



Terms and Conditions of Use of Digitised Theses from Trinity College Library Dublin

Copyright statement

All material supplied by Trinity College Library is protected by copyright (under the Copyright and Related Rights Act, 2000 as amended) and other relevant Intellectual Property Rights. By accessing and using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you acknowledge that all Intellectual Property Rights in any Works supplied are the sole and exclusive property of the copyright and/or other IPR holder. Specific copyright holders may not be explicitly identified. Use of materials from other sources within a thesis should not be construed as a claim over them.

A non-exclusive, non-transferable licence is hereby granted to those using or reproducing, in whole or in part, the material for valid purposes, providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. Where specific permission to use material is required, this is identified and such permission must be sought from the copyright holder or agency cited.

Liability statement

By using a Digitised Thesis, I accept that Trinity College Dublin bears no legal responsibility for the accuracy, legality or comprehensiveness of materials contained within the thesis, and that Trinity College Dublin accepts no liability for indirect, consequential, or incidental, damages or losses arising from use of the thesis for whatever reason. Information located in a thesis may be subject to specific use constraints, details of which may not be explicitly described. It is the responsibility of potential and actual users to be aware of such constraints and to abide by them. By making use of material from a digitised thesis, you accept these copyright and disclaimer provisions. Where it is brought to the attention of Trinity College Library that there may be a breach of copyright or other restraint, it is the policy to withdraw or take down access to a thesis while the issue is being resolved.

Access Agreement

By using a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library you are bound by the following Terms & Conditions. Please read them carefully.

I have read and I understand the following statement: All material supplied via a Digitised Thesis from Trinity College Library is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of a thesis is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or for educational purposes in electronic or print form providing the copyright owners are acknowledged using the normal conventions. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone. This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Trinity College Library Dublin



University of Dublin

THIS THESIS MAY BE READ ONLY
IN THE LIBRARY

Trinity College Library College Street Dublin 2 Ireland

DECLARATION

HUGH BISHOP OF DIE AND ARCHBISHOP OF LYONS (1073-1106)

AN AGENT OF PAPAL REFORM IN FRANCE

Hazel Goggin

A thesis submitted to the School of History
in the University of Dublin
for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy

Trinity College

November 1995

HUGH BISHOP OF DIE AND ARCHBISHOP OF LYONS (1073-1106)

AN AGENT OF PAPAL REFORM IN FRANCE

Hazel Goggin



A thesis submitted to the School of History
in the University of Dublin
for the degree of M.A. in Philosophy

THESIS

4086

Trinity College

November 1995

HUGH BISHOP OF DIE AND ARCHBISHOP OF LYONS (1073-1106):
AN AGENT OF PAPAL REFORM IN FRANCE

Abstract

DECLARATIONS

The aim of the thesis is to examine the career of Hugh of Die and Lyons and to evaluate his position as the principal agent of the papal reform movement in France.

Chapter 1 considers the events of Hugh's life, his relations with

This thesis was written under the supervision of Professor I. S. Robinson during the years 1985 to 1995. It is entirely my own work and has not been

submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university. The Library of Trinity College Dublin may lend or copy the thesis on request.

Having a particular interest in the French Church, the career of Hugh of Die during the period of his greatest legislative activity (1073-1106) was examined individually. The decrees of the Synod of Lyons 1079, which ratified those already promulgated under Gregory VII are noted, together with the distinctive value of French legislation promulgated in Lyons. The synods which Hugh held in France during the year he spent there have also been looked at individually. Finally in this section, the only three councils known to have been held by Hugh of Lyons during the papacy of Urban II and Paschal II have been considered.

Chapter 2 sets the work of Hugh as a legate in context with that of his contemporaries. It includes a brief biographical survey of the other legates in France, and the position of Gregory VII, Urban II and Paschal II. In this survey Hugh of Clermont and Bernard are then considered in greater detail than the other legates. He was the legate most closely associated with Hugh, both in the degree of authority conferred on him and in the extent of his territory.

Chapter 3 provides brief biographies of the seven bishops who were suffragan bishops of the diocese of Lyons during Hugh's tenure of the metropolitan see. Chapter 4 concentrates on the career of the three metropolitan bishops of France, the archbishops of Rheims, Tours and Sens, who put up great resistance to the authority of the legate. Archbishop Hildebrand I of Rheims is considered with greater attention than the others because he is an excellent witness for the opposition to reform as it was implemented by the legate. Chapter 5 indicates how the French episcopate retained its loyalty to King Philip I, particularly in the affairs of his marriage to Bertrada de Montfort, without coming into complete conflict with the decrees of the reform papacy.

Hazel M. Goggin

Hazel Goggin

November 1995

HUGH BISHOP OF DIE AND ARCHBISHOP OF LYONS (1073-1106)
AN AGENT OF PAPAL REFORM IN FRANCE

Abstract

The aim of the thesis is to examine the career of Hugh of Die and Lyons and to evaluate his position as the principal agent of the papal reform movement in France.

Chapter 1 considers the events of Hugh's life, his relations with the popes Gregory VII, Victor III, Urban II and Paschal II. The loss of momentum in his work for Gregory VII after the council of Poitiers in 1078 and his opposition to the papacy of Victor III are shown to have fatally interrupted his career.

The second chapter studies Hugh's mission as an agent of the papal reform movement in France and assesses his value to the papacy. It surveys the major decrees issued at the synods of Pope Gregory VII and the elements at those synods having a particular bearing on the French Church. The councils of Hugh of Die during the period of his greatest legatine activity (1075-1082) are examined individually. The decrees of the Roman synods of Pope Urban II, which ratified those already promulgated under Gregory VII are noted, together with the diminishing volume of French business conducted in Rome. The synods which Urban held in France during the year he spent there have also been looked at individually. Finally in this section, the only three councils known to have been held by Hugh of Lyons during the papacies of Urban II and Paschal II have been considered.

Chapter 3 sets the work of Hugh as a legate in context with that of his contemporaries. It provides a brief biographical survey of the other legates in France during the pontificates of Gregory VII, Urban II and Paschal II. In this survey Amatus of Oloron and Bordeaux has been considered in greater detail than the others because he was the legate most nearly approximating to Hugh, both in the degree of authority conferred on him and in the extent of his territory.

Chapter 4 provides brief biographies of the seven bishops who were suffragan bishops of the diocese of Lyons during Hugh's tenure of the metropolitan see. Chapter 5 concentrates on the cases of the three metropolitans of France, the archbishops of Rheims, Tours and Sens, who put up great resistance to the authority of the legate. Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims is considered with greater attention than the others because he is an excellent witness for the opposition to reform as it was implemented by the legate. Chapter 6 indicates how the French episcopate retained its loyalty to King Philip I, particularly in the affair of his marriage to Bertrada de Montfort, without coming into complete conflict with the doctrines of the reform papacy.

The final chapter places Hugh of Lyons in confrontation with the great intellectual figure of the end of the eleventh century, Ivo of Chartres, and contrasts their relative positions on the subjects of lay investiture and the basis of authority in the reform Church.

CONTENTS

<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u>	i
<u>ABBREVIATIONS</u>	ii
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	iii
I <u>LIFE OF HUGH, BISHOP OF DIE, ARCHBISHOP OF LYONS</u>	
1 Birth and family	1
2 Election to the bishopric of Die	6
3 Ordination and consecration in Rome	10
4 The bishop, metropolitan and primate	14
5 The legate	21
7 Relations with Pope Gregory VII	33
8 Conflict with Pope Victor III	48
9 Relations with Pope Urban II	61
10 Relations with Pope Paschal II, last years and death	66
II <u>THE AGENT OF REFORM 1</u>	69
<u>Roman synods during the Pontificate of Gregory VII</u>	75
Decrees against simony and nicholaism	77
Decrees against lay investiture	83
Direct involvement of Rome in the French Church	92
Roman synods as tribunals	100
<u>Legatine councils of Hugh of Die during the Papacy of Gregory VII</u>	
1 Anse, 1075	107
2 Dijon, January 1076	109
3 Clermont, August 1076	110
4 Autun, September 1077	112
5 Poitiers, January 1078	114
6 Lyons, January or early February 1080	122
7 Avignon, January or February 1080	122
8 Toulouse, 1080	123

<u>Councils of Hugh of Die (continued)</u>		
	9 Bordeaux, 1080	124
	10 Saintes, January 1081	125
	11 Issoudun, March 1081	127
	12 Meaux, 1081	128
	13 Lyons, 1082	131
III	<u>THE AGENT OF REFORM 2</u>	133
	Roman Synods during the papacy of Urban II	136
	Piacenza	141
	Clermont, Tours and Nîmes	144
	<u>Councils of Hugh of Lyons during the papacy of Urban II and Paschal II</u>	
	1 Brioude, 1094	156
	2 Autun, October 1094	157
	3 (<u>Portus Ansillae</u>)	158
	4 Anse, 1099 or 1100	160
IV	<u>THE LEGATES OF POPE GREGORY VII IN FRANCE</u>	165
V	<u>THE LEGATES OF POPE URBAN II AND POPE PASCHAL II</u>	214
VI	<u>THE SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS OF HUGH OF LYONS</u>	222
VII	<u>THREE METROPOLITANS: ARCHBISHOP MANASSES I OF RHEIMS ARCHBISHOP RALPH I OF TOURS AND ARCHBISHOP RICHERIUS OF SENS</u>	249
VIII	<u>THE FRENCH BISHOPS AND KING PHILIP I</u>	284
IX	<u>HUGH OF LYONS AND IVO OF CHARTRES</u>	298
	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	325
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	1 Primary Sources	329
	2 Secondary Literature	333
<u>APPENDIX</u>	1 Itinerary of Hugh of Die and Lyons	340
<u>APPENDIX</u>	2 Election of Hugh of Die	342

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While writing this thesis I have benefited from the advice and help of a great many people. I am profoundly grateful to my supervisor Professor I. S. Robinson for his wisdom, guidance and encouragement during these years and for his generous allocation of his time. I am indebted also to his colleagues in the Medieval History Department for the constant stimulation of their interest.

I should like to express my gratitude to the late Professor K. Gordon Davies and to the members of the History Department of Trinity College who allowed a very mature student to re-enter the academic life. Dr. Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, former Dean of Graduate Studies, has provided invaluable assistance and counsel in the preparation of this thesis.

I am very indebted to the efficiency and kindness of the staff of the Berkeley Library, in particular to Anne Walshe, the History Librarian and to Mary Higgins, the assistant librarian in the Research Area, as well as to Rosemary Gleeson and the staff of the office of Inter-Library Loans and to Aine Keegan of the Department of Early Printed Books. I am grateful also to the staff of the Bibliothèque Nationale for their help in identifying and photocopying essential material, and for allowing me to study their Latin manuscripts.

My family have had to live with Hugh of Die and Lyons for an unreasonably protracted period and I am very grateful for their tolerance and forbearance. My thanks are especially due to my daughter Ann for her careful editing of the final draft of the text and for a supply of nourishing meals at unsociable hours; to my son Michael for providing me with a word-processor and for his breezy confidence that I would be quite capable of coping with its complexities; and last, and first, to my late husband John for everything that really mattered.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have been used in the footnotes.

E. V.	The <u>Epistolae Vagantes</u> of Pope Gregory VII, ed. H.E.J. Cowdrey (Oxford, 1972)
<u>Gall. Chris.</u>	<u>Gallia Christiana in Provinciis Ecclesiasticas Distributa</u> i-xvi, (Paris, 1715-1865)
Hefele	K.-J. von Hefele, <u>Histoires des Conciles</u> , 5 (1), ed. Dom H Leclercq, (Paris, 1912)
JL	P. Jaffé, <u>Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII</u> ed. S. Loewenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner P. Ewald 1-2 (2nd edition: Leipzig, 1885-8)
Mansi	G. D. Mansi, <u>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</u> i-xxxi (Venice-Florence 1759-1798)
MGH SS	<u>Monumenta Germaniae Historica Scriptores</u>
PL	J. P. Migne, <u>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series latina</u>
<u>Registrum</u>	E. Caspar (ed.), <u>Das Register Gregors VII., Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae selectae</u> 2
RHG	<u>Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France</u> , Dom Martin Bouquet, nouvelle éd. Léopold Delisle; i-xxiv, (Paris 1869-1904)
RS	Rolls Series. <u>Rerum Britannicarum medi aevi Scriptores</u>

INTRODUCTION

The period of reform in the Church which started in the second half of the eleventh century has attracted the attention of many historians. One of the most eminent of these, the French medievalist Augustin Fliche, is credited with the invention of the phrase 'Gregorian Reform,' by which the movement has become generally known. This is a useful blanket term, but it is not accurate. Pope Gregory VII was merely one of a line of reformers who, during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, were responsible for the inauguration and implementation of change in the structure and government of the Church. He, however, had the clearest vision of how the Church might be released from its dependence on royal favour and restored to its original freedom. Gregory saw this reform, or renewal as he preferred to call it, as possible only if the government of the Church were concentrated in Rome. To achieve this end, the establishment of the papacy as the supreme arbiter in ecclesiastical affairs, it was necessary to create an episcopate freed from the constraints of loyalty to the lay ruler, composed of worthy men who had not paid for their office and who would no longer acknowledge any authority except that of Rome. These essential elements in Gregory VII's programme brought him into conflict with King Henry IV of Germany and King Philip I of France and with the network of loyal bishops surrounding them. Subsequently, because of the escalation of the conflict with Germany, it became desirable for Gregory's successors in the papacy to strive for a degree of reconciliation with the French king.

It is the aim of this dissertation to assess the progress of this reform in France through a consideration of the life and work of Gregory VII's legate, Hugh, bishop of Die and archbishop of Lyons. During his thirty-three years as the representative of three popes, Hugh's role in France was of the greatest importance, yet no modern assessment of the value of his work has been attempted. There are only two modern biographical studies of Hugh, one German and one French. The more recent of these,

that of Gilles Bollenot,¹ while describing the events of Hugh's life, makes use of these events as a platform on which to build an examination of the office of legate, its functions, its judicial powers and the way it was developed by the reform papacy. Wilhelm Lühe's study² is a more detailed survey of Hugh's life and work, making extensive use of all the references to Hugh in the sources. It has proved most valuable as a reference work. Two articles by Abbé Rony,³ describing the early career of Hugh and his later work as an instrument of Gregory VII's policy of reform in France, have provided useful solutions to some difficulties created by earlier historians.

Because Hugh of Die and Lyons is an important figure in every aspect of French ecclesiastical life in the last quarter of the eleventh century, he appears in almost every work dealing with that period. For the purpose of this dissertation the works of Augustin Fliche have been an essential source of information. They were consulted for almost every branch of Hugh's career and for every facet of the papal reform movement. Modern research has shown that Fliche's estimate of that reform as having been initiated and imposed exclusively by the mid-eleventh century papacy is no longer valid. However, Fliche's three volumes on Gregorian Reform, and his monumental biography of King Philip I of France have provided an invaluable fund of detail for the period. H.E.J. Cowdrey's analysis of the spread of the reforming ideals of Gregory VII in the context of Cluniac reform⁴ and his study of the life of Abbot Desiderius, later Pope Victor III,⁵

¹ Gilles Bollenot, Un légat pontifical au xie siècle. Hugues, évêque de Die (1073-1082): primat des Gaules (1082-1106). Thèse, Lyons, 1973.

² Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, Inaugural Dissertation, Breslau, 1898.

³ Abbé Rony, 'Hugues de Romans,' Revue des Questions Historiques, cvii, 1927; 'La Politique Française de Grégoire VII,' Revue des Questions Historiques, cix, 1928.

⁴ H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, (Oxford 1970).

⁵ The Age of Abbot Desiderius, (Oxford 1983)

have been essential in reconstructing a number of episodes in the career of Hugh of Die and Lyons. Theodor Schieffer's detailed biographical study of the papal legates in France has provided an immense amount of information about Hugh and his interaction with the other legates of his period. The many other authors of books and articles in periodicals and journals, whose work has been consulted, are listed in the bibliography.

Accounts of various aspects of the life and work of Hugh of Die appear in many of the chronicles of his period.⁶ These chroniclers have related (with varying degrees of accuracy) the main incidents of his career. The author of the Verdun Chronicle, Hugh, monk of St. Vanne and for a time abbot of the monastery of Flavigny-sur-Ozerain, lived for some years in Hugh's household and obviously knew him very well. The chronicler's quarrel with Bishop Norgaudus of Autun, which led to his eventual expulsion from the abbacy, seem to have eroded the admiration for the objectives of reform which is so evident in his narrative. He is thought to have finally abandoned the papal party and returned to the imperial alliance, as abbot of the monastery of St. Vanne.⁷ Prior to his eventual disillusionment, he had written the most comprehensive contemporary account of the life of the legate, Hugh of Die and Lyons, whom he greatly admired. His chronology is occasionally inexact, but his accurate transcription of letters verifiable in other sources suggests that he is to be relied on in matters of fact. His chronicle has been drawn on extensively in the dissertation.

The most fruitful of the sources consulted were the letters of Hugh of Die and Lyons and the letters to him and about him, particularly the letters of Pope Gregory VII. Erich Caspar's

⁶ The most important of these are Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii, MGH 8 368-502; Berthold, annales, MGH 5, 264-326; Bonizo of Sutri, Liber ad amicum, Libelli de lite 1, 571-620; Chronica Monasterii Casinensis MGH 34.

⁷ Wilhelm Wattenbach & Robert Holzmann, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, 2, (ed. F.-J. Schmale, 1967), pp. 624-5.

edition of Gregory's Register⁸ and H. E. J. Cowdrey's edited translation of the Epistolae Vagantes⁹ have provided an essential basis for the survey of the work that he was engaged in as an envoy of the pope. From them and from the letters of his contemporaries an assessment has been made of his success in carrying out that work. The letters of Urban II indicate the lessening of papal dependence on Hugh as legate, although he was kept informed of developments in France by the pope. No letters exist from Paschal II to Hugh of Lyons.

Of his own letters only twenty-eight remain.¹⁰ They show him to have been a man of limited intelligence and no great literary gifts. His talents were practical and physical. Augustin Fliche said of him that he coupled a prodigious energy with an extraordinary doctrinal severity, which was the dominant trait of his character. 'Ceaselessly in highways and byways, making nothing of difficult journeys nor of inclement weather, he embodied the spirit of the papacy and worked continually towards the reform of the church, which was for him the living interpretation of the law of Christ.'¹¹

It is hoped also in this dissertation to explore the reasons why Hugh, a pivotal figure in the French Church during the papacy of Gregory VII, should have been largely ignored by Gregory's successors, Urban II and Paschal II. Neither Gilles Bollenot nor Wilhelm L  he have attempted any detailed study of this eclipse of the most powerful agent of the papacy.

The area which came under the jurisdiction of Hugh as legate

⁸ Gregory VII, Registrum, ed. E. Caspar, Monumenta Germaniae Historica Epistolae Selectae 2.

⁹ The Epistolae Vagantes of Pope Gregory VII, ed H.E.J. Cowdrey, (Oxford 1972).

¹⁰ 27 are listed in PL 157, 1, not in the PL, in RHG xiv, 796 and another in Gall. Chris. iv, ins. xvi, 234; but an editorial note in RHG claims that that the first letter in the Patrologia should not be attributed to Hugh (see p. 273 below).

¹¹ Augustin Fliche in L'Histoire de L'  glise, 8, 91.

was never precisely defined. It is referred to by the three popes under whom he served as 'Burgundy,' but the field of his operations obviously extended well beyond this territorial limit: he held councils in places as far apart as Toulouse, Poitiers and Meaux. His metropolitan see of Lyons was in imperial territory but the sees of his suffragan bishops were all under the control of the French king. As primate of the four provinces of Lyons, Tours, Sens and Rouen Hugh had, nominally at least, ecclesiastical judicial authority over a very large area. Because the areas of his administration were not precisely defined it has been found practical in this dissertation to make use of the term 'France' rather than 'Gaul' to designate the area covered by his various titles. It is an area which corresponds roughly to modern France, with the exception of Normandy, which is outside the scope of this work.

ooo000ooo

LIFE.BIRTH AND FAMILY.

Hugh of Die and Lyons is unusual among the eleventh century bishops of Burgundy and France in that nothing is known about his family or his early life. His most recent biographer, Gilles Bollenot,¹ says that he was probably born in 1030 or a little later, but there is no evidence anywhere for the date of his birth or the age at which he died in 1106. In 1101 he went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which indicates that he was not yet debilitated by extreme old age, particularly as Paschal II employed him as a legate during this journey.² On the other hand the pope's words about him at this time, as reported by the chronicler Hugh of Flavigny, *...quam bene rexerat in Burgundia*,³ suggest that this journey was the crown of a long life. The appeal of visiting the newly liberated Jerusalem was very strong and in the eleventh century old age commanded respect rather than pampering, so neither of these facts is conclusive about his age. When Hugh was elected to the bishopric of Die in 1073 he was still not in orders.⁴ The reason given for this by Hugh of Flavigny, who was for a time a member of his household and to whom he was well known, was that he had refused ordination by Humbert, the simoniac archbishop of Lyons;⁵ implying that he might have been ordained earlier. If he had been born in 1030 he would have been 43 when he was elected to the bishopric. However, Hugh of Flavigny, describing the friendship that developed between Hugh and Anselm II of Lucca in Rome in 1074, said specifically that they were not old in years but in the

¹ Gilles Bollenot, Un légat pontifical au xie siècle. Hugues, évêque de Die (1073-1082); primat des Gaules (1082-1106). Thèse, Lyon. 1973. p. 57.

² Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii; MGH 8, 487; ut legationem suam ei committeret in Asia...

³ ibid.

⁴ ibid., 411.

⁵ ibid., ...detestabatur enim simoniacorum ordinationes

maturity of their behaviour.⁶ This does not suggest men of more than forty (they were the same age).⁷ C. Violante⁸ gives 1035 as the date of Anselm's birth: a date between 1035 and 1040 for Hugh's birth would seem to be more reasonable than 1030.

About the place of his birth it is possible to be a little more accurate. Writing to the monks of St. Bernard in Romans in March, 1075, Gregory VII said that he was sending them as legate the bishop of Die qui et Romanus et Viennensis ecclesie filius est.⁹ Hugh of Flavigny recorded that in 1080 Hugh retired apud Viennam pro corporis curatione.¹⁰ This convalescence may have been at a family home and, taken in conjunction with Gregory's letter, suggests that he was a native of that region which was quite close to his see of Die. But Theodor Schieffer took the letter to mean that Hugh had been a monk in the monastery of Romans.¹¹ This is not referred to by anyone in the contemporary records of his life.

Mabillon described Hugh as being a nephew of the duke of Burgundy.¹² Bernard Guillemain has pointed out that the upper ranks of the clergy in France tended to be recruited from local families¹³ and also that their origins were usually noble. 'Les origines sociales des évêques ne changent guère; elles ramènent

⁶ ibid., 411; Senes autem erant non longevitate vitae sed morum maturitate.

⁷ ibid. Aetatibus pares...

⁸ C. Violante, Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani 3, 339.

⁹ Registrum ii, 59, 213.

¹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny Chronicon ii; MGH 8, 421.

¹¹ Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 91.

¹² Mabillon, Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, v, Lucca, 1749. p.440

¹³ Bernard Guillemain, 'Les Origines des Évêques en France aux xie et xiie Siècles,' in Le istituzionie ecclesiastiche della "societas christiana" dei secoli xi-xii, 1 (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Mediaevali 7, Milan 1974), 374-402, p.384.

aux familles de l'aristocratie d'ailleurs très différentes les unes des autres mais réunies par les mêmes intérêts et soucieuses, chacune, de s'insérer dans la hiérarchie et de s'y tenir'.¹⁴ Hugh's family may have belonged to the local nobility, but if this were the case it is difficult to see why it is not mentioned in the chronicle of Hugh of Flavigny or anywhere else at that time. The abbé Rony, in his article 'Hugues de Romans,' claimed that Mabillon was mistaken about the relationship of Hugh to the duke and he demonstrated how the mistake could have arisen.¹⁵ In a diploma of the duke in 1104, in which he renounced his supposed rights over the domaine of Fleury-sur-Ouche in favour of the priory of St. Marcellus, the following sentence occurs: ...donec tempore successionis a domino Hugonem venerabilem Lugdunensis archiepiscopi nomine similiter Hugonis nepotem ventum est, cui et ipse prior praedicti loci de eadem calumnia ipsius conquestus est.¹⁶ Rony maintained that the word venerabilem should be in the genitive case, venerabilis, agreeing with the archbishop not with the nephew. Failing to see this, Mabillon eliminated the nephew of the archbishop and made the archbishop the nephew of the duke and also the prior of St. Marcellus: ...donec prioris dignitas devenisset ad dominum Hugonem venerandum Lugdunensem archiepiscopum Hugonis (the duke) nepotem.¹⁷ Mabillon was obviously puzzled by the situation he had created. He commented: Neque enim veri simile est, tunc temporis saeculares monachorum Priores extitisse.¹⁸ The author of the most detailed modern study of Hugh, Wilhelm Lühe, followed Mabillon in this and also concluded that Hugh was at one time a monk.¹⁹ Gilles Bollenot

¹⁴ ibid. 394.

¹⁵ Abbé Rony, 'Hugues de Romans', Revue des Questions Historiques, cvii, 1927, 290-293.

¹⁶ Gall.Chris. vi, Ins. xvii, 236.

¹⁷ Mabillon, 470.

¹⁸ ibid.

¹⁹ Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, Inaugural Dissertation. Breslau, 1898. p.5. 'Wahrscheinlich ist auch er wie jene erwähnten Verwandten Mönch geworden'.

was confused by this passage in Mabillon, but he pointed out that it was very unlikely that the elderly archbishop should have been a nephew of the very young duke.²⁰ As no contemporary source mentions either Hugh's relationship to the duke or his having been a monk, Rony's explanation seems entirely reasonable.

The nephew Hugh, mentioned in the charter, had already appeared as witness to a diploma of 1094, in which Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, made a gift of two churches to Hugh of Cluny and his successors.²¹ It is possible that this gift was a dowry for the nephew, who eventually became prior of St. Marcellus, a dependant priory of Cluny.

Hugh also had a brother Wigo who, in 1106, witnessed a diploma recording Hugh's donation of a chapel to the abbey of Savigny as Wigonis abbatis fratris ejus.²²

The earliest appearance of Hugh in any record is in the account of the election of an abbot of St. Rigaudus in 1072. Hugh witnessed the actum as praecentor et camerarius of the church of Lyons.²³ The position of camerarius was obtained through election by the canons of the cathedral chapter. Although in theory under the authority of the bishop, the canons received donations from the laity and by the end of the eleventh century they had become increasingly emancipated from him, frequently living in small houses within the confines of the cathedral.²⁴ This could lead to a degree of strife.²⁵ It might also explain

²⁰ Gilles Bollenot, Un Légat pontifical, p. 86, n. 31.

²¹ Hugonis Lugdunensis archiepiscopi Epistolae et Privilegia, xiv, PL 157, 518-519.

²² ibid., xxx. 528. Charta donationis ab archiepiscopi Hugone Lugdunensi abbatae Saviniensi de capella S. Petri de Camposeto.

²³ Gall.Chris. iv, Ins 282, xxvi.

²⁴ Lot et Fawtier, Histoire de l'Eglise 7, iv, 251-61.

²⁵ See Registrum i, 54, 81 and 73, 104, concerning the difficulties encountered by Isembert of Poitiers in his efforts to control the canons of his cathedral. The position of canons in the eleventh century is

why Hugh, whose feelings about the simoniac archbishop must have been well known because of his refusal to accept ordination, could have remained in an important position in the cathedral.

ELECTION TO THE BISHOPRIC OF DIE.

Die, the Roman town Dea Augusta, is situated in the valley of the Drôme, a tributary of the Rhone. The area was probably converted to Christianity through the efforts of St. Irenaeus and a bishop of Die is recorded as present at the council of Nicea in 325.²⁶ The bishopric was in the archdiocese of Vienne.

Two near-contemporary sources, the chronicles of the Lotharingian monk, Hugh of Flavigny²⁷ and the Swabian Berthold, monk of Reichenau,²⁸ give detailed accounts of the election of Hugh to the bishopric of Die. Both these men were convinced Gregorians and were writing not merely a narrative of events but a polemic in favour of the reforming pope. The accounts are substantially the same.

According to Hugh of Flavigny the papal legate, Cardinal-bishop Gerald of Ostia, following a council at Chalon-sur-Saône in October 1073, was staying near Die on his way back to Rome. He had summoned Lancelinus, bishop of Die, to appear before him to answer charges of simony. Lancelinus refused to appear and barricaded himself into his house in an effort to retain his office. On 19 October, while the legate and the people were discussing how best to handle the situation, Hugh came into the church. He was in travelling clothes (praecinctum et paratum equitandum), starting a journey from Lyons to Rome. When he appeared the crowd with one voice acclaimed him as their bishop and in spite of his resistance carried him into the presence of the legate. Hugh resisted, but a beam of light from an overcast sky illuminating the front of the church seemed to endorse the people's choice and, with the blessing of the legate, his election was confirmed. The simoniac Lancelinus accepted the inevitable, abandoned the episcopal house and departed. Hugh of Flavigny asserted that the election of Hugh to the bishopric of Die was divinely inspired:

²⁶ Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne, Paris, 1920.

²⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 410.

²⁸ Bertholdi annales, a. 1054-1080, MGH 5, 306.

In electione igitur et consecratione domni Diensis
evidenter ostenditur operata divinitas quia per hanc
occasionem sanctae Dei aecclesiae sub papatu domni
Gregorii multis retro annis obnubilata electionis
aecclesiasticae splenduit veritas. Viderint igitur
viri cordati, quid iuris imperatoribus, regibus et
principibus in electione pontificis reservetur.²⁹

He mistakenly placed these events in October 1074 instead of 1073 and also claimed that Alexander II, dead since April 1073, was pope at the time.

Berthold's account is also chronologically inexact: he placed these events in 1078. While agreeing in the main with Hugh of Flavigny, he was a good deal more dramatic. He also said categorically that the election was divinely inspired: non humana set divina electione episcopus factus est, and he mentioned, significantly, that Hugh was already known to Gerald, indeed was a close friend (amicissimus), and that it was Gerald, not the people, who first acclaimed him as bishop. Is there a suggestion here of sleight of hand? The archbishop of Lyons had been at the council of Chalon³⁰ and it is likely that Hugh, his camerarius, was in his train. Gerald could have encountered the high-principled cleric and seen in him the perfect candidate to replace the simoniac usurper of the see of Die. Might he have suggested that it would be a good idea for Hugh to appear as though by chance at Die, where some sort of acclamation could be arranged? The suggestion that Hugh and Gerald were already friends gives the whole episode a distinctly theatrical flavour.

In the accounts by Berthold both of this election and of the election of Gregory VII³¹ in the same year there are strong echoes of John the Deacon's ninth century description of the

²⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412.

³⁰ Mansi, xx, 391, points out that this council is only known because of the reference to it in Hugh of Flavigny's chronicle, so it is impossible to check the accuracy of this.

³¹ ibid. 276.

election of Pope Gregory I.³² In the three accounts the elect declared himself unworthy of the office, requested a delay to consider, tried to conceal himself but was discovered (Gregory I and Hugh of Die by a beam of heavenly light) and and compelled to submit.³³ Berthold's accounts of the elections of Gregory VII and Hugh of Die are so alike in phraseology and incident and bear so strong a resemblance to John the Deacon that he appears to have considered the literary model more important than an accurate narrative of events. There is good reason to regard his account of the election of Gregory VII as fictitious because Gregory, describing his own election to Wibert of Ravenna,³⁴ gave a straightforward account: he stressed his shock and sense of unworthiness but he said nothing about having requested a delay of several days or about having hidden from his electors. On the contrary, he maintained that he was immediately confirmed as pope.³⁵ The account of Hugh's election by Hugh of Flavigny does not bear so close a resemblance to that of John the Deacon as Berthold's, but he did include the heavenly light,³⁶ the element of compulsion³⁷ and the presumption that God was directly involved. He reported that Gerald prophesied a still higher destiny for Hugh. Huic civitati pastor quidem est electus et a Deo donatus, sed maiora ei praedestinavit Altissimus.³⁸ The introduction of a miraculous component into Hugh's election by these two contemporary writers indicates how great was his importance in the eyes of Gregorian polemicists as an agent for the implementation of reform. Writing after Gregory's death,

³² John Deacon, S. Gregorii magni Vita, PL 75, 79-81.

³³ A table for the purpose of comparing these accounts has been provided on p. 342

³⁴ Registrum i, 3, 5.

³⁵ ibid.

³⁶ Hugh of Flavigny; MGH 8, 410, ...lux in modum sperae per aliquas horas in gremio et facie splenduit ecclesiae.

³⁷ ibid., compulsus est auctoritate apostolica remorari...

³⁸ ibid., 410

when the credibility of both pope and legate was suffering a temporary eclipse, this is an obvious attempt to restore their authority and prestige by creating an analogy between their elections and that of the earlier reformer, Gregory I. Gregory VII himself regarded Gregory I as his model: hence the attempt of Gregorians to conflate the two figures.³⁹

ORDINATION AND CONSECRATION IN ROME, 1074.

The usurper Lancelinus had left the affairs of the church of Die in such disorder that Hugh was not able to leave for Rome until December.⁴⁰ He was then elevated to the rank of deacon by the pope; ...in mense Decembrio per manum eius usque ad presbiteratus gradum promotus est...⁴¹ There is no evidence that he returned to Die before the following March. On the Saturday of Quadragesima, at the end of the council of 1074, he was ordained by Gregory and consecrated to his bishopric the following day.⁴² Eight days later 'enlightened by divine teaching and amply strengthened by the decrees of the Church' he was sent back to his diocese by the pope.⁴³

Anselm II, bishop elect of Lucca, was in the Lateran palace at the same time.⁴⁴ He was descended from a noble Milanese family and was a nephew of Bishop Anselm I of Lucca, who became Pope Alexander II. He was to be a firm supporter of Gregory VII's programme of reform and an opponent of Henry IV (although, with Gregory's approval he accepted investiture from the German king).⁴⁵ Because of this enmity he was forced to leave his see and to spend his last years as the pope's vicis in Lombardy where he was spiritual director to Countess Matilda of Tuscany.⁴⁶ He was one of those designated as a possible successor by Gregory

⁴⁰ See below for Hugh of Flavigny's account of this situation.

⁴¹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411.

⁴² Caspar (Registrum i, 69, p. 99, fn 2) gives 16 March as the date of his consecration.

