

Title	Church and state in the civil war of King Stephen : the arrest of the Bishops in 1139 and its consequences (II)
Sub Title	
Author	吉武, 憲司(Yoshitake, Kenji)
Publisher	三田史学会
Publication year	1986
Jtitle	史学 (The historical science). Vol.56, No.2 (1986. 9) ,p.3(260)- 4(259)
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	Abstract
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00100104-19860900-0145

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

sons born of his first wife; included was J̄ingim(真金), who was Qubilai's son and heir, and Manggala(忙哥刺), one of J̄ingim's brothers. In the late period, only descendants of J̄ingim's eldest son, Qamala(甘麻刺), were eligible for the title. Each prince thus named was commanded to crusade and to govern a city.

The second phase, which is the main concern of this paper can be seen in the latter half of the Yüan dynasty. Bestowals were concentrated in the early years of each emperor's regime: Qaišan(武宗)in 1307-08, Yäsün-Tämür(泰定帝)in 1324, and Tog-Tömür(文宗)in 1329-30.

The context of the bestowals, however, was considerably altered. A major difference involves the fierce power struggles for the throne which took place before the bestowals were made. It was thus natural for a new emperor to award the princely titles to those who were not necessarily direct descendants in order to secure and strengthen his vulnerable position. Apparently, in this phase the single-character titles were awarded not only to the heir, but even to the Fou-ma(駙馬)or imperial son-in-law.

So it can be said that the bestowals in this phase were different in terms of both extent and function.

Church and State in the Civil War of King Stephen: The Arrest of the Bishops in 1139 and its Consequences

Kenji Yoshitake

In June 1139, when Empress Matilda was rumoured to be on the point of invading England to press her claim to the throne, King Stephen arrested Roger Bishop of Salisbury(*de facto* Chief Justiciar), Nigel Bishop of Ely(the treasurer of the Exchequer) and Alexander Bishop of Lincoln, who were all important figures in the politics and administration of the kingdom.

About a hundred years ago, William Stubbs wrote that this incident had two major consequences. Firstly, it is said to have ruptured the alliance between the Church and the Crown which had lasted since the accession of Stephen in 1135. Secondly, it is supposed to have destroyed the sophisticated administrative machinery which had been developed under the direction of Roger of Salisbury and Nigel of Ely in the reign of Henry I. As a result, Stubbs regarded the arrest of the bishops as a trigger for the subsequent "anarchy". Although some

qualifications have been voiced about Stubbs' statement, modern historians such as R. H. C. Davis and Edward J. Kealey still hold similar views.

In spite of their arguments, however, closer scrutiny of various chronicles and charters makes it clear that the traditional view can no longer be upheld. The Church seems to have continued to support Stephen even after the arrest of the bishops (June 1139) and at least until the Battle of Lincoln (February 1141), as virtually all the English and Welsh bishops (excepting only that of Ely) attended the king's court between these two incidents. Likewise, the charter evidence shows that in this period many local administrators were still attending the king's court and the king seems to have had enough officials to maintain the royal government relatively in order. In short, the effect of the arrest of the bishops was not so serious as has been supposed. It was, in fact, after the capture of Stephen at the Battle of Lincoln that the royal government stopped functioning and the Church, though reluctantly, deserted the king for the first time.

The common belief of ecclesiastics in those days was the Gelasian view which stressed co-operation between Church and State. Therefore, even after the arrest of the bishops, the ecclesiastics could not oppose the anointed king out of hand, nor did the royal officials, the majority of whom were clergy, find it inconsistent with their order to serve him in government.