrupted the connection of the Manx church with the archbishopric of York and soon shifted ecclesiastical oversight officially to the new archdiocese of Nidaros.

92. Charles Frederick Partington, The British Encyclopaedia of the arts and sciences: including treatises on the various branches of natural and experimental philosophy, the useful and fine arts, mathematics, commerce, &c. (London: Orr & Smith, 1835), 738.

93. Chronicle of Man, f. 36 r. - f.36 v. Three sons of Harald, Olaf I’s abjured brother, who were raised in Dublin, gained forces to take power from Olaf I.

94. Chronicle of Man, f. 36 r. - f.36 v.
Norway itself was in disorder at the time. A period of anarchy followed the death of the Norwegian King, Harold Gille, in 1136, pertaining to the King’s three sons. Pope Eugenius III sent Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman and later Pope Adrian IV, as a legate to the distressed country in 1152. While in Norway, Nicholas founded the archiepiscopal See of Nidaros, which encompassed not only Norway but many outlying islands, including Iceland, Greenland, the Faroes, the Shetlands, the Orkneys and the Sudreys, which includes the Isle of Man. Godred II of Man, the heir of King Olaf, being in Norway at this time, probably took part in the transfer of the bishopric of the Isles from York to Nidaros. The new archbishopric was confirmed by Pope Anastastius IV on November 30, 1154; by that time, Godred II was King of the Isles. In 1253, Innocent IV confirmed and renewed the foundation bull of the See of Nidaros in extensor, and in 1266 another charter transferred rulership of

95. Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 74. Harold’s three sons, Inge, Sigurd, and Eystein had been creating civil unrest in Norway.


98. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 36 r. See also Ashley, *The Church in the Isle of Man*, 14; Watt, “Bishops in the Isles before 1203,” 111.


102. “Innocent IV. to the Chapter of the Church of the Sudreys; notifying the consecration
the Isle of Man to Scotland and affirmed Nidaros as its ecclesiastical metropolitan.¹⁰³

**York over Nidaros**

The monks at Furness and Rushen Abbey fought for English rather than Norwegian prelacy. The abbeys continued to have their bishops-elect consecrated at York instead of Nidaros.¹⁰⁴ Around 1154, Bishop Reginald I, being from Norway, was the first to recognize Norwegian suzerainty.¹⁰⁵ This Norse bishop may have been placed in office by Godred II, who from 1152-1153 had briefly been a vassal of the King of Norway.¹⁰⁶ The *Icelandic Annals* record Bishop Reginald I’s death as occurring in 1170.¹⁰⁷ The fact that they mentioned him at all was likely due to his submission to Nidaros.

After 1154, the consecration of bishops oscillated, curiously, between Dublin and York, not Nidaros. Nicholas of Argyll, influenced by Olaf II and despite the protests of the monks of Furness and Rushen,¹⁰⁸ was consecrated by

---


¹⁰⁵ *Chronicle of Man*, f. 36 r. See also Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 77.


¹⁰⁸ “Olaf, King of the Isles, desires Robert, dean, and the chapter of York, to send back to his people Nicholas, bishop, elected and consecrated. The monks of Furness raised objections.
the archbishop of Dublin in 1194.\textsuperscript{109} He was called Koli in the \textit{Icelandic Annals} and is one of the only bishops of the Isles mentioned.\textsuperscript{110} The \textit{Icelandic Annals} may have acknowledged the bishops consecrated at Dublin over those at York because the Dublin Vikings had familial connections to Iceland, whose writers would be interested in Hiberno-Norse relations.

Nicholas of Meaux, Abbot of Furness, was elected by the monks around 1217 and was consecrated probably at York.\textsuperscript{111} Simultaneously, Bishop Reginald II was consecrated at Dublin, probably at the instigation of Olaf II.\textsuperscript{112} In 1226, after the disturbance brought to the diocese by having two claimants to the episcopal seat of Mann and the Isles, Bishop Simon of Argyll restored ecclesiastical peace and secured amiable relations with Norway.\textsuperscript{113} Following Simon’s death in 1244 or 1247, Archdeacon Lawrence of Man was elected by the bishop of the monastic chapter and sent to Norway for approval by the king and

---

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Victoria History of the County of Lancashire,} 117 (28); Dempsey, \textit{The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man,} 78.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys,} ed. Peter Munch, note 54, 112.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey,} ed. Brownbill, 2:3, no. 3, 711. \textit{Furnensium vero clamor sive injusta querimonia vos nullatenus disturbet.}

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Theiner's Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum,} in Manx Society 33, no. 31 (Douglas), 296-8.

\textsuperscript{113} \textit{The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys,} ed. Peter Munch, note 56, 243-46. Dempsey, \textit{The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man,} 82. There is no mention of where Simon was consecrated.
consecration by the archbishop.\textsuperscript{114} The king and bishop-elect drowned on the way back to Mann, however, and a new election was not held again.\textsuperscript{115}

Although Nidaros was the metropolitan for the bishopric since 1152, bishops were still consecrated at York, as well as at Dublin. In 1244, Innocent IV issued a bull confirming that the Bishop of the Isles was ordinarily to be consecrated “by the Archbishop of York or the Archbishop of Nidaros, according to the change of occasion.”\textsuperscript{116} Furthermore, the pope stated, the archbishop of York should be allowed to consecrate candidates presented by Furness as “the Church of Nidaros is very remote from the Church of Man and separated from it by a perilous sea.”\textsuperscript{117} The next Bishop of the Isles, Richard, was consecrated in 1253 by Innocent IV while the archbishop of Nidaros was in Rome.\textsuperscript{118} In this way, the pope ended the metropolitan controversy between Nidaros and York. This was significant as the different metropolitans had a role in creating multiple claimants to the bishopric and therefore confusion. Thereafter the Bishops of the

\textsuperscript{114} Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117 (27); Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 19.

\textsuperscript{115} Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v.

\textsuperscript{116} “Innocent IV. to the Archbishop of York; giving him Faculty to consecrate the Bishop-Elect of Man,” no. 19 in “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch (Douglas: 1860), 309-10. quem interdum Eboracensis, aliquando vero Nidrosiensis archiepiscopus consecrate pro varietate temporum consuevit...

\textsuperscript{117} “Innocent the IV to the Archbishop of York,” no. 19 in “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 309-10. Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 14. pro eo maxime quod ecclesia Nidrosiensis multam est ab eadem ecclesia periculosissimi maris interjectione remota.

\textsuperscript{118} Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 88; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man; “Vatican Archives,” in Manx Society 22 (Douglas), 315-16.
Isles were invariably consecrated by the pope or by a papal representative, such as a cardinal in the case of John Dongan in 1387 and John Spoten in 1392.  

**Electoral Right of Bishopric**

The only true dissent between the kings of Mann and the abbots of Furness and Rushen arose over the rights of episcopal election. Controversy first arose in the thirteenth century after two kings, Godred II in 1154 and Reginald in 1188, and two popes, Eugenius III in 1153 and Urban II in 1186, had confirmed the 1134 charter of Olaf I assigning electoral right to the Abbey of Furness. The issuance of each of the papal and royal confirmations followed significant events: the charters of both kings, Godred II in 1154, and Reginald in 1188, were

---


issued after they had inherited and secured their title as King of Man. Eugenius III’s confirmation of Olaf I’s “Charter of Olave” around 1153 was probably issued in response to the unstable climate in which Furness found itself during the civil war between Stephen and Matilda in England and in the frontier land of Cumbria. Urban II’s confirmation in 1186 of Olaf’s “Charter of Olave” was issued around the time of Godred II’s death. Each event would have spurred Furness and Rushen to seek papal and royal confirmation of their properties and privileges.

The years following Godred II’s death were not peaceful. Discord grew between his eldest son, Reginald, King of the Isles, and his younger half-brother, Olaf II. When Reginald became king, he sent Olaf II to William, King of Scotland, and Olaf II remained there as a prisoner until the Scottish king died in 1214. Reginald then granted Olaf the island of Lewis and married him to Lavon, the sister of his own queen and a cousin of Olaf II’s first wife.

125. Chronicle of Man, f. 36 v. and f. 40 r.
129. McDonald, “Rognvldr, Olaf and the Manx war: family, succession, and kin-strife in Man and the Isles,” in Manx Kingship in its Irish Sea Setting 1187-1229, 70-100; Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117.
130. Chronicle of Man, f. 42 r.
131. Chronicle of Man, f. 42 r. See also West, The Antiquities of Furness, 128.
events eventually led to quarrels that impinged upon the rights of the bishopric and of the abbey, and led to appeals to Rome.

**A Tale of Two Bishops**

In 1194, Olaf II, while still a prisoner at Scotland but considering himself the rightful King of Man, attempted, when Bishop Christian died, to install a new bishop, Nicholas of Argyll, in the Manx See by having him consecrated at Dublin.\(^{132}\) Nicholas of Argyll must have attempted but been refused assent at York, for Olaf II had sent a very rude letter to the dean and chapter of York demanding his choice be consecrated immediately.\(^{133}\)

In all charitable haste, therefore, for the honor of God and the dignity of our mother church, which we think you should never suffer to be diminished, consider how you may contrive to send to us, Nicholas, our bishop-elect, consecrated by the hands of your Archbishop, putting aside all pretext and without any delay. Otherwise, which God forbid, the mutual devotion of spiritual love which we promised you for your exultation, within a certain time, according to the decision of our clergy and people, will perish forever without hope of recovery.\(^{134}\)

---

132. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 51 r. See also *Victoria History of the County of Lancashire*, 117 (28); Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 78. The discussion is continued below in Section “A Tale of Two Bishops,” 184-188. In 1194, the date in the *Manx Chronicle*, Olaf was still a prisoner of Scotland. He claimed to be King of Man, representing a bishop-election with the first name starting with N which can only be Nicolas of Argyll. Olaf II must have had connections in Scotland to be able to conduct such a scheme; even so, his youth is indicated in the poor form in addressing the Dean of the Chapter of York.