⁴³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411; affatim inbutus divinis dogmatibus et ubertim roboratus ecclesiasticis sanctionibus. See below, p. 14.

⁴⁴ ibid.

⁴⁵ See below.

⁴⁶ C. Violante, 'Anselmo,' Dizionario Biografica degli Italiani 3, 399-407

VII.⁴⁷ He is chiefly known for his Liber contra Wibertum.⁴⁸ and the Collectio Canonum,⁴⁹ which he seems to have compiled for Gregory VII.

A friendship developed between these men which lasted until the death of Anselm in 1086. Hugh of Flavigny, describing this close friendship, recounts that the prefect of Rome, making a play on the names of their dioceses, said that they were indeed as day and light - one never seen without the other.⁵⁰ This prefect was undoubtedly Cencius Johannis, an ally of Gregory VII and the reformers, who was subsequently recognised as a martyr.⁵¹

While they were in Rome King Henry IV of Germany sent envoys to request that, in conformity with established custom, they should receive investiture from him.⁵² Gregory consulted with his cardinals and, on their advice that long custom in the church had here the force of law, he decided that Anselm should accept investiture as a gift from the king but that Hugh should not. In Lucensi tamen electo eis adquevit ut consecrationem eius differret donec investituram episcopatus ex regio dono accepisset. In Diensi vero adquiescere noluit...⁵³ Hugh of Flavigny omitted something important from this account. In September, 1073, the pope had advised Anselm not to accept investiture from Henry IV until the king should have abandoned his communion with his excommunicated advisers. Ab investitura episcopaliis de manu regis abstinere donec de communione cum

⁴⁷ Hildesheimer Briefe 35: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV., (MGH Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, 75-76.

⁴⁸ Libelli de lite 1, 517-28.

⁴⁹ Collectio Canonum, ed. F. Thaner (Innsbruck, 1906).

⁵⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411.

⁵¹ Bonizo of Sutri, Liber ad Amicum, Libelli de lite 1, 603, 611, 620.

⁵² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411.

⁵³ ibid., 412.

excommunicatis Deo satisfaciens rebus bene compositis nobiscum pacem possit habere.⁵⁴ Rudolf Schieffer points out that this was the first open rejection by a pope of the performance of investiture by the Roman-German emperor.⁵⁵ Immediately after that Henry wrote to Gregory in very obsequious terms, deploring his past disloyalty and promising repentance and submission.⁵⁶

As a result he was restored to communion with the church at Nuremberg at Eastertide 1074 and this apparent change of heart on the king's part explains the pope's willingness to concede the right of investiture of the bishop of Lucca early the following year.⁵⁷

This was not the only example of an early ambivalence in Gregory's attitude. During the same period he had agreed that Landeric de Brézé, bishop-elect of Mâcon, should accept his bishopric as a gift from King Philip I of France.⁵⁸ This willingness to concede a right to the king in the consecration of a bishop, which Gregory demonstrated twice in 1073-4, proves that at the beginning of his pontificate he was prepared to negotiate about investiture and that he and his advisers had not yet reached their final position on this subject.⁵⁹

According to Hugh of Flavigny the decision to refuse to allow Henry IV to invest Hugh with his bishopric was Gregory's.⁶⁰ It is, however, at least a possibility that Hugh

⁵⁴ Registrum i, 21, p.35.

⁵⁵ Rudolf Schieffer, Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturerbots für den deutschen König. MGH Schriften 28, p. 111.

⁵⁶ Die Briefe Heinrichs IV, ed. Carl Erdmann, MGH Deutsches Mittelalter Kritische Studientexte, 5, 8; Registrum i, 29(a), p.47.

⁵⁷ Rudolf Schieffer, Investiturerbots, p.112.

⁵⁸ Dono gratis...Letter of Gregory to Roclinus of Chalon. Registrum i, 35, 56.

⁵⁹ See 'Agent of Reform' below pp. 83-91, where the subject of investiture is discussed.

⁶⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii, MGH 8, 412.

himself opposed the suggestion, as he had refused to accept ordination from the simoniac Humbert of Lyons. Because he did not receive investiture from the king he encountered a good deal of trouble in his diocese, but a regard for expediency was never one of his faults.

BISHOP, METROPOLITAN AND PRIMATE.

Hugh of Flavigny's chronicle provides an account of the circumstances prevailing in Hugh's new diocese of Die.

Invenit itaque civitatem angoris plenam, tribulationibus circumseptam, vigilantia multa egentem, res episcopi direptas, ita ut non invenerit unde vel uno die de redditibus domus episcopalis vivere potuerit, ita omnia attriverant qui ante eum fuerant. Adeo ut de omnibus totius episcopatus aecclesiis vix unam haberet domus episcopalis aut mater aecclesia, cum fere omnes possiderentur a militibus et quibuslibet secularibus.⁶¹

This depressing state of affairs may have been largely due to the simoniac Lancelinus, but a letter from Gregory VII to Count William of Die⁶² shows that he was implicated to some extent and that he tried to rouse the people of Die to a demonstration against the man they had lately acclaimed with such enthousiasm.⁶³ Gregory wrote that he would have taken severe measures against the count had it not been for the intercession of Hugh himself.⁶⁴ If this situation was not rectified at once, the new bishop was authorised by the pope to excommunicate him.⁶⁵

This enmity on the part of the count was possibly a result of Hugh's refusal to accept investiture from Henry IV, but Count William's involvement in the simoniac practices of Lancelinus demonstrates how the system of Eigenkirchen, which had become so widespread during the tenth and eleventh centuries, represented

⁶¹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411.

⁶² Registrum i, 69, p.99.

⁶³ ibid. Postquam ad apostolica limina venit, clericos et cives urbis depredatus es et, quod valde nefandum est, quendam clericum cepisti.

⁶⁴ ibid. ...rogatu tamen euisdem episcopi tui adhuc debite ultionis iaculum in te vibrare distulimus.

⁶⁵ ibid.

a problem for reformers at every level in the church. The interdependence of the local secular lord and the bishop, whose church was the property of the lord, created a tangle of relationships which rendered a satisfactory implementation of reforming principles exceedingly difficult. Through his new bishop in Die Gregory proceeded to attack this problem head-on. He informed Count William that he had seriously recommended Hugh 'to struggle with all his strength against simony, to consecrate no church and to refuse to allow the celebration of divine office in those already consecrated until they should be delivered out of lay hands and given back to his jurisdiction and episcopal care, according to canon law.'⁶⁶ Hugh of Flavigny said that these reforms had been successfully inaugurated even before Hugh went to Rome.

Et factum est divina cooperante clementia ut omnes gratanter iussionem eius susciperent et obedirent ita ut ante eius ordinationem haec suae meliorationis incrementa sibi commissa per eum suscepere ecclesia.⁶⁷

Hugh's subsequent career as bishop of Die was assimilated into his greater work as legate and ally of Pope Gregory VII. This work of reform is studied in detail in another chapter.⁶⁸

In 1082 Gebuin, archbishop of Lyons, died⁶⁹ and Gregory VII urged Hugh to seek election to the see, suggesting that he should imitate St. Peter who agreed to transfer from the minor church of Antioch to Rome:

...ex apostolica tibi precipimus auctoritate ut

⁶⁶ ibid. Nos enim inter cetera eum sollicite ammonuimus ut contra symoniacam heresim totis erigeretur viribus et ecclesias sue parrochie non prius consecraret nec consecratas aliter divinum officium celebrare permetteret nisi prius absolute a laicorum manibus, sicut canonicum est, suo iuri et episcopali eius providentie redderentur.

⁶⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 411.

⁶⁸ 'Agent of Reform,' below.

⁶⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 460

rogatus a fratribus tuis et electus ab eiusdem ecclesie filiis indubitantur presumens de adiutorio celesti ad regimen predictae Lugdunensis accedas sancte ecclesie imitando dominum et patrem nostrum beatum Petrum apostolum, qui de minori ecclesia Antiocena translatus est in Romanam.⁷⁰

(Was this a hint that Hugh might eventually be in line for the papacy?)⁷¹

In his dissertation on Hugh of Die Wilhelm Lühe indicated the difficulty in arriving at the actual date of Hugh's election and consecration to the archbishopric.⁷² According to Lühe, the last reference to Hugh as bishop of Die is in a letter from Gregory written on 24 October 1081,⁷³ and he is first called archbishop of Lyons in a charter of 23 July 1083.⁷⁴ Lühe has, however, overlooked two letters which make it possible to be a little more precise about the date. In one of these Hugh is called 'primate,' implying that he was already archbishop, and Mansi, citing Baluze, firmly placed it in 1082.⁷⁵ This letter is from Agano of Autun, Robert of Langres, Walter of Chalon and Landeric of Mâcon (vice Primatis curam gerentes ecclesie Ludunensis), together with all the clerks of Lyons - in fact from the suffragans of Lyons. The letter concerns the excommunication of Count Fulk of Anjou for his attack on Archbishop Ralph I of Tours, which took place at a council of Lyons in 1082⁷⁶ and states that Fulk was excommunicated on the authority of Hugh,

⁷⁰ Registrum ix, 18, 598.

⁷¹ See below, p.46, for Gregory's intentions concerning his successor in the papacy.

⁷² Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 14.

⁷³ Registrum ix, 18, 598.

⁷⁴ Gall Chris xiii, Instr. xi, 11.

⁷⁵ Mansi xx, 587.

⁷⁶ See below, 'Metropolitans,' p. 277.

'primate and Roman legate.'⁷⁷ Hugh's absence from this council, indicated by the bishop of Mâcon acting for him, may have been due to his being in Rome to receive the pallium.⁷⁸ The second letter is from Gregory VII to the people of the church of Thérouanne and Count Robert of Flanders, in which he says: 'Let him (the bishop Lambert, accused of simony) seek a hearing of our legate the bishop of Die - or rather the archbishop of Lyons...' Obviously the translation has been very recent. From internal evidence H.E.J. Cowdrey places this letter in 1082.⁷⁹ In the Gallia Christiana the length of Hugh's tenure of the see of Lyons is given as 23 years, 8 months and 7 days⁸⁰ which, reckoning from the date of his death, 7 October 1106, would place his elevation to the see on either 31 January or 1 February 1083. For various reasons Lühe preferred 2 February, the feast of the Purification.⁸¹ Hugh may have been elected to the see at the end of 1082, just before this council at Lyons, and have immediately left for Rome, to receive the pallium and his consecration, at the beginning of February 1083. This would reconcile all the problems.

Two years before Gebuin's death the pope had conferred on him a primacy over the four provinces which were called Lyonnaise at the end of the Roman Empire - Lyons, Rouen, Tours and Sens.⁸² In the letters which he wrote to the three metropolitans who were to be subject to Lyons Gregory quoted Pseudo-Isidore as a precedent for basing this division of ecclesiastical authority on the model of the provincial government of the Roman Empire. Provincie autem multo ante Christi adventum tempore divide sunt maxima ex parte et postea ab apostolicis et beato Clemente

⁷⁷ Mansi xx, 587; Fulconem vero cum monachis majoris monasterii ex auctoritate beati Petri atque domni Hugonis Primatis et Romanae Ecclesiae Legati excommunicationis gladio percussimus...

⁷⁸ See below p.131; council of Lyons 1082.

⁷⁹ E.V. 46, p.111-113.

⁸⁰ Gall Chris iv, 109, ex antiquo monumento.

⁸¹ Wilhelm Luhe, Hugo von Die und Lyon p. 14.

⁸² Registrum vi, 34, 448.

predecessore nostro ipsa divisio est renovata:⁸³ but the extent of the primate's juridical powers was left very imprecise. Gregory seemed to regard the primate as a super-metropolitan. 'Show towards the church of Lyons the same honour and reverence...which you do not scruple to demand from your own suffragans,' he wrote:⁸⁴ and he also, most importantly, reserved to the papacy the right to adjudicate in certain cases.⁸⁵ He obviously saw this revived office as another step in the centralisation of authority in Rome: he told the archbishops of Rouen, Tours and Sens that 'each fulfills his office the more efficiently when there is one superior to whom he may refer his action'.⁸⁶ In the Lent council in Rome in 1080 the decree that '...the clergy and people...shall, with the consent of the apostolic see or their metropolitan, elect for themselves a pastor according to God',⁸⁷ seemed to ensure that the place formerly occupied by the secular ruler should now be occupied by the pope or the metropolitan. The reintroduction of the primate created a further bulwark against any future lay intrusion. This cluster of offices demonstrates the element of improvisation inherent in Gregory's reform programme as well as his anxiety that his reforms should appear to be grounded in tradition.⁸⁸

The imprecise definition of the rights of the office of primate caused some confusion. The saintly Gebuin, archbishop of Lyons, made only a timid effort to assert his primatial rights when the legate, Amatus of Oloron, entered the province of Tours and ordered the archbishop, Ralph, to appear before him to clear

⁸³ Registrum vi, 35, 451.

⁸⁴ ibid.

⁸⁵ Registrum vi, 34, 449. ...salva in omnibus apostolice sedis reverentia et auctoritate.

⁸⁶ Registrum vi, 35, p.451; ...unumquodque tunc salubriter completur officium cum fuerit unus ad quem possit recurri prepositus.

⁸⁷ Registrum vii, 14(a), p. 482: clerus et populus...apostolice sedis vel metropolitani sui consensu pastorem sibi secundum Deum eligat.

⁸⁸ See 'Agent of Reform,' below p. 79.

up some matters in dispute.⁸⁹ Gebuin wrote, not to Amatus but to Ralph himself, and complained, not that his own rights were being infringed, but that Amatus was operating in the territory of Hugh of Die, to whom Gebuin had been asked by the pope to give help and advice.⁹⁰ If Gebuin had been more jealous of his prerogatives as primate and more enthusiastic in exercising them, he might at that point have forced Gregory to define those prerogatives more precisely. He could also have made things very difficult for the legates.⁹¹ In this case Ralph's letter to his suffragan, Arnald of Le Mans, in which he asked who was the real primate, Gebuin or Amatus, shows that he also was not sure what the position was,⁹² although he did eventually comply with the legate's summons. He may indeed have seen in the division of powers between primate and legate a possible undermining of papal authority in France: something which would have pleased this determined upholder of metropolitan rights⁹³ but which Gregory had not envisaged.

Hugh of Die's appointment to the primacy was never accepted by Richerius, archbishop of Sens, who felt that the office belonged traditionally to the archbishopric of Sens.⁹⁴ As a result of this mutinous attitude Hugh subsequently became involved in a controversy with Bishop Ivo of Chartres concerning the rights of the offices both of metropolitan and primate.⁹⁵

The appointment of Hugh to the archbishopric of Lyons meant

⁸⁹ RHG xiv, 670, vi and vii.

⁹⁰ ibid. 671, viii.

⁹¹ Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, pp. 28-29. Wäre Erzbischof Gebuin von Lyon ein so ehrgeiziger Politiker wie Manasses I von Reims oder nur auf die Vorrechte seines Stuhles so eifersüchtig gewesen wie Richer von Sens, die Legaten Amatus und Hugo hatten von ihm viel zu befürchten gehabt.

⁹² RHG xiv, 671, ix.

⁹³ See 'Metropolitans,' below pp. 272-8

⁹⁴ ibid., pp. 279-83.

⁹⁵ See 'Ivo of Chartres', below, pp. 298-324.

that three offices were combined in one man: as metropolitan, legate and primate Hugh should have been able to exercise unlimited authority throughout a very large area of France. But Gregory's difficulties in Rome, his death in 1085 and Hugh's disgrace under Victor III meant that he went into eclipse, and when he emerged under Urban II the papal attitude to the roles of primate and legate had changed: so precisely how Gregory had envisaged the development of the office of primate cannot now be ascertained. In 1094 Archbishop Reynardus of Rheims declared that Hugh of Lyons did not have the right, as primate, to summon him to a council (the archbishop of Rheims had also been made a primate in 1089).⁹⁶ Hugh of Lyons, obviously not altogether clear about the rights of the primacy, replied that he was calling the council, not as primate, but as legate. He had no doubt which was the more important office.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ JL 5415.

⁹⁷ Letter of Hugh of Lyons to Lambert of Arras, PL 157, xi, 516-7. See 'Debate with Ivo of Chartres,' below, pp. 298-324.

Hugh's importance in the history of the papal reform movement in France is bound up with his role as legate of Pope Gregory VII. During that papacy he presided over thirteen councils. We know of only two under the subsequent reforming pope, Urban II, and one under Paschal II (although there may have been some not recorded). Were it not for him, the reform of the French church under Gregory VII would certainly have been a less turbulent process, but perhaps also less effective.⁹⁹ Theodor Schieffer pointed out that from Hugh's first appearance in Rome Gregory recognised his qualities of enthusiasm and energy.¹⁰⁰ The pope's letter to Count William of Die, written within a few days of Hugh's consecration to the see,¹⁰¹ indicates that he had at once marked him as a suitable agent to implement his reformist policies in Gallia. From this time he was always referred to by the pope with respect and even affection. In Gregory's correspondence the pope's most impressive term for a legate, vicarius, is used seventeen times and fifteen of these references are to Hugh.¹⁰² Not only by the use of this term but in almost every reference Hugh was to be singled out by phrases which show the esteem in which the pope held him. 'Our beloved son',¹⁰³ 'our dearest brother',¹⁰⁴ 'our most beloved brother in

⁹⁸ See pp. 165-221 below, for a detailed study of the legates of the Gregorian period.

⁹⁹ See below, p. 31, for an assessment of his reforming methods.

¹⁰⁰ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130, (Historische Studien 263, Berlin 1935), p. 91.

¹⁰¹ Registrum i, 69, p. 99.

¹⁰² Registrum iv, 16, p.321; v, 23, p.388; vi, 21, p. 433; vi, 26, p.439 (three times); vi, 27, p.439 (twice); vi, 28, p.440; vii, 12, p.477; viii, 18, p.540; viii, 19, p.541 (twice); E.V. 24. p.63 and 38, p.97. See below, 'Legates' p. 168.

¹⁰³ E.V. 12, p. 29.

¹⁰⁴ Registrum ix, 9, p. 585.

Christ,¹⁰⁵ and 'this most holy man',¹⁰⁶ are some of the terms used in letters introducing Hugh all over France. But Hugh was to find that what the pope said about him, and what he appeared genuinely to feel for him, was not a guarantee of papal approval of his actions. A letter from the pope shows that early in Hugh's career Gregory deplored the legate's severity and wished him to deal more gently with offenders.

Melius enim nobis placet ut pro pietate
interdum reprehendaris, quam pro nimia
severitate in odium ecclesie tue
venias. Debes quidem filios tuos,
quia rudes sunt et indocti, conspicere
et ad meliora paulatim provocare...¹⁰⁷

More than any other legate Hugh was to see his sentences reversed and his recommendations ignored, and alone among the legates he was the subject of a public and humiliating reprimand.¹⁰⁸ It was as though Gregory, having recognised in Hugh a zeal for reform equal to his own, was eventually unable to tolerate in this alter ego an inflexible adherence to principle, totally without the compassion for the individual which informed all Gregory's actions and which he unavailingly urged Hugh to cultivate. Hugh of Flavigny said that the pope urged Hugh not to abuse the power which had been given to him to correct vice and to suppress evil, but to teach goodness and holiness and to be himself an example.¹⁰⁹

In the primary sources Hugh appears predominantly as a legate. Hugh of Flavigny said that the pope 'sent him as his deputy into Gaul where the evil plague of simony was spreading

¹⁰⁵ Registrum ix, 15, p.494.

¹⁰⁶ Registrum vi, 26, p.438.

¹⁰⁷ Registrum ii, 43, p.180.

¹⁰⁸ See Registrum v, 17, p.378 and p. 40, below.

¹⁰⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412: Plurimum illi inculcans
potestate data non abuti, quo minus deprevata
corrigeret, dampnanda recideret, sancta et honesta
doceret et docenda faceret.

because there were very few who were not simoniacs or ordained by simoniacs or invested by laymen,¹¹⁰ implying that he had been designated legate by the pope from the beginning of his episcopacy. Nevertheless, the precise date of his appointment as legate is not certain; Fliche considered the Roman council of 1075 a likely time.¹¹¹ Gregory did not first use the term until March 1075, and even then the designation is only implied. Writing to the monks of St. Barnard in Romans Gregory said:

Ecclesiam vestram quam per legatum apostolice sedis reconciliari quesistis, prefato filio nostro Diensi episcopo qui et Romanis et Viennensis ecclesie filius est, consecrandum commisimus.¹¹²

The word vicis was not used about him until late in 1075, when Gregory wrote to all the abbots and superiors of France: ...dilectum filium nostrum Hugonem Diensem episcopum...vices nostras exequuturum mittimus...¹¹³ and he was not again referred to as legate by the pope until March 1077, when, in a letter to King William I of England, Gregory referred to Hugh and Hubert¹¹⁴ and Teuzo¹¹⁵ as legati nostri.¹¹⁶ His appointment as legate was confirmed at the Lent council in Rome in 1076, when he was commended for his success in the collection of the census: et ea que Diensis episcopus in episcopatu Diensi de decimis primitiis et ecclesiis fecit, et cetera que in

¹¹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412. Commisit autem ei vices suas in Gallia ubi plurimum symoniae serpebat pestis iniqua; quia perrari erant qui non essent aut symoniaci aut a symoniacis ordinati aut per manum laicam investiti.

¹¹¹ Augustin Fliche, La Réforme Gregorienne, ii, 147, n. 2.

¹¹² Registrum ii, 59, 212.

¹¹³ Gregory VII, Epistolae Vagantes, ed. H.E.J. Cowdrey (Oxford 1972); 12, p. 28. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412.

¹¹⁴ See below 'Legates', p. 180.

¹¹⁵ ibid.

¹¹⁶ Registrum iv, 17, p. 322.

legatione nostra statuit, nos quoque confirmamus.¹¹⁷

The collection of the census in France was an early duty imposed on Hugh after his accession to the bishopric of Die.¹¹⁸ The census at that time was a regular contribution by certain monasteries to the income of the papacy, in return for the protection of St. Peter or for the Libertas Romana (or both).¹¹⁹ This contribution could take the form of either money or goods and the amounts varied enormously. The first complete record of the amounts claimed by the papacy was the Liber Censuum of 1192¹²⁰ but the canonical collections of both Deusdedit and Anselm II of Lucca included accounts of the possessions of the Roman church. The similarities between these accounts have suggested that they had a common source in a 'privilege collection' compiled in Rome at the suggestion of Gregory VII, who would therefore have had at least some idea of what was due to him.¹²¹ It is obvious from his letter to the abbots and superiors of France that the calculation of the amounts due, as well as the actual collection, was frequently left to the houses themselves. This method had become unsatisfactory: '...some of you, partly from carelessness but partly from stubborn obstinacy, have hitherto fulfilled their obligation less completely than they should...'¹²² The collection of the census by Hugh is the

¹¹⁷ Registrum iii, 10(a).

¹¹⁸ E.V. 12, p.28.

¹¹⁹ I. S. Robinson, The Papacy, 1073 - 1198; Cambridge 1990, pp. 228-229, 269-270. The Libertas Romana could mean either temporal or spiritual freedom from the control of the bishop in whose diocese the monastery was situated; this could lead to friction, as in the case of Cluny and the bishopric of Mâcon (p.193).

¹²⁰ M. Michaud, 'Censuum (Liber)', Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique 3 (Paris 1942), 233-53.

¹²¹ Horst Fuhrmann, Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudo-isidorischen Fälschungen, MGH schriften, 24, 2, 517.

¹²² E.V. 12, p. 29. In a footnote H.E.J. Cowdrey has deduced from the evidence of this letter and two others from Urban II that it was not until the compilation of the Liber censuum of 1192 that the papacy had any accurate idea of the amounts due to it.

first recorded task which was not directly related to the office of bishop and may therefore be regarded as his first recorded legatine commission,¹²³ but the words '...we have found that he has faithfully performed all the duties that we have laid upon him...' indicate that there must have been others before this.¹²⁴

One such duty could have been his involvement with Abbot Hugh I of Cluny in making peace between King Philip I of France and Count Simon of Crépy, for which the date is not certain. The rather confused account in the anonymous life of Count Simon¹²⁵ relates how Simon's father, Ralph of Valois, having died, Philip saw an opportunity for an easy conquest and attacked and plundered his lands. Ralph had been married to Anne of Kiev, mother of Philip I: this was sufficient justification for Philip, who was constantly striving to extend his territories. Simon resisted him but was troubled because he was unable, as a result of this war, to offer prayers and perform penances for the soul of his father. Before his death Ralph had unjustly attacked and seized the castle where he was subsequently buried, and this action preyed on the mind of his scrupulous son. Breaking off the war with the king, Simon went to Rome where a penitencia was imposed on him by the pope. This penitencia consisted of having masses said for his father's soul, of transferring his body from the unjustly acquired castle and of the payment of money, part of which Gregory retained and part of which was distributed as alms to 'two religious men'. Gregory then instructed Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny to advise Simon, and through their mediation a peaceful settlement was arrived at between Simon and Philip. Fliche, on the evidence of two charters, pointed out that the anonymous author of the Life of Simon of Crépy must be mistaken in placing all these events in 1077. He considered 1075 a more likely date for Simon's journey to Rome. This date is

¹²³ It was a commission usually entrusted by Gregory to minor legates such as the subdeacon Hubert, who was sent to England in 1080 to collect the arrears of Peter's pence; see 'Legates,' p.183 below.

¹²⁴ E.V., 12, p. 29.

¹²⁵ Vita B. Simoni Crispeiensis i-iv, RHG xi, 37-8.

confirmed by the chronicle of Alberic of Three Fountains.¹²⁶ Many times during the years of Hugh's turbulent legation Gregory VII informed his correspondents in Burgundy that Hugh would be acting in conjunction with Hugh of Cluny in various cases,¹²⁷ but this is the only recorded instance of his having done so.

In letters written by Hugh before the death of Gregory VII he always referred to himself as a legate,¹²⁸ except in the only two letters that survive from him to the pope. These he subscribed 'the most useless servant of your holiness, Hugh, humble priest of Die',¹²⁹ and 'Hugh, humble priest of Die'.¹³⁰ After his excommunication by Victor III at the council of Benevento¹³¹ he did not again use the title 'legate' until 1094,¹³² and, as in the case of his letters to Gregory, he did not use it in his letter to Urban II after he had been reinstated,¹³³ or to Pascal II.¹³⁴

Following his estrangement from the papacy in 1087¹³⁵ Hugh

-
- ¹²⁶ Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium, MGH 23, 797. Augustin Fliche, Le Règne de Philippe Ier, Roi de France (1060-1108), Paris 1912, pp. 147-9.
- ¹²⁷ See below, 'Relations with Gregory VII' pp. 45-6.
- ¹²⁸ PL 157, 507, ii; ...sanctae sedis apostolicae legatus: 508, iii; Romanae Ecclesiae legatus: others.
- ¹²⁹ PL 148, 744A.
- ¹³⁰ PL 157, 509, No.vii.
- ¹³¹ Chronica Mon. Cass. iii, 72, MGH 34, 454.
- ¹³² PL 157, 516, xi; apostolicae sedis legatus.
- ¹³³ Letter from Hugh to Urban II, RHG xiv, 793: Hugo Lugdunensis ecclesiae servus.
- ¹³⁴ Letter of Hugh to Pascal II, PL 157, 525, xxiv: Hugo Lugdunensis Ecclesiae servus. The date for this letter is wrongly given as '1097-1098'.
- ¹³⁵ See below p.48-60, for an account of his quarrel with Desiderius of Monte Cassino (Victor III).

was not again designated legate until May 1094.¹³⁶ The chronicler Alberic of Three Fountains claimed that this was done at the request of Ivo of Chartres.¹³⁷ Certainly Ivo wrote to Urban II in 1091 or 1092 urging him to send a legate to France but he did not at that time specify that the legate should be Hugh,¹³⁸ (although writing to Hugh himself Ivo implied that he had asked for him).¹³⁹ Alberic was confusing this letter with a later one of Ivo to Paschal II in which he again asked for a legate from France (transalpinus) and specifically suggested Hugh.¹⁴⁰ Ivo wrote congratulating Hugh on his reappointment in 1094 and it is evident from this letter that Hugh was showing some reluctance about accepting the position, perhaps feeling that his difficulties with Urban, as well as Urban's difficulties with the anti-pope Clement III, would prevent his continuing with Gregory's reforming policies.¹⁴¹ However, he accepted and, following his reappointment by Paschal II, remained a legate until his death.

He was employed by Urban II in one more important diplomatic mission, the endeavour to persuade King Philip of France to abandon his unlawful wife, Bertrada de Montfort.¹⁴² In this he was not successful. In 1101, when he went on pilgrimage to

¹³⁶ Letter of Urban II, PL 151, 389, cxvi, JL 5523.

¹³⁷ Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium, MGH 23, 803. Anno 1094. Scribit (Ivo) Hugoni Lugdunensi archiepiscopo quod papa Urbanus disponat per Franciam legatum constituere, sicut fecerat papa Gregorius Hildebrandus; implying that Ivo had suggested this to Urban.

¹³⁸ PL 162, Ep xii, 24. Suggero paternitati vestrae ut partibus nostris ordinetis aliquem legatum, viri boni testimonii...

¹³⁹ See 'Debate with Ivo of Chartres,' below p. 312.

¹⁴⁰ PL 162, Ep. cix, 127-128. ...nullam magis cognovimus ...quam domnum Lugdunensem archiepiscopum...

¹⁴¹ PL 162, xxiv, 35; ...mihi dictum est te in tanta perturbatione humerum tuum huic oneri nolle supponere...

¹⁴² See below, pp.288-96, for a discussion of this affair.

Jerusalem, Pascal appointed him legate in Asia,¹⁴³ but no record remains of any business he may have conducted there. He was reappointed as legate in Burgundy on his return from the East.¹⁴⁴

Undoubtedly Hugh's quarrel with Odo of Ostia at the time of the election of Victor III and his temporary loss of the title of legate left him for a time in the wilderness,¹⁴⁵ but this was only part of the reason for his eclipse. Gregory VII stated many times that reform must be achieved by cooperation between the papacy and the episcopate, but he was aware that before this could take place the dead wood in the episcopate would have to be cut away.¹⁴⁶ In this enterprise his legate, Hugh of Die, had proved an able ally. Although reform had been ruthlessly implemented the presence of so many French bishops at all Urban's councils is evidence for its continuing success. But as Schieffer has pointed out,¹⁴⁷ when it came to building on that success, Urban may have been wary of employing a man who had made so many enemies during the days of his greatest legatine power. Although he reinstated Hugh as legate in 1094, Urban never addressed him with the confidence and intimacy that Gregory had always displayed towards him. It was unfortunate that Hugh did not attend the synod at Piacenza: his absence and temporary suspension from office may have placed a further strain on a relationship which had not been good since the election of Victor III. Moreover, the journey of the pope through France in 1095-6 obviously made the employment of legates in that country of less importance for the three remaining years of Urban's life; although Urban kept Hugh informed about his dealings with the

¹⁴³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487.

¹⁴⁴ Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 118.

¹⁴⁵ See below.

¹⁴⁶ See his letter to Hugh of Cluny, Registrum ii, 49, p. 188; Vix legales episcopos introitu et vita qui christianum populum Christi amore et non seculari ambitione regant invenio.

¹⁴⁷ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p. 140.

French bishops.¹⁴⁸

The title Hugh used most frequently, 'legate of the apostolic See',¹⁴⁹ suggests the status of that category of legate who by c. 1200 was being called legatus a latere, rather than the native legate whom canonists were to call legatus natus. But in fact he was an early example of a unique breed - the Gregorian permanent legate.¹⁵⁰ These legates differed from their predecessors in three important ways. Firstly in their rank: they were usually archbishops or bishops; secondly in the extent of their territory: this could be enormous, covering several provinces as it did in the case of Hugh and of Amatus of Oloron; thirdly in their juridical powers: in theory at least they possessed the vicis of the pope with full authority to deal with any dispute concerning matters of doctrine or discipline in their territories. Gregory wrote to the Christians of Narbonne, Gascony and Spain about the legate, Amatus: obedire atque eum audire mandamus ut propria faciem nostram seu nostrae vivae vocis oracula.¹⁵¹ In fact Hugh, like all Gregory's legates, was to find that he only possessed this kind of authority while Gregory agreed with his decisions.

At the beginning of Gregory's pontificate the territories under the jurisdiction of a Gregorian permanent legate were only in France and Burgundy. Henry IV's alleged simoniacal relationship with his bishops and his continuing hostility towards the papacy obviously made Gregory wary of trusting the German episcopate with such extensive (theoretical) powers, and it was only in the early 1080s, when communication between Germany and Rome became almost impossible, that he finally appointed permanent legates in Germany and in Lombardy.¹⁵² In

¹⁴⁸ See PL 151, clxv, 438; ccxvi, 488; ccxxvi, 491.

¹⁴⁹ PL 157, 507. ii; 516, xi; 517, xii & xiii; 520, xvii; 522, xx; 523, xxii; 526, xxviii.

¹⁵⁰ See I. S. Robinson, The Papacy, p. 149, seq.

¹⁵¹ E. V. 21, pp. 56-58.

¹⁵² Bishops Altmann of Passau and Anselm II of Lucca.

France the relative weakness of the king and the fact that he was at least paying occasional lip-service to the concept of loyalty to the papacy allowed the permanent legates to pursue their reforming activities with a fair amount of freedom.¹⁵³ However even in France difficulties could arise. Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims objected to having to submit to the authority of a local man (Hugh of Die) and demanded that someone be sent from Rome to judge him.¹⁵⁴ On the other hand the clerks of Cambrai resented the severity of Hugh of Die and Hugo Rainard of Langres, referring to them contemptuously as 'Romans', that is, having been sent by Rome.¹⁵⁵ Gregory himself seemed to feel that a legate native to the region would be more generally acceptable¹⁵⁶ and this theory was also advanced by Ivo of Chartres when he urged Paschal II to re-appoint Hugh as legate.¹⁵⁷ But because of the ambivalent attitude towards the legates in a clergy jealous for its local autonomy, and also, most importantly, because of Gregory's frequent failure to support his legates' decisions, their path in France was not always easy. Nevertheless, the office of permanent legate remained the principal instrument of reform in the French church during the Gregorian period. This was in a large measure due to the intransigence and perseverance of Hugh of Die.

The office declined at the end of the eleventh century, in part because of the success of one of Gregory's reforming

¹⁵³ King Philip could still make trouble for them; see Hugh's difficulties at the the council of Poitiers in 1078.

¹⁵⁴ Letter of archbishop Manasses to Gregory VII, RHG xiv. 611, lxxvi: ..legatis vestris Romanis, non ultramontanis...

¹⁵⁵ Letter of the clerks of Cambrai to the clerks of Rheims, RHG xiv, viii, 779: ...siquidem Romanorum...

¹⁵⁶ See his letter introducing Hugh as legate to the monks of St. Bernard in Romans, where he is careful to point out that Hugh is 'a son of Romans and Vienne', (Registrum ii, 59, p. 212).

¹⁵⁷ PL 162, Ep. cix, 127-128; ...ut alicui transalpino legationem sedis apostolicae injungatis...nullam magis cognovimus...quam domnum Lugdunensem archiepiscopum...

measures. By that time the centralization of authority in the papacy was firmly enough established to enable Paschal II to send out his legates, members of the college of cardinals, from the Roman church. These men, in their turn, were resented by Hugh, then archbishop of Lyons.¹⁵⁸

Hugh's early career as a legate was a stormy one. Hugh of Flavigny said that the pope sent him into Gaul to stamp out the evils in the church - particularly the evil of simony.¹⁵⁹ It is evident from his earliest councils that he had not taken this commission lightly. He proved quite ruthless in his campaign against simony, showing very little mercy to those whom he judged to be tainted with this and many other errors. During his thirty-three years as legate he is known to have held at least sixteen councils. As a result of his action at these councils eleven archbishops (Vienne, Lyons, Bordeaux, Sens, Bourges, Rheims, Tours [Ralph I and Ralph II] Besançon, Narbonne and Alby) and nineteen bishops (Le Puy, Clermont, Grenoble, Noyen, Auxerre, Senlis, Chartres, Rennes, Beauvais [Guy and Stephen], Amiens, Laon, Soissons [Theobald and Ursio], Poitiers, Térouanne [Drogo and Lambert], Arles, and Angers) had been excommunicated, suspended or placed under a ban of some sort. A study of his relations with the papacy during the years 1074-1078, suggests that Gregory, far from approving this ruthless application of the letter of the law, deplored the severity of his legate and tried to mitigate it and to persuade Hugh to adopt a more compassionate attitude. Gregory VII was in a difficult position. His handling of King Henry IV had caused a virtual schism in the German Church and he must have been afraid that the actions of his legate might provoke a similar rebellion on the part of Philip I of France. The decimation of the French bishops, so many of whom owed their positions to the king, can only have been a matter of great anxiety to the pope, trying to find a via media between the implementation of reform and the conciliation of the king. To this dilemma was added his sense of responsibility for

¹⁵⁸ See below p. 67 and 'Suffragans,' pp. 226-7.

¹⁵⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412. Commisit autem ei vices suas in Gallia, ubi plurimum symoniae serpebat pestis iniqua...

the souls of those committed to his care. It is not surprising that there is often a contradiction between his public pronouncements and the decisions he reached in private. Hugh of Die, understandably but unjustly, blamed him for this. 'Simoniacs and other criminals, suspended or deposed or even condemned by us, run to Rome, where they should be made to feel the full rigour of justice, and they bring back only mercy, freely given.'¹⁶⁰ Hugh's harshness invoked several rebukes by Gregory, as well as reversals of his decisions. This failure of papal support caused the first setback in his career.

PL 157, vii, 511; ...quod simioniaci vel quicunque criminiosi a nobis suspensi vel depositi aut etiam damnati libenter currunt Romam et ubi deberent sentire ampliorem rigorem justitiae inde reportant quasi misericordiam pro voluntate,

RELATIONS WITH GREGORY VII.

Gregory VII was not an easy man to serve. His frequent use of the prophetic exhortation 'cursed be the man who holds back his sword from blood',¹⁶¹ (accompanied by Gregory I's explanation, interpreting the sword as 'the word of preaching') seems to encourage his agents to great severity, but on the other hand he many times urged compassion and moderation. His attitude might be described as hatred of heresy combined with charity towards the heretic - an attitude his lieutenant would find very difficult to reconcile with the extirpation of heresy on the ground. As early as January, 1075, there is an indication that Gregory may have been worried about the draconian methods of his vices. Writing to Hugh about some members of the cathedral chapter in Die who had been stealing from the church¹⁶² he urged him, instead of prosecuting them, to accept restitution and to bring some of them to the Lent synod in Rome. He said:

Melius enim nobis placet ut pro pietate interdum reprehendaris, quam pro nimia severitate in odium ecclesie tue venias. Debes quidem filios tuos, quia rudes sunt et indocti conspicere et ad meliora paulatim provocare...¹⁶³

There is no evidence over the next four years that Hugh gave any consideration to this advice. Quite the reverse: his policy was to be to strike hard at the offender, to allocate the severest punishments and to drive transgressors to better ways by fear rather than lead them by encouragement. He was never in his life to be reproached for his leniency.

¹⁶¹ He made use of this quotation (Jeremiah 48, 10) ten times in his Register; Caspar, p. 645

¹⁶² For an account of these difficulties in Die see above, p. 14

¹⁶³ Registrum ii, 43, p.180. He was to express that same idea in 1081 when writing to Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oleron about William of England (Registrum ix, 5, p.579). 'It seems to us far better and easier to win him to God by gentleness and leniency and open reasoning, rather than by severity and stern justice'.

No letter exists from Gregory to Hugh between January 1075 and May 1077. This is not surprising. The relatively small number of letters extant addressed to legates suggests that communications to them from the pope were entrusted to messengers to deliver orally for reasons of security. What is surprising is how little communication there was from the legate to the pope. Only two letters survive to Gregory VII. This is not merely a case of letters having been subsequently lost, but of important letters never having been written. It is obvious from Hugh's letter to Gregory, written some time after the council of Autun (September 1077), probably in November 1077, that he had neither written after the council of Clermont, thirteen months before Autun, nor had he been to Rome.¹⁶⁴ Hugh was here violating a strict rule laid down by Gregory VII early in his pontificate. In two letters to Gerald of Ostia he had explicitly said that it was the duty of a legate to report fully and frequently to Rome either in person or by letter.¹⁶⁵ Hugh was probably in Rome for the Lent council of 1075, to which he had been invited by the pope,¹⁶⁶ and for the Lent council of 1076, at which his appointment as legate was confirmed and his work as Gregory's agent commended:¹⁶⁷ but he is not mentioned among those present at Canossa in January 1077.¹⁶⁸ He told the pope that he would come to Rome after the council in Poitiers in January 1078,¹⁶⁹ but a letter from Archbishop Manasses of Rheims establishes that he was not at the Lent council in Rome (25

¹⁶⁴ PL 148, 744, viii.

¹⁶⁵ Registrum i, 6, p.8 and Registrum i, 16, p.25. I. S. Robinson has pointed out that this duty, referred to by Gregory as having 'long been the custom', appears here for the first time in legatine history. (The Papacy, 1073-1198, Cambridge Medieval Textbooks, 1990, p. 151).

¹⁶⁶ Registrum ii, 43, p.179

¹⁶⁷ Registrum iii, 10 (a).

¹⁶⁸ Registrum iv, 12 (a), p.314

¹⁶⁹ PL 157, no. vii, 509; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

February - 3 March 1078).¹⁷⁰ The next certain record of his being there is in a letter from Gregory to the legates Teuzo and Hubert written in May 1078.¹⁷¹

This lack of communication had some very serious results. After the council of Autun, instead of going to Rome or at least writing to the pope, Hugh entrusted the details of the council (and of the council of Clermont, thirteen months previously) to a man he referred to as 'R. your Parisian'. It was only when he discovered that the unreliable R. had returned from Rome and had failed to contact him that he finally wrote to the pope about the two councils.¹⁷²

Just how unreliable R. was may be seen from Gregory's ignorance of the affair of Geoffrey of Chartres, nephew of the chancellor of France, Geoffrey of Paris. Geoffrey of Chartres had been deposed in his absence, by Hugh at Autun.¹⁷³ Towards the end of 1077, three months after Autun, Gregory wrote to Hugh that it had come to his ears (obviously he is not talking about an official report)¹⁷⁴ that Geoffrey had been deposed because of his extreme youth and general unworthiness to hold a bishopric. If this were the case, Gregory said, he would be pleased to confirm the sentence. Shortly after this letter was written Geoffrey himself, with his uncle the chancellor, arrived in Rome complaining loudly that he had been uncanonically accused and deposed in his absence and that the legate Hugh had refused to allow six bishops and the bishop of Paris to speak on his behalf.¹⁷⁵ Gregory again wrote to Hugh saying that he had kept

¹⁷⁰ RHG xiv, 782A

¹⁷¹ Registrum v, 22, p.385.

¹⁷² PL 148, viii, 744. This letter of Hugh of Die to the pope is included by Migne in the letters of Gregory VII.

¹⁷³ Registrum v, 17, p.378.

¹⁷⁴ Registrum v, 11, p.363. Pervenit enim ad aures nostris.

¹⁷⁵ Registrum ix, 15, p. 594. This letter is misplaced in the Register; see n. 1, p.594.

the two men in Rome for more than three weeks expecting that Hugh would come himself or that he would at least let the pope have an official account of the proceedings by letter. Then, hearing nothing from the legate, he had felt compelled to absolve Geoffrey and let the two men return to France.¹⁷⁶ When they had gone, the pope received Hugh's letter which explained about the unreliable R. but still gave him no details of the case, merely asking what had been done about it.¹⁷⁷ In reply Gregory wrote one of the sternest letters in his Register, castigating Hugh for his neglect of the normal forms of legatine procedure. Because he had neither come to Rome nor written, the pope had felt obliged to reinstate Geoffrey. In this letter Gregory is almost incoherent with anger:

...aut ipse venires aut ad comprobanda obiecta in eum capitula legatos et testes idoneos delegares. Quod cum minime feceris iustitie necessitate coacti de eius restitutione sancte Romane ecclesie iudicio adquevimus. Cui si superna pietas aliquando respirare concesserit liquido tua beatitudo intelligere poterit, eam multo inreprehensibilis hoc egisse, quam te in matris tue iudicalem censuram manum reprehensionis extendisse¹⁷⁸

It is possible to sense the embarrassment of the pope faced with the anger of the chancellor and compelled to admit to ignorance of the details of the affair. In fact, events were to prove that Hugh had been right. Geoffrey of Chartres was unfit to hold episcopal office. He had been pushed into the bishopric of Chartres by his uncle, he was below canonical age and he led a

¹⁷⁶ Registrum ix, 15, p.594. Is it coincidence that R. was from Paris? He may have been guilty of dishonesty rather than unreliability. Did uncle and nephew encounter him on the way to Rome and persuade him not to deliver the legate's report to the pope?

¹⁷⁷ PL 148, 744, viii. Rogamus paternitatum vestrum ut sententiam suam nobis dignetur scribere super ordinatione...Cartonensis.

¹⁷⁸ Registrum ix, 32, p.618. This letter is also misplaced in the Register. See n.3, p.618.

scandalous life;¹⁷⁹ but because of Hugh's neglect of the duties expected by Gregory of a legate, it was to be twelve years before he was finally convicted and deposed, by Urban II in 1089.¹⁸⁰ Fliche saw this affair as an example of Gregory's moderation towards those who appealed to him personally.¹⁸¹ It is true that he was always prepared to give a sympathetic hearing to transgressors, but in this case he was acting not through benevolence but through lack of information. The letter to the legate shows how he resented this.¹⁸²

It may have been because of these two letters from Gregory that Hugh wrote to the pope so promptly after the council of Poitiers in January 1078.¹⁸³ He described the council as 'not unfruitful', a reasonable assessment in view of the decrees emanating from it,¹⁸⁴ but he gave very few details, most of his letter being taken up with his complaints about Ralph of Tours.¹⁸⁵ Again he entrusted additional information to a messenger, this time the more reliable Teuzo, a monk occasionally employed as a legate by Gregory.¹⁸⁶ He wrote that he was coming to Rome 'as soon as possible' to discuss in private with the pope

¹⁷⁹ See letter of Ivo of Chartres to Richerius of Sens, PL 162, 18D; ... caprum emissarium, cujus adulteria, fornicationes, perjuria, proditiones per omnem ferme latinam ecclesiam publicatae sunt...

¹⁸⁰ See letters of Urban II to the Chartrains and to Richerius of Sens, JL 5438, 5439; PL 151, 325-327;

¹⁸¹ A. Fliche, La Réforme Grégorienne 2, 250.

¹⁸² See also Registrum i, 16, p.25, where the pope, writing to Gerard of Ostia, is quite explicit about the difficulty and embarrassment he is subjected to by having to act without a clear idea of the details of the cases he is dealing with.

¹⁸³ PL 157, no.vii, 509. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

¹⁸⁴ See below, pp. 115-19 for an account of this council.

¹⁸⁵ See below p. 274-5 for an account of this affair.

¹⁸⁶ See below, 'Legates,' p. 185.

certain intimate difficulties and the people who had caused them.¹⁸⁷

He must have been aware that his condemnation of so many leaders of the church in his area, as well as making him very unpopular locally, was not meeting with papal approval because at the end of the letter he complained that his sentences were not being upheld in Rome:

Provideat itaque sanctitas vestra ne diutius
tam obprobriose nobis impropereetur, quod
symoniaci vel quicumque criminosi a nobis
suspensi vel depositi aut etiam dampnati,
libenter currunt Romam; et ubi deberent
sentire ampliorem rigorem justitiae, inde
reportant quasi misericordiam pro voluntate;
et qui antea nec in levibus praesumpserunt
peccare, postmodum exercent aptissimam
negociationem cum tyrannide in commissis
sibi ecclesiis.¹⁸⁸

He certainly knew by the time he wrote this that his deposition of Geoffrey of Chartres had been reversed and he may have been aware of reversals of his decisions in other cases, of which no record now remains. Those cases for which there are records reveal the extent of the pope's rejection. Of the eight archbishops arraigned by Hugh at that time, only two (Lyons and Vienne) were finally deposed.¹⁸⁹ Joscelyn of Bordeaux, the only archbishop not specifically reinstated in the bull of 9 March, remained in his see until his death in 1086.¹⁹⁰ The accounts in the Gallia Christiana of the careers of the bishops

¹⁸⁷ This may be another reference to his difficulties with Richerius of Sens about which Hugh was so mysterious after Autun. See 'Metropolitans' below, p. 279.

¹⁸⁸ PL 157, no. vii, 509; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

¹⁸⁹ See councils of Clermont, Autun and Poitiers, below pp. 110-119.

¹⁹⁰ Gall. Chris. ii. 805C; 'we are persuaded that he was restored to grace in that same year...' citing a placitum conferred by Joscelyn in 1078 in the presence of Duke Guy-Godfrey (William of Aquitaine).

accused by Hugh and their appearances in subsequent documents show that only three of them (Le Puy, Clermont and Grenoble) were deposed at this time. If Hugh was aware of even some of these decisions it is not surprising that he complained of lack of papal support.

On 9 March 1078, immediately after the Lent council, Gregory issued a proclamation which Hugh must have seen as a personal attack and a betrayal of all the pope's earlier instructions and decrees on the subject of reform. This bull was not directed to any one person or group but presumably to all the faithful. It went tersely to the point:

'Because it is the custom of the holy Roman church, of which by God's will we are the unworthy servant, to tolerate some things and to dissemble in others, preferring a discreet moderation to the rigours of canon law, we have discussed, not without serious deliberation, the following cases of the bishops of France and Burgundy who were suspended or excommunicated by our legate, Hugh, bishop of Die.'¹⁹¹

In every case discussed the verdict arrived at was the same. The archbishops of Rheims, Besançon, Sens, Bourges and Tours and the bishop of Chartres were all restored to their offices. Moreover, Hugh was accused of having passed a sentence lacking not merely in clemency but in *gravitas* on Manasses of Rheims and of having suspended Richard of Bourges in anger rather than in a spirit of conciliar justice (*irato animo et non synodale iudicio*).¹⁹² The pope wrote to the clergy and people of Tours explaining that their archbishop, Ralph, had not been suspended 'by due process of law' and also that his case had already been settled by Pope Alexander II.¹⁹³ The sole concession to Hugh's status was a

¹⁹¹ Registrum v, 17, p.378; Quia consuetudo sancti Romane ecclesie cui Deo auctore licet indigni deservimus quedam tolerare quedam etiam dissimulare, discretionis temperantiam potius quam rigorem canonum sequentes causas episcoporum Francie et Burgundie qui suspensi seu damnati a legato nostro Hugone Diensi episcopo fuerant, non sine gravi labore discussimus...

¹⁹² ibid.

¹⁹³ E.V. 22, p. 59; see 'Ralph I of Tours,' below p.275.

stipulation in every case that the prelate should appear before the legate or someone delegated by him to receive a final absolution. It is not known if any of them did this. Manasses of Rheims certainly did not.¹⁹⁴

Although not directed to any one person, this letter was undoubtedly written by Gregory VII with Philip I in mind. The deposition of the three archbishops from the desmesne, Rheims, Sens and Tours, and the disgrace of the nephew of the bishop of Paris must have been seen by the pope as injurious to his relations with the French king. Whatever may have been the legalities of their cases, their summary dismissal by the pope's legate represented a degree of hostility to Philip at a time when Gregory would have preferred to develop a more cordial relationship with France, in view of the troubled situation in Germany. King Philip must have been appalled by these sentences, coming as they did so soon after the prohibition of investiture at Autun the previous year. The pope's swift reversal of his legate's decisions was undoubtedly a placatory gesture, and Hugh's loyalty in implementing his master's decrees seems to have been sacrificed on the altar of expediency.

Hugh was not present at the Lent council when the 'serious deliberations' took place, but he sent delegates in his place. This is categorically stated in a letter from Manasses of Rheims to Hugh himself.¹⁹⁵ The chronicler Berthold of Reichenau reported that Hugh was present,¹⁹⁶ but Berthold was confused about the councils of 1078 and 1079 and may have been confused about this also. Hugh said that he was coming to Rome immediately after Poitiers (quam citius venturi),¹⁹⁷ but the letter from Manasses proves that he did not come. It would be difficult to reconcile the wording of the bull of 9 March with Hugh's being present in Rome when it was written. Promisit enim

¹⁹⁴ Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 782 C.

¹⁹⁵ ibid., 782A.

¹⁹⁶ Bertholdi Annales, MGH 5, 306.

¹⁹⁷ PL 157, no.vii, 509; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

in manu nostra quod...coram legato debeat exponere... and promittens se de obiectis coram legato nostro satisfacere...¹⁹⁸ suggests that these men would go from Rome to the presence of the legate. However, Gregory's letter of May 1078, to Teuzo and Hubert, proves that Hugh was eventually in Rome at that time.¹⁹⁹

The effect of this public repudiation and reprimand on a man of Hugh's temperament must have been profoundly disturbing. His plea for support from the pope a few weeks earlier shows his awareness of the loss of the papal sympathy which was essential if he were to carry out the programme of reform outlined by Gregory at the start of his pontificate. After 9 March 1078 he was aware that he bore the sole responsibility for the administration of the most serious punishments without any certainty that the pope would concur with his judgements. It seems obvious from the evidence of the next two years that his health, perhaps already giving trouble, broke down completely. Hugh of Flavigny said that at some time before the council of Lyons in 1080 Hugh had retired to Vienne to recover from an illness (pro corporis curatione).²⁰⁰ Gilles Bollenot, however, claims that this illness was not genuine, that the legate was sulking and in disgrace after Autun and Poitiers.²⁰¹ C-J Hefele implied, in his account of a later incident, that Hugh was capable of feigning illness for his own end.²⁰² However, a gradual breakdown in his health would explain his uncharacteristic inertia in the performance of the basic duty of a legate, formulated by Gregory VII, a frequent communication with Rome. It could also be a reason for his suspicion of plots

¹⁹⁸ Registrum v, 17, p.380.

¹⁹⁹ Registrum v, 22, p.385. Qui tunc presens aderat.

²⁰⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 421.

²⁰¹ Gilles Bollenot Un Légat Pontifical, p.125.

²⁰² C-J Hefele, Histoire des Conciles, ed. Dom Henri Leclercq (Paris 1912) 5, 468. 'Une maladie diplomatique'. See below, 'Suffragans,' p. 226.

against him²⁰³ and, most importantly, it could explain why nothing was done in six cases which he was called on by Gregory to deal with during the next two years.

The first of these cases concerned bishop Rainerius of Orléans, since 1076 a source of scandal in his diocese because of his uncanonical election, his sale of clerical appointments and his disorderly private life.²⁰⁴ In April 1078, Gregory ordered him, under pain of anathema, to present himself at a council to be held by Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny.²⁰⁵ A year later Gregory wrote to the people of Orléans that he was sending the legates to judge Rainerius and he promised, if their report was unfavourable, to depose him and appoint a certain Sancho to the see.²⁰⁶ But Rainerius, still defying papal orders, was at the council of Issoudun in 1081.²⁰⁷

In May 1078, Gregory instructed his legates Hubert and Teuzo to bring the complaints of Ivo of Dol (who was having difficulty in retaining his bishopric although he had been Gregory's choice) to a council which Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny would be holding to deal with Manasses of Rheims and the bishops of France.²⁰⁸ A council for that purpose was arranged to take place at Troyes in 1079 but was subsequently cancelled.²⁰⁹ The question of Dol did not arise at the council of Lyons in 1080, which dealt with the case of Manasses.²¹⁰

²⁰³ See below, p.279, for his suspicions of Richerius of Sens and pp. 275-6 for his quarrels with Ralph of Tours. It does seem, however, that Ralph may have been involved in a plot to discredit him.

²⁰⁴ Registrum v, 8, p.358 and 20, p.383.

²⁰⁵ Registrum v, 20, p.383.

²⁰⁶ Registrum vi, 23, p.435.

²⁰⁷ Mansi xx, 579.

²⁰⁸ Registrum v, 22, p.385. It must have been at this council that the bishops sent back from Rome in March were to receive absolution from Hugh. See below p.96.

²⁰⁹ Letter of Manasses to Hugh. RHG xiv, 782.

²¹⁰ Mansi xx, 551. See 'Agent of Reform,' below p.122.

In August 1078 Gregory wrote to Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny to urge them to hold the council he had already mentioned to Hubert and Teuzo, in order to deal with various complaints as well as with the case of Manasses, still pending since his oath in Rome at the end of 1077.²¹¹ Nothing was done about Manasses until the council of Lyons in 1080.²¹²

When Robert of Flanders did nothing about the moral tone of his clergy, a great many of whom were married,²¹³ or about the uncanonical appointment of archdeacon Hubert to the see of Térouanne after the death of Drogo,²¹⁴ he was excommunicated by Hugo Rainardus of Langres and the legate Hubert.²¹⁵ In spite of Robert's inactivity in the matter of reform, Gregory was shocked by this and wrote urgently to Hugh of Die to investigate this case with Hugh of Cluny and to reinstate Robert. There is a suggestion in this letter, written in November 1078, that the pope may have had some misgivings about the state of Hugh's health. ...mandamus fraternitate tue ut si tibi molestum non est ad illas partes festines accedere...Si autem tibi possibile non est per temetipsum agere mitte personas religiosas pro te...²¹⁶ There is no record that Hugh ever undertook this investigation. On Hubert's death Robert imposed the blatantly simoniac Lambert on the see of Térouanne.²¹⁷ A letter of the pope to Robert shows that this had been done at the insistence of the king: 'Now you may say that you were brought to do this evil since the king opposed you.'²¹⁸ (Lambert, although excommunicated, was eventually pardoned and retained in his see because of the

²¹¹ Registrum vi, 3, p.394.

²¹² Mansi xx, 551.

²¹³ Registrum iv, 10 and 11, pp.309-10.

²¹⁴ Registrum iv, 10, p.309, and Registrum vii, 16, p.490

²¹⁵ Registrum vi, 7, p.407.

²¹⁶ ibid. See below, Suffragans, p.233 and Legates p.182

²¹⁷ See Regisrum ix, 13, p. 592, ix, 31, p. 617 and ix, 33, p. 620; also Council of Meaux, below p.

²¹⁸ E. V. 46, p. 113.

intervention of Gregory VII).²¹⁹

The fifth case concerned the the quarrel between the abbeys of Saint-Sever and Sainte-Croix.²²⁰ In March 1079 Gregory wrote to Amatus of Oloron asking him to hold a council with Hugh of Die to enforce the papal decision in this matter.²²¹ Nothing was done about this until the council of Bordeaux. (There is doubt about the date of this council, but Fazy preferred 1080).²²²

The final case in which the legate appears to have done nothing was the dispute between the canons of St. Vincent in Mâcon and the monastery of Cluny, which escalated into a battle involving the bishop of Mâcon, Landericus de Brézé, supported by his metropolitan, Gebuin of Lyons.²²³ In April or May 1079 Gregory had written to Hugh expressing his distress at the serious harm that this disagreement could cause to so many people and urging him, in association with other religious men, to call the protagonists together in order to bring about a settlement.²²⁴ Nothing was done until Gregory, early in 1080, sent another legate, Peter of Albano, to resolve the case.²²⁵ These six cases underline Hugh's complete absence from the records between May 1078 and January 1080.

In the summer of 1078 Gregory wrote to Archbishop Ralph I of Tours, who had been unjustly condemned by Hugh at Poitiers,

²¹⁹ See Council of Meaux, below, p.128.

²²⁰ See below, 'Agent of Reform,' p. 94.

²²¹ Registrum vi, 24 and 25, pp.436-437 (March 1079).

²²² Max Fazy, Notice sur Amat évêque d'Oloron, archevêque de Bordeaux et légat du Saint-siège. Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, Université de Paris, xxiv. Cinquième mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen-Age, Paris 1908. pp.91-93. Mansi xx, 527, 551.

²²³ See below, pp. 193-6, for an account of this quarrel.

²²⁴ E.V. 30, p.77. It may be because of this letter that Gaussin presumed that Hugh of Die presided over the council of Anse in January, 1080; see p. 121, n.245.

²²⁵ See 'Legates,' below pp. 193-6.

to say that he was sending Hugh, together with Hubert and Wighard,²²⁶ to discuss 'church business' and to bring some unspecified affair to an end.²²⁷ It is clear from this letter that the pope would not be surprised if Hugh did not come to Tours.²²⁸ There is nothing to show if he did or not.

During 1078 and 1079 nothing was done in these cases because the councils which Hugh was to hold in conjunction with Hugh of Cluny and Amatus of Oloron did not take place. A council was arranged to take place in Troyes in 1079, but was cancelled.²²⁹ In spite of this apparent indolence Gregory's letters to Hugh at this time remain as cordial as before. There is a note of sympathy and encouragement in Gregory's letter concerning the trouble between Lyons and Cluny which suggests that he was aware that Hugh was struggling with some personal problems.²³⁰

It is significant that in all these cases Hugh was not to appear alone. Undoubtedly his actions at Autun and Poitiers had caused a lot of resentment and it is possible that Gregory thought that an association with Abbot Hugh of Cluny would act as a curb on the zeal of the bishop and make the decisions of his councils more generally acceptable. He admitted as much some years later in a letter to Robert of Flanders:

Quoniam Lugdunensis archiepiscopus quamvis de eo
satis confidam, vobis suspectus est ne suspicio
prorsus ordinem rerum utiliter gerendarum

²²⁶ ibid., p. 185.

²²⁷ E. V. 23, p. 61.

²²⁸ ibid., 'If... it should happen that by reason of some hindrance the legates whom we have named cannot be present together...'

²²⁹ See letter from Manasses of Rheims to Hugh of Die in which he mentions this council. RHG xiv, 782B. It is also referred to by Gregory VII in a letter to Hugh of Die, E.V. 30, p.76.

²³⁰ E.V. 30, p.77. 'Let it always remain firmly established in your mind that Almighty God...will both secure for you a sufficiency of this world's peace and...will also reward you with eternal peace according to your merits.'

inpediat, gravem et illustrem virum Cluniacensem
abbatem sibi associare censuimus.²³¹

H.E.J. Cowdrey suggested that Hugh of Cluny, because of his moderation and skill in handling men, was especially fitted to serve in double harness with Hugh of Die, and he maintained that the collaboration between the two men 'is likely to have been more considerable than the scanty surviving evidence records.'²³² As we have seen, except for their early partnership in the affair of Simon of Crêpy,²³³ there is no record that the two men ever acted together.

Hugh's absence from the records of ecclesiastical affairs in France came to an end at the council of Lyons in 1080,²³⁴ at which Manasses of Rheims was finally deposed. A final clue about Hugh's health is provided by Hugh of Flavigny (a notable opponent of Manasses). He reported that before this council, while Hugh was recovering from an illness at Vienne, Manasses tried to bribe him not to insist that he be present at Lyons.²³⁵

From this time until the end of Gregory's life, the pope's relations with his legate remained cordial. Writing to the count of Blois in 1081, he referred to Hugh as 'maxime karissimus frater.'²³⁶ When Gebuinus of Lyons died Hugh was the pope's immediate choice as his successor.²³⁷ According to one Gregorian account, when Gregory VII was dying in Salerno in May 1085 he was asked by the cardinals and bishops who were present who he would wish to succeed him. He suggested Anselm II of

²³¹ Registrum ix, 34, p.621.

²³² H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, Oxford, 1970: p.166

²³³ See above p. 25.

²³⁴ Mansi xx, 551.

²³⁵ Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii, MGH 8, 421-422.

²³⁶ Registrum ix, 9, p.585.

²³⁷ Registrum ix, 18, p.598.

Lucca, his legate in Lombardy, cardinal-bishop Odo of Ostia, recently his legate in Germany, or Hugh of Lyons, his legate in France.²³⁸ (The chronicle of Monte Cassino claimed that Abbot Desiderius, who was present when Gregory died, was the pope's first choice).²³⁹ During the two years of negotiation which followed there is no evidence that Hugh was even considered by the electors.

²³⁸ Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann und N. Fickermann, MGH, Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit.5, 75.

²³⁹ Chronica Monasterii Casinensis, MGH 34, 447.

When Desiderius of Monte Cassino was finally elected to the papacy as Victor III, Hugh manifested great opposition to the election and great animosity towards the new pope. As a result of this quarrel he was excommunicated at the council of Benevento in August 1087.²⁴¹ This disgrace was a second setback in his career. He wrote at length to Countess Matilda of Tuscany, who had sent legates urging him to come to Rome, to express his disapproval of the election of Abbot Desiderius²⁴² but his letter does not clarify the reasons for his extraordinary antipathy to the man nor for his delay in going to Italy. His nomination as a successor by Gregory on his deathbed,²⁴³ had he known of it, should certainly have ensured his speedy journey, but by his own account he did not appear in Italy until Pentecost 1086, when Desiderius was first persuaded to accept the papacy.²⁴⁴ In the letter to Matilda he gave no indication that he was aware that Gregory had nominated him but it is obvious that he felt that he should have had some part in the election.²⁴⁵ Anselm of Lucca, who had known him since they were together in Rome waiting consecration,²⁴⁶ urged Bishop Pontius of St. Tropez to persuade Hugh to go to Rome matrem suam

²⁴⁰ Chronica Monasterii Cassinensis, H. Hoffmann, MGH 34; H. E. J. Cowdrey, The age of Abbot Desiderius: Monte Cassino, the Papacy and the Normans in the eleventh and the early twelfth centuries, Oxford 1983.

²⁴¹ Chronica Mon. Cass. iii, 72, MGH 34, 454; Mansi xx, 639.

²⁴² PL 157, 511, viii.

²⁴³ Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, Carl Erdmann und Norbert Flickermann, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 5, Munich 1981, p.75. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 466

²⁴⁴ PL 157, 511, viii.

²⁴⁵ See below, p. 51, for a possible explanation of his considering this.

²⁴⁶ See above, p. 10.

visitare et liberare de manu mortis.²⁴⁷ He was of the opinion that fear or negligence or 'a guilty desire to do nothing',²⁴⁸ could be the cause of Hugh's delay. Abbé Rony saw this as a joke,²⁴⁹ but Hugh had already manifested a culpable negligence in his dealings with Gregory VII,²⁵⁰ and as for fear, Anselm knew that Hugh had reason to be afraid. According to the chronicler Bernold of Constance, Anselm and Hugh had been prevented by Henry IV from attending the Rome synod of 1083.²⁵¹ This hindrance may have been achieved by threats and even by imprisonment, as was the case of Odo of Ostia.²⁵² Anselm's assessment of the reasons for Hugh's tardiness in going to Rome was probably quite serious.

Dom Leclercq commented that this letter to the countess Matilda is so full of malevolence and falsehoods that it is difficult to believe that it can be the work of Archbishop Hugh.²⁵³ Fliche, also unwilling to believe the worst of Hugh, managed to find it essentially truthful, at the expense of the chronicle of Monte Cassino, which he declared biased in favour of its former abbot.²⁵⁴ Abbé Rony, wanting to believe the best of everybody, succeeded, to his own satisfaction at least, in reconciling the Cassinese account of Peter Deacon with Hugh's letter, claiming that there was no essential difference between them. 'Les deux lettres d'Hugues de Lyon à la comtesse Mathilde confirment, dans l'ensemble, le récit de Pierre du Mont-Cassin:

²⁴⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, p. 444.

²⁴⁸ ibid. Quietis noxiae amore.

²⁴⁹ Abbé Rony, 'Hugues de Romans, Légat Pontifical 1073-1106,' Revue des Questions Historiques, cvii, 1927, 296.

²⁵⁰ See above p.34, (not writing after Clermont and Autun)

²⁵¹ Bernoldi Chronicon, a. 1080, MGH 5, 438. 25.

²⁵² Registrum ix, 35a, 627.

²⁵³ C.-J. Hefele, Histoires des Conciles, ed. Dom H. Leclercq, v, 333, fn.3.

²⁵⁴ A. Fliche, 'Le Pontificat de Victor III (1086-1087)', Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, xx, (1924), 387-412.

l'accord est complet sur les points importants'.²⁵⁵ Hugh's letter to the countess is certainly full of spite, but it is not impossible to believe that he wrote it because of the very similar manner in which he wrote about Ralph of Tours to Gregory VII after the council of Poitiers in 1078.²⁵⁶

Three possible reasons for his writing it suggest themselves. In the first place he may have resented the fact that his claim to the papacy, as one of those designated by Gregory, had been overlooked. Deusdedit, who was completing his canonical collection at precisely that time (it was dedicated to pope Victor III), conceded that a dying pope might suggest names, as Gregory did, but did not suggest that this would have any binding power.²⁵⁷ However, the election decree of 1059 had certainly ruled out any attempt to reduce the papacy to an item of testamentary deposition.²⁵⁸ Hugh could not have considered that his having been mentioned gave him any rights, but it is very possible that he was aggrieved that both men mentioned with him, Anselm of Lucca and Odo of Ostia, were seen as serious candidates by Desiderius.