Reginald of York refused to receive Olaf’s bishop-elect, and Nicholas’ investiture at Dublin brought howls of protest from the monks of Furness.\textsuperscript{135}

Pope Celestine III, at the monks’ request, confirmed the election right of Furness in 1194, assuaging their outrage.\textsuperscript{136} He declared: “Moreover, in the election of a bishop for the Isles, we confirm by our apostolic authority, the liberty which their kings of good memory, namely, Olaf and Godred, his son, gave to your monastery, as is contained in their authentic [writings].”\textsuperscript{137} Before Nicholas’ appointment, Furness had already, sometime around 1194, elected as bishop their own abbot, Michael of Dalton (c. 1194-1203). The Cistercian General Chapter of 1194 was not pleased to discover that one of their own had been made a bishop of the Isles in competition with Nicholas of Argyll and expelled the unnamed bishop (who we can deduce was indeed Michael) from the Order.\textsuperscript{138} Even though expelled and no longer a Cistercian, Michael continued as Bishop of the Isles.\textsuperscript{139} An appeal may have been made on Michael’s behalf, for Pope

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{135} The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey, ed. Brownbill, 2:3, no. 3, 711. Furnensium vero clamor sive injusta querimonia vos nullatenus disturbet. See also Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, vol. 2. 117.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{138} Twelfth-century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell, (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2003), Lil 1194/51, 300-1. Monachus de Fornaio, qui fecit de dolose in Episcopum du mans consecrari adhuc viuente Episcopo civitatis isitius, expellatur de ordine; iniungitur autem Abbati Savigniaci ut eum denuntiari faciat excommunicatum et eictum de ordine Cisterciensi.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{139} Chronicle of Man, f. 41 r.
\end{flushright}
Celestine III affirmed Furness’ right to elect and declared that royal interference in the episcopal election had caused a second bishop to be created.140

As successor to Bishop Michael and having waited for the death of the imposed Bishop Nicholas of Argyll, the monks of Furness then again chose as bishop their own abbot, Nicholas of Meaux (1217-1226), who had just returned from the Cistercian General Chapter.141 In 1217, Nicholas of Meaux issued two charters from Furness. One was a charter of acquittance, stating that he had been legitimately elected Bishop of the Isles by the monks of Furness and had received from the abbey the bishop’s regalia and books, which had been held there since the death of Bishop Michael in 1203.142 The witnesses included the prior, sub-prior, and sacristan of Furness Abbey, who had likely served under Nicholas of Meaux before he became bishop.143

Bishop Nicholas of Meaux’s second charter, of the same date, laid claim to

140. “Bull of Pope Celestine III. To Furness Abbey. A.D. 1194,” in Monumenta de Insula Manniae, ed. Oliver, vol. 2, 21-24. Since the same thing happened again with Nicholas of Meaux, who was not expelled from the Cistercians, Michael may have been pardoned and the only knowledge of Nicholas was an extant abbey letter with his name on it after his time as bishop. Michael, however, died during his tenure as bishop of the Isles.


the full episcopal right given by Olaf I and confirmed by popes:144

Be it known to all of you, that we approve whatever liberty has been heretofore in electing Bishops of the Isles, the Episcopal seat of which is called Sodor, which illustrious men, Kings of the Isles, have voluntarily conferred on the monks of the church of Holy Mary of Furness; which liberty also the popes have confirmed by their authority to the said monks. Since, therefore, the aforesaid Episcopal see has become vacant, the aforesaid monks to whom the right of election belongs by right, have unanimously agreed in the election of our person, and have devoutly accorded us their common assent, through the mediation of God.145

It is not surprising that Nicholas defended the right given to the abbey. As the former abbot of Furness who had been elected by the monks of that abbey to be the Bishop of the Isles, Nicholas apparently sought to forestall future challenges to his position as bishop and to the electoral rights of Furness Abbey: “Lest, therefore, in time to come, anything be done to the prejudice of the said monks, we have affixed our seal to the present document to strengthen the testimony of its validity.”146 Disagreement on the right of election did not end there, as


Nicholas of Meaux had suspected.

**Civil War**

Undaunted, Olaf II, in 1217, made a second attempt to establish a bishop of his choosing, this time nominating his nephew, Reginald (1217-1226).\(^{147}\) Olaf II sent his nominee to Dublin, where he was consecrated, and again there were two bishops of the Isles: Nicholas of Meaux and Reginald.\(^{148}\) Olaf II’s interference in ecclesiastical affairs caught the attention of King Henry III of England and Pope Honorius VI, both of whom intervened. In 1218, Henry III cautioned Olaf II not to challenge the abbot and monks of Furness and threatened Olaf if he persisted in interfering in the rights of the monastery.\(^{149}\)

The next year, 1219, Honorius III confirmed Furness’ right in a bull addressed to the bishop of Carlisle concerning the monks of Furness’ right of election after the appointment of Nicholas of Meaux, “our beloved son of the monastery of Furness, to whom belonged the election of the bishop of the Isles.”\(^{150}\) Honorius III continued by admonishing the “prince,” not the “king,” of Mann, apparently a slur on Olaf II, as Honorius III refers to Reginald as “king” in

---

\(^{147}\) Dempsey, *The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man*, 80.


The prince, however, of the land, and certain others of the diocese of the Isles, unmindful that there is no power given to lay persons even though they be religious over churches and churchmen whom they are bound to obey but have no authority to command, in order to prevent his obtaining possession of the bishopric forbade the aforenamed clergy to receive him, threatening to cause injury and grievous evil to them and their church if they did. Now, since We neither wish to pass over, nor ought We to close our eyes to the undeserved hardships of our brethren and fellow-bishops, We commend to your prudence, through these our Apostolic Letters, so to provide by admonition and efficacious inducement that the said prince and other persons, laying aside such presumption, shall in no wise by themselves or through others, prevent the said bishop from enjoying peaceable possession of his bishopric, and that they make adequate amends for the loss and injuries he has sustained; and if need be, to compel them by ecclesiastical censures, without appeal; any decree of a General Council notwithstanding.

Furness probably asked for this confirmation, having just had their right of election encroached upon for a second time within twenty-four years, and the bishop they had canonically elected continued to preside over the see.

In light of the actions taken by his brother, Olaf II, Reginald of Man, in

---


152. “Honorious III to the Bishops of Carlisle and of Norwich,” in no. 11, “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 196-98. Princeps autem terræ ipsius et quidam alii dieceesis Insulanæ, non attendentes quod laicis quamvis religiosis super ecclesiis vel personis ecclesiasticis nulla est attributa potestas, quos obsequi manet necessitas non auctoritas imperandi, ut eam impedirent, quominus possessionem ipsius epatus obtinere valeret, ne ipsum recipierent clero prohibuere preefalo, alias sibi et ecclesiae sua damna gravia et injurias irrogandi. Quia vero frutrum et coepiscoporum nostortum gravamen indebitum conniventer oculis pertransire nec volumus, nec dehennus, discretioni vestrae per apostolica scripta mandamus, quatenus praefatum principem et aliou, ut a presumptione hujus modi desistentes, nullatenus per se vel per alios impediant gnominus prodictus episcopus episcopatus sui paetica valeat possessione gaudere, competenter satisfacientes sibi de damnis et injuriis irrogatis, moneneatis prudenter et efficaciter inducatis, et si necesse fuerit, ipsos ad hoc per censuram ecclesiasticam, appellazione remota, sicut justum fuerit compellatis. Non obstante constitutiones concilii generalis, etc.
1219, turned to Rome and sought to secure favor with the pope.\textsuperscript{153} Imitating the action of King John of England, he presented the Kingdom of the Isles to the pope as a fief.\textsuperscript{154}

Be it known to your Holiness, that we, in order that we may be partakers of the blessings which belong to the Roman Church, at the admonition and exhortation of our beloved Father, lord P[andulph], Bishop elect of Norwich, your chamberlain and legate, we have given and presented to him, as your own representative of the Roman Church, have given and offered to him by name, and to your Catholic successors, our Island of Man, which belongs to us by hereditary right, and for which we are bound to do no man any service, henceforth we and our heirs will forever hold in fee the said Island from the Roman church, and will perform homage and fealty for the same, and in recognition of her sovereignty, we and our heirs in perpetuity shall annually on the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Mary pay the sum of twelve marks sterling, under the title of tribute, to the Roman Church, at the abbey in Furness of the Cistercian Order in England.\textsuperscript{155}

Reginald wrote his letter while at the House of the Knights Templar in London and may have sought advice from King John before doing so.\textsuperscript{156} Despite this appeal, in 1220, Honorius IV reproached Reginald when he issued a bull to King


Reginald concerning the patronage of churches under the king’s care:

Because it has reached our ears that certain churches of your Kingdom, all of which you are the patron, are said not to possess free land, we beg, we advise, we exhort Your Highness, as earnestly as possible, since it appears in every way unbecoming that the said churches should be entirely free from a sufficient dower.157

Reginald seems to have corrected any papal misgivings, for in 1223, the same pope in another bull declared himself pleased with all Reginald had done for the church:

… the disposition of ready faith and devoted attachment which you have exhibited in a laudable manner to exhibit towards the Roman church, worthily deserves, that, embracing your person with sincere benevolence, we should further you with the special favor of the Apostolic See, favorably assenting to your supplications.158

The dispute between Kings Reginald and Olaf II had by then escalated into civil war. Bishop Reginald visited Olaf II at Lewis and presided over his divorce. The chronicle would have the reader believe this action came as a surprise to Olaf II, yet he benefited greatly from the actions of the nephew whom

---


he had installed as bishop. By subsequently marrying Scristina, the daughter of Ferkar, earl of Ross, Olaf II formed an alliance with Ross and was able to challenge King Reginald’s supposed usurpation of his royal prerogative. They ended the schism by dividing the rule of the Kingdom of the Isles between them: Reginald retained the island of Man and the title of King, and Olaf II held half of the islands.

Meanwhile, in 1224, Bishop Nicholas de Meaux, Furness’ elected bishop, sought permission to resign his see on the grounds that he could not return to the Isles because the lord of the lands, and others, did not recognize his authority. The answering bull refers to Olaf II as “lord,” not as king. Honorius IV, in recognizing Nicholas of Meaux as Bishop of the Isles, declared he would allow him to “render up his bishopric, and reserved to him the use of pontificals” if what Nicholas of Meaux claimed was proven true; Honorius had charged the archbishop of York to “examine the circumstances.” By 1226, Bishop Nicholas

159. Chronicle of Man, f. 42 r. - f. 42 v.
160. Chronicle of Man, f. 42 v. See also West, The Antiquities of Furness, 128. Ferkar was earl of Ross, a medieval Gaelic lordship in northern Scotland, from c. 1224-31.
161. Chronicle of Man, f. 43 r. See also West, The Antiquities of Furness, 128; Moore, History of the Isle of Man.
must have resigned, for in witness to a charter he signed: “Nicholas, quondam Manniae et Insularum episcopus.” In the same year, the rival bishop, Reginald, died and was buried at Rushen Abbey. Bishop Reginald was of the royal line, nephew to both King Reginald and Olaf II, and a stone sarcophagus discovered at Rushen Abbey in the style of this period may have been his. In 1228, the final battle between Reginald and Olaf II occurred at Tynwald, near Peel. King Reginald was slain; his body, found by the monks, was later buried at Furness Abbey as he had requested. After King Reginald died, Olaf II ruled the Kingdom, yet continued the war over hereditary rights with Reginald’s son, Godred Don past 1228. By 1231, the Isles were embroiled again in civil war, which ended with Godred Don’s death.