It is also possible that Hugh resented the fact that the election had taken place before he came to Rome. He had been summoned by both Anselm of Lucca and envoys from Matilda²⁵⁹ to

²⁵⁵ Abbé Rony, 'L'élection de Victor III,' Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France xiv, 1928, 159.

²⁵⁶ PL 157, 509, vii.

²⁵⁷ Deusdedit, Collectio Canonum, ed. V. Wulf von Glanvell, Paderborn, 1905, iv, p. 14, 30-33: Ut imminente suo transitu idem pontifex (Romanus) de suo successore decernat.

²⁵⁸ MGH Legum iv. Constitutiones et Acta i, p.539 seq. 'on the death of the pontiff of the universal Roman church, firstly the cardinal bishops shall treat together with the greatest care, then shall summon the cardinal clerks to them and then the rest of the clergy and the people shall approach to consent to the new election.'

²⁵⁹ PL 157, 511, viii; Quot et quantis sanctae Romanae ecclesiae litteris et reverentissimae memoriae beati Anselmi et vestrarum tam legationibus...

come to the aid of the mother church and he seems to have expected to participate in the election, or to at least have been able to stop it: electionem vero Casinensis abbatis antequam ego Romam venerim factam... Here again he would have been on doubtful ground. The election decree of 1059 had limited the electors of a pope to the cardinal-bishops, who might consult with the cardinal-priests.²⁶⁰ In his canonical collection *Deusdedit* used the abbreviated form of the synodal legislation of 1059 and maintained that only the Roman cardinales, that is the cardinal-priests and the cardinal-deacons of the Roman church, could properly elect a pope, from among their number.²⁶¹ Under neither of these arrangements could a Gallic metropolitan have expected to take any part in the election. The *De ordinando pontifice* of the 'auctor Gallicus', written about 1048, conceded full participatory rights to bishops in papal elections: ut vel presentia vel consensu omnes episcopis convenient in ordinationem summi pontificis.²⁶² This work, of which only a fragment survives in a single MS, is unlikely to have a wide distribution or influence. However, Anselm writing to Pontius and Matilda sending legates to Hugh himself may both have been aware of the theory expressed in this work and have been thinking of Hugh as an elector rather than as a candidate for election. H.E.J. Cowdrey points out that Hugh was ever the champion of the rights of metropolitans and the episcopate, instancing Hugh's struggle for jurisdiction over the abbot of Cluny,²⁶³ and would therefore have expected to participate in a papal election.²⁶⁴ Hugh's letter to Matilda seems to confirm this:

Ego et abbas Massiliensis atque archiepiscopus Aquensis apud Salernum commorantes ab episcopo Ostiensi et principe Salernitano et Conciano R(omano) ex parte vicarii et R(omanae) Ecclesiae invitati ut

²⁶⁰ See note 258 above.

²⁶¹ *Deusdedit*, *Collectio Canonum* i, 168-9, p. 107; I. S. Robinson, *The Papacy 1073-1198*, p. 61.

²⁶² *Libelli de Lite*, 1, 11, 20. *De ordinando Pontifice, auctor Gallicus*.

²⁶³ See Hugh's second letter to Matilda, PL 157, 514, ix.

²⁶⁴ Cowdrey, *Desiderius*, p.190.

communi consilio R(omanum) pontificem eligeremus
veniendo obedivimus.²⁶⁵

But if the rancour expressed in this letter was caused by the election in S. Lucia in Rome having taken place without him, his delay in coming to Rome - eleven months after the death of Gregory VII - seems inexplicable. Certainly he did not try to explain it.²⁶⁶

A third possible reason for Hugh's writing this letter was that he did not believe that Desiderius was worthy to succeed Gregory: this is the impression that he was anxious to convey. His first accusation against Desiderius was that he went to the court of Henry IV and promised him that he would help him obtain the imperial crown if he (Henry) entered the lands of St. Peter and came to Rome. Because of this Desiderius had been excommunicated (and made jokes about his excommunication).²⁶⁷ The explanation of this incident in the chronicle of Monte Cassino is that, harassed by Prince Jordan I of Capua and lacking any reply to a letter asking Gregory for advice, Desiderius went reluctantly to Henry's court at Albano and promised to help him to the imperial crown tamen salvo ordine suo.²⁶⁸ H.E.J. Cowdrey points out that in view of Gregory's constant anxiety for a reconciliation with Henry this may not have been an anti-Gregorian move but a desire to test Henry's willingness to abandon Wibert if he were sure of the crown, coupled with an understandable effort on the part of Desiderius to keep Monte Cassino clear of trouble from Henry and the Normans.²⁶⁹ Cowdrey

²⁶⁵ PL 157, 512D.

²⁶⁶ ibid. ...quantoque tempore in partibus Italiae contra officii mei propositum moratus sim...

²⁶⁷ Hugh does not make it clear whether this excommunication was automatic, because of the association with an excommunicated person, or whether Desiderius was officially excommunicated by Gregory; but he does say that he was absolved by Gregory. ibid. 512A, post absolutionem a beatissimo papa Gregorio susceptam excommunicatum garriret.

²⁶⁸ Chronica Mon. Cass. Cap. 50, MGH 34, 432.

²⁶⁹ ibid. 431. 'imminet periculum et eversio monasterii'

claims that it appears from the chronicle of Monte Cassino that Desiderius drew advantage from a difficult situation without compromising himself in matters of principle and he feels that the chronicle here has the ring of truth.²⁷⁰ There is no record in Gregory's letters or anywhere else that Desiderius was ever excommunicated. If he was not, then Hugh was lying or was misinformed, because obviously the abbot would not have joked about an excommunication that did not take place. It is, of course, possible that Desiderius joked about the fact that while he was in Henry's presence he was, by a strict application of Canon Law, outside the bounds of the Church; but such a joke could hardly be regarded as a crime.

In support of the action of Desiderius at Albano, as described in the chronicle of Monte Cassino, it is worth looking at a letter written by Gregory to Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany in 1073.²⁷¹ In it he said that it was his intention to send pious men to Henry by whose admonitions the king might be brought back to loyalty to the church of Rome.²⁷² At that time, as in 1082, Henry was an excommunicate because of his continuing association with his excommunicated advisers, and foremost in Gregory's mind was the desire to win him back. It is at least possible that he would have approved the action of Desiderius, and there is no doubt that, had Henry submitted, Gregory would have given him the imperial crown.

Hugh's second accusation against Desiderius, intended to show that he was unworthy of the papacy, was that he prayed for, and referred to as blessed, the cardinal-priest Atto of San Clemente (at one time the Patarene candidate for the see of

²⁷⁰ H. E. J. Cowdrey, Desiderius, p. 158.

²⁷¹ Registrum i, 11, p.17.

²⁷² ibid. ...hec est voluntas nostra ut ad eum religiosos viros mittamus quorum ammonitionibus inspirante Deo ad amorem sancte Romane et sue matris ecclesie eum revocare...

Milan).²⁷³ This man had defected from Gregory in 1084 and had died an impenitent excommunicate.²⁷⁴ The seriousness of this kind of charge is dependent on the attitude of the person who makes it and Hugh made it sound criminal, but, in view of Gregory's last words in which he specifically absolved and blessed many of those who had aided Henry and Wibert²⁷⁵, this prayer of Desiderius seems justifiable - particularly as he was with Gregory during his last illness.²⁷⁶

Hugh's third accusation against Desiderius was that, in word and deed, he condemned the decrees of the lord pope Gregory and set them aside.²⁷⁷ It is impossible to comment on this because Hugh did not mention any specific decree or incident. If Peter the Deacon's Cassinese account of Victor III's discourse at Benevento, in which he declared himself prepared to continue the work of Gregory VII,²⁷⁸ is accurate then this accusation is not true.

Finally Hugh claimed that, because the election in Rome had taken place in a tumultuous manner, Desiderius himself refused

²⁷³ Rudolf Hüls, Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms 1049-1103. Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom; xlviii. Tübingen, 1977. p.185.

²⁷⁴ PL 157, 512B. ...Attonem cardinalem Mediolanensem electum a praedicto papa eodem abbate subscribente publice excommunicatum et sine penitentia defunctum non solum beatum praedicare praesumeret, ...gloria futurum oraret.

²⁷⁵ Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit, v, 75; Chron. Flav. MGH viii, 466; ...et praeter omnes principales personas, quae aut consilio aut auxilio favent nequiciae illorum et impietati, omnes absolvo et benedico...

²⁷⁶ Chronica Mon. Cass. Cap. 65, MGH 34, 447. 'qui tunc unacum Desiderio presentes erant.'

²⁷⁷ PL 157, 512B; Quoties decreta domini sui papae Gregorii...non solum verbo aperto improbaverit verum etiam manifestis operibus postea destruxerit...

²⁷⁸ Chronica Mon. Cass., iii, MGH 34, 72-3, 453-5.

to accept it and swore that he would continue to reject it,²⁷⁹ but at Capua he broke that oath. This is probably the main reason for Hugh's animosity. Had Desiderius remained obdurate about accepting the papacy Hugh, together with Odo of Ostia and Richard of Marseilles, might have campaigned successfully for the election of someone more in the direct Gregorian tradition than the aesthetic and studious abbot:²⁸⁰ perhaps even Hugh himself, although it is hard to see how he might have been successful when Odo had been rejected at S. Lucia as an uncanonical candidate. Richard of Marseilles, who was a cardinal-priest of the church of Rome, would have been an obvious choice.²⁸¹

These are Hugh of Lyons' direct accusations against Desiderius but his letter is also full of innuendo. In the account of the proceedings at Capua there is no real discrepancy between the chronicle of Monte Cassino (naturally very pro-Desiderius) and Hugh's letter. The difference is one of interpretation. Both accounts show Desiderius coming to Capua determined to refuse the papacy, and being eventually won over to accept it. Neither produces a completely satisfactory explanation of how this happened.

The Chronicle of Monte Cassino recorded: 'Finally, when the duke (Roger of Apulia) and the prince (Jordan of Capua) with the bishops and all the catholic men who were present had thrown themselves in tears at his feet, he yielded reluctantly, compelled by their arguments and prayers, and taking back the cross and the purple robe, accepted his election on 21 March, Palm Sunday. After this he returned to Monte Cassino and there

²⁷⁹ PL 157, 512C. ...electionem suam non secundum Deum sed tumultarie factam aseverans publice refutaverit et nunquam se acquievisse vel in perpetuum adquieturum sub terribili attestazione affirmaverit. Deusdedit (Collectio Canonum iv, 20, p.410) declared that an election conducted in a tumultuous manner was invalid.

²⁸⁰ A. Fliche, 'Le Pontificat de Victor III (1086-1087)'; Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, xx, (1924), 411; 'L'ancien abbé du Mont-Cassin, avant tout esthète et bibliophile...'

²⁸¹ See 'Legates,' below, p. 190-1.

celebrated Easter Sunday, then, accompanied by the princes of Capua and Salerno, he went to Rome.²⁸²

In his letter to Countess Matilda, Hugh provided a great deal more detail than this.²⁸³ He claimed that at Capua he, Odo of Ostia and a monk, Witmund of Aversa, with some others, having consulted together, decided that Desiderius should submit himself to a canonical examination. Not surprisingly the abbot refused, reiterating his determination to reject the papacy. Witmund publicly stated that, because of his excommunication by Gregory and his having remained a year without doing penance, Desiderius was unworthy to become pope. Hugh then withdrew as night was approaching but Duke Roger remained and sought to obtain from the Roman bishops and cardinals the gift of the bishopric of Salerno for a certain Alfano. Odo refused this because Alfano was guilty of 'overweening ambition.'²⁸⁴ The duke withdrew in annoyance and then Desiderius, because he realised that he could not obtain the papacy without Roger's help, called him back in the middle of the night, when everyone was asleep, and agreed to consecrate Alfano to the bishopric the following day (Palm Sunday). Hugh was describing an extraordinary situation here: on the one hand Desiderius wanted the papacy so badly that he was prepared to bribe the duke to help him obtain it, while on the other he had refused the office for almost a year. Hugh asserted that Desiderius had his reward for this infamous barter that same day after lunch (Hugh and his friends being asleep and completely ignorant of what was happening). 'When the sun was setting but the wine, alas, was in

²⁸² Chronica Mon. Cass. Cap. 68, MGH 34, 450. Tandem cum dux et princeps unacum episcopis ceterisque catholicis viris flentes euis pedibus adiacerent, multis rationibus coactus vix tandem succubuit et preteritam electionem crucis et purpure resumptione firmavit duodecimo scilicet kalendas Aprilis domenica in ramis palmarum. Inde Casinum reversus ibidem pascha celebravit. Peracta festivitate cum Capuano ac Salernitano principe Romam perrexit.

²⁸³ PL 157, 513A seq.

²⁸⁴ ibid., manifestissima ambitione.

the ascendant,²⁸⁵ with the support of the duke Desiderius accepted the papal office. Hugh's having been twice asleep during these important events strikes a faintly comic note.

Fliche found the account of the Cassinese chronicle unacceptable for various reasons, one of which is invalid. He said that the inclusion of Richard, abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles, among the electors of Desiderius in Rome was wrong, because Richard was not a member of the Roman church.²⁸⁶ Several letters from Gregory VII to Richard after he succeeded his brother Bernard in the abbacy prove that he continued to hold his office of cardinal-priest and would have been entitled to participate in a papal election (and to have been a candidate for the office).²⁸⁷ Fliche also found the chronicle unbelievable because of the contradiction in Desiderius's refusing the papacy on the one hand and reappointing Hugh as legate in Gaul on the other²⁸⁸ and because of the lack of precision about certain questions. Why did Desiderius summon the council at Capua? Why, having at last recognised the validity of his election, did he withdraw again to Monte Cassino? And finally, why did the chronicler say that after the council Henry IV came to ravage the Roman lands and to enthrone Clement III as pope?²⁸⁹ These are difficult problems, but no more difficult than those posed in Hugh's letter to Matilda which Fliche accepted without question, saying of the legate 'son honnêteté est à l'abri de tout soupçon',²⁹⁰

²⁸⁵ ibid., sole declinante ad inferiora, sed vino obtinente superiora, heu, pro dolor!

²⁸⁶ A. Fliche, 'Le Pontificat de Victor III'. 401.

²⁸⁷ E.V. 44, p.107, 'Richard, cardinal and abbot'; E.V. 50, p.121, 'Richard, cardinal of the holy Roman church and abbot of Marseilles'; Registrum ix, 6, 581, 'Richard, cardinal priest of the holy Roman Church'. See 'Legates,' below, p. 190-1.

²⁸⁸ Chronica Mon. Cass. Cap. 72, MGH ss 34, 454.

²⁸⁹ Chronica Mon. Cass. Cap. 68, MGH ss 34, 450.

²⁹⁰ ibid. 402

The most important of the problems in Hugh's letter to the countess is the supposed excommunication of Desiderius, which is not mentioned anywhere else. This alone is sufficient to make it difficult to believe the charges made against the abbot by Hugh. The events of the brief papacy of Victor III show that Hugh's view of him as an unprincipled opportunist was not shared even by Hugh's companions, with the exception of Richard of Marseilles. Odo of Ostia was one of four bishops who consecrated Victor III,²⁹¹ another was the very pro-Gregorian, Peter of Albano.²⁹¹ Countess Matilda, to whom this tirade was addressed, did not receive it until after Victor's death, but she at no time showed any misgivings about him, although she would have been better placed than Hugh to have heard of any taint of disgrace. On the contrary, Victor had her complete support and encouragement during his few months as pope.²⁹²

Victor III excommunicated Hugh and Richard of Marseilles at the council of Benevento in August, 1087, because, according to the Cassinese chronicle, through pride and ambition, they secretly strove to obtain the apostolic see, and having failed in this they caused a schism in the Church.²⁹³

Fliche's estimate of Desiderius as a weak man is undoubtedly accurate. It is possible that Hugh recognised that Desiderius was vulnerable, because of his constant concern for the safety of Monte Cassino, and that it was another reason for Hugh's opposition to the election. The seeming contradictions in the account of the chronicler of Monte Cassino and that of the archbishop can be reconciled by a recognition that Desiderius was motivated by fear of the Normans. He did not want the papacy but the Normans wanted him because they could control him through his anxiety for the safety of Monte Cassino. This would explain his reiteration of his unworthiness for the office - he himself could see that he would always be a tool of the Normans, as he proved

²⁹¹ Chronica Mon. Cass iii, 68, MGH 34, 450.

²⁹² ibid. 69, 451; auxillio et ope prephate comitis per Transtiberim Romam intervenit.

²⁹³ Chronica Mon.Cass, III, 72, MGH 34, 454.

to be in the affair of Alfanus. He procrastinated for a year but the conjunction of Roger of Apulia and Jordan of Capua (and perhaps the increasing weakness of ill-health) forced him to yield. It is significant that the Normans were present at every stage in this long-drawn-out drama. Desiderius went to Henry at Albano because he was being harassed by Jordan of Capua.²⁹⁴ After Gregory's death he urged Jordan of Capua to get Matilda to bring the three candidates named by Gregory to Rome, but Jordan did not do this and he and the cardinals plotted (*machinantur*) to impose the papacy on Desiderius.²⁹⁵ Desiderius withdrew to Monte Cassino and was followed there by Jordan and his army.²⁹⁶ They retreated from the summer heat, but the following spring they returned and forced him to go to Rome where his choice, Odo of Ostia, having been declared uncanonical, he was persuaded to accept the papal crown. Three days later he rejected it and returned to Monte Cassino but the Normans did not give up.²⁹⁷ When he called a council at Capua the following year to resolve the situation he was forced to submit by the presence of Duke Roger of Apulia and Prince Jordan of Capua. Finally, having celebrated Easter at Monte Cassino, he was accompanied to Rome by the princes of Capua and Salerno.²⁹⁸ This pressure would have been enough to overcome a stronger character than Desiderius, because of the vulnerable position of Monte Cassino.

The letter from Hugh of Lyons to the Countess Matilda concerning the papal election was written after the council of Benevento, where he and Richard of Marseilles were excommunicated, and after the death of Victor III.²⁹⁹ It may be seen as full of the contempt for weakness felt by a strong man.

²⁹⁴ *ibid.*, 50; 432.

²⁹⁵ *ibid.* 65; 447-8.

²⁹⁶ *ibid.* 448.

²⁹⁷ *ibid.* 449-450.

²⁹⁸ *ibid.* 450.

²⁹⁹ Letter of Hugh to Matilda, PL 157, 514. ...et in capitulo non ut papam sub ut abbatem sepeliri.

In this affair he certainly could not have acted from motives of self-interest. The quarrel with Victor III caused a second major set-back in his career, one from which it never really recovered. For seven years he appears to have taken no active part in the affairs of the church. If he held any councils they are not recorded and no accounts of his movements, no charters or diplomas, remain. There is one letter to Hugh, archbishop of Besançon, which Baluze has dated circa 1088.³⁰⁰ It deals with some questions arising out of the council of Meaux which took place in 1081 and, therefore, may be incorrectly dated.

²⁹⁸ For an account of Urban's councils in Rome and France see 'Agnes of Hohenstaufen', below pp. 127-133.

²⁹⁹ Letter of Hugh to Matilda of Tuscany, PL 157, 511. No other source mentions this as being originally opposed to the election of Basileus.

³⁰⁰ 1015-12a, 77, 21.

³⁰¹ Alfred Becker, *Rechtsgeschichte*, pp. 31-33.

³⁰² Philip of Harbini, *Rechtsgeschichte*, pp. 101-102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

In March 1087 at the council of Capua, when Desiderius finally agreed to accept the papacy, Odo of Ostia had joined Hugh of Lyons and Richard of Marseilles in their opposition to the election,³⁰² but he agreed to consecrate the new pope two months later, evoking from Hugh the bitter quotation: conversus est in die belli.³⁰³ Odo of Ostia was elected to the papacy as Urban II only ten months later at the council of Terracina.³⁰⁴ It may have been this rupture in their relationship which prevented Urban from employing Hugh as a legate for almost six years, although Fliche and Lühe agreed that it is likely that Urban restored Hugh and Richard of Marseilles to communion with the church at the beginning of his pontificate.³⁰⁵ Lühe claimed that during this period Hugh succeeded in winning back three important German bishoprics, Metz, Toul and Verdun, for the papacy, but his evidence for Hugh's involvement in their submission to Urban II is sketchy.³⁰⁶ Hugh was reinstated as legate in 1093 or 1094 when he was called on by Urban II to adjudicate in a quarrel between the bishoprics of Vienne and Grenoble.³⁰⁷ However he remained a peripheral figure in the new reform movement.³⁰⁸ In October 1094, at a council in Autun, he excommunicated King Philip of France for his continuing

³⁰¹ For an account of Urban's councils in Rome and France see 'Agent of Reform', below pp. 136-155.

³⁰² Letter of Hugh to Matilda of Tuscany, PL 157, 511. No other source mentions Odo as being originally opposed to the election of Desiderius.

³⁰³ ibid. (Ps. 77. 9).

³⁰⁴ Alfons Becker, Papst Urban II, pp. 91-96.

³⁰⁵ Fliche et Martin, Histoire de l'Eglise 8, 258, fn.1. Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon pp. 101 - 106.

³⁰⁶ Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon. pp.101-106

³⁰⁷ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, pp. 153-4. He was first called 'legate' by Urban II in May 1094 (JL 5523, PL 151, 389).

³⁰⁸ See pp. 156-9 for an account of Hugh's activities during the papacy of Urban II.

association with Betrada de Montfort.³⁰⁹

In April, May and June, 1095, Hugh went on pilgrimage to St. James of Compostela.³¹⁰ He had failed to attend the council of Piacenza in March,³¹¹ perhaps because of this projected journey, although that seems an inadequate reason, particularly as he sent no representatives. Because of this he was suspended from his archbishopric for a short time by the pope.³¹² A charter of the monastery of Mozac shows that Hugh and King Philip I were together there before Clermont.³¹³ He may have been sent by the pope to sound out Philip's intentions with regard to Bertrada before Urban confirmed at Clermont the sentence of excommunication pronounced on Philip by Hugh at Autun the previous year.

Hugh of Lyons was at Cluny in August 1095 for the consecration of the new basilica by Urban II, where he also consecrated an altar³¹⁴ and he was in Urban's company throughout the papal journey in France in 1095-6. He was at the councils of Clermont,³¹⁵ Tours³¹⁶ and Nîmes.³¹⁷ During this period the resentment which Richerius, archbishop of Sens, had harboured

³⁰⁹ Mansi xx, 799; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 473; Bernoldi Chronicon 1094, MGH 5, 461; Hefele, 387; Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, 156. See below pp. 287-96 for an account of the affair of Philip and Bertrada.

³¹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH, 8, 474.

³¹¹ Bernoldi Chronicon MGH 5, 462.

³¹² ibid.

³¹³ Prou, Recueil des Actes de Phillipe I cxxxv p. 342.

³¹⁴ RHG xiv, 101-2; Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, v, 332; Lühe, p.106.

³¹⁵ Letter of Urban II to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5600, PL 151, clxv, 438.

³¹⁶ Cartulaire de Cormery 791-1505; cited in Hefele, p.446.

³¹⁷ Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 107.

against Hugh for so many years because of the primacy finally came to a head. The pallium was withdrawn from Richerius who died shortly afterwards without being reconciled with the Church. His successor, Daimbert, continued to cause problems for Hugh and the papacy for some time after Richerius's death.³¹⁸

In January 1098, Hugh was instrumental in the foundation of the new monastery at Cîteaux, near Dijon, and later he played an important part in ensuring its continued existence. It was as archbishop and legate that he first became involved in the foundation³¹⁹ but his interest and involvement eventually went beyond the duties of either of those offices. In late 1097 or early 1098 Robert, abbot of Molesme, applied to Hugh for permission to leave his monastery, where the Rule of Benedict was observed in a 'lukewarm and careless manner',³²⁰ and to found a new monastery in a remote area where he and some companions might pursue a life more in accord with the Benedictine ideal. Hugh agreed to this project³²¹ and Robert retired to Cîteaux. He was consecrated to the abbacy by Walter of Chalon, a suffragan of Hugh, in whose diocese the new foundation was situated.³²² In 1099 the monks of Molesme came to Pope Urban II at his council in Rome three weeks after Easter, complaining that their monastery was suffering desolation and destruction because of the absence of Robert and the enmity of their neighbours.³²³ (The trouble was that when the saintly Robert left, the local people thought that he had been unjustly expelled, so all offerings to the monastery ceased).³²⁴ Urban agreed that Robert should

³¹⁸ See below 'Richerius of Sens,' p.281 and 'Debate with Ivo of Chartres' p. 313.

³¹⁹ Letter of Hugh to Robert of Molesme, PL 157, 523, Ep. xxii.

³²⁰ ibid. ...tepide ac negligenter...

³²¹ ibid.

³²² See 'Suffragans' below p. 245.

³²³ Mansi, xx, 967, 973 seq.

³²⁴ W.A. Parker Mason, The Beginnings of the Cistercian Order; Alexander Prize Essay, 1904, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, New Series xix, p. 169.

return to Molesme but he left it to Hugh to bring the affair to a conclusion.³²⁵ This was done at a meeting (colloquium) held by Hugh apud portum Ansillae in 1099 or 1100³²⁶ and at first sight appears to have been ratified at 'Rupem scissam', which Mansi called a council and placed in 1099. ...Hoc ad Rupem scissam concilium posterius est illo quod ad portum Ansillae convenit, hoc enim pro Roberto a Novo-monasterio avellando et Molismensibus restituendo habitum est; illud vero iam destitutis abbate suo Novi-monasterii monachis ne disperderentur providet...secundum Domini archiepiscopi Hugonis definitionem.³²⁷ Hugh wrote to Robert of Langres, in whose diocese Molesme was, explaining that as the affair had been left in his hands, totum dispositioni et arbitrio nostra, he and the assembled bishops had agreed in colloquio that Robert should return to Molesme, together with any of those who had accompanied him to Cîteaux who no longer cared for the life: therefore Walter of Chalon had released Robert from the abbacy of Cîteaux.³²⁸ Mansi seems to have complicated this incident by calling the meeting apud portum Ansillae a council, and then by introducing another council at 'Rupem scissam'; but a note in the Bouquet edition of the Exordium Cisterciensis coenibii defines 'portum Ansillae' as Petram scissam.³²⁹ Tessier, quoted by W. A. Parker Mason, sees this as the castle of 'Pierre-scise' at Lyons.³³⁰ This seems sufficiently like Rupem Scissam to suggest that there was in fact only one meeting, at which this affair was settled. Both Watkin Williams and Dom David Knowles pointed out that Robert appears to have exhibited a certain degree of instability, as this was

³²⁵ Letter of Urban II to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5793; PL 151, 545.

³²⁶ Letter of Hugh to Robert of Langres; PL 157, xxiii, 523-4.

³²⁷ Mansi, xx, 975.

³²⁸ PL 157, 523, xxiii.

³²⁹ RHG xiv, 110, fn. C.

³³⁰ The Beginnings of the Cistercian Order, p. 185, n.1; Mabillon, Annales Benedictini v, 378, realised this also: ...petram-scissam, quae modo Lugdunensis urbis arx est...

not the first time he had changed his habitation and then returned.³³¹ Hugh's instructions for what is to be done si deinceps eandem ecclesiam solita levitate deseruerit show that he was alert to this being a possibility,³³² but he nevertheless supported Robert. It is clear from the letters of Urban and Hugh and from the account in the Exordium Cisterciensis Coenobii³³³ that it was because of Hugh's tactful handling of the whole affair that the foundation of Cîteaux did not collapse at its first crisis. On 19 October, 1100, Pascal II issued a libertas for Cîteaux.³³⁴

³³¹ Watkin Williams, St. Robert of Molesme; JTS xxxviii (1936), 410. Dom David Knowles, The Monastic Order in England from the times of St. Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 940-1216; p. 198: 'his many changes of habitation...earned him a reputation for fickleness... and baffle the modern enquirer...'

³³² PL 157, xxiii, 524.

³³³ RHG xiv, 109-112.

³³⁴ JL 5842.

HUGH OF LYONS AND PASCHAL II.

Urban II died on 29 July, 1099.³³⁵ He was succeeded by an Italian, Rainier of Bleda, cardinal priest of San Clemente, as Paschal II.³³⁶ When the antipope Clement III died, also in 1099,³³⁷ the Wibertine party in Rome elected three further antipopes, which meant that Paschal, like his predecessors, had no secure residence in Rome at the beginning of his pontificate. Ivo of Chartres wrote to Paschal, as he had to Urban, urging him to establish a permanent legate in France, but this time he specified Hugh of Lyons.³³⁸ Taking the opposite view to that taken by Manasses I of Rheims many years before,³³⁹ Ivo pointed out that the cardinal legates sent from Rome had not been able to cope with the situation in France³⁴⁰ and that a local man such as Hugh, whose zeal and energy were already well known, would suit better. According to Lühe Hugh was reappointed as a legate in France after his journey to Asia.³⁴¹

At the council of Anse in 1099 or 1100 Hugh announced his intention of going to Jerusalem.³⁴² Paschal II gave his blessing to this enterprise, making Hugh his legate in Asia quam bene rexerat in Burgundia;³⁴³ but immediately afterwards he sent the legates, John, cardinal priest of S. Anastasia and Benedict, cardinal priest of S. Pudenziana, into France who, according to Ivo of Chartres, were not a success. They held a

³³⁵ Bernold of Constance, Annales, MGH 5, 467

³³⁶ Orderic Vitalis, ed Chibnall, iv, Book x, p. 195.

³³⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8 490.

³³⁸ PL 162, Ep. cix, 127.

³³⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 419; RHG xiv, 611. See 'Metropolitans,' below p. 267-8

³⁴⁰ Ep. 87, PL 162, 107; see below.

³⁴¹ Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 118.

³⁴² Hefele, p. 467, is not sure of the date of this council. Mansi, xx, 1127, liked 1100 as did Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487, but he is not always accurate.

³⁴³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487; JL 5824.

council at Valance in September to deal with the case of Bishop Norgaudus of Autun.³⁴⁴ This appearance of legates from Rome in his territory must have been a blow for Hugh. He did not attend the council quia ipse infirmabatur,³⁴⁵ and he forbade his suffragans of Langres and Chalon to attend also. When another suffragan, Norgaudus of Autun, was suspended there by the legates for simony 'and other things' (possibly his treatment of the chronicler, Hugh of Flavigny), Archbishop Hugh, although a lifelong upholder of legatine authority, went to Rome at the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem and persuaded Paschal to withdraw the sentence.³⁴⁶

This was at the beginning of 1101. It is not known how long he remained in Jerusalem. He was not in France for the council of Marseilles in 1103: he was represented there by the bishop of Mâcon.³⁴⁷ He must have returned soon after that because he was in Lyons when Anselm of Canterbury was there between 1103 and 1105.³⁴⁸

Hugh of Lyons died on 6 October 1106, at Susa in the Italian alps.³⁴⁹ His death was obviously quite sudden because he was on his way to attend the council at Guastalla called by Paschal II.³⁵⁰ Hugh of Cluny, writing to inform Anselm of Canterbury of his death, said:

Quoniam noveramus quanta inter vos et dominum Hugonem Lugdunensem archiepiscopum deo volente exstiterat familiaritas, dignum duximus vobis significare ejusdem

³⁴⁴ Mansi xx, 1115; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH viii, 488.

³⁴⁵ 'une maladie diplomatique' according to Hefele, p. 468

³⁴⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 494; see below, 'Suffragans', p. 224-30, where the case of Norgaudus is discussed.

³⁴⁷ Mansi xx, 1161-4.

³⁴⁸ Eadmer, Life of St. Anselm, ed. R.W. Southern, 1962, p. 131; De vita et conversatione Anselmi archiepiscopo Cantuariensis, RS 81, 407-8.

³⁴⁹ Letter of Hugh of Cluny to Anselm of Canterbury, PL 159, 241.

³⁵⁰ Mansi xx, 1209; JL 6076.

obitum, nobis et omnibus bonis viris, gravem et
irrecuperabiliter dolendum quatenus et per vos et per
vestros veram quam vivens exhibuit dilectionem nunc ei
defunto repensare satagatis.³⁵¹

Hugh was buried at the abbey of St. Just in Susa.³⁵² The poet Baudri, abbot of Bourgueil, wrote a splendid epitaph for him.

Post Lugdunensis praesul, prius Hugo Diensis,
Magnus Romanae filius ecclesiae,
Quem sibi legatum Romanus papa rogavit
Ad synodum veniens, proh dolor! occubuit.
Virtutum cellam, Divini pectoris aulam
Hac tumulavit humo Segusiensis homo.
Laetatus Justus, hospes bonus hospite tanto
Quem Deus eximius misit ei socium.
Lugdunum luge, solemnia conciliorum
Occubitu patris occubuere tibi.³⁵³

ooo000ooo

³⁵¹ Letter of Hugh of Cluny; PL 159, 241.

³⁵² ibid.

³⁵³ Gall. Chris. iv, 109.

AGENT OF REFORM. PART 1.

Gregory VII's years as adviser and confidant of Pope Alexander II meant that he came to the papacy with an awareness of the difficulties and dangers inherent in the measures he was about to take to implement his programme of reform and renewal. Shortly after his election he wrote to Lanfranc of Canterbury:

'Bishops and those who should be shepherds of souls follow with insatiable lust after worldly glory and fleshly delights...You well know how dangerous it is for us not to proceed against them, yet how difficult to resist and bridle their iniquity.'¹

He had no doubt that he, as bishop of Rome and successor to St. Peter, bore the responsibility of purging the Church of these evils and of overseeing the establishment of a new order. The conception of the judicial supremacy of the Roman church which he shared, derived essentially from a decree of the council of Sardica in 343 which had stated that the Roman see was the court of appeal for all bishops and the pope's decision was final.² This ruling had been elaborated in a letter of Pope Gelasius I of 496 (an edited version of which appeared in the eleventh century Collection in 74 Titles), was quoted by Anselm II of Lucca and Ivo of Chartres and was subsequently absorbed into the Decretum of Master Gratian of Bologna.³ Pope Gelasius stated:

The whole church throughout the world knows that the holy Roman church has the right of judging every church and that no one is allowed to dispute her judgement. Indeed there ought to be a right of appeal

¹ EV, no. 1, p.2-4

² H. Hess, The canons of the council of Sardica A.D. 343, Oxford 1958, pp. 109-27.

³ John Gilchrist, Diversorum patrum sententie, sive Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta, Monumenta Iuris Canonici, Series B, Corpus Collectionum, Vatican City, 1973, i, 10, p. 24. Anselm of Lucca, Collectio canonum, ed. F. Thaner, Innsbruck 1906, ii. 16; Ivo of Chartres, Panormia iv. 9, PL 161, 1184; Corpus Iuris Canonici, Decretum Magistri Gratiani II, c ix, q iii, cap 17; ed. Æ. Friedberg, Leipsig 1879.

to her from any part of the world but no one is allowed to appeal from her. Nor do we overlook the fact that the apostolic see has the right to absolve without any preceeding synod those whom an unjust synod has condemned, and of condemning without any existing synod those whom she ought (to condemn). And she has this power by virtue of the primacy (principatus) which St. Peter the apostle by the Lord's word both held and will always hold.⁴

This claim to judicial supremacy was reinforced and enlarged by the eighth or early ninth century forgery, the Constitutum Constantini, which not only made the pope a monarch over the rest of the priesthood but conferred on him all the insignia and some of the jurisdiction of the Roman emperors. Relying on the Donation of Constantine Peter Damian could claim that 'the edict of Emperor Constantine establishes the principate of the apostolic see above all the churches in the world'.⁵ Writing to the patriarch, Michael Cerullarius, Pope Leo IX reiterated the claim that the Roman pontiff was the princeps over all priests throughout the world.⁶ He did this in order to prove the supremacy of the see of Rome over the four eastern patriarchs rather than with any idea of claiming total jurisdiction over the episcopate. But Gregory VII drew upon the Gelasian tradition and the Donation of Constantine to reinforce his authority over the whole church. By this means he was able to view the papacy as

⁴ John Gilchrist, Collectio in LXXIV titulos, p. 24.

⁵ Peter Damian, Disceptatio Synodalis, Libelli de Lite i, 80. Ut autem id ipsum adhuc non festius pateat... lege Constantini imperatoris edictum ubi sedis apostolicae constituit super omnes in orbe terrarum aecclesias principatum.

⁶ Pope Leo IX, JL 4302 and 4332, PL 143, cii, 773 and 774..

a monarchy and the bishops, hitherto autonomous rulers in their own dioceses, as officials of his government owing obedience and loyalty not so much to God as to him.⁷ Evidence for this reassessment of the relationship of pope and bishops is to be found in the Dictatus Papae. 'That he (the pope) can depose and reinstate bishops without calling a synod,' (sentencia 25); 'That his legate takes precedence over all bishops in a council, even if of inferior rank, and he can give sentence of deposition against them' (4) and 'That he (the pope) can depose men in their absence' (5):⁸ these are pronouncements which demonstrate the magisterial vision of the papacy which was to be central to Gregory's proposed restructuring of the Church.⁹

Gregory VII's chosen instrument of enlightenment and chastisement was to be the Roman council, the decrees of which would be publicised and implemented by the councils of his legates. In January 1074, he announced to the patriarch of Aquileia that he would hold a council in Rome during the first week in Lent to discover a remedy for the great evils of the church, beset from without by rapacious princes and from within by an ambitious and immoral clergy.¹⁰ At the same time he informed the suffragans of Milan of his intention to continue the 'long-established' custom of holding a synod in Rome during Lent and urged them as faithful soldiers of Christ to hasten to Rome

⁷ See the letter to Bishop Otto of Constance, (E. V. 9, p. 19); 'so that...you might the more safely and boldly obey our commands...' and (p. 21) 'Oh the imprudence! oh the unparalleled insolence! that a bishop should despise the decrees of the apostolic see...'

⁸ Registrum ii, 55(a), p. 202.

⁹ Bernard of Clairvaux said to Eugenius III, c. 1150; 'Appeals come to you from all the world and this bears witness to your unique primacy' (De consideratione iii, 2.6., PL 182, 761A). But in 1136 Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia had denounced the Roman church for this assumption of imperial power; ...quando monarchiam quod sui officii non erat invasit... (Anselm of Havelburg, Dialogi m.8, PL 188, 1219B).

¹⁰ Registrum i, 42, p. 64.

to enjoy the victory achieved there.¹¹ The nucleus of his programme for reform is contained in these early letters - the Church was to be freed from the control of the laity and purged of an immoral clergy, and this was to be achieved by the centralisation of authority in Rome, implemented by conciliar decrees and legatine activity.

It is intended in this chapter to investigate the French element in these synods and in the synods of Urban II and Paschal II; to assess how effectively decisions taken in Rome were promulgated and implemented in France; and to evaluate the rôle of the papal legate, Hugh, bishop of Die and later archbishop of Lyons, in this apostolic enterprise.

FRENCH BISHOPS ATTENDING THE SYNODS OF GREGORY VII.

The chronicles of the eleventh century mention by name very few of the bishops from France who attended the synods of Gregory VII. Hugh of Flavigny said that 50 bishops were present at the synod of 1074, but gave no details.¹² The chronicler Berthold, monk of Reichenau, maintained that the Lent synod of 1078 was attended by 70 bishops, but he named only one of them, Hugh of Die.¹³ An analysis of Hugh's movements during this period indicates that he was not in Rome for this council.¹⁴ At the synod of 1079 Berthold named several Italian bishops but only one Frenchman - the scholasticus Berengar of Tours.¹⁵ The chronicler Bernold, monk of St. Blasien, also mentioned that Berengar was at the synod of 1079 and he said that in November 1083 'many bishops and abbots' came from France, but gave no

¹¹ Registrum i, 43, p. 65-66. ...iamdudum constitutum esse... In fact it had been the custom during earlier pontificates to hold synods at Easter.

¹² Chronicon Hugonis, monachi Viridunensis et Divionensis, abbatis Flaviniacensis ii, MGH 8, 412.

¹³ Bertholdi, Annales anno 1078; MGH 5, 306.

¹⁴ See 'Life,' above, p. 40.

¹⁵ Bertholdi, Annales anno 1079; MGH 5. 316.

names.¹⁶ To the end of his pontificate Gregory sought to involve the French Church in his struggle with King Henry. In 1083 he was urged by the Romans, who hoped that either the pope or the king would yield, to hold the synod. To it he summoned the archbishops, bishops and abbots of France and Germany assuring them that the 'so-called king' had issued a sworn guarantee that he would hinder no-one either coming or going.¹⁷ However Henry prevented many of Gregory's supporters from attending, among them two Frenchmen, Hugh of Lyons and Odo of Ostia.¹⁸ Gregory did not renew the anathema against Henry IV but he excommunicated all those who prevented his supporters from coming to him.¹⁹ The protocol of that synod in the Register states that because of the treachery of the tyrant Henry (IV of Germany) so few attended that no business could be transacted.²⁰ Bernold claimed that the scholastic, Berengar of Tours, was once more in Rome for this council²¹ but Ebersolt denies this, saying that his last appearance was at the council of Bordeaux in 1080.²²

This meagre amount of information in the chronicles of the period about the identity of French bishops attending the synods of Gregory VII may be augmented by a consideration of the councils of Hugh of Die where so many were sent to have their cases reviewed in Rome. However as these men cannot be said to have made the journey willingly, and as they appeared before the

¹⁶ Bernold Chronica, 1079 and 1083; MGH 5, 435, 438.

¹⁷ E.V. 51, p.125. Bernoldi, Chronicon, 1083, MGH 5, 438.

¹⁸ Bernold, Chronicon, 1083, MGH 5, 438.

¹⁹ ibid.

²⁰ Registrum ix, 35a, pp. 627-8. ...Pauci quoque Gallicani...

²¹ Bernold Chronicon, 439.

²² Jean Ebersolt, Béranger de Tours et la Controverse Sacramentaire au xie Siècle, II, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions xlviii (1903), 158; 'Découragé, désespérant de voir triompher sa cause, il prit le parti de se taire et de se retirer du monde.'

pope as defendants rather than as counsellors, their presence does not assist us in judging how much French influence there may have been in the decisions taken in Rome.

different kinds of assembly: the papal curia as such, the
 suburban bishops and occasionally by other bishops of Italy
 which dealt with local problems of the Roman Church, and the
 imperial councils summoned by the emperor for regional
 ecclesiastical affairs in the empire.¹ During the pontificate
 of Leo IX (1049-54) a new phenomenon appeared, a papal synod, the
 sole presidency of the pope, attended by bishops from all over the
 ecclesiastical provinces of Italy and the imperial territories.
 In these new synods the papal curia as such was not a
 source of spiritual power but as the centre of active and
 directive government in the Church.² In 1059 the first of
 these new synods was held at the Lateran Palace for the reforming
 synods of the late eleventh century.³ During
 the papacy of Gregory VII the Lateran Palace became a meeting
 ground where laws were discussed before they became laws
 legislation.⁴ These were usually held in the Lateran Palace
 palace of St. John Lateran as Rome is known to us today, at
 the beginning of 1059.

No unifying theme emerges from the events which during
 Gregory's pontificate. Quite the contrary, the pontificate
 relative to the French Church illustrates the whole dramatic
 character of the events which took place in the Church during
 the pontificate of Gregory VII.

¹ P. J. Schmitt, 'Synodus, Concilium, Capitulum', *Revue de Droit Canonique* 19 (1925), 80-102; see also J. H. Sarrasin, *The Pope's Power*, 1925, Cambridge University Press, 1925, p. 122.

² See A. Sotgiu, *La Sinodo Pontificia* 1, 124: 'Il papa
 (X) rappresenta per loro presenza la persona di
 Dio sulla terra, e per questo la sua parola è
 legge per tutti i fedeli. Per questo la sinodo
 rappresenta la persona di Dio sulla terra, e per
 questo la sua parola è legge per tutti i fedeli.'
 Sarrasin, op. cit. pp. 119-122; J. H. Sarrasin, *op. cit.* p. 122.

³ Sarrasin, *op. cit.* pp. 121-122.

⁴ See for example the question of divorce in France,
 Sarrasin, *op. cit.* pp. 121-122.

ROMAN SYNODS DURING THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY VII.

The synods of the reform period developed from two very different kinds of assembly: the papal synods attended by the suburbican bishops and occasionally by other bishops of Italy which dealt with local problems of the Roman church, and the imperial councils summoned by the emperor to regulate ecclesiastical affairs in the Empire.²³ During the pontificate of Leo IX (1049-54) a new phenomenon appeared, a synod under the sole presidency of the pope, attended by bishops from outside the ecclesiastical provinces of Rome and the imperial territories. In these new synods the papacy began to be seen not just as a source of spiritual power but as the centre of active and directive government in the Church.²⁴ In 1049 Leo IX held at Rheims the first of these new assemblies which became the model for the reforming synods of the late eleventh century.²⁵ During the papacy of Gregory VII the Roman synod became a debating ground where issues were discussed before they passed into legislation.²⁶ These were usually held in the basilica and palace of St. John Lateran in Rome in Eastertide or, later, at the beginning of Lent.

No unifying theme emerges from the synods held during Gregory's pontificate. Quite the contrary: the proceedings relative to the French church illustrate the widely disparate character of business carried out there. But because the

²³ F.-J. Schmale, 'Synodus - synodale concilium - concilium' Annuario Historiae Conciliorum 8 (1976), 80-102; see also I.S. Robinson, The Papacy, 1073-1198, Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 122.

²⁴ See A. Fliche, La Réforme Grégorienne i, 128; 'Il (Leo IX) empruntera aux deux programmes (de Lorraine et d'Italie) un article commun, celui qui vise la réconstitution de l'autorité apostolique. Avec lui la réforme n'est plus épiscopale ni impériale; elle est romaine;' R. W. Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, pp. 115-162; I. S. Robinson, Papacy, p.122

²⁵ Mansi xix, 727-746.

²⁶ See for example the question of Berengar of Tours, below pp. 101-3.

problems which disrupted his relations with Germany throughout his papacy were absent or greatly modified in France, it is possible to see in his dealings with the French church the four elements of which his programme for reform was composed. These were: the condemnation of simony and nicholaism, the prohibition of investiture, the direct involvenment of Rome in local ecclesiastical affairs and the creation of a tribunal in Rome for the chastisement of offending church dignitaries.

Gregory's attitude towards the French church is clearly revealed in his legislation against clerical abuses. The first of these was the prohibition of simony, which was included in the first of his decretals, issued in 1075. This was a direct result of the fact that the French church was the only one in which the practice of simony was still widespread. Gregory's attitude towards the French church is also revealed in his legislation against clerical abuses. The first of these was the prohibition of simony, which was included in the first of his decretals, issued in 1075. This was a direct result of the fact that the French church was the only one in which the practice of simony was still widespread. Gregory's attitude towards the French church is also revealed in his legislation against clerical abuses. The first of these was the prohibition of simony, which was included in the first of his decretals, issued in 1075. This was a direct result of the fact that the French church was the only one in which the practice of simony was still widespread.

It is unfortunate that the records of these important events are so fragmentary. Some records should have been kept, but they were not. The only records of these events are the few fragments that have survived.

¹ *Gregory's Decretals*, 1075, c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

² *Gregory's Decretals*, 1075, c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

³ *Gregory's Decretals*, 1075, c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

⁴ *Gregory's Decretals*, 1075, c. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100.

I. DECREES AGAINST NICHOLAISM AND SIMONY.

The chronicler Lambert of Hersfeld recounted that letters urging bishops to 'dissolve by an eternal anathema' the associations between priests and women were sent by Pope Gregory VII to Gallia after the council of 1074,²⁷ but the first records of this legislation are not found until the period following the Lent synod of 1075. Even though no such letter to the French clergy survives, incidents at Rouen and Paris confirm that legislation against clerical unchastity was promulgated very early in Gregory's pontificate, causing frequent scenes of violence at legatine councils in France. A violent outburst was provoked at a council in Rouen in the summer of 1074 when the archbishop, John of Bayeux, threatened married priests with anathema. He was chased from his church with stones.²⁸ A similar scene occurred at a council in Paris later in the year when it was decided that it was not necessary 'to obey the decrees of the lord pope, Hildebrand...in the matter of clerical celibacy and being forbidden to hear the Mass of an unchaste priest.'²⁹ Walter, abbot of St. Martin of Pontoise, who had lately returned from Rome, protested against this disobedience, citing St. Gregory to prove that the orders of a superior must be obeyed even if not understood. He was knocked down, spat on and carried off to the king's prison.³⁰ These incidents indicate that France may be included in the areas where legislation outlawing married priests had been published.

It is unfortunate that the records of these important early Roman synods should have been either lost or merely remain as brief accounts inserted in the Register. Because of this the

²⁷ Lamberti Annales a. 1074, MGH 5, 217 - 18; Hoc decreto per totam Italiam promulgato, crebras litteras ad episcopos Galliarum trans mittebat praeci piens ut ipsi quoque in suis ecclesiis similiter facerent...

²⁸ Mansi xx, 442; Ex Bessin Concil. Rotomag. Prov. p. 15.

²⁹ Ex actis S. Galterii Abbatis S. Martini Pontisarae, Mansi xx, 437.

³⁰ Mansi xx, 437.

outline of the campaign against simony and nicholaism during 1074 and 1075 can only be discerned in the papal correspondence. The three key letters, to Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz, Archbishop Werner of Magdeburg and Bishop Otto of Constance, which contain these decrees, had been assigned by Jaffé,³¹ and later by Fliche,³² to the Lent council of 1074; but H.E.J.Cowdrey finds their arguments for this date not conclusive and he prefers Lent 1075.³³ Because these decrees obviously relate to the whole Church they are included here, although no such letters to the French prelates survive. They are:

Those who have been promoted by the simoniac heresy, that is with the intervention of money, to any rank or office of holy orders may no longer exercise any ministry in holy church. Those, too, who obtain churches by the gift of money must utterly forfeit them, so that no-one for the future may be allowed to sell or buy them.

Nor may those who are guilty of the crime of fornication celebrate masses or minister at the altar in lesser orders. We have further appointed that if they disregard our rulings, or rather those of the holy fathers, the people may in no wise receive their ministrations, so that those who are not corrected from the love of God and the honour of their office

³¹ JL 4931-3

³² Augustin Fliche, La Réforme Grégorienne ii, 136, n. 5.

³³ E.V., Additional note, pp. 160-161. Cowdrey has three reasons for this preference: firstly, in 1074 Gregory sent legates into Germany after the council but in 1075 he sent no legates but publicised the decrees by letters such as these; secondly, legates of Otto, referred to in his letter, are known to have been at the council of 1075; and finally the references in all three letters to a stipulation that laymen should refuse the ministrations of disobedient clergy allude to something that Gregory is known from his letters to have promulgated in Germany during the winter of 1074-75.

may be brought to their senses by the shame of the world and the reproof of the people.³⁴

For Gregory the concept of reproof had fairly rigorous overtones; he urged Dukes Rudolf of Swabia and Berthold of Carinthia to strong measures against simony and nicholaism. 'You are to prevent such persons, to the best of your ability, even by force if that be necessary, from serving at the sacred mysteries.'³⁵

From the beginning of his pontificate Gregory asserted that his decrees contained nothing new but were restatements of the rulings of 'the holy fathers' and sanctified by long custom. He often made this claim: to King Henry IV he said ad sanctorum patrum doctrinamque recurrimus nichil novi nichil ad inventione nostra statuentes³⁶ and, to the clergy and people of Aquileia, Et ideo nichil novi, nichil nostris adinventionibus superinducere conamur.³⁷ But he also said in the letter to Rudolf and Berthold quoted above that it seemed to him far better to strengthen divine justice by new policies than to allow the souls of men to perish by neglect of the law.³⁸ The application of 'the reproof of the people' as a remedy for clerical immorality was not altogether a new policy,³⁹ but it was one that was explicitly resented. In his polemical letter of January, 1076, Henry IV accused Gregory: 'You have armed subjects against prelates and you have unlawfully conferred authority over priests

³⁴ Letters to the Archbishops Siegfried of Mainz, Werner of Magdeburg and Otto of Constance; E.V. 6, 7 and 8, pp. 14-18.

³⁵ Registrum ii, 45, p. 182.

³⁶ Registrum iii, 10, p.266:

³⁷ Registrum v, 5, p. 353: see also Registrum i, 54, p. 81 to the canons of St. Hilary in Poitiers; ...in aliis ecclesiis rite et rationabiliter teneri...

³⁸ Registrum ii, 45, p. 182; Multo enim melius nobis videtur iustitiam Dei vel novis reëdificare consiliis quam animas hominum una cum legibus deperire negletis.

³⁹ See Robert Somerville, 'The Councils of Gregory VII,' Studi Gregoriani xiii, Rome 1989, 42.

upon laymen'. Sigebert of Gembloux called this law horrenda novitate res and said of it; distrinxit gladios laicorum in cervices clericorum.⁴⁰

Letters to Sigehard, patriarch of Aquileia, and Anno of Cologne, also in March, 1075, instructed them to take action against married clergy to compel them to resign their offices and referred also to the decree against simony. Gregory reiterated that these orders were not of his invention but 'decrees of the ancient fathers'.⁴¹ According to Berthold of Reichenau simoniacs and unchaste priests were anathemised at the Lent council of 1078, and deprived of the benefits of all sacraments except baptism.⁴²

These prohibitions were re-defined in November, 1078, when Gregory held an extra synod in Rome. The account of the proceedings in the Register is not complete; it gives the titles of thirty-two canons but the text of only twelve. Hugh of Flavigny, whose principal source for conciliar affairs at that time was Hugh of Die and his circle, gives the text of these twelve canons also. This agrees in the main with the account of Berthold of Reichenau, written probably in 1079.⁴³ In addition to the prohibition of investiture,⁴⁴ simony and concubinage were again expressly forbidden and bishops who permitted their clerics to live in sin were chastised:

⁴⁰ Henry IV, ep.12, January 1076. Die Briefe Heinrichs IV., MGH Deutsches Mittelalter Studientexte 1, 1937, 16: Sigebert of Gembloux, Epistola Leodicensium 2, MGH Libelli de Lite 2, 452, 453:

⁴¹ Registrum, ii, 62, p. 217; (...sanctorum patrum auctoritatem statuimus...): ii, 67, p. 223. (...predicandam atque inculcandam iuxta patrum decreta et auctoritatem canonum...)

⁴² Bertholdi Annales, a. 1078; MGH 5, 308.

⁴³ Mansi xx, 507; Registrum vi, 5b, p. 403, Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 423; Bertholdi, Annales, a. 1078, MGH 5, 314 - 15.

⁴⁴ See below p. 89.

Ordinationes, quae interveniente precio vel precibus, vel obsequio alicui personae impenso, vel que non communi consensu et populi secundum canonum sanctiones fiunt ...irritas esse censuimus.

Si quis episcopus fornicationem presbiterorum diaconorum, subdiaconorum, et crimen incesti precibus vel precio interveniente consenserit...ab officio suspendatur.⁴⁵

These are the last reports of prohibitions of simony and clerical unchastity during the pontificate of Gregory VII. J. Pflugk-Harrtung published thirty-two canons which he attributed to a Roman synod held by Gregory VII. One of these canons (9) forbids the buying or selling of churches or church property.⁴⁶ Hefele, however, is of the opinion that they do not emanate from any one council but are a compilation of the important decrees of Gregory's pontificate, one of many which recur in a number of manuscripts of the late 11th and 12th centuries.⁴⁷

These decrees of the Roman synods are considered here in order to evaluate their influence in Hugh of Die's own synodal legislation and his promulgation of them in France. There can be no doubt that it was in this area - the detection and extirpation of simony and nicholaism - that Hugh's zeal as papal legate was most apparent, but unfortunately a complete list of decrees is available for only one of his councils (Poitiers, 1078).⁴⁸ At that council canon 6 was a prohibition of the purchase or inheritance of churches and canon 9 enjoined complete clerical celibacy: but it is certain that the decrees against simony and nicholaism were issued and enforced at all his

⁴⁵ Registrum vi, 5b, 403 (4) and 405 (12); Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 423-4;

⁴⁶ Hefele, 309.

⁴⁷ See I. S. Robinson, 'Zur Arbeitsweise Bernolds von Konstanz und seines Kreises,' Deutsches Archiv 34, 1978, 65-82.

⁴⁸ See below, pp. 117-8.

councils because of the great number of men from Burgundy accused of these crimes who appeared before Gregory in Rome.⁴⁹

II. DECREES AGAINST LAY-INVESTITURE.

Rudolf Schieffer⁵⁰ maintains that Gregory VII, following the ideas first expressed by Humbert of Silva-Candida in his Libri III adversus simoniacos, saw a return to strictly canonical episcopal election as the surest way to achieve reform in the church - that is, to bring the church back to what Peter Damiani called its 'golden age'.⁵¹ But a year after Gregory's election to the papacy he was still undecided about what line to take in the matter of investiture. He agreed that Anselm II of Lucca should accept investiture from Henry IV if the king agreed to abandon his excommunicated advisers and he allowed the bishop-elect of Mâcon to accept investiture from Philip I, stipulating only that it should be a gift.⁵² But he also supported Hugh of Die, elected at the same time as Anselm, in his refusal to accept investiture from Henry IV.⁵³ At the beginning of his papacy Gregory saw the prohibition of investiture not as an end, merely as a means to an end - the election of suitable candidates to the bishoprics. He only gradually came to the realisation that the way to ensure the safety of episcopal elections was to prohibit investiture completely. This apparent reluctance to confront the issue of investiture is understandable because the eleventh century king was not perceived as an entirely secular personage. He was the rex-sacerdos responsible to God for the spiritual welfare of his subjects, not merely for the peace and safety of the realm. At the consecration of Conrad II in 1024 the archbishop of Mainz declared 'You have come to the highest dignity: you are the vicar of Christ...' When Gregory VII was contemplating leading an expedition against the Saracens in 1074 he declared that he would leave the Church 'under God' in King Henry's care and he asked for Henry's 'divinely inspired

⁵⁰ Rudolf Schieffer, Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturverbots für den deutschen König, MGH schriften 28, pp. 46-7

⁵¹ See letter of Peter Damiani to Gregory VI, PL 144, I, i, 205; Reparetur nunc aureum apostolorum saeculum...

⁵² Registrum i, 21, p. 35; i, 35, p. 56. See above, 'Life,' p. 12.

⁵³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412. See above, 'Life,' p. 11

judgement' about the enterprise.⁵⁴ The ban on investiture marked the end of this papal confidence in the king's God-given authority.

Rudolf Schieffer maintains that the decision to ban investiture was not taken until the Rome synod of November, 1078, even though, according to the chronicler Arnulf of Milan, it was at the Lent synod of 1075 that Gregory VII's first prohibition of lay investiture was promulgated.⁵⁵ Hugh of Flavigny confused the issue by declaring this to have taken place in 1074,⁵⁶ but he is occasionally inaccurate about the chronology of these years: the important thing is his conviction that there was a decree in the early years of the pontificate. In his letter to Henry IV of 8 December, 1075, Gregory referred to 'this decree, which some who place the honour of men above that of God call an intolerable burden, we, using the correct word call rather a truth and a light necessary for salvation...'.⁵⁷ Historians have usually taken this to be a reference to a decree against lay investiture, confirming Arnulf's statement.⁵⁸ It is Rudolf Schieffer's theory that both Arnulf and the letter of December 1075 have been wrongly interpreted. He maintains that

⁵⁴ Augustin Fliche Le Règne de Philippe Ier, Roi de France; Paris 1912, p. 5. Registrum ii, 31, p. 165.

⁵⁵ Arnulfi, Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium 4. 7., MGH ss viii, 27; ...prefatus papa habita Romae synodo palam interdicit regi ius deinde aliquod in dandis episcopatibus omnesque laicas ab investituris ecclesiarum summovet personas.

⁵⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412.

⁵⁷ Registrum iii, 10, p. 266; Huius autem decreti quod quidam dicunt humanos divinis honoribus preponentes importabile pondus et immensam gravitudinem nos autem magis proprio vocabulo recuperande salutis necessariam veritatem vocamus et lucem...

⁵⁸ See Z. N. Brooke, Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy; Raleigh Lecture, 1939; Proceedings of the British Academy, xxv, 226: 'Gregory VII...in February 1075 officially mentioned investiture for the first time and applied the prohibition to the higher churches as well. So much can be said for certain though we have not the wording of the decree.'

the decree of November, 1078, was the first of Gregory's pontificate which directly prohibited lay investiture,⁵⁹ but that the edict of 1075 excommunicating Henry's five counsellors (and Henry himself while he remained in contact with them) effectively barred the king from investiture.⁶⁰ Schieffer considers that Arnulf elevated the king's continued association with the excommunicated counsellors and his consequent alienation from the Church into a virtual prohibition of investiture (for Henry).⁶¹ The 'decree' referred to by the pope in his letter to the king could be, according to Schieffer, the decree against simony publicised in the letters to the German bishops⁶² and not a prohibition of investiture. This theory explains the absence of any reference to a prohibition of investiture as such in the papal correspondence at that time. According to Schieffer, it was only when the differences between pope and king had become irreconcilable that Gregory decided to forbid all investiture: in France in 1077 (in a letter to Hugh of Die concerning Gerard of Cambrai) and in the Church as a whole in November 1078, with a more detailed prohibition at the Lent synod of 1080. To Hugh of Die he said:

'In a general assembly of all members of the council you are to make a public and emphatic declaration that henceforth, in the appointment of bishops, canonical and apostolic authority is to be observed and, in accordance therewith, no metropolitan or other bishop shall dare to lay consecrating hands upon anyone who received the gift of a bishopric from a lay person, under penalty of losing his own office and rank. In the same way let no (lay) power nor any person henceforth have any part in the conferring or accepting of such office. If he shall venture so to do

⁵⁹ Mansi xx, 507; Registrum vi, 5b, p. 403; Hefele, 240; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 423.

⁶⁰ Mansi xx, 443; Hefele, 121; Registrum iii, 10, p. 263-4; 'you cannot receive the favour of God nor apostolic blessing unless you shall first put away those excommunicated persons...'

⁶¹ Rudolf Schieffer, Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturverbots für den deutschen König. pp. 128-32.

⁶² See above, p. 78.

let him understand that he is bound by the same sentence and penalty which the blessed pope Adrian in the eighth council passed upon this kind of offenders and corrupters of sacred authority.⁶³

The decree of Adrian II (867-72), at the council of Constantinople was: Quisquis autem saecularium principum et potentem vel alterius dignitatis laicus adversus communem ac consonantem atque canonicam electionem ecclesiastici ordinis agere tentaverit, anathema sit, donec obediat et consentiat in hoc quod ecclesia de electione ac ordinatione proprii praesulis se velle monstraverit.⁶⁴ In a letter written to Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, twenty years later, Bishop Ivo of Chartres also referred to this decree, but he did so to demonstrate that the various prohibitions of investiture did not refer to the temporalities of the bishopric.⁶⁵ Z.N.Brooke maintained that Gregory VII's decrees were in accord with this theory and that it had never been his intention to deny to the king the right to confer the temporalities of the bishopric.⁶⁶ He quoted from Gregory's letter to the people of Aquileia in 1077,⁶⁷ in which he said that he wished to restore the rule of the people of God in every church, especially in episcopal elections, but that he did not wish to contradict or prevent that which pertained to the service and fealty due to the king. On the other hand Fliche maintained that because the temporalia were not expressly

⁶³ Registrum iv, 22, p. 333; The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII, translated by Ephraim Emerton, Records of Civilisation, Sources and Studies, Columbia University Press, 1932, p. 120; Rudolf Schieffer pp. 162-4. See below, council of Autun, p. 112.

⁶⁴ Mansi xvi, 174-5.

⁶⁵ Ivo of Chartres to Hugh of Lyons; Ep. 60, PL 162, 73B. See 'Ivo of Chartres,' below p. 320.

⁶⁶ Z. N. Brooke, 'Lay investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy'. Raleigh Lecture, 1939. Proceedings of the British Academy, xxv. p.231.

⁶⁷ Registrum v, 5, p. 353.

excluded in the various decrees of Gregory VII investiture with them was forbidden equally with the spiritualia.⁶⁸

A letter of Manasses of Rheims to Gregory VII confirms that investiture was prohibited at the council of Autun in September, 1077.⁶⁹ At Hugh's next council, in Poitiers in January 1078, investiture was again prohibited.⁷⁰ We do not know from the letter of Manasses after Autun the exact form which the prohibition took but the language in Canon 1 of the decrees of the council of Poitiers is very precise. It forbids any bishop, priest or clerk to receive a benefice from any lay man and also, in accordance with Gregory's instructions in the letter quoted above, declares that any lay man who tries to retain his church property should be excommunicated. Whether or not Rudolf Schieffer is correct in his assertion that the first decree against investiture was that of November, 1078, there is no doubt that the first Roman decree in which the investor was declared equally culpable with the invested was not until Lent, 1080. It is therefore possible that the pope was using the legate, Hugh, to test the waters in France before promulgating these decrees to the whole Church. This is an argument in favour of Schieffer's theory. If one of these decrees had not yet been enacted in Rome then it is possible that neither had.

However, Rudolf Schieffer's theory explains neither the very precise reference earlier in the letter from Gregory to Hugh to an existing decree forbidding a bishop to accept investiture nor a similar reference in a letter to the bishop of Speyer, Huzmann, who had been elected in 1075.⁷¹ Cambrai was in the German kingdom and Gerard had explained to the pope that he had been unaware of Henry's alienation from the Church when he accepted

⁶⁸ A. Fliche, *La Réforme Grégorienne*, ii, 181, n. 1: On chercherait en vain un thèse semblable chez Grégoire VII ou chez le cardinal Humbert, pour qui la juridiction temporelle de l'évêque est inhérente à son pouvoir spirituel, comme le corps et l'âme.

⁶⁹ RHG xiv, 611.

⁷⁰ See below, p. 117.

⁷¹ *Registrum* v, 18, p. 381.

investiture, which clouds the issue, but Gregory's words - se neque decretum nostrum de prohibitione huiuscemodi acceptionis nec ipsum Henricum regem a nobis excommunicatum fuisse aliqua certa manifestione cognovisse - ⁷² are quite explicit. The reference here is to two separate impediments to investiture, the excommunication and the decree. Gregory immediately refers to the violation of a synodal decree on the one hand and the defilement incurred by association with an excommunicated man on the other: quod ei ante acceptionem illam...investituram episcopatus regem excommunicatum fuisse et illud decretum nostrum de prohibitione huiuscemodi investiendi et accipiendi ecclesias ...indubitantur notificatum fuerit.⁷³ In fact if all that was referred to here was Henry's excommunication the question of a decree would not arise. The separation of an excommunicated person from all involvement in the life of the church was a matter of canon law and not of synodal decision (although it is possible that the reference to a decree could still mean the synodal decree excommunicating Henry or a decree of the 1075 synod forbidding Henry to invest while excommunicate).

In his account of the Lent synod in Rome in 1078 Berthold of Reichenau declared that the investiture of clergy by laymen was absolutely forbidden. He spoke of this as something already promulgated, not as a new decree: ...quod domino Deo prius canonica et legitima traditione...⁷⁴ However, this could be a reference to the decree of Adrian II mentioned by Gregory. The chronology of the decrees concerning investiture remains very imprecise.

The chronicles of Berthold and Hugh of Flavigny and the Register⁷⁵ agree for the most part on the text of twelve canons

⁷² Registrum iv, 22, p. 333.

⁷³ ibid.

⁷⁴ Bertholdi, Annales a. 1078; MGH 5, 308-309.

⁷⁵ Registrum vi, 5(b), p.400; Bertholdi: Annales ad anno 1078. MGH 5, 313-14; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 423.

promulgated during the synod of November 1078. of which the second was:

Quoniam investituras ecclesiarum contra statuta canonem multis in locis cognovimus a laicis fieri, et ex eo plurimas in aecclesia oriri, ex quibus christiana religio perturbatur, decernimus ut nullus episcoporum investituram episcopatus vel abbatae vel ecclesiae de manu imperatoris vel regis vel alicuius laicae personae, viri vel feminae, suscipiat. Quod si presumpserit, recognoscat investituram illam apostolica auctoritate irritam esse et se usque ad condignam satisfactionem excommunicationi subiacere.⁷⁶

At the Lateran synod in March, 1080⁷⁷, this decree was again promulgated and Gregory took the final step in his campaign against lay investiture by pronouncing the investor equally culpable with the invested:

Si quis imperatorum, regum, ducum, marchionum, comitum vel quilibet secularium potestatum aut personarum, investituram episcopatum vel alicujus ecclesiasticae dignitatis dare praesumpserit, ejusdem sententiae vinculo se obstrictum esse sciat. Insuper etiam, nisi resipiscat et ecclesiae propriam libertatem dimittat divinae animadversionis ultionem in hac presenti vita tam in corpore suo quam caeteris rebus suis sentiat, ut in adventu Domini spiritus salvus fiat.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ ibid. p.403. Hugh of Flavigny omits the last sentence.