The next royal influence of which there is documentation occurred in the

---

165. Document mentioned in Munch, The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, 241; Proceedings of National History and Antiquarian Society, vol. 3 (Douglas: 1897), 321; Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 80: no primary source is extant. A second letter that year was mentioned in Munch citing Dean and Gloucester Archives of York, folio 104.

166. Chronicle of Man, f. 44 v.

167. Chronicle of Man, f. 51 r.

168. William Cubbon, “Figure 43,” Rushen Abbey (Douglas: 1927), 86.

169. Chronicle of Man, f. 44 r. - f. 44 v.


episcopal election of 1231, for Pope Innocent IV felt obliged to remind York that at these elections “[monks of Furness] have the sole right of electing a bishop for the cathedral church of Man in accordance with an ancient and approved custom hitherto peacefully observed.”\textsuperscript{172} This time, Bishop Simon (1231-c.1244) was elected, who established a cathedral chapter on Mann.\textsuperscript{173} Confirmation of Furness’ electoral right usually occurred during a time of political unrest or during the election of a new bishop: the 1231 bull dated to the time of civil war with Godred Don and the election of Simon.

The Effects of the Civil War on Election Rights

In 1244, Innocent IV again confirmed Furness Abbey’s right to election.\textsuperscript{174} After the death of Bishop Simon, sometime between 1244-1247,\textsuperscript{175} the monastic chapter elected Lawrence, Archdeacon of Man. He travelled to Norway to be approved by Harald, the King of Man,\textsuperscript{176} and consecrated by the archbishop of Nidaros, Sigurd.\textsuperscript{177} “However, Harald on account of certain letters that had been

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{172}] “Innocent IV to the Archbishop of York; giving him Faculty to consecrate the Bishop-Elect of Man,” in no. 19, “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 309-10. \textit{ad quos solummodo jus eligendi episcopum in ecclesia cathedrali de Mannia de antiqua et approbata consuetudine hactenus pacifice observata pertinet}.
\item[\textsuperscript{173}] Chronicle of Man, f. 51 r. See also Dempsey, \textit{The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man}, 82.
\item[\textsuperscript{174}] “Innocent IV to the Archbishop of York; giving him Faculty to consecrate the Bishop-Elect of Man,” in no. 19, “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 309-10.
\item[\textsuperscript{175}] Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v.
\item[\textsuperscript{176}] Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also A. O. Anderson ed., \textit{Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers}, 500-1286, (London, 1908), 381-2.
\item[\textsuperscript{177}] Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also \textit{Victoria History of the County of Lancashire}, 117 (27); Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 19.
\end{itemize}
sent from Mann against [Lawrence], refused to agree to the election until [Lawrence] should return with him to Mann and be elected in the king’s presence by all the clergy and people.” On the return voyage, Harald and bishop-elect Lawrence both drowned, leaving the kingdom with neither temporal nor spiritual ruler. Harald’s brother, Reginald II, succeeded him as king two years later in 1249. Yet the royal conflict had not ended. The fact that Reginald II did not assume the throne until two years later suggests resistance to his hereditary claims. Reginald II began to rule on May 6, 1249, and on May 30, 1249 was attacked by a group of Manx men and killed by a certain Sir Ivar in a meadow near Holy Trinity church to the south of Rushen Abbey. Harald, son of Godred Don and grandson of Reginald I, took control of Man.

During these years the bishopric of the Isles remained vacant until 1253. This may have been due to a distressed state of affairs in the Kingdom of Man after the death of its King, with other claimants vying for the kingship after the

178. Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

179. Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

180. Chronicle of Man, f. 47 r. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

181. Chronicle of Man, f. 47 r. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

182. Chronicle of Man, f. 47 r. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

183. Chronicle of Man, f. 47 v. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.
civil war.\(^\text{184}\) In 1247, Pope Innocent IV resolved the situation by authorizing the Abbot of Iona to accept the “mitre and ring” of the Sodor diocese.\(^\text{185}\) Iona retained jurisdiction over the bishopric of the Isles for six years, until Pope Innocent IV appointed a new bishop in 1253.\(^\text{186}\)

In that year, 1253, the archbishop of Nidaros was in Rome to receive the pallium, and the pope seized the occasion to name Richard, an Englishman, the next Bishop of the Isles.\(^\text{187}\) The only recorded connection Bishop Richard had with Rushen was in 1257, when he consecrated the abbey church of St. Mary.\(^\text{188}\) Building the church had been begun one hundred thirty years earlier and its church was the final resting place of many Manx kings. It is probable the church had not been completely finished, or had had to be altered since the 1192

\(^{184}\) Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also Moore, A History of the Isle of Man; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.

\(^{185}\) “Innocent IV. to the Abbot of Iona; granting the use of mitre and ring to him and his successors,” in no. 21, “Appendix,” of The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys, ed. Peter Munch, 312-12; Theiner’s Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum, 309-10. See also: Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man. The first abbot of the Benedictine abbey at Iona in 1204 is Cellach and the next named abbot is Fionnlagh in 1320, so the abbot during 1247 isn’t known. Cum igitur Romana ecclesia sibi subjectis humiliter venientibus ad eandem consuevit esse pizematrix affectu favorabilis ac benigna, et dignum existat ut tanti labor ilinieris munere compensetur gratiae specialis, tuae devotionis supplicationibus inclinati tibi et successoribus tuis annuli, et in divinis officiis, diebus, horis ac locis competentibus, mitra usum, quodque in prædicto et aliis monasteriis ordinis beati Benedicti ac etiam ecclesiis secularibus monasterio memorato subjectis, Clero et populo, legato sedis apostolicae aut archiepiscopo vel episcopo non praesente, benedictionem possis dare solleimnem, auctoritate praesentium duximus concedendum.

\(^{186}\) Chronicle of Man, f. 49 v.

\(^{187}\) Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 88; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man; “Vatican Archives,” in Manx Society 22 (Douglas), 315-16.

\(^{188}\) Dempsey, The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, 90; Grose, Grose’s Antiquities, in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 162; Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man.
buildings. Bishop Richard died on his way home from the Council at Lyons in 1274, making him the last bishop of the Crovan dynasty.

The See of the Isle of Man was transferred to the oversight of Scotland in 1266, when, as the annals of Furness reveal, the monks attempted to reclaim the right of election by taking the matter up with the King of Scotland:

The abbot of Furness went to the King of Scotland and claimed his right concerning the election to the bishopric of Man; and the King of Scotland received the abbot with courtesy and deceived him with false promises. But with guile and treachery he commanded the clergy and people of Man on pain of grave peril not to dare to receive anyone elected by the abbot and convent of Furness. Meanwhile the clergy and people of Man agreed upon the election of a bishop and unanimously appointed Master Gilbert, abbot of Rushen. But the King of Scotland, contrary to the canons, set aside his election and intruded one Master Mark, a relative of the bailiff of Man; and immediately sent him, with letter from himself and letters extorted from the clergy and people with their seals, to Norway to his metropolitan the Archbishop of Trondheim to be consecrated, but what has been done about it is not yet known.

Master Mark was consecrated at Nidaros c. 1275. The unique election right of Furness and influence of Rushen had come to an end, but their influence of

189. Grose, Grose’s Antiquities, in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 162.

190. Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 19.


192. Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 19 (52); Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117; Billings, “Furness Abbey: Wayward Daughter of Savigny,” 38. No Latin text was given.

Rushen’s motherhouse over religious affairs in the Isles was still substantial. Furness’ possessions, rights, and local daughter house had an influence on the new bishop, which may have made him uneasy. In 1299, having spent little time on Mann, Mark gave the appropriations of the churches of the Manx Kirk Michael and Maughold to Furness Abbey.\footnote{194} In the charter, Mark declared that he did so of “his own free will.”\footnote{195} This grant surely made him unpopular with his sponsor, the Scottish king, and with the Manx people, and this certainly makes it seem that, despite his assertion, these churches were granted under duress.\footnote{196}

Over the course of two hundred years, Furness Abbey had held the very unusual right of being able to elect to the bishopric of the Isles. Although they received papal approval throughout the years, opposition by the King of the Isles grew after the Manx civil wars that had begun with Reginald and Olaf II.\footnote{197} The


\footnote{195. “Letter of Marc, Bishop of Sodor. A.D. 1299,” in Monum\nenta de Insula Manniae, ed. Oliver, vol. 2, 132-134. Nos igitur appropriationem ecciesiaruin Sanctorum Michaelis et Michaldi in M\nniae nostrae dyocesis Abbati et Monachis de Furnesio per nos cx concensu tociiis den nostri tenore prescencium factam confirmatam et ratificatam per nullamcompulsionem coactionem factas vel faciendas vel pene timorem ejusdem Abbatis guanquam tempore appropr​iacionis custodiem insule Mannie habuisset vel quoruncunque aliorum, sed ex mera nostra voluntate et libera ob honorem dci et beate virginis et anime nostre meritum et parenttim et amicorum nostrorum et specialiter pro anima Domini Iticardi pie memorie predecessoris nostri qui in basilica prefati monasterii sepelitur sponte rile et integraliter absque retentione tertie partis predictarum ecclesiarum esse factam in verbo Dei veraciter protestamur.

\footnote{196. Cubbon, “The Cistercian Order and its Influence in the Isle of Man,” 501-51.}

\footnote{197. Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 116; Beck, Annales Furnesienses, 123; Oliver, Monumenta Manniae, vol. II, I.}
monks of Furness repeatedly applied, after political strife and between episcopal elections, to numerous popes for papal confirmation of their right and were never refused.\textsuperscript{198} Yet, as discord escalated in the Isles, Pope Innocent IV eventually intervened and sent his own candidate, already consecrated by the archbishop of Nidaros at Rome, and so effectively removed ecclesiastical oversight from Furness Abbey.\textsuperscript{199} Furness tried to regain its electoral privilege when the Crovan dynasty surrendered governance of the Isles to Scotland in 1265, but was refused, and when the Scottish King appointed the new bishop, Mark.\textsuperscript{200} After two hundred years of exercising powerful influence as electors of the Bishops of the Isles, Furness and Rushen had been the most powerful houses in the Irish Sea region, influencing the region in religious as well as political matters.

\textbf{Cathedral Chapter}

There is no evidence that the bishopric of the Isles during these two centuries had its own diocesan chapter\textsuperscript{201} elect the Bishop of the Isles.\textsuperscript{202} In the \textit{Chronicle of Man}, Bishop Simon is credited with establishing a diocesan chapter for Sodor when he rebuilt St. German Cathedral on St. Patrick’s Isle, near Peel, in

\textsuperscript{198} See note 122.

\textsuperscript{199} See notes 186 and 187.