⁷⁷ Registrum vii, 14a, p.480, 1; Mansi xx, 531; Hefele, 262; Rudolf Schieffer, Investiturerbotes, pp. 173-5

⁷⁸ Registrum vii, 14a, p.480, 2. Mansi, xx, 531.

This tardy association of the investor in the guilt of investiture perhaps indicates the point at which Gregory finally abandoned any hope of achieving 'the harmony of empire and priesthood',⁷⁹ that co-operation between the spiritual and temporal powers which he had outlined to Rudolf of Swabia with so much optimism at the beginning of his pontificate.⁸⁰

Augustin Fliche⁸¹ saw the decrees against investiture as a means to prevent simony, which so often accompanied investiture. For this reason the decrees were not promulgated in Normandy and England during the lifetime of William the Conqueror, who never accepted payment for a bishopric. Fliche commented that Gregory VII, 'plus opportuniste qu'on ne l'a cru...n'a pas voulu sacrifier cette réforme morale...à une réforme ecclésiastique...'⁸² Although every bishop was William's own choice there was never any doubt of their suitability and probity. This was not true of Philip I of France, about whom Gregory wrote at the beginning of his pontificate that of all the princes who had ill-used the church of God and shown towards her a perverse greed, selling her offices and subjecting her to servitude, Philip was certainly the most guilty.⁸³ But even in his case Gregory was slow to forbid investiture because he could not afford to antagonise Philip while he carried on the struggle with Henry IV. It was only after Henry's apparent submission at Canossa in January, 1077, that Gregory felt able to publish his decree in France. In fact there was no real 'investiture contest' in France, although there was a certain amount of

⁷⁹ Registrum i, 19, p.31; ...ut sacerdotium et imperium in unitate concordie coniungantur...

⁸⁰ ibid: ...quatenus voluntate nostra bene a vobis cognita si rationes nostras iustas esse probaveritis nobiscum consentiatis: si vero ratione nostre aliquid addendum vel subtrahendum... conciliis vestris parati erimus assensum prebere.

⁸¹ A. Fliche, Y a-t'il eu en France et en Angleterre une Querelle des Investitures?; Révue Bénédictine, 46 (1934), 283 - 295.

⁸² ibid. 284.

⁸³ Registrum i, 35, p. 56.

contention. While appearing to yield in some cases, Philip managed to ensure that the bishops of his kingdom were men on whose loyalty he could rely.⁸⁴

Z.N. Brooke⁸⁵ considered that investiture has been given a 'spurious significance' not only in the case of France but even in the struggle between papacy and empire. This struggle up to the death of Henry IV in 1106 was not about investiture but about supremacy, specifically about control of the church of Milan. It was only with Henry V's refusal to accept the decrees against investiture that the real Investiture Contest started.

Because of the paucity of information about all legislation enacted at Hugh's councils there is very little evidence for his support of papal decrees concerning investiture, but it is obvious that wherever he encountered investiture he opposed and corrected it. He was the person selected by Gregory to publicise the prohibition of investiture in France (at Autun in 1077) and the first decree promulgated at his council at Poitiers in 1078 is also a prohibition of investiture. At that council Ralph of Tours was accused of receiving his bishopric from the king; and at his council of Meaux, in 1081, an appointee of Philip I, Ursio, was deposed from the see of Soissons.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ See below, p. 284, where this loyalty is discussed.

⁸⁵ Z.N. Brooke, Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy, 217-19.

⁸⁶ See 'Councils of Hugh of Die,' below, pp. 115 and 129 for details of these cases.

III. DIRECT INVOLVEMENT OF ROME IN THE FRENCH CHURCH.

From the beginning it was Gregory's stated intention to involve himself in all matters concerning the Church throughout western Europe. Writing to Hugh of Cluny, deploring the state of the western church, he said that he found very few bishops who governed in the love of Christ and not for wordly ambition, and that among secular princes he found none who preferred the honour of God to their own, or righteousness to gain. Therefore 'it becomes our duty, when there no prince to care for such matters, to keep watch over the lives of religious men'.⁸⁷ He used almost the same terms to Lanfranc of Canterbury.⁸⁸ It is evident from his synodal decrees and from the letters written after his synods that this interference in the affairs of the episcopate was a duty which the pope took very seriously in France. No dispute was too trivial for his intervention or the intervention of his legates. That his actions might be counter-productive, creating enemies where he might have found allies, was something that did not seem to occur to a pope whose watchword was 'Cursed be the hand that withholds the sword from blood' (Jer. 48, 10).⁸⁹ It is the greatest enigma of this enigmatic man that he could also say to his legate, Hugh of Die: 'It is preferable little by little to bring your children to do better,'⁹⁰ and find nothing inconsistent in these two attitudes.⁹¹

Letters from the pope after the Lent synod of 1075 indicate that a good deal of business concerning France was considered there. Gregory reminded the abbots and superiors of religious houses in France of their obligation to pay annual tribute to

⁸⁷ Registrum ii, 49, p. 190; oportet nos quandoquidem non est princeps qui talia curet religiosorum tueri vitam

⁸⁸ E. V. 1, p.3.

⁸⁹ Quoted in Registrum i, 15, p. 23 and many other letters listed in Caspar, p. 645.

⁹⁰ Registrum ii, 43, p. 108

⁹¹ See below, p. 105, where these seeming contradictions are discussed.

Rome and reprimanded those who had fallen behind in this. He informed them that he was sending Hugh of Die to collect these offerings and 'to attend to various matters of importance for the church' on his behalf.⁹² The appointment of legates to France was also announced to Ivo, abbot of St. Denis at that time.⁹³ King Philip I of France was threatened with excommunication if he did not give firm assurances of his amendment to the representatives of the pope sent to interview him.⁹⁴

Letters from Gregory to the belligerent bishop of Poitiers, Isembert II, and the equally belligerent canons of the church of St. Hilary in Poitiers provide early examples of the kind of papal interference that was to be commonplace during his pontificate. The cathedral canons of Poitiers complained that the canons of St. Hilary, in contravention of an old custom, refused to allow their bishop, Isembert, to say Mass in St. Hilary's church on the feast of All Saints. They took this complaint, not to the metropolitan, Joscelyn of Bordeaux, but to Rome, where Gregory found their complaint to be justified.⁹⁵ Immediately afterwards the canons of St. Hilary complained, also to Rome, that Bishop Isembert had taken possession of the monastery of Noailles, although Alexander II had declared it to be the property of St. Hilary; and also that the cathedral canons had locked them out of the cathedral to which they had, by old custom, been wont to process with relics on Rogation Days. In this case Gregory found in favour of St. Hilary.⁹⁶ (Is it coincidence that in each of these cases Gregory gave judgement in favour of the side which quoted old custom as a reason for its claim? This argument always had weight with him, except when it was attached to secular 'custom' like investiture.) He instructed Isembert to attend a council in Poitiers to be held

⁹² E.V. 12, p. 29; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413. See above, 'Life' p. 24, where this is discussed.

⁹³ Registrum ii, 64, p. 219.

⁹⁴ Registrum ii, 52 (a), p. 196.

⁹⁵ Registrum i, 54, p. 81. March 1074

⁹⁶ Registrum i, 73, p. 104. April 1074.

by the metropolitan.⁹⁷ When this council was held it was presided over by the papal legate, Amatus of Oloron. It was to consider the case of Isembert and also the dissolution of the marriage of Count William of Poitiers, who had married a close relation, a daughter of the Duke of Burgundy.⁹⁸ Isembert burst into the council with a troop of soldiers and broke up the meeting: for this he was summoned to appear in Rome the following November.⁹⁹ He did not attend and was again summoned to the Lent synod in Rome in 1075. In the meantime he was suspended from his office and excommunicated.¹⁰⁰ The bishopric of Poitiers had been held by members of Isembert's family for three generations and Degert has pointed out that he probably considered it to be like an hereditary fief where he was not obliged to recognise any superior allegiance.¹⁰¹ His anger and subsequent intransigence were undoubtedly provoked, in part at least, by the intrusion of the papacy into the local disputes which would formerly have been settled by the metropolitan or even by the parties themselves, and no doubt also by the decision against him in the matter of the monastery of Noailles.

A dispute in which papal interference, although present, was ignored for a long time concerned the ownership of the church of Ste. Marie of Soulac. This church had been the property of Sainte Croix, a monastery in Bordeaux, but had been taken over by Arnold, abbot of the monastery of Saint Sever in the diocese of Aire.¹⁰² At a council in Bordeaux in 1074¹⁰³ the pope's legate, Gerard of Ostia, decided in favour of the monks of Sainte

⁹⁷ ibid.

⁹⁸ Registrum ii, 2, p. 125, September, 1074; 'faciendo divortio'

⁹⁹ ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Registrum ii, 23, p. 155, November, 1074.

¹⁰¹ A. Degert, 'Amat d'Oloron, un Ouvrier de la Réforme au XIe Siècle', Révue des Questions Historiques, lxxxiv, 1908, 42.

¹⁰² Registrum i, 51, p. 77.

¹⁰³ ibid.

Croix. Pope Gregory wrote to Arnold, who although summoned had not attended the council, ordering him to restore the church immediately.¹⁰⁴ Arnold paid no attention to the legate's decision or to the papal ultimatum and Gregory took this disobedience seriously enough to have Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron affirm his decision at a council in Bordeaux in 1079 or 1080.¹⁰⁵ This case exemplifies the new attitude of the reform papacy. Traditionally it would have come under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan but Gregory had no hesitation first in sending his legate to oversee the two metropolitans involved, Aux and Bordeaux, and then in taking over the whole affair himself. It also highlights one obvious disadvantage of the new system. Arnold's long disregard of the orders of pope and legate was possible because Gregory was in Rome and Gerard gone elsewhere: the metropolitan's constant presence would have prevented this kind of flagrant disobedience.

The case of Manasses I, archbishop of Rheims, provides the most striking example of the fatal results of papal interference in areas more properly the province of the metropolitan. A letter to Manasses written shortly after the synod of 1075 rebuking him for his failure to discipline the bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, and announcing the institution of special legates for France,¹⁰⁶ may have aroused that obstinate upholder of metropolitan rights to the rebellion which, as may be seen in a later chapter, was to lead to his ultimate disgrace.¹⁰⁷

The cases of two men, Joel, bishop of Dol in Brittany since 1046, and Aicardus, archbishop of Arles, illustrate a new approach to the way in which decisions were taken at Roman synods. They also provide an example of how papal interference in what was properly the concern of the local episcopate could alter legal decisions taken at the local level.

¹⁰⁴ ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Registrum vi, 24, p. 436 and 25, p. 437; Mansi xx, 505, 529. See below, p.125

¹⁰⁶ Registrum ii, 56, p.209.

¹⁰⁷ See 'Manasses,' below, pp. 249-271.

Joel had been guilty of simony and had taken a wife and dowered his daughters with revenues from the church. He was therefore excommunicated and deposed in 1076. Letters from Gregory to William I of England and to the people of Dol show that he was replaced by a certain Gelduin, who was under age but otherwise canonically elected.¹⁰⁸ When this man arrived in Rome for his consecration Gregory professed himself disturbed by the very bad reports he had received about him from the monk Teuzo and from the cathedral clergy of Dol.¹⁰⁹ These bad reports were opportune for Gregory because he had already appointed ('by divine suggestion') a man of his own, Ivo, abbot of St. Melanious, to the bishopric.¹¹⁰ (Not surprisingly Ivo had problems establishing himself in Dol and Gregory asked Hugh to meet him to hear his complaints: this was one of the cases about which Hugh did nothing at that time.)¹¹¹

Archbishop Aicardus was a known supporter of Henry IV, and obviously could not remain in his bishopric. Gregory informed the clergy and people of Arles that he was sending Bishop Léger of Gap to study the situation with them so that they might choose a person 'pleasing to our vicar Hugh of Die' or, failing that, accept from the hands of Léger a bishop sent by Gregory, already consecrated and invested with the pallium.¹¹² In fact the people of Arles did not wait for this uncanonical interference but availed themselves of the first option. At the council of Avignon in 1080, presided over by Hugh, Aicardus was suspended and one Gibelin elected in his place.¹¹³ (There is no record of Léger having been present.)

¹⁰⁸ E.V. 16, p.44 and Registrum iv, 4, 5 and 17, pp. 300, 301 and 322.

¹⁰⁹ Registrum iv, 17, p.322, to William of England.

¹¹⁰ E.V. 16, p.44.

¹¹¹ See 'Relations with Gregory VII,' above, p. 42.

¹¹² Registrum vi, 21, p.432.

¹¹³ See Council of Avignon, below, p. 122.

In the decrees of the Lateran synod of 1080 such instances of papal intervention were retrospectively legalised. Canon 6 stated that a bishop nominated by the pope or metropolitan as a visitor should have charge of the election, so that clergy and people, removed from secular ambition, fear or favour, should choose a pastor pleasing to God, with the agreement of the pope or of the metropolitan.¹¹⁴ This intrusion of the papacy into episcopal elections suggests that Gregory, having outlawed the lay investor, was seeking by this means to promote the papacy to the place left vacant. Such an intrusion was not foreseen in canon law and was contrary to established custom, but Hugh of Die, who was present at the synod in Rome, had no qualms about making use of it at the council of Meaux a short time later. In 1081 or 82 he and Amatus of Oloron appointed a bishop to the See of Meaux, vacant for only a week, although the metropolitan was not present.¹¹⁵

Gregory VII's interventions in the French Church also illustrate his interest in the office of metropolitan. There was a continuing dispute between the archdiocese of Tours and the diocese of Dol in Normandy concerning the claims of each to hold the title of metropolitan of Brittany. This was discussed at length at the Roman synod of 1080 and a decision was given in favour of the archbishop of Tours. The bishop of Dol, Ivo, although appointed by Gregory himself, did not appear at the deliberations. A legate was sent to reconcile the differences between the sees.¹¹⁶ This was certainly Hugh of Die. He was in Rome for that synod and he, in conjunction with Amatus of Oloron, eventually achieved a temporary resolution of the problem at the council of Saintes the following year.¹¹⁷

The place in France which had most experience of Roman authority in conflict with local autonomy was the diocese of

¹¹⁴ Mansi xx, 531; Registrum vii, 14(a), p.482. L

¹¹⁵ See council of Meaux, below, p. 130.

¹¹⁶ Registrum vii, 15, p. 488.

¹¹⁷ See council of Saintes, below p.

Mâcon where the monastery of Cluny was situated. The privileged position of Cluny, exempted from all control except that of Rome, was not created by Gregory VII. It had been in place for more than a century and a half when he came to the papal throne.¹¹⁸ But Gregory was always an enthusiastic upholder of Cluny's libertas, seeing in it something that might eventually be achieved in the whole Church.¹¹⁹ Also, his devotion to St. Peter intensified his concern to protect Cluny and to uphold her interests in her disputes with neighbouring bishops. In February 1080, he sent a legate to Cluny to put down a revolt against Roman interference led by the bishop of Mâcon and the archbishop of Lyons.¹²⁰ At the Lent synod he repeated, with added emphasis, Peter Damiani's 1063 confirmation of Cluny's unique position.¹²¹ He asserted significantly that not even his own legate might pronounce adversely on the monastery or have any authority there.¹²²

At the end of his life Gregory reproached the bishops and metropolitans of France for their lack of support in 'the storms of persecution and the burdens of danger' which the Roman church had endured during his pontificate. He expressed his gratitude however, that, even without their help, he had remained faithful to his purpose. 'We return our thanks without number to Him who so far has kept us unharmed from the attacking storm, and has so led us by the way of liberty towards the hope of calm that neither our own conscience nor the scrutiny of religious men who

¹¹⁸ Foundation Charter of Cluny, 909; see H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, Oxford, 1970; pp. 4 - 6.

¹¹⁹ H.E.J. Cowdrey declares 'For the reformers Cluny ...stood out as an epitome of this liberty (from subjection to temporal lordship) and therefore as a conspicuous example of what they sought to achieve' The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p.136.

¹²⁰ See Peter of Albano in 'Legates,' below, p. 193.

¹²¹ Council of Châlon-sur-Sâone, Mansi xix, 1025.

¹²² Bullarium Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis; in fol. Lugduni 1680; Quoted in H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, pp. 56 and 272.

know us well accuses us of having acted contrary to the overruling purposes of righteousness.¹²³ This consciousness of rectitude was obviously enough to justify in his own eyes the fact that he had, by his attempts to subdue their independence, made enemies of many who, approached in a more conciliatory spirit, might have co-operated with him in the work of reform.¹²⁴

¹²³ E.V. 51, p. 125.

¹²⁴ Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims is an example.

IV. THE ROMAN COUNCILS AS TRIBUNALS.

From the beginning of his papacy Gregory VII assumed the position of final arbiter in ecclesiastical affairs with enthusiasm.¹²⁵ In the Dictatus Papae of 1075 he claimed 'that the greater causes of any church must be referred to (the apostolic see),¹²⁶ and other chapters of that memorandum identified the maiores causae which came under the judicial authority of the papacy.¹²⁷ The early results of this assumption of supremacy may be found in the long catalogue of excommunications at the Roman Lent synod of 1075,¹²⁸ Not since the council at Rheims in 1049 had so many churchmen been judged and condemned, and the pattern which emerged there was to become a feature of Gregory's subsequent synods. The Roman synod had become a tribunal, judging and punishing offences against the church which in former times had been most frequently dealt with locally: this was to continue during his pontificate.

The full records of the synod of 1075 are lost but the Registrum shows that seven bishops from Germany and Italy were suspended, the five counsellors of Henry IV who had supported his simoniac practices were excommunicated, as were Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and his nephew, Robert of Loritello. Philip I of France was threatened with excommunication if he failed to give the pope's messengers satisfactory proofs of his repentance and amendment.¹²⁹ There were no French bishops on that list but at the Roman council the following year (February, 1076) there were four: Berengar of Agde, for his continuing association with his frequently excommunicated metropolitan,

¹²⁵ See above p. 70-71.

¹²⁶ Registrum ii, 55a, c. 21, p. 206.

¹²⁷ ibid. caps. 3, 7 and 13, pp. 202-4.

¹²⁸ Registrum ii, 52 a. p.196. Mansi xx, 443; Hefele, 121;

¹²⁹ Mansi xx, 443; Hefele, 121; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412; Registrum ii, 52(a), p. 196;

Geoffrey of Cerdaña, archbishop of Narbonne;¹³⁰ Hermann of Vienne, for simony, together with Hermann's suffragan, Pontius of Grenoble; and Stephen of Le Puy for simony and 'bloodshed'. Hugh's position as legate and the decisions he arrived at were confirmed at this council.¹³¹

The case of Berengar of Tours¹³² was one which was debated during several councils in Rome but it was not in quite the same category as the cases listed above. In the first place Berengar's view of the doctrine of transubstantiation was seen as a heresy and he was a master in the cathedral school of Tours; therefore his case might properly come under the direct jurisdiction of the pope. Matters concerning the faith constituted one of the maiores causae specified in the Dictatus Papae.¹³³ In the second place the pope, then archdeacon Hildebrand, had been present during Berengar's appearance before the council of Tours in 1054 and had had several interviews with him at that time.¹³³ Finally, Berengar himself had eagerly

¹³⁰ In 1019 Geoffrey's father, Count Wilfred of Cerdaña, had purchased the archbishopric of Narbonne for his son, then a boy of ten. He was subsequently excommunicated several times because of this simony but he remained in his bishopric until his death in 1079. Gams; 'pluries excommunicatus'; Gall. Chris vi, 32 (Marc. Hisp. 543). R. W. Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, London, 1953, pp. 118-9

¹³¹ Registrum iii, 10 (a), p. 268. Mansi xx, 467; Hefele, 158.

¹³² Jean Ebersolt, Essai sur Bérenger de Tours et la Controverse Sacramentaire au xie Siècle, Révue de l'Histoire des Religions, xlviii, (1903). Jean de Montclos, Lanfranc et Bérenger: la Controverse Eucharistique du xie Siècle: (Louvain, 1971). Margaret Gibson, 'Berengar of Tours', Studies in Church History, 7. Councils and Assemblies, 1971, 61-68.

¹³³ Registrum ii, 55(a), c 21, p. 206.

¹³³ For Gregory's early involvement in Berengar's case see 'Legates,' below, p. 165.

sought a hearing in Rome.¹³⁴ A letter from Gregory to Hugh of Cluny shows that it was at the prompting of the latter that the case had been re-opened.¹³⁵

Berengar came to Rome for the November council in 1078, but he was disappointed in his hope of a general discussion of his theory. He was forced to take an oath in the presence of the assembled bishops that the bread and wine, after the consecration, were the real body and blood of Christ. Gregory then declared that he was not a heretic and that his teachings were in conformity with the teaching of the Church but several of those present were dissatisfied with this and insisted that Berengar should remain in Rome until the Lent council of the following year. His views were then debated during three sessions of the council before the minority, who had supported Berengar in his contention that the bread and wine by the consecration became merely a figura of the body of Christ, were won over to the majority belief that the elements were changed in substance (substantialiter), retaining only the appearance of bread and wine.¹³⁶ Berengar took an oath, again unwillingly, that he agreed with this decision:¹³⁷

Ego Berengarius corde credo et ore confiteor panem et vinum, quae ponuntur in alteri, per mysterium sacrae orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris substantialiter converti in veram et propriam et vivificatricem carnem et sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri...¹³⁸

Berengar was sent back to Tours with instructions from the pope to 'all the faithful of St. Peter' that he was not to be

¹³⁴ The right of appeal to Rome was defined in the Dictatus Papae; Quod nullus audeat condemnare apostolicam sedem appellantem.

¹³⁵ Registrum v, 21, p. 384; De Berengario unde nobis scripistis...

¹³⁶ Mansi xx, 523, 525.

¹³⁷ Jean Ebersolt, Essai sur Bérenger de Tours et la Controverse Sacramentaire au xie Siècle, Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, Paris, p. 154-5.

¹³⁸ Registrum vi, 17(a), p. 426.

injured in his person or in his property, although he might be termed a heretic.¹³⁹ It is not certain from this letter that Gregory was totally unsympathetic to Berengar's teaching.

The affair of Berengar provides a practical example of the theory of the supremacy of the papal see which lay behind Gregory's perception of his jurisdictional authority. It also demonstrates the element of charity which so frequently appeared to soften his judgements. Although deemed a heretic, Berengar was not persecuted for his sincerely held beliefs. The account also provides a useful illustration of the way in which decisions were arrived at in Gregory's synods. There is no question here of the synod merely ratifying a papal decree. The minority, who supported Berengar, were able to force a debate in which they had to be convinced of his error. This procedure was to change during the pontificate of Urban II, when the work of the bishops was no longer to make decisions but merely to acclaim decrees announced by the pope.¹⁴⁰

Margaret Gibson pointed out that the affair of Berengar marks Gregory's only excursion into the realms of theology: his chief interests were always good government and liturgical uniformity. Dr. Gibson believed that Gregory was forced to confront this case because of his own precarious situation with Henry IV.¹⁴¹ Involvement in heresy could be a good reason for the deposition of a pope. Gregory's association with Berengar was one of the charges brought against him at the synod of Brixon in 1080. 'Long a disciple of the heretic Berengar, he places in question the catholic and apostolic Faith, in regard to the Body and Blood of the Lord.'¹⁴²

¹³⁹ E. V. 73, p. 157; vel qui eum vocabunt hereticum.

¹⁴⁰ Urban II, JL 5446, PL 151, 328-9; council of Troia, Mansi xx, 789; Eadmer Historia Novorum ii, RS 81, 114. See below, p.

¹⁴¹ Margaret Gibson, 'Councils and Assemblies;' Studies in Church History 7, 61 - 68.

¹⁴² MGH, Constitutiones et Acta i, 119.

In the establishment of the see of Rome as a judgement seat over the whole Church Gregory VII had an able ally in France in Hugh of Die. It was no coincidence that large numbers of prelates from France were sent to Rome for judgement from the time when Hugh began his mission as Gregory's legate.¹⁴³ While Gregory lived he was to have no one more enthusiastic in carrying out his precepts. From the time of his appointment as legate in Burgundy until the council of Poitiers in January 1078, Hugh's councils were marked by great numbers of suspensions, depositions and excommunications.¹⁴⁴ The number of accused prelates from France making the journey to Rome did not again reach the record achieved in 1076-8, when eight archbishops and sixteen bishops were under sentences of greater or lesser severity.¹⁴⁵ But until the end of Gregory's pontificate there was a constant presence of French bishops at his councils, brought or sent by the legates. At the Roman synod of 1079 Geoffrey of Cerdaña, archbishop of Narbonne, was again excommunicated (for the last time, because he died that year).¹⁴⁶ Peter, bishop of Rodez and usurper of the See of Narbonne,¹⁴⁷ and Manasses, archbishop of Rheims, were deposed and excommunicated in 1080¹⁴⁸ and a judgement was given against the monks of Dol in their dispute with the bishop of Limoges, Guido de Laron, concerning the usurpation of two monasteries.¹⁴⁹ At the Lent synod in Rome in 1081 the sentences against Aicardus of Arles and Peter of Narbonne were confirmed. 'Some bishops' who failed to attend

¹⁴³ According to Hugh of Flavigny Hugh's first council was at Anse in 1075; MGH 8, 413

¹⁴⁴ Letters of Hugh to Gregory VII, PL 148, 744, viii and PL 157, 509, vii; also Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418. See 'Life,' above, p. 31 and the councils of Hugh of Die, below pp. 107-132.

¹⁴⁵ See councils of Clermont, Autun and Poitiers, below pp. 110-119.

¹⁴⁶ Mansi xx, 519. See p. 101, n. 129.

¹⁴⁷ Gall Chris i, 204 and vi, 39.

¹⁴⁸ Mansi xx, 531; Registrum vii, 14(a), p. 479 See 'Metropolitans' below, for a discussion of Manasses.

¹⁴⁹ Registrum vii, 17, p. 491.

(understandably, as Henry IV was advancing on Rome at the time) were suspended.¹⁵⁰

It is important to understand that, in the context of the Roman synod as a tribunal, Gregory saw his rôle as that of a judge, but not necessarily that of an executioner. His early warning to Hugh that an excess of severity could drive people away rather than reconcile them with the Church¹⁵¹ and his angry reaction to Hugh's adherence to the letter of the law, which culminated in the letter of March 1078, prove his unwillingness to condone injustice, or even undue severity.¹⁵² There was often an element of mercy in the judgements delivered at Gregory's synods which ran contrary to the pope's own interests. His reconciliation with Henry at Canossa lost him a unique opportunity for political advantage in Germany and his leniency with Berengar of Tours left him open to a charge of sympathy with heresy. He urged Hugh of Die to severity with Manasses of Rheims,¹⁵³ but when the archbishop had been excommunicated the pope wrote to him 'in direct contravention of the custom of the church of Rome' offering him a chance to exculpate himself.¹⁵⁴ Gregory VII did not lack clemency and he tried to ensure that his legate should act with mercy as well as justice, but he also insisted that, whatever his legate did, all the facts must be fully explained in Rome. 'Wherefore we enjoin on you to return to us as soon as you can so that we may understand what you have

¹⁵⁰ Mansi xx, 577; Suspendit ab officio quosdam episcopos qui ad concilium invitati neque ipsi necque nuntii eorum pro ipsis venerunt.

¹⁵¹ Registrum ii, 43, p. 180; 'We should be better pleased that you were reproached for your leniency than that the Church should fall into disrepute through your severity'.

¹⁵² Registrum v, 17, p. 378; ...quia irato animo et non synodali iudicio dimisit ecclesiam suam...

¹⁵³ E. V. 30, p. 77. 'If suitable accusers and witnesses can be found...we desire you without hesitation to pass the sentence which righteouness requires.'

¹⁵⁴ Registrum vii, 20, p. 495.

accomplished and with God's help may come to a more intelligent decision as to further action.¹⁵⁵

A study of Hugh's councils falls naturally into two parts: the early councils held while he was bishop of Auxerre, which were terminated by a period of illness and exile, subsequent from 1071 to 1074, and the later ones which began with his elevation to the archbishopric of Lyons and continued in declining numbers until his death. In view of his position as Gregory's most important legate in France it is curious that records of his work remain for only one of the councils he held during Gregory's pontificate, namely the 1071-1072 council in 1072. At the council of Auxerre in 1071, when he was appointed as legate by Urban II, the council is mentioned.

1071-1072.¹⁵⁶

This is recorded by Hugh of Viannes as Hugh's first council.¹⁵⁷ The chronicle gives no details of what took place there and the legate himself, writing to Gerard of Auxerre, refers to it only in general terms.¹⁵⁸ The council of the year 1072 in Rome in February, 1072, suggests, however, that the council at Auxerre must have been a most successful assembly.¹⁵⁹ The archbishop of Viannes, the bishop of La Ferté, and Rainald and the clerics of the cathedral in Auxerre were all present to hear of Hugh for disciplinary action. There was no suggestion for the work with which he had accomplished his first mission for

Registrum i, 6, p.8, to Gerard of Ostia and Rainald, legates in France; admonemus...ut quantotius possitis ad nos revertamini quatenus et quid egeritis cognoscamus et de cetero consultius adiuvante Deo statuere valeamus.

THE LEGATINE COUNCILS OF HUGH OF DIE.

A study of Hugh's councils falls naturally into two parts: the early councils held while he was bishop of Die, which were terminated by a period of illness and partial estrangement from Rome, and the later ones which almost coincided with his elevation to the archbishopric of Lyons and continued in dwindling numbers until his death. In view of his position as Gregory's most important legate in France, it is curious that records of decrees remain for only two of the councils he held during Gregory's pontificate, Autun in 1077 and Poitiers in 1078. At the council of Autun in 1094, when he had been re-appointed as legate by Urban II, one decree is recorded.

ANSE, 1075.¹⁵⁶

This is recorded by Hugh of Flavigny as Hugh's first council.¹⁵⁷ The chronicler gives no details of what took place there and the legate himself, writing to Ralph of Tours, refers to it only in general terms.¹⁵⁸ The protocol of the Lent synod in Rome in February, 1076, suggests, however, that the council at Anse must have been a most eventful meeting.¹⁵⁹ The archbishop of Vienne, the bishops of Le Puy, Agde and Grenoble and the clerks of St. Barnard in Romans were all brought to Rome by Hugh for disciplinary action. There he was commended for the zeal with which he had accomplished his first mission for

¹⁵⁶ Mansi xx, 481. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413; Lühe. Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 43. Hefele, 219; Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schism von 1140, Berlin 1935, p. 94-95

¹⁵⁷ Invigilabat enim idem sollicitus gregi sibi credito et legationis sibi creditatae sollicitas servans excubias primum concilium celebravit apud Ansam...; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413.

¹⁵⁸ RHG xiv, 777, no. 1.

¹⁵⁹ Registrum iii, 10(a), p.269.

Gregory, the collection of the census owed by the abbeys enjoying the protection of St. Peter.¹⁶⁰

Hugh's activities had certainly been noteworthy. If not at this council certainly at one of his earliest councils, he proceeded against his former archbishop, Humbert of Lyons, for simony (predictably, in view of his known views about Humbert's simoniac practices).¹⁶¹ Humbert was finally deposed at the council of Autun two years later but he had already vacated the see and become a monk.¹⁶² It was probably also at this council that Hugh indicted his current metropolitan, Herimanus of Vienne, who was excommunicated at the Lent synod in Rome the following year, together with the homicidal Stephen de Polignac, bishop of Le Puy and Pontius, bishop of Grenoble:

Viennensem episcopum Herimannum iuste depositum pro simonia periuriis, sacrilegiis et apostasia, quia Viennensem ecclesiam infestare non desistit, excommunicamus... Podiensem symoniacum homicidam Stephanum scilicet a legatis nostris excommunicatum, et Pontium Gratianopolitanum quousque rescipiscat excommunicamus.¹⁶³

Although 'our legate' who ordered these depositions could have been Gerard of Ostia, during his tour of Burgundy in 1073,¹⁶⁴ the commendation of Hugh in the matter of the census coming immediately after the list of offenders suggests that he was the judge in every case. If he were, these men were probably arraigned at Anse or perhaps at Dijon in January, 1076,¹⁶⁵ or

¹⁶⁰ ibid.

¹⁶¹ See above, 'Life,' p. 1.

¹⁶² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415; ...quia Lugdunensis sedes, Humberto symoniaco expulso et in locis Iurensibus monacho facto, vacabat antistite...; Gall Chris iv, 88 - 89.

¹⁶³ Registrum iii, 10(a), p.269.

¹⁶⁴ See 'Life,' above, p. 6; also Council of Chalon, Mansi xx 391.

¹⁶⁵ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413.

perhaps at a council in Die not recorded by Hugh of Flavigny.¹⁶⁶ The important thing here is not the place but the evidence of fanatical enthusiasm in the newly-appointed legate. In the cases cited above the pope endorsed the sentences passed in France, but he had already realised that the intransigence of his agent in Burgundy might become an obstacle to the progress of reform. As early as January, 1075, he had written to Hugh: Melius enim nobis placet ut pro pietate interdum reprehendaris, quam pro nimia severitate in odium ecclesie tue venias.¹⁶⁷

DIJON, JANUARY 1076.¹⁶⁸

A letter from Hugh to archbishop Ralph of Tours¹⁶⁹ shows that Hugh of Flavigny is mistaken in referring to this as Hugh's third council.¹⁷⁰ The letter makes it clear that this council took place before the council of Clermont in August, 1076. As in the case of the council of Anse, the chronicler gave no details of what took place at Dijon. Hugh of Flavigny wrote:

Persequebatur symoniacos, adversus quos ei iugis pugna conflictus fuit perpetuus, quos etiam prout ab ecclesia eliminavit et orthodoxos substituit.¹⁷¹

The date of this council is not known, but any date in January does not allow much time for people to travel to Rome by February 14. The case of Liemar of Hamburg-Bremen in 1074, however, reveals how little such practical details were taken

¹⁶⁶ See 'Council of Clermont,' below p. 111 where the confused case of Stephen of Le Puy is studied.

¹⁶⁷ Registrum ii, 43, p.180.

¹⁶⁸ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413; Mansi xx, 483; Hefele, 220; Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon p. 43; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 95.

¹⁶⁹ PL 157, 507, ii.

¹⁷⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413. ...primum concilium celebravit apud Ansam, secundus apud Clarummontem...Tertium Divioni.

¹⁷¹ ibid.

into account by the pope.¹⁷² It is possible that some of the men convicted at the Roman council in February had been arraigned at Dijon.

CLERMONT, AUGUST 1076.¹⁷³

Ralph of Langeais, archbishop of Tours, presided at this council with Hugh of Die.¹⁷⁴ Hugh of Flavigny, whose chronology is sometimes inaccurate,¹⁷⁵ says that Stephen de Polignac, formerly a bishop of Clermont and current usurper of the see of Le Puy, was excommunicated at this synod together with William, the current bishop of Clermont.¹⁷⁶ Stephen had been in trouble two years previously and, after an interview with Gregory, had been sent back to his diocese and forbidden to exercise his episcopal functions until judgement should have been passed on his case at a local council.¹⁷⁷ But this judgement must have taken place earlier than Clermont because in the protocol of the Lent council in Rome, seven months previously, Stephen 'simoniac and murderer, already excommunicated by our legate'... is mentioned among the ultramontane bishops who were finally

¹⁷² Letter of Liemar of Bremen to Hezilo of Hildesheim, Hildesheimer Briefe, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5; Briefsammmlung der Zeit Heinrichs IV, (Carl Erdmann und Norbert Fickermann) pp.33-35; ex qua die date mihi sunt littere vix iiii septimane supersunt ad eam septimanam qua synodus celerabitur.

¹⁷³ Mansi xx, 481. PL 148, 744, viii (a letter from Hugh to Gregory VII, written after the council of Autun in 1077). Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413; Lühe p. 43, Hefele 219, Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 95-96

¹⁷⁴ Mansi xx, 481. See Hugh's letter to Ralph which invites him to be present at this council, PL 157, 508, iii. The association of Hugh and Ralph is discussed in 'Metropolitans,' below, p. 272-278.

¹⁷⁵ For instance he declared that Hugh was elected in 1074 and that the pope at the time was Alexander II. MGH 8, 410.

¹⁷⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413.

¹⁷⁷ Registrum i, 80, p.114.

excommunicated.¹⁷⁸ Neither Stephen nor William is mentioned by Hugh to Gregory in the letter written the following year about this council and the subsequent one at Autun,¹⁷⁹ but as he had already sent some details by a messenger this means nothing. The council at Anse in 1075 seems a more likely locale for this excommunication, which would then have been confirmed at Rome in January, 1076. Caspar postulates two separate Stephens mentioned in Gregory's letter to the clergy and people of Le Puy, Stephen de Polignac, the bishop-elect and Stephen the simoniac, deposed earlier. This could be an explanation of a very muddled situation.¹⁸⁰ Stephen obviously gave trouble about his deposition because in March of the following year Gregory was still writing to the clergy of Le Puy, as well as to 'the bishops and priests of Gaul', confirming the fact that Stephen had been deposed and excommunicated.¹⁸¹

No details are available about the deposition of William of Clermont. According to Hugh of Flavigny, Durannus, abbot of Casa Dei since 1067, was elected to the bishopric of Clermont in his place at this council.¹⁸² Joscelyn de Parthenay, archbishop of Bordeaux, was summoned to attend this council but neither came nor sent a canonical excuse. He was therefore suspended from his episcopal functions.¹⁸³ The provost of Rheims, Manasses, came to the council to declare that he had received his office unworthily and to resign it into the hands of the legate, Hugh.¹⁸⁴ He was accompanied by Bruno, master of the cathedral school of Rheims, subsequently founder of the Carthusian

¹⁷⁸ Registrum iii, 10(a), p.268.

¹⁷⁹ PL 148, 744, viii.

¹⁸⁰ Registrum i, 80, p.114, fn. 2.

¹⁸¹ Registrum iv, 18, p.324 and 19, p.325.

¹⁸² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413.

¹⁸³ Letter from Hugh of Die to Gregory VII. PL 148, 744, viii.

¹⁸⁴ ibid.

order.¹⁸⁵ The letter which Hugh wrote to Gregory about all this is damaged but it is possible to make out from it that these men also accused Manasses I, archbishop of Rheims, before the council.¹⁸⁶ The archbishop was eventually to be deposed by Hugh at Lyons in 1080 and finally excommunicated by the pope later that year.¹⁸⁷

AUTUN, SEPTEMBER 1077.¹⁸⁸

Hugh was instructed by Gregory to hold this council to deal with the case of Gerard of Cambrai, who had accepted investiture from Henry IV, and to announce that in future all investiture was forbidden.¹⁸⁹ According to Hugh of Flavigny, Duke Hugh of Burgundy presided over this council which was attended by many illustrious men, bishops and clergy, abbots and monks.¹⁹⁰ Among the bishops was Hugo Rainard, Bishop of Langres, greatly praised by the chronicler.¹⁹¹

A great many bishops and archbishops were disciplined at Autun. The details are only available in a letter from Hugh to the pope, which also deals sketchily with what happened at Clermont the previous year.¹⁹² According to this letter Rath-

¹⁸⁵ ibid.

¹⁸⁶ PL 148, 744, viii.

¹⁸⁷ This case is discussed on pp. 249-271 below.

¹⁸⁸ Letter of Hugh to Gregory VII, PL 148, 744, viii; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415; Mansi xx, 483. Hefele, 220. Lühe, p.46. Schieffer, p. 99.

¹⁸⁹ Registrum iv, 22, p. 333. See above 'Investiture,' p. 89.

¹⁹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415: ...assensu et laude Hugonis ducis...ubi convenerunt ex Francia et Burgundia multi illustres viri, episcopi et clerici, abbates et monachi quampures...

¹⁹¹ ibid. See below 'Suffragans,' pp. 231-4, for details about this man.

¹⁹² PL 148, 744, viii. (For a discussion of this gap in Hugh's correspondence with the pope See 'Relations with Gregory VII' above, pp. 33-46).

bodus, bishop of Noyen, threatened with a public enquiry, admitted his simony and promised to abdicate.¹⁹³ Ivo, bishop of Senlis, was sent to Rome for judgement because he had received investiture from the king and been consecrated by the 'heresiarch', Manasses of Rheims.¹⁹⁴ The case of Robert, son of count William of Nevers was also to be considered by the pope. He had not been of canonical age when he received the bishopric of Auxerre, but he had refused investiture by the king.¹⁹⁵

There was a complaint, not specified in Hugh's letter but entrusted to a messenger, against the archbishop of Sens, Richerius, who was suspended and sent to Rome.¹⁹⁶ Joscelyn de Parthenay, archbishop of Bordeaux, suspended the previous year for non-attendance at the council of Clermont, failed to attend this council also, and was suspended from all sacerdotal function and sent to Rome.¹⁹⁷ Richard, archbishop of Bourges was dismissed for an unspecified reason and sent to Rome.¹⁹⁸ Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, was sent to Rome for judgement.¹⁹⁹ Manasses, archbishop of Rheims, who did not attend the council, was deposed and excommunicated for crimes against the church.²⁰⁰

Following Gregory's instructions the council of Autun reviewed the case of Gerard, bishop of Cambrai, who had received investiture from Henry IV but had resigned the bishopric into Gregory's hands when he learned of the prohibition against

193 ibid.

194 ibid.

195 ibid.

196 This quarrel with Richerius is studied on pp. 279-82

197 PL 148, 744, viii.

198 ibid.; See also Registrum v, 17, p.378.

199 ibid.; this case is studied above, pp. 35-37.

200 Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, MGH, Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, (Carl Erdmann und Norbert Fickerman), 107, p. 182.

this.²⁰¹ His election was confirmed and he was consecrated by Hugh.²⁰² Humbert, the simoniac archbishop of Lyons, accused at one of Hugh's early councils, was finally deposed and Gebuin, archdeacon of Langres, universally renowned for his saintliness, was elected in his place.²⁰³

Dom H. Leclercq was mistaken in saying that we only know of one decree from this council at Autun, that prohibiting regular canons from becoming monks.²⁰⁴ From a letter of Archbishop Manasses to Gregory we know also that Hugh of Die made there the 'public and emphatic' declaration enjoined on him by the pope²⁰⁵ that no-one was to be consecrated to a bishopric who had received it as a gift from a lay person.²⁰⁶ From this time forward no-one in France could claim, as Gerard of Cambrai had done, that he did not know of this prohibition. These two, however, are the only decrees surviving from this council.

POITIERS, JANUARY 1078.²⁰⁷

²⁰¹ Registrum iv, 22, p.330.

²⁰² Letter of Manasses to Gregory, as n. 200, above.

²⁰³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 416.

²⁰⁴ Hefele v, i, p. 220, n. 1. Mansi xx, 488. See below pp. 153-4, where the position of regular canons is discussed.

²⁰⁵ Registrum iv, 22, p.333; ...ut congregatis omnibus et in conventu residentibus manifesta et personanti denuntiatione interdicat... See above, pp.83-91, for a discussion of the question of investiture.

²⁰⁶ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611; ...contra decretum vestrum quo statueratis ne quis saltem archiepiscoporum eum consecraret episcopum qui a laica persona accedisset episcopii donum ...apud Augustodunense concilium, ubi domnus H. Diensis episcopus promulgavit et statuit coram omnibus hoc vestrum ecclesiasticum decretum. See council of Poitiers, for further discussion of this point.

²⁰⁷ Mansi xx, 495.; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418; Lühe, p. 54-55; Hefele, 229; Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 103.

Again the only record of this council is a letter from Hugh of Die to Gregory VII.²⁰⁸ In it Hugh accused King Philip I of France of double-dealing. While assuring Hugh of the honour and respect in which he held his legation, the king had written at the same time to the count of Poitiers²⁰⁹ that he would hold him guilty of lèse-majesté if he allowed a 'conventicula' or 'quasi concilia' to take place in his jurisdiction (ius). In spite of this warning the count was present at the council.²¹⁰ Philip had also informed the bishops of the count's jurisdiction that he would regard their attendance at such a meeting as an insult to the crown. Hugh maintained that the trouble caused at this council by 'the enemies of truth', Archbishop Ralph of Tours and his suffragan Bishop Sylvester of Rennes, was a result of this royal intervention.²¹¹ Ralph of Tours, accused of having been uncanonically elected and of having received investiture from Philip I for payment and bribery, was suspended from his bishopric, as was his suffragan, Sylvester of Rennes, accused of simony. Both men were sent to Rome for judgement. They invaded the council with armed men and for this reason the location of the council was changed by Hugh to the church of St. Hilary in Poitiers.²¹²

At the council Hugo de Montfaucon, archbishop of Besançon, who had failed to come to either Autun or Poitiers was suspended and sent to Rome for judgement.²¹³ The bishop of Beauvais, accused of trafficking in the prebendaries of his church, was

²⁰⁸ PL 157, no.vii, 509; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

²⁰⁹ Duke William VIII of Aquitaine, also known as 'Guy Godfrey' (see A. Fliche, Philippe Ier, p. 235).

²¹⁰ See letter of Bishop Ernardus of Le Mans cited below, p. 117. William of Aquitaine was a supporter of Pope Gregory VII.

²¹¹ PL 157, No. vii, 510, inimici veritatis; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418. See below, p. 276, where the loyalty of Ralph of Tours to the king is discussed.

²¹² ibid.

²¹³ ibid.

suspended and likewise sent to Rome for judgement.²¹⁴ Rathbodus, bishop of Noyen, who had admitted to simony and sworn to abdicate at Autun, was suspended and sent to Rome because he had failed to do so.²¹⁵ Radulfus, described by Hugh as a usurper (pervasor) of the see of Amiens, was sent to Rome with the three bishops who had consecrated him - Helinand of Laon, Theobald of Soissons and Ivo of Senlis.²¹⁶

Oral messages were sent by the monk Teuzo²¹⁷ concerning Isembert, bishop of Poitiers and Drogo, bishop of Térouanne since 1028. The problem with Isembert is not specified in any of the letters of the period, it may have been a further manifestation of his belligerence towards legatine interference.²¹⁸ A letter from Gregory to the cathedral chapter of Térouanne clarifies the affair of Drogo, showing that he was selling the holy oils to the monks of the chapter;²¹⁹ a tribute classified as simony in 1075 but probably exacted by Drogo during his lifetime as a bishop.

Hugh wrote that, at Gregory's suggestion, he had listened to the arguments put forward by the count of Anjou and found them fairly reasonable, but that he was leaving a decision in the case

²¹⁴ ibid.

²¹⁵ ibid.

²¹⁶ ibid. The bishops of Laon and Soissons are not included in the list of bishops disciplined by Hugh, on p. 31, because they do not appear to be charged with any crime other than their involvement in this consecration. The bishop of Senlis is included because his own consecration was tainted - see above, council of Autun, p. 113.

²¹⁷ This man is possibly identical with the legate employed by Gregory VII in the affair of Dol; see 'Legates,' below, p. 185.

²¹⁸ For his invasion of the council of Poitiers in 1074 see above p. 94.

²¹⁹ This letter, not included in the Register nor in the Epistolae Vagantes, survives in the Archives of the cathedral chapter of St. Omer (11.G.55) and is quoted in Hefele, p. 226, fn.1.

to Gregory.²²⁰ This undoubtedly referred to Count Fulk's long imprisonment of his brother, Geoffrey the Bearded, in Chinon.²²¹

In view of the riotous atmosphere in which the council was conducted²²² it is surprising to find that ten very reformist decrees were promulgated there, but a letter from Ernaldus of Le Mans seems to prove that they belong to this council. Ernaldus affirmed that these decrees were brought from Poitiers by Duke Godfrey of Aquitaine (William VIII) and promulgated to his subjects, in particular to the monks of St. Hilary of which he was lay-abbot, in 1078; also that he added several clauses to them.²²³ This certainly indicates that the duke was present at the council. Hefele²²⁴ quotes Baronius and 'other historians' who held that these decrees belong to a council of Poitiers in 1100, but Rudolf Schieffer has recently maintained that 'their authenticity has been adequately proven.'²²⁵ Certainly Hugh himself described the council as 'fairly fruitful' in spite of his lurid account of events there.²²⁶ These decrees, if authentic, represent the only complete list of decrees issued at any council held by Hugh, either as bishop of Die or archbishop of Lyons, so it is appropriate to cite them here in full.

- 1 No bishop, abbot, priest or clerk is to receive any bishopric, abbey or benefice from the hand of a lay-man. The bishop is to receive these from his metropolitan, the

²²⁰ PL 157, no. vii, 509; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 418.

²²¹ Chronicae S. Albini Andegavensis, mlxviii Gofridus Barbatus captus est in bello a Fulchone fratre suo. RHG xi, p. 287.

²²² Hugh of Die reported that Teuzo was almost slain by the forces of Ralph of Tours; PL 157, vii, 510D

²²³ Mansi xx, 499.

²²⁴ p. 232.

²²⁵ Rudolf Schieffer, Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturverbots für den deutschen König, MGH schriften, 28, Stuttgart 1981, p. 165. ...hinreichend gesichert in ihrer Autentizität...

²²⁶ Letter to Gregory VII, PL 157, vii, 509: cum aliquo fructu...

priest from his bishop. If the laity, in contempt of canon law, should wish to remain by force in possession of churches they shall be excommunicated and their churches placed under interdict.

2 Nobody shall hold office in two churches and whoever has paid for an ecclesiastical benefice shall be summarily deposed.

3 No priest or layman shall claim a benefice by inheritance.

4 No bishop shall receive presents for administering the sacraments or any other blessing.

5 No abbot or monk may impose a penance unless he has received this charge from the bishop.

6 Abbots, monks and canons must not buy a church or inherit it without the consent of the bishop of the diocese. They may keep the revenues and benefices of the churches which they already hold, but they shall be responsible to their bishop for the souls in the church and for the services.

7 Abbots who are only deacons should be ordained priest. Also those who have arch-diaconates should be deacons, etc.

8 Sons of priests and illegitimate children in general may not be admitted to orders except by becoming monks or regular canons.

9 No priest, deacon or subdeacon should have a concubine or a woman living in his house in circumstances which might give rise to suspicion; anyone assisting at the Mass of a simoniac or unchaste priest shall be excommunicated.

10 Priests bearing arms or practising usury shall be excommunicated.

If Ernardus of Le Mans is right in saying that the duke of Aquitaine brought these decrees back from Poitiers to the monastery of St. Hilary it may have been in order to seek clarification of his own position as lay-abbot, a position which he had held as count of Poitou, and which canon 7 declared to be no longer viable. The practice of 'commendation,' or lay-abbacy, had existed in the early church in the absence of an abbot, when it was used to help protect the abbey from invasion, but the Carolingian kings disposed of their monasteries, like any feudal property, as rewards or payments. The man who thus acquired the monastery enjoyed the revenues it produced and he could call himself abbot (contrary to the Rule of St. Benedict which stated that the abbot must be a monk). The practice fell into disrepute when it was seen to have lost its temporary character.²²⁷ It may be that the clauses which Ernardus claims the duke added to the ten already quoted contained some mitigating circumstances to justify his continuance in that office.

After this council at Poitiers a break occurs in the continuity of Hugh's apostolic work. Although he is frequently referred to by the pope as being about to hold councils and to undertake disciplinary measures at meetings with various people all over Burgundy and Aquitaine,²²⁸ he is not recorded as having been anywhere or having done anything until the council of Lyons in January, 1080, when the campaign against Archbishop Manasses of Rheims was completed.²²⁹

Hugh of Flavigny, who carefully numbered all Hugh's early councils, recorded the council held at Lyons in January or February 1080 as his sixth.²³⁰ This means that he can have held no council between Poitiers in January 1078 and that council

²²⁷ Fliche et Martin *Histoire de l'Église*, 7, iii, chap. 1, 297-8; Jean Dunbabin, *France in the Making 843-1180*, (Oxford 1985), p. 118.

²²⁸ See 'Relations with Gregory VII,' pp. 41-46, above.

²²⁹ See below, p. 122.

²³⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 421. Mansi xx, 551.

in Lyons. In spite of this clear statement there is disagreement among historians about the next council convoked by Hugh after Poitiers. Degert,²³¹ Hefele,²³² Lühe²³³ and Gaussin,²³⁴ possibly relying on Mansi and the Gallia Christiana²³⁵, all placed in 1079 a council of Bordeaux, presided over by Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron. The chronicle of S. Maxentius, admittedly by no means reliable, placed it in 1080.²³⁶ Various documents refer to councils held in Bordeaux in 1079 and 1080²³⁷ but because the documents show that only local affairs were dealt with and that the same people, with two exceptions, witnessed all the documents, it seems more reasonable to assume that there was only one council, in 1080. However there may have been a smaller council, not held by the legates in 1079. Fazy had no doubt that 1080 is the correct date.²³⁸ Hefele, relying on the Gallia Christiana,²³⁹ Gaussin²⁴⁰ and Schieffer²⁴¹ also claimed that Hugh, with Amatus of Oloron, held a council at Toulouse in 1079,

²³¹ A. Degert, 'Un Ouvrier de la Réforme au xie Siecle. Amat d'Oloron', Revue des Questions Historiques, lxxxiv, (1908), 33 - 84.

²³² Hefele, 281.

²³³ Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, Dissertation, Breslau, 1898, p.61.

²³⁴ Pierre-Roger Gaussin, 'Hugues de Die et l'episcopat franco-bourguignon (1075-1085)' Cahiers d'Histoire, 13, 1968. 77-98.

²³⁵ Mansi xx, 527, 529 and 551; Gall. Chris. xvi, 517.

²³⁶ Chronicon S. Maxentii, RHG xii p.401.B.

²³⁷ The date of this council is discussed in 'Legates,' p. 207.

²³⁸ Max Fazy, Notice sur Amat, évêque d'Oloron, archevêque de Bordeaux et légat du Saint Siège. Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, Université de Paris, xxiv. 5me Mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen-âge. Paris, 1908.

²³⁹ Baluze, Miscellanea, v, 416, 432, cited in Gall. Chris. xvi, 517, Hefele, 141.

²⁴⁰ Gaussin, 'Hugues de Die' 87.

²⁴¹ Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.114.

but Rony preferred 1080.²⁴² Gaussin said that he also held a council at Valence in 1079,²⁴³ but this is certainly a mistake. In a letter to Hugh in March, 1079, Gregory suggested that Hugh should meet the monks of Deols at Valence on the first Sunday after Pentecost,²⁴⁴ but there is no suggestion that this meeting was to be an official council. Gaussin linked Gregory's letter with the account, in Guigo's Life of Hugh of Grenoble, of the meeting between Hugh of Die and Hugh, then a canon in Valence, which took place at about that time: but again there is no indication that this was at a council. ...contigit dominum Hugonem ad eandem venire civitatem...et rogans ut ad se veniret suorum certaminum comes futurus et particeps.²⁴⁵

This period of nearly two years, (from May, 1078, when, according to Gregory, he was in Rome,²⁴⁶ until the council of Lyons in January, 1080), during which Hugh disappeared completely might be accounted for by an illness. This would explain why he cancelled the council at Troyes in the summer of 1079 to which he had called Manasses to answer his accusers, in conformity with the oath he had taken in March, 1078.²⁴⁷ The Verdun Chronicle mentions an illness severe enough to cause Hugh to retire to what was probably a family home in Vienne in order to recuperate.²⁴⁸

²⁴² Abbé Rony 'La Politique Française de Gregoire VII', Revue des Questions Historiques, cix (1928), 27.

²⁴³ Gaussin, 'Hugues de Die', 87.

²⁴⁴ Registrum vi, 27, p.439.

²⁴⁵ Vita Sancti Hugonis Episcopi Gratianopolitani, auctore Guigoni priore carthusiensi, PL 153, 765. The fact that Gaussin gives Hugh credit for the council at Anse in 1080 at which the quarrel between the church of Mâcon and Cluny was settled (by Peter of Albano, see 'Legates,' p. 193) proves that he is not a reliable authority. Hugh was urged by Gregory VII to mediate in that quarrel when it began, (E.V. 30, p. 77) but he did not do so.

²⁴⁶ Registrum v, 22, p.385. Qui tunc presens aderat.

²⁴⁷ Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 782.

²⁴⁸ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 421; ...apud Viennam pro corporis curatione...

This illness and the subsequent period of inactivity has already been discussed.²⁴⁹

LYONS, JANUARY OR EARLY FEBRUARY 1080.²⁵⁰

The council of Lyons at the beginning of 1080 seems to have dealt solely with the case of Manasses I, archbishop of Rheims, who was finally condemned there and deposed in his absence.²⁵¹ This sentence was confirmed from Rome by the pope, who took the unprecedented step of offering, even after that final condemnation, to reinstate Manasses if he would comply with certain conditions.²⁵²

The final alienation of the premier archbishop of France, brought the first, turbulent, phase of Hugh's career as papal representative in Gaul to an end. After this time Gregory's synods in Rome were dominated by the growing animosity of Henry IV, while in France a more temperate spirit was evident at the subsequent councils of the legate.

AVIGNON, JANUARY OR FEBRUARY 1080.²⁵³

Immediately after the council of Lyons Hugh held a council at Avignon and following it he came to the Roman synod of 1080, bringing with him Gibelinus, elected in place of Aicardus of Arles who had openly supported King Henry IV. (The people of Arles had not waited for Gregory to send Léger of Gap or a

²⁴⁹ See 'Relations with Gregory VII,' above p. 41.

²⁵⁰ Mansi xx, 551. Hefele, 281; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 421. Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.118.

²⁵¹ Letter of Gregory to Manasses, Registrum vii, 12; pp. 475-477. See below pp. 249-71, where this case is studied in detail.

²⁵² Registrum vii, 20, pp. 495-6.

²⁵³ Mansi xx, 553; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 422; Hefele, 282; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.121.

replacement chosen by himself, as he had suggested).²⁵⁴ The legate brought with him also Desiderius, bishop-elect of Cavaillon, Hugh, bishop-elect of Grenoble and Lantelinus, archbishop-elect of Embrun. These men were all elected at the council of Avignon and were consecrated by the pope. Surprisingly the sentence against Aicardus, who had been deposed early in 1079, was not finally confirmed until a year later, at the Lent synod in Rome in 1081, 'during which, among other matters, the lord pope, with the agreement of all who were present, confirmed the sentence of deposition and excommunication of the archbishops of Arles and Narbonne which had been issued by the legates of the apostolic see.'²⁵⁵

TOULOUSE, 1080.²⁵⁶

As noted above, Mansi placed this council in 1075, Hefele, citing the Gallia Christiana, favoured 1079, as did Schieffer and Gaussin, but Rony preferred 1080. In view of Hugh of Flavigny's careful numbering of the early councils held by the legate, in which Toulouse is not included, 1080 seems the more likely date. Frotardus, archbishop of Alby, was excommunicated for simony, and a successor, Rodez, elected.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴ Letter to the clergy and people of Arles, Registrum vi, 21, p. 432. See above p. 96, Roman council, 1080.

²⁵⁵ Registrum viii, 20 (a), p. 543: In qua inter cetera sententiam depositionis archiepiscoporum Arelatensis et Narbonensis atque excommunicationis per legatos apostolice sedis promulgatum dominus papa his qui aderant collaudantibus firmavit.

²⁵⁶ Mansi xx, 457; Hefele, 141; Abbé Rony, La Politique Française de Grégoire VII, Révue des Questions Historiques, cix (1928), p. 27; Th Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 114; Gaussin, Hugues de Die, 87.

²⁵⁷ Gall. Chris. i, 11, 'tab. eccl. Alb.' edita nuperrime A. Baluz miscell, vi.

During the following year Hugh presided over four councils in company with Amatus of Oloron. There is no indication in the documents relating to these councils why two legates should have been necessary to deal with them. It is possible that, because of the suspicions about Amatus, Gregory had sent Hugh to keep an eye on him, just as he had tried to arrange for Hugh of Cluny to work with Hugh during the latter's turbulent period two years earlier.²⁵⁸ It is also possible that Amatus was replacing Hugh of Cluny as an observer at Hugh's councils, since Abbot Hugh seems never to have accepted the role proposed for him by the pope. This, however, is not very likely because the first two councils, Bordeaux and Saintes, were in Aquitaine, the legatine jurisdiction of Amatus. (For this reason his name appears before that of Hugh on the documents).

BORDEAUX, 1080.²⁵⁹

Mansi, followed by Hefele and Schieffer, claimed that there were two councils in Bordeaux, in 1079 and 1080. The fact that the subscribers to all the related documents are, however, the same with only two exceptions inevitably casts doubt on this assumption. Fazy, by analysis of the dates on the documents, proved that there was only one council²⁶⁰ and Degert also preferred one council.²⁶¹ Berengar of Tours was summoned to appear at Bordeaux because immediately on his return from Rome in 1079 he had retracted the oath he had taken there. He

²⁵⁸ For the suggestion about Abbot Hugh see 'Relations with Gregory VII' above, pp. 45-6: for the suspicions about Amatus see 'Legates,' below pp. 205-6.

²⁵⁹ Mansi xx, 527, 529, 551; Hefele p. 281; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.123.

²⁶⁰ Max Fazy, Notice sur Amat d'Oloron, pp.91-93.

²⁶¹ Augustin Fliche, La Réforme Gregorienne ii, 220, fn 3. A. Degert, Amat d'Oloron, Revue des Questions Historiques, lxxxiv, 1908, p.66.

remained silent after his appearance at this council.²⁶² A letter from Gregory shows that the continual trouble between the monasteries of Ste. Croix and St. Séver was discussed there.²⁶³

SAINTES, JANUARY 1081.²⁶⁴

A charter from the council of Saintes held in January 1081, shows it to have been a scene of reconciliation. Presided over by Amatus and Hugh, it was attended by Joscelin, archbishop of Bordeaux, Warmond, archbishop of Vienne, Richard, archbishop of Bourges, Ralph, archbishop of Tours, Ademar, bishop of Angoulême, Rainardus-Hugo, bishop of Langres and Raymond, bishop of Bajas. Between the councils of Clermont (1076), Autun (1077) and Poitiers (1078) Joscelyn, Richard and Ralph had all been cited for some offence by the legate, Hugh, but they appear to have acted here in perfect accord.

In accordance with Gregory's instructions the legates settled here the quarrel between the sees of Tours, in the demesne of France, and Dol, in Normandy, who both claimed the title of metropolitan over Brittany.²⁶⁵ The bishop of Dol, Ivo, had been Gregory's arbitrary choice in 1076²⁶⁶ but on the pope's instructions the legates gave judgement in favour of the see of Tours, whose archbishop, Ralph I, had provided documents proving his title at the Roman council of 1080.²⁶⁷ This decision was a triumph for King Philip and a blow to Norman ambition

²⁶² Jean de Montclos, Lanfranc et Bérenger. La controverse Eucharistique du xie siècle. Leuven, 1971, p.243. Montclos places the council in 1080, quoting the chronicle of Ste. Maxence.

²⁶³ Registrum vi, 24 and 25, pp.436 and 437. See above, p. 94 (Involvement of Rome in the French Church) and below, Amatus of Oloron, pp. 204-5.

²⁶⁴ Mansi xx, 571; Hefele, 282. Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.124.

²⁶⁵ Registrum vii, 15, p.488.

²⁶⁶ See above p. 96.

²⁶⁷ Registrum vii, 15, p.488.

in Brittany, but the dispute was still causing trouble when Urban II came into France in 1095.²⁶⁸ At Clermont in that year the metropolitan jurisdiction of Tours over Brittany was again confirmed.²⁶⁹

Fliche,²⁷⁰ Degert²⁷¹ and Schieffer²⁷² are agreed that it was for failure to attend this council at Saintes, rather than the council of Bordeaux as claimed by Fazy²⁷³ and Lühe,²⁷⁴ that Hugh and Amatus suspended all the bishops of Normandy except the archbishop of Rouen. (Had they attended, the affair of Tours versus Dol might not have been settled so easily). As had happened after the council of Poitiers in 1078, this too zealous application of the law called forth a vigorous protest from Gregory and an order for their immediate restoration. The pope instructed the legates to avoid all action against the duke of Normandy (William I of England) because it was better to win him over to enduring loyalty to St. Peter by gentleness and leniency and clear reasoning rather than by severity and stern justice.²⁷⁵ In 1075 he had used very similar words to Hugh about the members of the cathedral chapter in Die who had been stealing from the church.²⁷⁶

²⁶⁸ JL 5519 and 5520. RHG xiv 708, xxx, and 709, xxxi.

²⁶⁹ See Council of Clermont, below p. 146.

²⁷⁰ La Réforme Grégorienne, ii, 220, fn. 4.

²⁷¹ Amat d'Oloron, La Revue des Questions Historiques, lxxxiv, 1908. 68.

²⁷² Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.125.

²⁷³ Notice sur Amat d'Oloron, p. 110.

²⁷⁴ Hugo von Die und Lyon, p.62.

²⁷⁵ Registrum ix, 5, p.579. Videtur enim nobis multo melius atque facilius lenitatis dulcedine ac rationis ostensione quam austeritate vel rigore iustitie illum Deo lucrari et ad perpetuum beati Petri amorem posse provocari...

²⁷⁶ Registrum ii, 43, p.180. Debes quidem filios tuos...conspicere et ad meliora paulatim provocare... See 'Relations with Gregory VII,' above p. 33.

ISSOUDUN, MARCH 1081.²⁷⁷

The new spirit of accord was still prevalent at the council of Issoudun, near Bourges, in March, 1081. A diploma confirming the donation of the church of St. Martin de Campis to the monks of Marmoutière is subscribed by the two legates, Hugh and Amatus, (Hugh's signature appearing first, as Issoudun was in Burgundy), the archbishops Richard of Bourges (who made the donation), Richerius of Sens, Ralph of Tours and Joscelyn of Bordeaux. Richard of Bourges brought two suffragans - Durand of Clermont and Guido of Limoges - and Richerius of Sens brought Robert of Auxerre, Hugh of Nevers, Rainerius of Orléans (still in his bishopric in spite of Gregory's orders),²⁷⁸ and Geoffrey of Paris. From the diocese of Rheims, lacking an archbishop since the fall of Manasses, came Guido of Beauvais, Roger of Châlons-sur-Marne, Helinandus of Laon and Rathbodus of Noyen: and from the empire (Burgundy) Hugh himself and Agano of Autun. Three years earlier Philip had refused to hear of Hugh's holding a council in the kingdom of France.²⁷⁹ This council, attended by so many from France, including four archbishops and four bishops who had been embroiled with Hugh at that time, marks a unique moment of accord between the legate and the king and the bishops of France. The conjunction is so surprising that Dom H. Leclercq, in his annotated edition of Hefele, suggested that the subscription 'Hugh legate of the church of Rome' might in fact be Hugh of Cluny rather than Hugh of Die.²⁸⁰ This, however, seems impossible in view of the fact that the text of the diploma specifically mentions 'Hugh, bishop of Die' as being present.²⁸¹ It is much more probable that the judgement in favour of Tours

²⁷⁷ Mansi xx, 577; Hefele, 282; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p.126.

²⁷⁸ See Registrum iii, 16, p.278; iii, 17, p.279; iv, 9, p.307; v, 8, p.358; v, 20, p.383 and vi, 23, p.435. Hugh's inaction in this case is discussed above, p.42.

²⁷⁹ Letter of Hugh to Gregory, PL 157, 509, vii.

²⁸⁰ Hefele, 282, fn. 6.

²⁸¹ Mansi xx, 578.

at the council of Saintes disposed the French king and clergy to look favourably on Hugh for a time.

Amatus issued an order of excommunication to the canons of St. Martin of Tours at this council, which was eventually revoked by Urban II in 1096.²⁸² They had refused to receive Amatus in procession as legate but when Urban came to Tours the canons were able to prove to him that, by special privilege, they were only obliged to receive the pope, the king and the archbishop of Tours in procession.²⁸³ There was obviously no question of the legates' standing so completely in the place of the pope that they were to be accorded the same reverence. Quite the reverse: the legates were threatened by Urban with severe penalties if they again tried to force this issue.²⁸⁴

Letters of Bishop Ivo of Chartres show that he also was present at this council.²⁸⁵ In his introduction to his edition of the letters of Ivo of Chartres, Jean Leclercq said that the archbishop (sic) Hugh of Die and the cardinal (sic) Amatus of Bordeaux (sic) were relieved of their office of legates in France at this council of Issoudun, but he gave no reference for this extraordinary and inaccurate statement.²⁸⁶

MEAUX, 1081.²⁸⁷

This was the last council presided over jointly by Hugh and Amatus of Oloron; it also appears to have been Hugh's last

²⁸² JL 5620; RHG xiv, 719, xlix.