\textsuperscript{200} See notes 191-193.

\textsuperscript{201} Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 19. A “chapter” usually refers to a permanently constituted body of clergy connected with a cathedral.

\textsuperscript{202} Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 18.
there is no specific mention of this chapter’s function other than the Synod of 1229. A bull of 1231 recognized the establishment of the chapter: “with the common assent of the chapter.”

The period followed the disruptive rule of bishops Nicholas of Meaux (1194-1226) and Reginald II (1217-1226). After Bishop Simon died in 1144, Lawrence was elected by a “chapter.” The “chapter” of the Isles, mentioned by the *Chronicle of Man* during the election of Archdeacon Lawrence in the thirteenth century, may have been the monastic chapter of Furness, which was the rightful elector of the bishopric, or Simon’s new diocesan chapter. The *Manx Chronicle* says that the monastic chapter was in full consent with Lawrence’s election and Furness did not object to this; objection was made by certain unnamed Manx citizens. It is hard to conceive that Simon’s chapter elected Lawrence. When the choice was announced, the Manx people and clergy,

---

203. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 50 v.


206. Nicholas of Meaux (King Reginald and Furness’ elect) and Reginald II (King Olaf II’s elect).

207. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 46 v. Quo mortuo communi consilio et assensu totius mannensis capituli laurentius quidam qui tunc archdiaconus fuit in mannia in episcopatum electus est. Capitulum could mean religious or cathedral chapter.

208. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 46 v. See also Ashley, *The Church in the Isle of Man*, 18-19; Billings, “Furness Abbey: Wayward Daughter of Savigny,” 37; Moore, *Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man*. We know this as shown by the Abbey’s being in agreement with the Chapter and not attempting to gain their electoral rights back at the time.

209. *Chronicle of Man*, f. 46 v. There is no extant objection in the *Furness Coucher Book*. 

205
not Furness, petitioned King Harald against the election. Rushen and Furness’ involvement is demonstrated by their acquiescence to the chapter’s decisions and by their failure to attempt to regain their direct electoral right, which they would have protested losing. In 1231, Pope Gregory IX decreed the election of Bishop Simon’s successors should be continued as it had canonically been observed in the past, which would confirm Furness’ rights. In 1244, Gregory IX issued a bull to the archbishop of York, stating:

The Archbishop of York is ordered, to entreat the abbot and assembly from the Furness monastery of the Cistercian Order, to whom alone the right of choosing the bishop in the cathedral church of Man concerns, if he finds the distinguished person canonically suitable, at that time with the consent of the Archbishop of Nidaros he may confirm and may also choose the consecration service. February 15, 1144.

The circumstances surrounding Lawrence’s election all seem to point to an election by the monastic chapter which superseded the cathedral chapter’s election as stated by Gregory IX, despite the fact that Lawrence was the


211. Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. There is no mention at all in The Coucher Book, yet at any other time the monks of Furness would have had evidence if their rights were infringed upon.

212. “The Bull of Pope Gregory IX, 1231,” in Appendix, Proceedings of the Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Society, vol. 5, no. 1 (1948): 14. “We decree also that in the election of your episcopal successors no violence, no influence of king or prince intervene; nor in the promotion of bishops let anyone obtain the office of the prelacy, but let that man be set over the vacant see, whom those to whom the right of election properly belongs shall have judged most suitable by his learning and character, the canonical form in election having been observed.”

archdeacon, not a monk, and a more likely candidate to gain approval of a diocesan chapter. However, archdeacons were regularly witnesses at Rushen: Jocelin, abbot of Rushen, and Archdeacon Dermod both signed as witnesses a charter of King Reginald in 1188, so this is not inconceivable.

By 1253, when the pope appointed the Bishop of the Isles, Innocent IV commended his appointee Bishop Richard “to the chapter, clergy, and people of Sodor,” the usual reference to Furness, Rushen, the clergy, and the Manx people. If Bishop Simon’s cathedral chapter did elect Lawrence, which cannot be proven and is unlikely, the chapter’s control of elections was short-lived and had no successful appointee. Less than a quarter of a century later, the pope directly appointed Richard without reference to any local chapter, monastic or cathedral, and after Mann passed to Scotland in 1265, the Scottish King simply chose the next bishop, Mark.

214. As Simon died in 1144, the monks probably attempted to get confirmation from York, which accounts for the bull since it appears they encountered resistance. The bull clearly states with the authority of Nidaros, but since the king of Man had received letters of objection by the people while in Norway, Sigurd declined. So the story was drawn out for three years.


217. Chronicle of Man, f. 51 r. See also Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 20; Victoria History of the County of Lancashire, 117; Billings, “Furness Abbey: Wayward Daughter of Savigny,” 38.
The Secular Affairs of Rushen Abbey

Trade

In addition to their pervasive religious influence, Rushen Abbey was the only trade organization on the Isle of Man during the Crovan dynasty or, at the least, held a monopoly on trade on the island, employing common Cistercian economic ventures such as agriculture, livestock, quarries, lead and iron mines, and fishing. Rushen operated a fortified warehouse located at Peel Castle for importing and exporting. Trade roads led from the abbey to Ronaldsway, the southern port, where the monks had developed a lead smeltry, through Douglas in the east, to Ramsey in the north, as well as to Peel in the west of the island.

The monasteries also formed a convoy system along sea routes to avoid physical hazards and pirate attacks. The abbeys obtained licenses to export or import items from Ireland because they owned the ships but needed licenses to transport their own goods. These ships were manned by seafaring monks, lay


brothers, or servants of the abbey.\textsuperscript{224} After 1247, licenses were issued by the crown for the abbey’s servants, mariners, and ships.\textsuperscript{225} During the Bruce Wars between 1319-1323, the trade routes declined and licenses were no longer issued.\textsuperscript{226} Trade rights and privileges were accorded by the monasteries to other friendly religious houses, allowing them the free right to fishing and exemption from disembarkation taxes.\textsuperscript{227}

Allocations and Tithes

As elsewhere, the tithes of the Manx people were divided in three parts.\textsuperscript{228} One part of the tithes was allocated to the maintenance of the bishopric, one to Rushen Abbey for the education of the young and alms to the poor, and one to parochial priests for their sustenance.\textsuperscript{229} The Manx people were reported by close second-hand sources to be “very respectful to their clergy, and pay their tithes without the least grudging.”\textsuperscript{230} Clergy were compensated around £60 per annum.\textsuperscript{231}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{224} Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 59.
\item \textsuperscript{225} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{226} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{227} Carville, “Cistercians and the Irish Sea Link,” 44, 57-58.
\item \textsuperscript{228} Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 16; Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in \textit{The Story of Rushen Castle}, 51; Cumming, Castle Rushen, 1857; Grose, Grose’s Antiquities, in \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 162; Dugdale, \textit{Monasticon Angelicanum}, in ed. William Harrison, \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 53; Moore, \textit{Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man}.
\item \textsuperscript{229} Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 16; Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in \textit{The Story of Rushen Castle}, 51; Cumming, Castle Rushen, 1857; Grose, Grose’s Antiquities, in \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 162; Dugdale, \textit{Monasticon Angelicanum}, in ed. William Harrison, \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 53; Moore, \textit{Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man}.
\item \textsuperscript{230} William Harrison, \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, Manx Society 18 (Douglas:
At the time of its sixteenth-century dissolution, Rushen Abbey had on its lands five parish churches for which they had to provide curates. In possessing these five churches, Rushen gained income in addition to their one-third of the tithe; this may have been spent to sustain the parish.

**Abbots as Barons and Judges**

All baronies on the Isle of Man were held by land-holding ecclesiastics; there were no lay baronies. Rushen, the Bishop of the Isles, and the prioress of the Nunnery in Douglas were barons. The abbot of Furness held a barony near Greeba; the abbot of Bangor and Saball in Ireland held a barony near Dalby; the prior of Whithron held the Church of St. Trinian and a small adjoining estate; and the prior of St. Bee’s in Cumberland held lands between Dhoon and Corna rivers, north of Laney. Each baron was entitled to a position at Tynwald with the King of the Isles during the yearly promulgation of laws.

---


The abbot of Rushen held court over the monastery’s temporalities and the tenants on their lands.\textsuperscript{236} He had the right to demand custody of a prisoner from the King’s Court if the person was his own tenant and to try his case by a jury of his tenants.\textsuperscript{237} A charter of 1257 gave the bishop and other barons the right of jurisdiction over the tenants to hold a “court of life and limb.”\textsuperscript{238} The involvement of the abbot as head judge in secular cases did not conform to the Cistercian ideal of disengagement with the secular world.

Monastic Tenants

Rushen Abbey had more tenants, in more parishes, than the bishopric of the Isles. The abbey had tenants in six parishes—Malew, Rushen, Aire, Braddan, German, and Lonan—and among them they counted women.\textsuperscript{239} Most of what is known about tenants comes from “The tenants of the abbey lands of the monastery of Rushen,” in the Registry of Deeds.\textsuperscript{240} Malew, the parish in which Rushen is located, had the largest number of Rushen tenants by far, one hundred fifty-nine; German, the seat of the bishopric, had seventy-nine.\textsuperscript{241} The other

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 13.
\item Dugdale, \textit{Monasticon Angelicanum}, in ed. William Harrison, \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 45.
\item Cumming, “Abbey of Rushen,” in \textit{The Story of Rushen Castle}, 52; Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 13.
\item “The tenants of the abbey lands of the monastery of Rushen,” in \textit{The Manorial Roll of The Isle of Man}, Appendix F. ed. Theophilus Talbot, 87.
\item “The tenants of the abbey lands of the monastery of Rushen,” in \textit{The Manorial Roll of
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
parishes of Rushen Abbey had fewer holdings: Rushen had sixteen; Aire, twenty-six; Lonan, fourteen; and Braddan, sixteen.242

There were three types of land holders: “demayne tenants,” “farm land tenants,” and “cottages.”243 Only Malew had all three types of holdings, with thirty demayne holders, eighty-nine farmers, and thirty-nine cottages.244 Almost all other parishes had only farmer tenants, making them the most numerous.245 German, however, had thirty-four farmer tenants and forty-five cottages, yet no demaynes.246

Each parish contained localized family groups, some of them quite large. In Malew, the Bell family unit show twelve holdings of the same name and the Byrdsonn group eight holdings.247 Most other families, however large, had only six or fewer holdings.248 Sometimes women held Rushen farms, as did Margarett Bytchell of German, who apparently rented the farm outright.249 Four cottages

---


244. Ibid.

245. Ibid.


247. Ibid.

248. Ibid.

were rented by women in German. The bishopric, in contrast, had only thirty-six tenants in nine locales and not one of them was a woman.

Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships

Rushen Abbey’s general interaction with the Kings of Man seems to have been cordial, perhaps because the abbey was well protected by its powerful benefactors. Nearly every Manx ruler successively granted the abbey lands and privileges, and throughout the Crovan dynasty confirmed its previous rights. Many grants in free alms were given for the salvation of the souls of the benefactor and his antecedents and descendants. Olaf I founded Rushen Abbey in 1134 and granted Furness Abbey, and by extension Rushen Abbey.


252. See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen Abbey,” 164-173.


the right of episcopal election in the Isles. This was confirmed by subsequent royal and papal decrees.\textsuperscript{257} Discord between patrons and the monastic house did not occur until the thirteenth-century civil war between the two sons of Godred II: Reginald and Olaf II.\textsuperscript{258} After the arrival of Olaf II on the political scene, disagreement between the royal house and the abbeys always concerned episcopal election rights.\textsuperscript{259} Olaf II is also conspicuously absent from the company of his fellow kings, not issuing a single charter to Furness confirming their rights, and he was not deferential to the archbishop of York when he refused to consecrate Olaf II’s candidate for bishop.\textsuperscript{260} The privilege of consecrating the Bishops of Sodor moved from one archbishop to another until after the end of the Crovan dynasty, when the election right had been assumed by the pope on the grounds of regional instability.\textsuperscript{261}

The secular activities of Rushen Abbey on the Isle of Man went beyond those of the ideal Cistercian house, yet were not outside the boundary of their


\textsuperscript{258} See Chapter VI, Section “Electoral Right of Bishopric,” 187-207.

\textsuperscript{259} See Chapter VI, Section “Royal Patronage and Land Grants,” 164-171.


\textsuperscript{261} See Chapter VI, Section “York over Nidaros,” 184-187.
Savigniac forebears. Preaching was characteristic of their former Congregation, and so not wholly inconceivable.\textsuperscript{262} Trade was constantly dominated by the Cistercians. The abbey was the main, if not the only, trading emporium on the island, something very common among Cistercian houses.\textsuperscript{263} Rushen collected one-third of the tithes of the Manx people and provided alms, and they held land allocations on which they also collected tithes.\textsuperscript{264} Rushen Abbey and Furness Abbey both held powerful baronies on the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{265} Rushen had tenants on their land and held courts over them.\textsuperscript{266} While tithes had been granted when the house was Savigniac and preaching was a staple of the Savigniac ideal, the secular status and worldly affairs of a baron conformed to neither Cistercian nor Savigniac ideals.

\textsuperscript{262} See Chapter II; “Purported Differences,” 48-51.

\textsuperscript{263} See Chapter VI, Section “Trade,” 208-09 and “Chapter V, Section “Trade among Irish Sea Monasteries,” 157-161.

\textsuperscript{264} See Chapter VI, Section “Allocations and Tithes,” 209-210.

\textsuperscript{265} See Chapter VI, Section “Abbots as Barons and Judges,” 210-211.

\textsuperscript{266} See Chapter VI, Section “Monastic Tenants,” 211-213.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

That Rushen Abbey exerted influence on ecclesiastical institutions and secular persons within the area of the Irish Sea, yet was also influenced by those same institutions and persons during the Manx Crovan dynasty, is shown by the evidence given in the preceding chapters. The importance of Rushen as a Cistercian monastic house in the Savigniac tradition in the frontier borderland of the Irish Sea region was significant. Its close filiation with its motherhouse, Furness in Cumbria, associations with other monasteries situated in Iona, Whithorn, Holmcultram, St. Mary’s of Dublin, Inch, and Grey in the Irish Sea region, and close connections with their patrons placed Rushen advantageously within a greater regional system of trade networks. Rushen, assisting with Furness’ unique electoral right over the bishopric of the Isles, exercised ecclesiastical and secular influence that most Cistercian houses did not possess. Rushen had good relationships with its patrons, the Manx kings, which resulted in many grants and donations, although only the electoral right of Furness over the bishopric of the Isles did cause some disagreement between royal patrons and monastic houses.

Previous Knowledge of Rushen Abbey

Existing information about Rushen Abbey has been gathered primarily through archaeological evidence, charters, and The Chronicle of Man. Rushen was founded in 1134 free of perpetual alms by Olaf I, King of Man, when he gave
lands to monks of Furness Abbey.\textsuperscript{1} Early sources state only that Rushen was a Cistercian house, yet, like Furness, it was originally Savigniac and became Cistercian after 1147.\textsuperscript{2} Rushen’s motherhouse, Furness,\textsuperscript{3} founded in 1124 by Stephen of Blois, was the premier Savigniac house in England\textsuperscript{4} and second in wealth and in power only to Fountains in Yorkshire among Cistercian houses.\textsuperscript{5} It was one of the largest landowners in Northern England and the most powerful

\begin{enumerate}


\end{enumerate}
force in the border territory of Cumbria. The monks of Furness were very vocally opposed to the 1147 merger with Cîteaux. However, by 1148, the abbey had submitted to papal mandate and the Cistercian General Chapter. The Cistercian and Savigniac Orders had been founded on similar principles: strict observance of the Rule of St. Benedict, manual labor, and simplicity of life. A comparison between the two Orders can be found in Chapter II under “Cistercian and Savigniac Orders: Compared.”


Early sources, such as the *Itinerarium* of William of Worcester (c. 1415–c. 1482) and Francis Grose’s *The Antiquities* (1731–1791), suggest Rushen was just a satellite of Furness.\(^\text{11}\) William of Worcester stated it had only three monks though does not specify a time;\(^\text{12}\) if true, this is markedly different from regular reformed monastic custom\(^\text{13}\) and the number of Rushen witnesses on a single document, the size of the dormitory, and the abbey’s hierarchy attest.\(^\text{14}\) At the sixteenth century dissolution, there were still six monks.\(^\text{15}\) Arthur Moore, in 1893, restated Grose’s theory that Rushen was merely a cell dependent upon Furness, which had all the power and not an independent abbey.\(^\text{16}\) In the eighteenth century, however, Thomas Cox insisted that Rushen had been a prominent abbey consisting of at least an abbot and twelve monks, the minimum number specified for a new foundation in the rules of Cistercian legislation.\(^\text{17}\) In 1866, James Gell stated Rushen was an autonomous abbey that had a filial relationship with

---


Furness. Peter Davey made a similar statement in 2015, stressing the close daughter house relationship Rushen likely had with its motherhouse. Rushen’s full complement of monks at its foundation is examined in detail in my Chapter III under “Foundation from Furness.”

There are few records by which to trace the details of Rushen Abbey after its foundation apart from a few references in the *Manx Chronicle.* In order to develop an historical background for Rushen, some older sources and a few recent guidebooks have applied generic Cistercian customs and history to Rushen. They have not researched any Manx sources for this Cistercian observance but have based their claims on the Cistercian custom, according to which all houses usually followed the same horarium, had similar architecture,


21. The Chronicle mentions: (1134) Foundation of Rushen; (1176) Foundation of Mirescoge, late given to Rushen; (1192) monks of Rushen moved to Douglas, returned to Rushen after four years; (1228) the monks of Rushen retrieved the body of King Reginald from the battlefield and brought it to Furness Abbey; (1237) King Olaf II was buried at Rushen; (1240) Gospatrick was buried at Rushen; (1249) Reginald II was buried at Rushen; (1249) the Miracle of St. Mary related at Rushen Abbey; (1257) the church of St. Mary of Rushen was consecrated; (1265) Magnus was buried at Rushen.

and followed identical principles of simplicity, manual labor, and seclusion. Although the Cistercians held granges supervised by lay brothers, some historians have debated whether Savigniac houses, and therefore Rushen, had had lay brothers before the merger. Having examined archaeological plans of both, I discovered both houses did in fact have laybrothers.\textsuperscript{23} Rushen Abbey was, in structure, a very small Cistercian monastery, which all usually had similar architectural plans.\textsuperscript{24} The church, cloister, dormitory, refectory, chapter house, and lay brothers’ range were all smaller than was usual.\textsuperscript{25} Most older scholars claimed the abbey was consecrated upon its completion in 1257;\textsuperscript{26} however, archaeological evidence shows that stone buildings existed at the site much earlier.\textsuperscript{27} It seems likely that the church was enlarged in 1192, then building continued or the abbey was renovated, resulting in another consecration at this

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{23} Savigny was a hermitage society before Abbot Geoffrey began instituting changes that paralleled Cistercian regulations, so laybrothers would not have appeared until that time. [Hill, \textit{English Cistercian Monasteries}, 86-87, 103.]


\textsuperscript{25} Davey, “Rushen Abbey,” 358.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 49 v.; Cumming, \textit{The Story of Rushen Castle and Rushen Abbey}, 53; Cumming, “Rushen Abbey in the Isle of Man,” 37. The \textit{Manx Chronicle} has this as the church’s consecration date that King Magnus attended, which does not mean that another church was not consecrated and used before that; it probably was, since the abbey had existed for over 100 years, as even Cumming admits in \textit{The Story of Rushen Castle and Rushen Abbey}, 53.

\end{flushright}
later date.\textsuperscript{28}

In 1176, Godred II donated Mirescoge, land inland and north of Douglas, to Rievaulx.\textsuperscript{29} Mirescoge was subsequently transferred to Rushen,\textsuperscript{30} and modern research suggests it was used as a large grange of Rushen.\textsuperscript{31} All agree with the \textit{Chronicle of Man} that in 1192 the monks of Rushen moved to Douglas for four years, after which the community returned to Rushen.\textsuperscript{32} The prevalent belief, which corresponds to archaeological dating, is that the buildings of Rushen were enlarged during this time.\textsuperscript{33} These may have been the building years for the first stone buildings.\textsuperscript{34} Two sources state that the monks may have stayed during this time at the Douglas Cistercian nunnery in new buildings and surrendered their

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 40 r.; Easson, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses Scotland}, 196; Grose, Grose’s Antiquities in \textit{The Old Historians of the Isle of Man}, 163; Moore, \textit{A History of the Isle of Man}, 165-4; \textit{Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man}, 35-6; Davey, Rushen Abbey, 351.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 40 r.; Easson, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses Scotland}, 196; Davey, Rushen Abbey, 351.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31} Easson, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses Scotland}, 196; Davey, Rushen Abbey, 351.
\end{flushright}
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\end{flushright}
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\end{flushright}
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\end{flushright}
Douglas habitation to the nuns upon leaving. Rushen made no foundations. Janauschek incorrectly states Rushen Abbey founded the Saddell Abbey in Scotland in 1220.

Like Furness, Rushen Abbey was also involved in broader ecclesiastical matters, notably the election of the bishopric of the Isles, at least until 1247, when Lawrence, Archdeacon of Man, was elected Bishop of the Isles by a monastic chapter that never consulted with the secular clergy or the Manx people, who protested in writing to King Harold, claiming that they should have the right to refuse an elected bishop. The king refused to allow Lawrence to be consecrated until the clergy and the people had elected him in the king’s presence. This never occurred, however, because the king, his retinue, and the bishop-elect drowned on the way back to the Isle of Man from Norway. It was widely known that the abbots of Rushen were barons of the Isle of Man and entitled to sit in positions at Tynwald, the body that governed the land. The abbots also


36. Leopold Janauschek, Originum cisterciensium, CCLIII, 292.

37. Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v. See also Moore, Diocesan Histories: Sodor and Man, 58.

38. Ibid. [Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v.]

39. Ibid. [Chronicle of Man, f. 46 v.]

40. Ashley, The Church in the Isle of Man, 13; Dugdale, Monasticon Angelicanum, in ed. William Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 45; Cox, Magna Britannia et Hibernia, antiqua et Nova, in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 87; Wilson, ‘The History of the Isle of Man’ in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, 107.

held court over temporalities and tenants on their lands.\textsuperscript{42}

Rushen was the burial site of the royal family during the Crovan dynasty.\textsuperscript{43} The \textit{Chronicle of Man} confirms that Reginald, bishop of Sodor and Man and the nephew of Olaf I (1225), Olaf II (1237) and his son, Reginald (1249), and the last Norse king of Man, Magnus (1265), were all buried within the abbey’s grounds.\textsuperscript{44} Because of its function as a royal mausoleum, Peter Davey recently referred to Rushen as the Westminster Abbey of the Manx Kings.\textsuperscript{45}

In 1313, after the Crovan dynasty had ended, Robert the Bruce of Scotland pillaged Rushen castle and surrounding areas.\textsuperscript{46} Furness in Cumbria was also subjected to Scottish raids throughout its history, while Rushen dealt with the Scottish only in 1313.\textsuperscript{47} On April 9, 1537, Furness was dissolved on orders of Henry VIII;\textsuperscript{48} three years later, on June 24, 1540, Rushen became the last Cistercian house to be dissolved in the English realm.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ashley, \textit{The Church in the Isle of Man}, 13.
\item \textsuperscript{44} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 51 r.; f. 44 v.; f. 47 r.; f. 48 v.; f. 49 v. Mentioned in Cumming, “Notes on Rushen Abbey,” 433; Butler, \textit{A Guide to Rushen Abbey}, 4.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 357.
\item \textsuperscript{46} \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 51 r. See also Moore, \textit{A History of the Isle of Man}, 190-1.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Joseph Richardson, \textit{History and Antiquities of Furness} (J. Richardson, 1880), 49, 95-96.
\item \textsuperscript{48} West, \textit{The Antiquities of Furness}, 163-73; Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 369-70.
\item \textsuperscript{49} Moore, \textit{A History of the Isle of Man}, 351-2; \textit{A Guide to Rushen Abbey}. Revisited, 2nd Edition (Douglas: Island Development Co., 1938), 19; Easson, “Religious Houses in the Isle of Man.”
\end{itemize}
Older Research and Documentation on Rushen Abbey

Primary Sources

Most pre-modern information on Rushen Abbey comes from the British Library manuscript Cotton MS Julius A. VII, *The Manx Chronicle*, or *The Chronicle of Man*, which was composed at Rushen in the fourteenth century. Chapter I of this dissertation describes the importance the chronicle as the only primary historical document for the Isle of Man during the Middle Ages. Peter Munch published a critical edition of it in 1860 and George Broderick another in 1979.

Other primary sources include bulls, charters, and letters. While primary sources are scarce, and others not extant, some can be found in compilations such as the indices of Munch’s *Manx Chronicle* or Oliver’s *Monumenta*. In 1860, John Oliver compiled all the primary sources relating to the Isle of Man in his three-volume *Monumenta de insula manniae*. Bulls, charters, and letters are located in

---

50. A much expanded and detailed account of all primary sources is included in Chapter I: for Rushen primary sources see Section “Manx Sources: Primary Sources,” 4-10; for archaeology see “Archaeological Reports,” 13-14; for Furness accounts see, “Sources on Furness Abbey,” 14-21.

51. *Chronicle of the Kings of Man and the Isles*, BL Cotton Julius A.VII: this is the only extant copy of the *Chronicle of Man*.


the second volume. Archaeological discoveries by Joseph G. Cumming in the
nineteenth and William C. Cubbon in the early twentieth centuries contribute to
our knowledge of Rushen gained through the first excavations at the abbey, and
detailing the first material culture finds in situ, before stratigraphy layers were
disturbed, allowing for better dating for artifacts and buildings.54

In 1412, John Stell, a monk of Furness, recorded the charters and deeds of
his abbey.55 In 1886, this Furness Coucher Book was edited by John Atkinson,56 and
in 1915, John Brownbill published a second volume entitled The Coucher Book of
Furness Abbey: Volume Two, which includes charters and documents involving
places at a distance from Furness, including holdings of Rushen on Mann.57

There are useful guidebooks to Furness Abbey, from Garton’s in 1943 to
the current guide and history by English Heritage in 1988.58 The most modern

54. Joseph G. Cumming, “Notes on Rushen Abbey in the Isle of Man” in Archaeologia
Cambrensis vol. XII, 3rd Series, no. XLVIII (1866): 432-39; William C. Cumming, “Rushen Abbey in
the Isle of Man,” Manx Society 15 (1868), 37-55; Cubbon: “Cistercian Order and its influence in the
Isle of Man,” Proclamations of the Isle of Man National Historical & Antiquarian Society 2, no. 4 (1925),
509-517; Cubbon, “History of Rushen Abbey, Ballasalla. Isle of Man. -1134 A.D.,” in Proclamations

55. Walford D. Selby, ed., Lancashire and Cheshire records preserved in the Public
Record Office, vol. 7 (London: Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 1882).

56. John Christopher Atkinson, ed., The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey: Printed from the
Original Preserved in the Record Office, London, Chetham Society, vol 1, pts. 9, 11, 14 (Manchester:
Chetham Society, 1886-8).

57. John Brownbill, ed., The Coucher Book of Furness Abbey: Printed from the Original
Preserved in the Record Office, London. Chetham Society vol. 2, pts. 74, 76, 78 (Manchester: Chetham
Society, 1915-9).

58. Samuel James Garton, Furness Abbey, Lancashire (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary
Office, 1943); John Compton Dickinson, Furness Abbey (London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office,
treatment on Furness Abbey is Mary Buck’s 1996 master’s thesis, which examined the abbey in its role as a twelfth-century reformed monastic house, as a Savigniac House, and as a frontier monastery in Cumbria.59

Secondary Sources60

In 1871, William Harrison collected seven of the best-known sources for the history of the Isle of Man in The Old Historians of the Isle of Man.61 Arthur W. Moore wrote the first ecclesiastical history of the Isle of Man from early Celtic times to the nineteenth century in 1893.62 He used little historical evidence, however, and made a number of wrong assumptions. In 1958, William Dempsey wrote The Story of the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, claiming the church had been most prestigious during the time of the Crovan dynasty.63 A year later, Anne Ashley wrote The Church in the Isle of Man, detailing the transition of the Manx Church from the Irish tradition to Roman authority during the Viking


60. A much expanded and detailed account of all important secondary sources is included in Chapter I: Manx secondary sources can be found at the last paragraph of “Manx Sources: Primary Sources,” 9-10 and “Manx Sources: Secondary Sources,” 10-13; Furness secondary sources can be found in section “Sources on Furness Abbey,” 19-21.

61. William Harrison, The Old Historians of the Isle of Man, Manx Society 18 (Douglas: Manx Society, 1871).


Publications on Rushen’s motherhouse include Thomas West’s *The Antiquities of Furness*, in 1774, and Joseph Richardson’s second version of this history in 1880. In 1884, Thomas Beck published *Annales Furnesienses*, an extensive history of Furness with many facts and some charters taken from the *Coucher Book*.

**The State of Modern Manx Research**

**Recent Research**

Beginning in the 1980s, publications on reformed monastic houses in the Irish Sea region, closer examinations of the remains Rushen and Furness, and new excavations have yielded additional information. In 1981, Geraldine Carville wrote an article concerning economic activities of Cistercian monasteries along the coast of the Irish Sea. In 1993, Jeffery Long examined English and Welsh primary sources, calculating the quality of materials in pre- and post-Savigniac

---


68. A much expanded and detailed account of recent sources is included in Chapter I: most can be found in “Manx Sources: Secondary Sources,” 10-13; others, “Archaeological Reports,” 13-14; “Cistercian Sources,” 21-24.

and Cistercian houses and concluding that the later Cistercians had not been weakened by the merger with the Savigniacs.\textsuperscript{70} He hypothesized, however, that the flourishing cash economy and the Cistercians’ rising popularity led succeeding generations of monks to become less separated from society and that the Savigniac-Cistercian had the same experience.

In 1994, Donald Watt compiled a list of bishops of the See of Sodor and Man with brief biographies.\textsuperscript{71} In 1998, Donald Dugdale published \textit{Manx Church Origins} on the early history of Christianity on the Isle of Man from earliest times to the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{72} This is the only recent book to cover Manx ecclesiastical history. However, Arthur Moore’s \textit{Diocesan History} from 1893 included more sources and did not speculate as much without supporting primary or secondary evidence.

In 2000, Karen Billings examined Furness as a frontier monastic house, relying on \textit{The Coucher Book} as her primary resource.\textsuperscript{73} She looked at the relationship between Furness and Mann in only a few pages, relying on secondary sources and making assumptions without supporting primary evidence.


\textsuperscript{72} Donald S. Dugdale, \textit{Manx Church Origins} (Felinfach: Llanerch Publishers, 1998).

Archaeological research on the monastery has progressed with recent excavations at Rushen. Every summer excavations take place and as findings are analyzed, they may shed additional light on the history of the abbey. The year following a major excavation in 1998, Peter Davey edited the premier archaeological report on Rushen: *Rushen Abbey: Ballasalla, Isle of Man, Historical Archaeology Report*.\(^7\) In 2015, Davey also used much of this knowledge in a few paragraphs on Rushen in his chapter on medieval monasticism in the third volume of the *New History of the Isle of Man*.\(^5\)

**Recently Addressed Issues Concerning Older Research**

Modern research has corrected the older studies concerning Rushen Abbey in many major respects. Rushen was correctly identified as a Savigniac house at its foundation, although this was not widely known until Glen Taylor’s “The Monastic Orders of Rushen Abbey (Savignian and Cistercian),” in 1927.\(^6\) Saddell, earlier thought to be Rushen’s daughter house, had by then already been assigned to its correct motherhouse, Mellifont in Ireland.\(^7\)

---


There has been debate over the years as to whether Rushen was simply a cell of Furness or an autonomous house. Thomas Cox was the first to regard Rushen as a full-fledged autonomous Cistercian monastery in its own right. James Gell and recently Peter Davey consider Rushen an autonomous monastery, claiming that it had only the normal filial connections any daughter house had to its motherhouse.

Archaeology has provided evidence that lay brothers were a part of the Rushen community. Although older scholars thought that the stone monastery was not completed until the 1257 consecration, this has had to be revised in light of archeological discoveries. It now seems that a wooden church and monastic buildings had already existed, replaced with stone buildings in 1192, and what was completed in 1257 was probably an expansion. The lay brothers had, as


previously stated,\textsuperscript{84} enlarged their first wooden settlement at Rushen in 1192, a date which corresponds to the construction of most of the stone buildings.\textsuperscript{85}

**Issues Addressed by This Dissertation**

Through new historical and archeological research, many of the older assumptions in the historiography of Rushen have proven to be mistaken and have been corrected. While research on Savigniac houses in general is still meager, modern research has focused on the differences between the Savigniac and Cistercian Orders, whereas most accounts before the twentieth century examined Rushen only as a Cistercian house. This dissertation is the first to analyze Rushen within both the Savigniac and Cistercian traditions.\textsuperscript{86} While the influence of Furness, this abbey’s powerful motherhouse, had been noted by previous historians, the role of Rushen in Savigniac history has not previously been analyzed.\textsuperscript{87} Rushen has been examined here both before and after the

\begin{footnotesize}


\textsuperscript{86} See Chapter II, “Cistercian and Savigniac Orders: Compared,” 46-51.

\textsuperscript{87} See Chapter VI, “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.
\end{footnotesize}
merger, to discover its level of conformity to the Cistercian Order, and to ascertain any lingering Savigniac practices.88

While archaeological reports provide the most abundant resource material for modern researchers on Rushen, this dissertation is the first study on Rushen to take advantage of archaeological discoveries and cross-reference them with all the available primary sources. For example, the architecture of the church has now, after excavations, been dated so that the 1257 consecration is shown to be indeed that of an expansion.89 In addition, by cross-referencing the Manx Chronicle and the burials uncovered during excavations in the north transept, more members of the royal family than had previously been realized are known to have been buried at Rushen.90

Previous scholars overlooked Rushen’s connections to other monasteries in the Irish Sea region, other than its obvious filial relationship with its motherhouse, Furness, although even this has barely been touched upon by Mary Buck in 1996, Karen Billings in 2002, and Peter Davey in 2015.91 This dissertation expands upon their research significantly, examining not only


Rushen’s relationship with Furness\(^\text{92}\) but also the connections that existed between Rushen, other Cistercian monasteries in the Savigniac tradition, nearby Cistercians houses, and other religious houses on the Isle of Man and around the Irish Sea.\(^\text{93}\) Prior research has addressed particular abbeys,\(^\text{94}\) but it has not examined the network of relationships among them; Buck and Billings, in particular, have failed to back up their claims with substantial up-to-date primary source material.\(^\text{95}\)

This dissertation further examines the intricacies of diplomatic relationships Rushen had within the secular sphere: its relationship with the King of the Isles and the influence of the king’s authority on it.\(^\text{96}\) Drawing from primary sources, this dissertation examines the circumstances surrounding the foundation of Rushen and the extraordinary royal gift to Furness of electoral rights over the bishopric of Sodor.\(^\text{97}\) It has uncovered the motives of the early

\(^{92}\) See Chapter IV, “Relationship between Rushen and Furness,” 113-115.

\(^{93}\) See Chapter V.


\(^{96}\) See Chapter VI: “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215 will highlight the aspects of the chapter dealing with the subject.

\(^{97}\) See Chapter VI, Section “The Bishopric and its Connection with Rushen,” 171-173.
Manx kings in making Rushen’s foundation and discovered that the relationship between the kings of Man and the abbey was good, except during the civil war over the right of election between the cathedral chapter and the two abbeys; Furness and Rushen never surrendered that right.98

Building on previous scholarship, this dissertation shows that Rushen was not only an independent monastic house,99 but also a powerful religious institution on the Isle of Man.100 It details the influence Rushen exercised on monastic and secular society in the Irish Sea region, not least through its ties to the magnates of neighboring Ireland, Scotland, and England.101 The Isle of Man may have been overlooked by most modern scholars, but this dissertation has shown that Rushen’s trade, religious and secular connections, and overall success and survival of this small abbey on a remote frontier made it the dominant religious and arguably, at times, secular power on the Isle of Man during the Crovan Dynasty.102

98. See Chapter IV, Section “Church Reforms on the Isle of Man,” 109-111.


100. See Chapter V, Section “Political Patronage,” 155-157.


How This Dissertation Increases Knowledge about Rushen Abbey

This dissertation shows that King Olaf, having heard of the great piety of the Roman Church and the reformed monastic Orders, founded Rushen Abbey and the bishopric of the Isles as a means of uniting religion in the Kingdom of the Isles and Man under the aegis of the Roman Church. The reason Olaf turned to Furness Abbey, Rushen’s motherhouse, is now known to be the renown of the reformed Orders, its close geographical proximity, and its reputation as a civilizing force in the Irish Sea region. This dissertation examines Rushen’s relationship with Furness, the limits and extent of Rushen’s dependence on Furness and analyzes the diplomatic and secular roles Rushen played in Manx ecclesiastical affairs. Rushen and Furness had a close connection by virtue of the visitation rights spelled out in the Carta caritatis and subsequent Cistercian legislation, and General Chapter records show that Rushen was never cited for failure to obey these. As further evidence, I have cited documents in which witnesses declared that the two abbeys worked with each other closely. I have

103. See Chapter IV, Section “Church Reforms on the Isle of Man,” 109-111.
104. See Chapter IV, Section “Church Reforms on the Isle of Man,” 109-111.
105. See Chapter IV, Section “Relationship between Rushen and Furness,” 113-115.
108. See Chapter IV, Section “Relationship between Rushen and Furness,” 113-115.
examined the network of monastic relationships,\textsuperscript{109} which included other religious houses on the Isle of Man\textsuperscript{110} and in the Irish Sea region.\textsuperscript{111}

I examined Rushen’s connection with the two other Cistercian institutions on the Isle of Man: the nunnery at Douglas and property at Mirescoge.\textsuperscript{112} The nunnery was connected with Rushen not only in following Cistercian observances, but it probably relied on the abbot of Rushen to appoint its visitor and whose prioress signed official documents on occasion in Rushen.\textsuperscript{113} In examining new evidence of Mirescoge’s location and size, as well as Cistercian regulations, I conclude that it was more likely a satellite of Rushen than a “large grange.”\textsuperscript{114}

Extracting information from archaeological records, I examined Rushen’s architecture in the light of Meredith Lillich’s guidelines for what is distinctive to a Cistercian monastery; to these Rushen adhered, albeit on a smaller than average size.\textsuperscript{115} After studying the buildings of Furness Abbey and comparing them to Rushen, I conclude that Rushen Abbey did not need to take special steps

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} See Chapter V, Section “The Relationship amongst Reformed Monasteries in the Irish Sea Region,” 155-161.
\item \textsuperscript{110} See Chapter V, Section “Other Monasteries on the Isle of Man,” 132-147.
\item \textsuperscript{111} See Chapter V, Section “Monastic Houses outside the Isle of Man,” 147-155.
\item \textsuperscript{112} See Chapter V, Section “Cistercian Houses during the Manx “Second Viking Age,”” 138-142.
\item \textsuperscript{113} See Chapter V, Section “Cistercian Nunnery at Douglas (Douglas Priory),” 140-142.
\item \textsuperscript{114} See Chapter V, Section “Mirescoge,” 138-140. Davey, “Medieval Monasticism,” 251.
\item \textsuperscript{115} See Chapter IV, Section “Architecture and Layout of Rushen’s Precinct,” 123-130.
\end{itemize}
to conform, like Furness, because its first stone buildings were constructed only after the merger and followed Cistercian guidelines.\textsuperscript{116} The archaeological reports, along with historical documents, support my claim that Rushen and Furness adapted to Cistercian customs, and rather quickly, but only after Furness’ initial heated protests against the merger of the two Orders.\textsuperscript{117}

The earlier Celtic St. Maughold’s monastery survived into the twelfth century only because the monks of Rushen viewed it as a holy place, probably because of past and present miracles associated with the grounds and mentioned in the \textit{Chronicle of Man}.\textsuperscript{118} If St. Patrick’s Isle had still existed when Rushen was established, it would have encroached upon the bishops’ and abbeys’ lands by placing keeills all over Mann.\textsuperscript{119} This might have been undesirable in the changeover from Celtic to Roman Christianity, and so Maughold may have been disbanded by the early Crovan kings in their support of Roman authority.\textsuperscript{120} By the fourteenth century, the \textit{Furness Coucher Book} reports St. Maughold’s had been

\textsuperscript{116} See Chapter IV, Section “Architecture and Layout of Rushen’s Precinct,” 123-130.

\textsuperscript{117} See Chapter IV, Section “Architecture and Layout of Rushen’s Precinct,” 123-130; See also Chapter II, Section “The Merger of the Congregation of Savigny with the Cistercian Order,” 51-65.

\textsuperscript{118} See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the late Eleventh Century,” 143-47. \textit{Chronicle of Man}, f. 47 v. - f. 48 r.

\textsuperscript{119} See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the late Eleventh Century,” 143-147.

\textsuperscript{120} See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the late Eleventh Century,” 143-147.
turned into a parish church.\textsuperscript{121} I propose that Rushen profited from Maughold’s connection with miracles, and once Rushen had a miracle of its own, as recorded in the \textit{Manx Chronicle}, St. Maughold’s monastery could be converted into a large parish church, leaving Rushen as the only abbey of men in Mann.\textsuperscript{122}

In analyzing Rushen’s and Furness’ secular affairs, I show that Rushen was also consulted as part of Furness’ right to elect the bishops of the Isles.\textsuperscript{123} Furness sought confirmation of electoral rights and privileges during times of unrest and after the death of a bishop or king,\textsuperscript{124} because the monks wanted to secure their rights in times of challenge and kept these approvals securely noted in their coucher.\textsuperscript{125} I discovered that successive popes confirmed the immense privileges and lands to Furness: Eugenius III in 1153,\textsuperscript{126} Urban III in 1186,\textsuperscript{127} and Celestine III in 1194.\textsuperscript{128} This dissertation reveals that the monks were on good terms with almost all of the kings of the Crovan dynasty and that the abbey was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{121} The \textit{Coucher Book of Furness Abbey}, ed. Brownbill, 2:3, 694, 713.
\item \textsuperscript{122} See Chapter V, Section “Survival of Celtic Monastic Traditions past the late Eleventh Century,” 143-147.
\item \textsuperscript{123} See Chapter VI, Section “The Bishopric and its Connection with Rushen,” 171-173.
\item \textsuperscript{124} See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen,” 164-173.
\item \textsuperscript{125} See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen,” 164-173.
\item \textsuperscript{126} Oliver, “Bull of Pope Eugenius III to Furness Abbey. A.D. 1153,” in \textit{Monumenta de Insula Manniae}, vol. 2, 8-12.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Oliver, “Bull of Pope Celestine III to Furness Abbey, A.D. 1194,” in \textit{Monumenta de Insula Manniae}, vol. 2, 21-5.
\end{itemize}
well protected by its powerful benefactors. Every successive ruler granted Rushen and Furness lands and privileges and confirmed previous rights, except Olaf II during the time of the civil war between himself and his older brother, Reginald.

In Chapter VI, I attempted to pinpoint the exact date Furness lost control of the episcopal election. Extant information indicates that Rushen and Furness both had a hand in the election of archdeacon Laurence to the episcopate in 1147, as described in Chapter V. After bishop-elect Laurence drowned, Furness lost the right of election and Iona was given oversight of the Sodor See, until the pope assumed the right to appoint the next bishop six years later. On the basis of existing records, I contend that no cathedral chapter elected a bishop of the Isles during the Crovan dynasty. Further research, if enough primary materials for conclusive study were to become available, is needed to explore the circumstances surrounding the transfer of the right to elect the Bishop of Man and the Isles from Furness and Rushen to the pope, from whom it was never regained by the monks. What brought about that transition and what was the function of Bishop Simon’s

129. See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen,” 164-173.

130. See Chapter VI, Section “Patrons of Rushen,” 164-173; See Chapter VI, Section “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.

131. See Chapter VI, Sections “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207.

132. See Chapter VI, Section “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207.

133. See Chapter VI, Section “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207.

134. See Chapter VI, Section “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207.
cathedral chapter if not to elect bishops would be interesting future subjects to explore, as would the feud between each of the two bishops (Michael vs. Nicholas of Argyll as well as Nicholas of Meaux vs. Reginald). For now, anything said on that subject would be an educated guess without satisfactory evidence.

This dissertation examines Rushen’s social, religious, economic, and political relations with other monastic houses and the influence Rushen and its patrons had in the Irish Sea region. Along with close filial ties between monastic houses separated by the sea, I specify relationships in trade, politics, and patrons between other religious houses. Political and marital connections as well as friendships among nobility, maybe influenced by Ælred of Rievaulx, were factors behind the decisions to invite and patronize new monastic houses to the Irish Sea region.

Like Furness, its motherhouse, Rushen drew wealth from Cistercian and Savigniac enterprises. In typical White Monk style, Rushen was the largest

---

135. See Chapter VI, Section “Cathedral Chapter,” 204-207, which are the findings I have concluded from extant resources.

136. See Chapter VI, Section “A Tale of Two Bishops,” 189-193 and “Civil War,” 193-199, which are the findings I have concluded from extant resources.

137. See Chapter V, Section “Monastic Houses outside the Isle of Man,” 147-155.


139. See Chapter V, Section “Political Patronage,” 155-157.

140. See Chapter VI, Section “Trade,” 208-209.
trade organization on the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{141} This dissertation demonstrates how Rushen was at the center of a trade system among reformed religious houses in the Irish Sea region.\textsuperscript{142}

Applying the frontier paradigm to Rushen Abbey, I show that Rushen and Furness had to adapt to survive in a hostile physical environment, even if that brought them into greater contact with the outside world than early Cistercian legislation had approved.\textsuperscript{143} Secular transactions of Rushen Abbey went beyond those of a normal Cistercian house, yet not all that far outside the boundaries of their Savigniac forebears:\textsuperscript{144} Rushen held parishes and appointed vicars or provided monk-priests for them, as preaching did not break Savigniac practices.\textsuperscript{145} While previous historians have revealed that all abbots, as major landowners, were barons in Mann, and only abbots and abbesses were granted baronies in Mann, I explain that this is an abnormal position for a Cistercian abbot or abbess.\textsuperscript{146} I expound how unusual this secular circumstance is to Cistercians, yet Furness, Rushen, and Holm Cultram all possessed landed

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{141} See Chapter VI, Section “Trade,” 208-209.
\item \textsuperscript{142} See Chapter VI, Section “Trade,” 208-209.
\item \textsuperscript{143} See Chapter VI, Section “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.
\item \textsuperscript{144} See Chapter VI, Section “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.
\item \textsuperscript{145} See Chapter VI, Section “Allocations and Tithes,” 209-210.
\item \textsuperscript{146} See Chapter VI, Section “Abbots as Barons and Judges,” 210-211.
\end{enumerate}
baronies in Mann and were also judges over tenants on their lands.\textsuperscript{147} Rushen not only had tenants, but they sheltered more tenants overall than the bishop and included female tenants.\textsuperscript{148} This secular power secured Rushen’s position in the frontier region, as they were regarded as a powerful institution by the Manx and their regional connections.\textsuperscript{149}

Located in the center of the Kingdom of the Isles, the predominant place of authority during the Middle Ages, Rushen Abbey and its motherhouse Furness profoundly influenced the medieval culture of the island and were a leading force in Christianizing on the Isle of Man, because of their connections throughout the Isles. Rushen was built as a civilizing force in a frontier region. It brought Roman Christianity to the island, created a massive trade network and, as barons, exercised leadership. Rushen should be considered Cistercian, as many other Cistercian monasteries had tenants, tithes, and parishes. The abbots’ involvement as judges and barons and the ecclesiastical affairs of the Sodor diocese are removed from the Cistercian ideal, but they may have been necessary if a Cistercian house in this extreme frontier region were to survive in a highly political world.\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[147] See Chapter VI, Section “Abbots as Barons and Judges,” 210-211; “Monastic Tenants” 211-213.
\item[148] See Chapter VI, Section “Monastic Tenants,” 211-213.
\item[149] See Chapter VI, Section “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.
\item[150] See Chapter VI, Section “Conclusion: Overview of Rushen’s Secular Relationships,” 213-215.
\end{footnotes}
APPENDIX

Tables and Figures
Table 1. Kings of Man and the Isles during the Crovan Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Godred Crovan</td>
<td>Godred I</td>
<td>1079-1098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Magnus Barelegs</td>
<td>invading from Scotland</td>
<td>1098–1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lagman Godredson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1103-1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Domnall mac Taidc Ua Briain</td>
<td>Regent for Olaf I</td>
<td>1111-1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Olaf Godredson</td>
<td>Olaf I</td>
<td>1112–1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reginald Haraldson</td>
<td>Reginald I (nephew of Olaf I, murdered him)</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Godred Olafson</td>
<td>Godred II</td>
<td>1154–1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Somerled</td>
<td>Lord of Argyll</td>
<td>1158–1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reginald Olafson</td>
<td>Reginald II (half brother to Godred II)</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Godred Olafson</td>
<td>Godred II</td>
<td>1164–1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reginald Godredson</td>
<td>Reginald III</td>
<td>1188–1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Olaf Godredson</td>
<td>Olaf II</td>
<td>1223–1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Harald Olafson</td>
<td>Harald I</td>
<td>1237–1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Reginald Olafson</td>
<td>Reginald IV</td>
<td>1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Harald Godredson</td>
<td>Harald II</td>
<td>1249–1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Magnus Olafson</td>
<td></td>
<td>1252–1265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Bishops of the Isles during The Crovan Dynasty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bishops</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.* Wimund, **</td>
<td>c.1134-1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John,**</td>
<td>1152-1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gamaliel,**</td>
<td>1154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reginald I,**</td>
<td>1154-1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Christian,**</td>
<td>c.1170-1190s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.* Michael,**</td>
<td>c.1194-c.1203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nicholas of Argyll,</td>
<td>c.1194-1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.* Nicholas de Meaux,**</td>
<td>1217-1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reginald,</td>
<td>1217-1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Simon of Argyll,</td>
<td>1229-1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. John?***</td>
<td>1244***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lawrence, Bishop-elect</td>
<td>1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Richard,</td>
<td>1253-1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.* Gilbert, Bishop-elect,**</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Mark,</td>
<td>1275-1303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes recorded monks of Furness Abbey.  
**Denoted recorded elected Bishops by monk of Furness.  
***Only mentioned at the end of the Manx Chronicle in the List of Bishops.
Table 3. Abbots of Furness Abbey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.**</th>
<th>Abbot</th>
<th>Dates if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.**</td>
<td>Ewan of Avranches</td>
<td>1124-c.1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Eudo of Sourdevall</td>
<td>c.1130-1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Michael of Lancaster</td>
<td>c.1139-c.1145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Peter of York</td>
<td>c.1145-1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Richard of Bayeux</td>
<td>c.1148-c.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.**</td>
<td>John of Cauncefeld</td>
<td>c.1155-c.1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Walter of Millom</td>
<td>c.1175-c.1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jocelin of Pennington</td>
<td>c.1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Conan of Bardoule</td>
<td>c.1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.**</td>
<td>William Niger</td>
<td>c.1180-c.1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Gerald Bristaldon</td>
<td>c.1190-c.1191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Michael of Dalton*</td>
<td>c.1191-1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Richard de St. Quintin</td>
<td>1194-c.1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.**</td>
<td>Ralph Fletham</td>
<td>1198-c.1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>John of Newby</td>
<td>c.1208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Stephen of Ulverston</td>
<td>c.1209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Nicholas of Meaux*</td>
<td>c.1210-1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.**</td>
<td>Robert of Denton</td>
<td>1217-c.1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Lawrence of Acclom</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.**</td>
<td>William of Midleton</td>
<td>c.1252-c.1262+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.**</td>
<td>Hugh Brown</td>
<td>c.1270-c.1290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bishops of the Isles.
**Only abbots catalogued in the Furness Coucher by the monks of Furness with those serving a term of ten years, and the first abbot. Ewan: therefore there are years or dates unaccounted for or uncertain and some abbots may be unaccounted for in the currently known list. The extant list pieced together from the Coucher Book list, from witnesses and charters, and other scholarship devised from Atkinson, Richardson, and Brownbill.
***Lawrence's abbacy was not of ten years yet placed between 1235 and 1252. He could well have been elected after Robert of Denton sometime after 1235, and was the "Lawrence, bishop-elect" whom Furness supported in 1247. Nothing is known of either Lawrence, beside the Furness Coucher Book and the Manx Chronicle, so the two could easily have been confused just as the Chronicle already confused two Bishop Nicholas'.
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