²⁸³ ibid.

²⁸⁴ ibid.

²⁸⁵ PL 162, Eps. 181 and 268, 186, 272.

²⁸⁶ J. Leclercq, ed., Lettres d'Yves de Chartres, in Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen-Age, Paris, 1949. p. viii-ix.

²⁸⁷ Mansi xx 573 and 583, seq.; Hefele, 283; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, pp.130-31.

council as bishop of Die. The dates on various documents indicate that there were councils in Meaux in 1080 and 1082 but Mansi concluded to his own satisfaction that there was only one council, in 1081.²⁸⁸

The count of Rosnay solemnly sanctioned a donation he had made to the monastery of Cluny.²⁸⁹ This document is subscribed by the two legates, one metropolitan (Richard of Bourges) and nine bishops: Hugh of Troyes, Roger of Châlons-sur-Marne, Rorico of Amiens, Hugh of Grenoble, Rainard-Hugh of Langres, Agano of Autun, Hugh of Nevers, Arnulf of Soissons and Landeric of Mâcon. Six of these men were from the French kingdom but in spite of this Arnulf of Pamèle, 'a most holy man' from the monastery of St. Médard, was elected here to the see of Soissons in place of Ursio, who had been appointed simoniacally by King Philip and was deposed at this council.²⁹⁰ Lambert, usurper of the See of Térouanne, was excommunicated here also but, as so often happened, Gregory urged Hugh to be lenient with him. 'This bishop should be treated with mercy and, in so far as justice will permit, the severity of the canons should be tempered with considerations of pity.' Gregory said that he was advising clemency in this case at the request of Count Robert I of Flanders but it is noteworthy how frequently he urged that transgressors be treated with leniency.²⁹¹

²⁸⁸ Mansi xx, 583. Quamvis in collectio Veneto Labbeana duo annotantur Meldensia concillia, aliud scilicet anno 1080 aliud vero 1082, unum tamen idemque concilium est quod nec anno 1080 nec 1082, sed potius anno intermedio, 1081, convenit.

²⁸⁹ Mansi xx, 585.

²⁹⁰ Mansi xx, 573.

²⁹¹ Registrum ix, 33, p.619. Pro amore nobilissimi comitis R (Robert of Flanders) qui nobis super eo petitorias litteras misit, ut cum misericordia tractetur et, quantum salva justitia potest, canonum rigor compassionis respectu temperetur. See also E.V. 72 and 73, pp.156 and 157 about Berengar of Tours, Registrum ix, 5, p.579 about William of England and Registrum ii, 43, p.180, concerning transgressors in general.

Relying on canon 6 of the Roman council of 1080, which allowed a 'visitor' to take charge of an election,²⁹² Hugh and Amatus at this council appointed Robert, abbot of Rebais, to the see of Meaux, vacant for only a week before the council. The metropolitan, Richerius of Sens, was not present and no election had taken place. Richerius, a dedicated upholder of the rights of metropolitans, excommunicated Robert as a usurper, but the legates, supported by the authority of canon 6, overrode his sentence and Robert remained in the see of Meaux for some years. This interference with the traditional rights of metropolitans undoubtedly contributed to the resistance of Richerius to the primacy of Lyons, which he maintained until his death.²⁹³ The *Gallia Christiana* commented that Robert showed small regard for the sentence of the archbishop.²⁹⁴ His successor, Gualterius II, was consecrated in 1085 by Richerius, when Robert was finally deposed.²⁹⁵ Fliche described this incident of the appointment of Robert as 'un précédent de conséquence.'²⁹⁶

The council was also attended by the Count of Blois, Tebaudus III, his wife Alaidis and their son, Odo. A letter

²⁹² *Registrum* vii, 14(a), p.482. See above, p. 97.

²⁹³ See his continuing struggle against the primacy of Lyons, below, pp. 279-82.

²⁹⁴ ...latum ab episcopis anathema parvipendit Robertus. Gall. Chris. viii, 1609. The date, 1082, given here is probably wrong. 1081 is a more likely date for the death of Gualterius I and the council of Meaux.

²⁹⁵ See RHG xii, 279C and E; Clarius, Ex Chronico S. Petri Vivi Senonensis, mlxxxii, Obit Walterius Meldensis et in sequenti septuana Hugo Diensis episcopus Romanae Ecclesiae Legatus congregavit Concilium in eadem urbe et ordinavit episcopum in eadem urbe Rotbertum Abbatem Ecclesiae Resbacensis. Quod quia sine presentia et assensu Richerii Archiepiscopi et Coepiscoporum ejus factum est, excommunicaverunt eum; and mlxxxv, Richerius...ordinavit Walterium Meldensem Episcopum...excommunicato supradicto Roberto. Also RHG xii, 289E, Ex Chronologia Roberti Monachi S. Mariani Autissiodorensis.

²⁹⁶ A. Fliche, *La Réforme Grégorienne*, ii, 234.

from Hugh of Die²⁹⁷ gives details of a dispute between the Count of Brienne and a monastery which Hugh called 'Dervensis.' Hugh's intervention in this quarrel was sought by Count Tebaudus, acting as advocate for the monastery. Tebaudus, referred to by Hugh as magnus et magnificus vir,²⁹⁸ was a known supporter of papal policies. In 1077, when Gregory VII instructed Hugh to hold a council to announce the prohibition of investiture, foreseeing that there might be problems with King Philip, he assured Hugh that Count Tebaudus could be relied on to furnish a meeting place and to give the legate his aid and counsel.²⁹⁹

LYONS, 1082.³⁰⁰

Hugh was not at this council, although he subsequently ratified the decisions taken there. It probably took place late in 1082, following the death of Gebuin and Hugh may have been on his way to Rome to receive the pallium at the time. Landeric of Mâcon, who attended with all the suffragans of Lyons, is described in Mansi as vice primatis curam gerentes ecclesiae Ludunensis.³⁰¹ There was a discussion concerning Count Fulk of Anjou who, with the canons of Saint Martin of Tours and the monks of Marmoutier, had attacked Archbishop Ralph of Tours and driven him from his see. Guafridus, bishop of Angers had done nothing to prevent them.³⁰² None of these people appeared at this council although summoned. The sentences against them, suspension of the bishop and excommunication of Fulk and his associates, was delivered 'by the authority of St. Peter and of

²⁹⁷ This letter is not with Hugh's letters in PL 157 but in Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, v, 641. Transcribed in RHG xiv, 787.

²⁹⁸ ibid.

²⁹⁹ Registrum iv, 22, p. 330

³⁰⁰ Mansi xx, 587; Hefele, 283.

³⁰¹ ibid. See 'Life', p. 16 above, for a discussion of the date of Hugh's consecration to the archbishopric of Lyons.

³⁰² E.V. 52, p.126; see 'Metropolitans,' below, p.277.

the lord Hugh, primate of the Roman church'.³⁰³ The use of the word primate indicates that he had been elected to the archsee of Lyons before this council.

At this point, the moment of his elevation to the powerful position of archbishop and primate, Hugh ceased to be a central figure in the life of the Church in southern France. From 1082 until his death in 1106 he is recorded as presiding at only three councils. One reason for this premature eclipse was undoubtedly his violent opposition to the election of Abbot Desiderius to the papacy and his quarrel with Odo of Ostia, the future Pope Urban II, because of Odo's involvement in that election.³⁰⁴ His re-appointment as legate in 1094³⁰⁵ seems to have been in order to give him an honourable title rather than to make use of him as a lieutenant of the pope. His career from this time provides an illustration of the new direction which the government of the Church was to take under the popes Urban II and Paschal II.

³⁰³ Mansi xx, 587.

³⁰⁴ See above, 'Life,' pp. 48-60.

³⁰⁵ Letter of Pope Urban II, PL 151, 389.

THE AGENT OF REFORM: PART 2.

The long delay before the election of Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino to the papacy and his brief tenure of the office meant that the programme of reform and renewal instituted by Gregory VII lost its momentum. As Pope Victor III he held only one synod, at Benevento in August 1087.¹ At it he renewed the condemnation of Henry IV and Wibert and the decrees against investiture but his sole reference to France was his excommunication of Hugh of Lyons and Richard of Marseilles because of their opposition to his election.² In a discourse reported by Peter Deacon he showed himself prepared to continue the work of Gregory VII,³ but his tenure of the papacy was too brief for him to make any impact. He died at Monte Cassino in September 1087.⁴ Because of Gregory's disastrous final years, the long delay before the appointment of his successor and the weakness of Victor III's short tenure of the papacy, it proved impossible for the cardinals to meet in Rome to elect a pope. In accordance with the decree of Nicholas II, they convened at Terracina and allowed proxy votes to be collected from Rome. After three days of prayer and fasting Odo of Ostia was unanimously elected as Urban II.⁵ He was a Frenchman, Odo de Largery, born at Châtillon-sur-Marne c.1042; according to Orderic Vitalis 'a man of high birth and great courtesy...of great piety, conspicuously learned and eloquent.' He had been at one time a pupil of Bruno, founder of the Carthusians, in the school of Rheims; later he was a prior of Cluny. In 1080 he had been appointed to the cardinal-bishopric of Ostia in succession to Gerard, who had also been a prior of Cluny.⁶ Although he

¹ Mansi xx, 639; Hefele, 335; Chron. Mon. Cas. iii, 72-3, MGH 34 pp. 453-5.

² ibid.

³ ibid.

⁴ ibid. p. 456.

⁵ Becker, Urban II i, pp 91-98.

⁶ Becker, Urban II i. 51-62; Cowdrey, Cluniacs, pp. 169-171; Hüls, Kardinäle, pp. 100-105.

was a Frenchman and spent almost a year of his papacy in France, he made very little use of Gregory VII's most prominent legate, Hugh of Lyons, in the direction of affairs in France. Hugh was only reappointed as legate six years after Urban came to the papacy.⁷

At the beginning of his papacy Urban declared himself to be in every way a follower of Gregory VII. He wrote to the clergy in Germany: De me porro ita in omnibus...credite sicut de beatissimo... Gregorio; cuius ex toto sequi vestigia cupiens, omnia quae respuit respuo, damnavit damno, quae dilexit prorsus amplector...⁸ But in spite of this early committment to the aims of his predecessor there is no doubt that under Urban II reform took a different direction, and a spirit of conciliation and even compromise began to be apparent. Theodor Schieffer has pointed out that, while Urban never disagreed with Gregory VII, he allowed the theocratic theories, which had proved completely untenable when confronted by political realities, to fade away. There were no more proclamations of anti-kings in Germany nor claims of the right to dispose of the crown.⁹ This more accommodating spirit was particularly apparent in Urban's relations with Philip of France, so much so that Hugh of Flavigny disparaged Pope Urban for his lenience towards the king's adulterous liason with Bertrada de Montfort.¹⁰ In fact Urban caused Hugh to excommunicate Philip at the council of Autun in 1094¹¹ and himself ratified the sentence at Clermont the following year;¹² and for a time he placed all France (except

⁷ He was first called 'legate of the apostolic see' in a letter of Urban II, JL 5523; PL 151, 389.

⁸ JL 5348; PL 151, 284.

⁹ Theodor Schieffer, 'Cluny et la querelle des Investitures', Révue Historique, ccxxv (1961), 70.

¹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 493; Romana pietas et errata donavit et remissione sua infamiam superavit.

¹¹ Mansi xx, 799; Bernoldi Chronicon, 1094, MGH v, 461; Hefele, 387; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 156.

¹² See 'Council of Clermont', below p. 146.

Cluny) under an interdict because of the intransigence of the twice excommunicated king.¹³ This was hardly leniency, but it was true that both he and Paschal II seemed eventually to close their eyes to the situation in France.¹⁴

¹³ Orderic Vitalis, *Historia Ecclesiastica* iv, viii, 20, 262; letter of Urban to the monks of Cluny, JL 5682; PL 151, 493; ...sancimus ne cellarum vestrarum ubilibet positarum fratres pro vincinarum dioecesum interdictione vel excommunicatione divinorum officiorum suspensionem patiantur sed tam monachi ipsi quam et famuli eorum, qui videlicet monasticae se professione devolverunt...divina servitiis officia celebrent... This letter is dated April, 1097 and the reference here to the various dioceses is evidence for this interdict having been binding on the whole kingdom; although Fliche has doubts about how seriously it was observed (Philippe I, p. 64).

¹⁴ See below, pp. 288-96, where Philip's relations with his clergy are discussed.

THE SYNODS OF URBAN II.

Because the Roman supporters of the imperial antipope, Clement III, retained their grip on Rome, Urban was never really master of the city and only spent about one third of his pontificate there. He was able to hold only three of the eleven synods of his pontificate in Rome - those of 1089, 1097 and 1099.

Of the others, four - Melfi, (1089), Benevento (1091), Troia (1093) and Bari (1098) - were held in southern Italy where the pope had the protection of his Norman vassals. Piacenza (1095) was the only synod held in imperial territory. The remaining three were held in France: Clermont (1095), Tours (1096) and Nîmes (1096).

Gregory VII had used his synods in Rome as a forum to which local affairs from the whole Church could be brought for discussion and where decisions could be made and judgements passed.¹⁵ This kind of debate was to give place, during the pontificate of Urban and subsequently, to the promulgation of decrees by the pope which he had already formulated with his cardinal advisors. These were then acclaimed by the bishops attending the synod. Canon 2 of the synod of Benevento was 'acclaimed by all fiat, fiat.'¹⁶ At Troia 'all replied fiat, fiat' when canon 2 was announced and canon 1 was decreed 'with the consent of all'.¹⁷ Eadmer, in his account of the synod of Rome in 1099, showed the bishops assenting to the decrees of Urban II by 'fiat, fiat', in this way marking the end of the synod.¹⁸

There is very little information in the sources about the bishops who attended the synods of Pope Urban II. Bernold, the

¹⁵ See above p. 75.

¹⁶ Letter of Urban II to Romualdus of Monopolitana, JL 5446; PL 151, 328-9.

¹⁷ Mansi xx, 789.

¹⁸ Eadmer, *Historia* II, RS 81 (1884), 114. His presentes fuimus, haec conspeximus his ab universis 'fiat, fiat' acclamari audivimus et in his consumatum concilium scimus.

principal authority for this period, provided, not necessarily accurately, the numbers of bishops present at Melfi (1089, 115 bishops)¹⁹ and Troia (1093, about 100),²⁰ but gave no indication of the numbers at Rome in 1089²¹ or Benevento in 1091.²² He did not record where any bishop came from until his account of the council of Piacenza in 1095. He claimed that bishops from Burgundy, France, Germany, Bavaria 'and other provinces' were among the great throng of churchmen (almost four thousand) who attended that council, but he gave no names.²³ One bishop who did not attend, although summoned, was Hugh of Lyons: for this he was temporarily suspended from his bishopric.²⁴ Ten bishops from France are among the thirty-two signatories to a deed of a gift from Raymond of Toulouse to the monastery of St. Gilles made at Piacenza.²⁵ They were Ralph II, archbishop of Tours, William, bishop of Aux, Sancho, bishop of Lescar, Otto, bishop of Oloron, William, bishop of Conserans, Amatus, archbishop of Bordeaux, Adelbert, bishop of Beziers, Peter, archbishop of Aix, Fulk, bishop of Beauvais and William, bishop of Orange. Richard, cardinal priest and abbot of St. Victor in Marseille, witnessed this document also.

There is an enormous difference in the estimates of the number of bishops attending the council of Clermont in November 1095.²⁶ These vary from eighty to more than three hundred, even

¹⁹ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 449-50. (He did not identify the location of this synod).

²⁰ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 456;

²¹ ibid. 448-9.

²² ibid. 451. Labbé (Mansi xx, 738) says that the number attending this council is not known.

²³ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 461-2.

²⁴ See 'Life', p. 62.

²⁵ Mansi xx, 808.

²⁶ Mansi xx, 815-920; Somerville, Papacy, Councils and Canon Law, v, 56-65; vi, 3-41; vii, 55-90; viii, 325-337.

in the accounts of possible eye-witnesses.²⁷ The number of archbishops mentioned as present is more constant, varying between twelve counted by Urban himself²⁸ and thirteen, according to both Lambert and Bernold. The letter of the pope enumerating the archbishops concerned the primacy of Lyons. Richerius of Sens refused to participate in any meeting in which that topic was raised,²⁹ which could account for the discrepancy.

Leclercq, editing Hefele, quotes an 'ancient chronicle' which gives the names of forty-four archbishops, bishops and abbots who were with the pope at Tours in March 1096, among them Hugh of Lyons, Amatus of Bordeaux and Ivo of Chartres.³⁰ There is no record of the number present at Nîmes (1096), Rome (1097) or Bari in 1098. Bernold said that 150 bishops and abbots were at Urban's last council in Rome in 1099.³¹

²⁷ Lambert of Arras counted 225 bishops (RHG xiv 751); Bernold of Constance mentioned 205 (Chronicon, MGH SS 5, 463) and William of Malmesbury counted 310 bishops and abbots. (De gestis regum Anglorum, ed. W. Stubbs, London 1889, 2, 391.)

²⁸ Letter of Urban II to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5600; PL 151, 438, (he said there were 80 bishops, 439D);

²⁹ ibid. See 'Metropolitans,' below pp. 279-82, for a discussion of this issue.

³⁰ J.J. Bourassé, Cartulaire de Cormery (791-1505), in Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine, 1861, xii; Hefele, 446, n.2,

³¹ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 466.

DECREES AGAINST SIMONY AND NICHOLAISM AT THE SYNODS OF URBAN II.

Simony and nicholaism were prohibited at Melfi, with an exception made for priests who had been married before they were sub-deacons, provided they had only been married once, and to a virgin.³² The heresies of simony and nicholaism were condemned at Piacenza³³ and again at Clermont³⁴ and presumably at Tours where, according to Bernold, the pope reiterated the decisions of Clermont and his previous synods.³⁵ Canons at Clermont and Nîmes refer to a form of simony which was specifically French - the custom among French bishops of demanding payment, on the death of the donor, for the revenues from churches given as gifts to monasteries. This was strictly forbidden.³⁶

DECREES AGAINST LAY-INVESTITURE.

In the great matter of investiture Urban II showed himself more pragmatic in his attitude than Gregory VII. In 1088 two bishops from France came to Urban in Italy to resign their bishoprics into the pope's hands because their elections were tainted. Henry of Soissons had received investiture from Philip I and Fulk of Beauvais had been elected through simony, but they were both restored to their Sees, necessitate exigente ecclesiae,³⁷ when they had taken an oath of obedience to the pope. In this ability to moderate the rules for the good of the

³² Mansi xx, 721, 725; Bernoldi Chronicon MGH 5, 449-50; Hefele, 344.

³³ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 461-2; Mansi xx, 801; Hefele, 391.

³⁴ Robert Somerville, The councils of Urban II, i, Decreta Claromontensia; Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum, (Amsterdam 1972), 7, p. 143.

³⁵ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 464.

³⁶ See Council of Clermont, p. 145, n. 64, where the text of this decree is given.

³⁷ JL 5406; JL 5509; JL 5522; PL 151, 388; Liber Pontificalis, ed. Abbé L. Duchesne, Paris 1892, ii, 293; Alfons Becker, Papst Urban II, MGH Schriften, 19/1, (Stuttgart 1964), p. 190.

Church as a whole Urban II resembled his former abbot, Hugh I of Cluny, who never ceased to pray for the excommunicated Henry IV in spite of the scandal his prayers caused.³⁸

In the matter of investiture Urban was also both more logical and more radical than Gregory had ever been able to bring himself to be. At the council of Clermont in 1095 it was decreed that 'No bishop or priest shall do fealty as a vassal to a king or to any lay-man.'³⁹ Urban repeated this at the synod in Rome just before his death in 1099, in the presence of Anselm and Eadmer, as they were returning to England: Eos nihilominus sub ipsius anathematis vinculo colligavit, qui pro ecclesiasticis honoribus laicorum hominum fiunt...⁴⁰ In this way the prohibition of investiture and of the performance of homage came at the same time to be known in England. This was immediately a cause of conflict between Henry I and the papacy.⁴¹ Investiture was also prohibited at Melfi,⁴² Piacenza,⁴³ Tours,⁴⁴ Nîmes⁴⁵ and Bari.⁴⁶

³⁸ See the letter of Hugh of Lyons to Mathilda of Tuscany, PL 157, ix, 515.

³⁹ Mansi xx, 817, cap. 17: Ne episcopus vel sacerdos regi vel aliqui laiconi manibus ligium fidelitatem faciat; Somerville, Decreta Claromontensia 19, p.145

⁴⁰ Eadmer, Historia Novorum in Anglia II, RS 81, p. 114.

⁴¹ Z. N. Brooke, Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy; Raleigh Lecture, 1939; Proceedings of the British Academy xxv, 217-247.

⁴² Mansi xx, 721, 725; Hefele 344.

⁴³ Mansi xx, 807; Hefele, 395, says that 'une ancienne tradition' attributes this prohibition to Piacenza.

⁴⁴ Mansi xx, 925; Hefele, 446; According to Bernold (MGH 5, 464) Urban repeated here the decrees of previous councils.

⁴⁵ Mansi xx, 933; Hefele, 449.

⁴⁶ Mansi xx, 1061; letter from Paschal II to Anselm of Canterbury, JL 5929, PL 163, lxxxvi, 107A

URBAN II IN FRANCE.PIACENZA, MARCH 1095.

According to the chronicler Bernold, the synod of Piacenza, on the eve of Urban's long sojourn in France, was convened inter ipsos scismaticos et contra ipsos, that is in Lombardy, where Henry IV was at the time. The number of bishops from the imperial territories marks the success of Urban's policy of recognising the claim of Conrad, and allowed the pope to confirm Gregory's legislation. The anti-pope Wibert was excommunicated with all his followers, the Berengarian heresy was redefined and re-condemned, as were simony and nicholaisism. Philip I, who did not attend but sent ambassadors to plead for him, was given until Pentecost (13 May) to extricate himself from his involvement with Bertrada. Bernold stated that legates came from the Byzantine emperor, Alexis I Comnenus, asking for aid against the pagans who were almost at the gates of Constantinople. It was for this reason, according to Bernold, that Urban arrived at the decision to despatch an army to help the emperor.⁴⁷

The reason for Urban's decision to continue his journey north after the synod at Piacenza, instead of returning to Rome in order to consolidate his hold on the city, is not immediately obvious. Undoubtedly there were strong pastoral motives. However he himself advanced one very human argument in favour of his French tour - he wanted to go home. When he was consecrating the altar at Cluny he is reported to have said:

Denique inter alias causas quae nos ad visitandas Gallias impulerunt haec prima et praecipua fuit ut locum istum et congregationem hanc speciali nobis cognatione germanam nostra praesentia laetificaremus, nostro accessu et alloquio juvaremus, et ad omnem utilitatem vel commodum nostram eis operam impenderemus.⁴⁸

He may also have considered that the proclamation of the Crusade

⁴⁷ Bernoldi Chronicon, MGH 5, 462.

⁴⁸ PL 151, 563; RHG xiv, 100.

would be greeted with more enthusiasm in France, where the warring noblemen had already expressed interest in such an expedition.⁴⁹ Robert Somerville asserts that the publicity value of the pope's journey through France may have been another factor in his decision to go: it must have enhanced his position as the legitimate pope.⁵⁰

Prior to Urban II's journey in 1095-1096 no pope had visited France since Leo IX in 1049. These two visits could not have been more dissimilar. There were only about twenty bishops present when Pope Leo laid the bones of St. Remigius on the high altar of the monastery-church at Rheims and called on the assembled clergy to declare if they had paid for their offices,⁵¹ but in the severity of the excommunications and sentences which followed the bishop of Rome was seen to have grasped the reins of command over the whole church as no pope before him had done. His successors, particularly Gregory VII, were to reinforce this centralisation of authority to ensure the implementation of their decrees. But it was during the year of Urban II's sojourn in France that the importance of the new expansion of papal judicial activity, inaugurated by Gregory VII,⁵² became apparent. Alfons Becker has pointed out the very large number of papal judgements in ecclesiastical suits of varying degrees of importance recorded in local chronicles and cartularies during 1095-6.⁵³ This continuing curial activity was regarded with some impatience by Urban II who expressed annoyance at his involvement in the trivial quarrels between religious houses while he was in France.⁵⁴ The presence of the

⁴⁹ Chronica monasterii Cassinensis, iv, 11, MGH 34, 475; see below, p. 147-8, where this is discussed.

⁵⁰ Robert Somerville, The Councils of Urban II, i, Decreta Claromontensia, Annuario Historiae Conciliorum (1972). p. 5.

⁵¹ Historia Dedicationis ecclesiae Sancti Remigii, PL 142, 1417 - 40.

⁵² See above, p. 70.

⁵³ Becker, Papst Urban II, pp. 219-20.

⁵⁴ JL 5642.

curia also ensured a consistently large attendance of the French episcopate at all stages of the pope's progress. René Crozet,⁵⁵ in his article on the journey of Urban II in France, has named 37 bishops from the various regions of France who were with Urban at this time, although he does not give references for all of them. Seven of these bishops deserve special mention. From the kingdom of France John of Orléans, Hugh of Senlis and Richerius of Sens came to Clermont (but Richerius left when he was suspended from his bishopric because of his intransigence in the affair of the primacy). Poppo of Metz and Pibo of Toul came to Clermont from the imperial territories and a third, Richerius of Verdun, sent legates and gifts to the pope. A fourth bishop from the Empire, Hugh of Besançon, came to the synod of Nîmes. These bishops showed some courage in appearing openly in the entourage of the pope: the majority of their compatriots stayed away.

CLERMONT, TOURS AND NÎMES.

No complete contemporary record remains of the canons of the councils of Clermont, November 1095,⁵⁶ Tours, March 1096⁵⁷ or Nîmes, July 1096.⁵⁸ Historians have attributed a fourth council, at Limoges,⁵⁹ to this period but Robert Somerville does not believe that it took place.⁶⁰ The presumption that there was such a council is based on tradition, because Urban spent Christmas there in 1095; but no direct reference to it remains in any chronicle. In a letter concerning a dispute between two monasteries, written immediately after the council of Nîmes, Urban refers to that council as the tertia synodus, which seems conclusive.⁶¹ Hugh of Lyons accompanied the pope at every stage of his journey and was present at all three councils.⁶²

In his study of the Decrees of Clermont⁶³ Robert Somerville has confronted the difficulties of extracting an accurate account of what was done at the council from the 'staggering' amount and diversity of the collected sources. At the conclusion of his long and detailed analysis of the material available in conciliar records, in the contemporary and subsequent chronicles and in the collections and accounts of later historians, he summarises all

⁵⁶ Mansi xx, 815-920.

⁵⁷ Mansi xx, 925.

⁵⁸ Mansi xx, 932.

⁵⁹ Mansi xx, 919; cf Hefele, 445, who attributed the deposition of Bishop Humbert of Limoges to a council in that city.

⁶⁰ Robert Somerville, The French Councils of Pope Urban II: Some Basic Considerations. Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum 2. Augsburg, 1970, reprinted in Papacy, Councils and Canon Law in the 11th and 12th Centuries, (Collected Studies series): v, p.60.

⁶¹ JL 5654. RHG xiv, 723, to Hugh of Cluny; tertia per instantiam nostram apud Nemausum synodus convenisset.

⁶² Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, pp. 106 seq; Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 159.

⁶³ Robert Somerville, Decreta Claromontensia.

the subjects for which there is a record of treatment and codification at Clermont. His final figure of sixty-one canons may be loosely connected under the following headings: decrees concerning the Peace and Truce of God (canons 1, 2, 60*); decrees concerning the Crusade (canons 3, 60*); decrees against simony (canons 7, 8,⁶⁴ 37); decrees against investiture (canons 17, 18, 19); regulations concerning the ordination and preferment of clerics (canons 4, 12, 14, 26, 39, 47, 48); regulations concerning the behaviour of clerics (canons 5, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 20, 36, 50); regulations concerning the election of bishops (canons 6, 39, 49); regulations concerning the laity (canons 11, 21, 22, 23, 33, 40, 53, 54, 55, 58); decrees concerning monks (canons 43, 46, 52); decrees concerning church property (canons 41, 56); decrees concerning matters of doctrine, faith and morals (canons 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 51, 59, 61).

Somerville's careful analysis of the available texts has almost doubled the number of canons which can now be attributed to this council with a degree of certainty. Hefele, citing William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis and Lambert of Arras as well as the collections of Mansi and Hardouin has tentatively advanced only thirty-two canons as belonging to the council of Clermont, with another canon attributed to it by Master Gratian and the Codex Cencii;⁶⁵

The decrees of Clermont represent a restatement of the major theses of eleventh century reform and were obviously of lively interest to the many French bishops taking part. Lambert of Arras noted: 'Although the council was protracted for ten days,

⁶⁴ This refers to the 'specifically French' form of simony mentioned above, p. 139. Quia quidam simoniace pravitatis ramus in Galliarum partibus iam diutius inolevit ut ecclesie vel decime, que vulgari vocabulo apud eos altaria nuncupantur, monasteriis date, sepius ab episcopis sub palliata avaritia venduntur, mortuis nimirum seu mutatis clericis, quos personas vocant. Nos auctore Deo venalitatem omnem tam ex rebus quam ex ministeriis ecclesiasticis propellentes, hoc ulterius fieri auctoritate apostolica prohibemus.

⁶⁵ Hefele, 399-403.

because of certain emerging matters of business, no participant and certainly no wise man was either bored or uncomfortable.⁶⁶ That the importance of this council was recognised at the time is obvious from the fact that twenty-four years later, at the council of Rheims in 1119, Calixtus II declared that he was affirming the legislation of Clermont.⁶⁷

Urban said that he came into France pro negotiis ecclesiasticis in partes Galliae...⁶⁸ the number of decrees enacted at Clermont indicates the enormous volume of business undertaken there. Wibert of Ravenna, 'who called himself pope', and Henry, Emperor of Germany, were excommunicated⁶⁹ and also Philip I of France because of his adulterous union with Bertrada de Montfort.

In eo concilio excommunicavit dominus papa Phillippum regem Francorum et omnes qui eum vel regum vel dominum suum vocaverint et ei obedierint et ei locuti fuerint, nisi quod pertinet ad eum corrigendum.⁷⁰

Alone among the chroniclers who mentioned this, William of Malmesbury said that Philip's 'accursed wife' was also excommunicated, together with all those who called her queen.⁷¹ The metropolitan jurisdiction of Tours rather than that of Dol over Brittany was once more confirmed.⁷² The archbishop of Lyons was confirmed in the primacy over the provinces of Lyons, Rouen,

⁶⁶ RHG xiv, 755: Cum autem concilium pro quibus emergentibus causis per dies decem protrahertur, nulli tamen ibidem consistenti et sane sapienti taedio fuit aut odio.

⁶⁷ Orderic Vitalis, Historia, vi, xii, ed. M. Chibnall, 263; '...and the rest of the canons which were there (council of Clermont) approved by the holy fathers I confirm by the authority of God and St. Peter the apostle and all the saints of God.'

⁶⁸ JL 5654. RHG xiv, 723; letter of Urban II to Hugh of Cluny.

⁶⁹ William of Malmesbury, De gestis regum Anglorum, 2, 393.

⁷⁰ ibid.

⁷¹ ibid. ...maledictam conjugam.

⁷² Letter of William, bishop of Poitou, in Mansi xx, 819; See above, Council of Saintes, 1081, p. 126.

Tours and Sens.⁷³ The other items of business, twenty-five in all,⁷⁴ were mainly concerned with the settlement of disputes between religious houses and the conferring of privileges.

The item which has acquired most importance for historians, the proclamation of the First Crusade, only appears in the surviving accounts because of the indulgence granted at Clermont to those who went to Jerusalem⁷⁵ and the decree placing their property under the Peace of God.⁷⁶ A discussion of the development of the idea of crusade as a by-product of Church reform, which may first be seen in Leo IX's action against the Normans⁷⁷ and was propounded (but not implemented) by Gregory VII,⁷⁸ would be inappropriate in this thesis, as would a study of the relations of Alexius Comnenus with Urban II and the intentions of his legates at Piacenza. But a passage in the Chronicle of Monte Cassino is of significance here because it suggests that the idea of the First Crusade may have originated in France and may have been one reason for Urban's journey.

It is said that this enterprise was undertaken in Gaul at the behest of certain penitent princes. Because they could not perform a worthy penance for their innumerable offences in their own land - for being laymen, they were ashamed to dwell among their friends while renouncing warfare - they pledged themselves

⁷³ Letter of Urban II to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5600; PL 151, 438. See 'Metropolitans' below p. 281, where the reaction to this of Richerius, archbishop of Sens, is discussed.

⁷⁴ Somerville, French councils of Pope Urban II, vii, 84-89.

⁷⁵ Mansi xx, 816, cap. 2; canon 3 in Robert Somerville, Decreta Claromontensia, p. 143.

⁷⁶ Somerville, canon 60, p. 148.

⁷⁷ Carl Erdmann, The Origin of the Idea of Crusade, translated Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart, Princeton 1977, p. 123-4

⁷⁸ Registrum i, 46, p. 70; 49, p. 75; ii, 31, p. 165; E. V. 5, p. 11.

...as a penance and for the remission of their sins to wrest the Lord's Sepulchre from the Saracens...This they promised on the authority and the advice of the wise Pope Urban...who was in the region at that time on the business of the Church.⁷⁹

In the opinion of the most recent editor of the Chronicle this passage, a fragment of his lost crusading chronicle, was composed by Leo Marsicanus, a former monk of Monte Cassino, who subsequently became cardinal bishop of Ostia and a confidant of Urban II.⁸⁰ It is therefore possible that this explanation originated with Urban himself. Some contemporary evidence for the validity of this theory is provided by Guibert of Nogent. He said that God had instituted a holy war so that knights and the 'unstable multitude who used to engage in mutual slaughter' might, while still indulging in their favourite pastime, 'in some measure achieve the grace of God.'⁸¹

The protection of the property of crusaders in their absence and its restoration on their return is referred to by Paschal II in a letter to the prelates of France written probably at the end of 1099. He declares that this was decreed by Urban II but does not specify that it was done at Clermont.⁸² However Robert Somerville, citing the Liber Lamberti of Arras, includes this decree in his summary of the decrees of Claremont.⁸³ In 1106 Ivo of Chartres was asked to adjudicate in the case of Hugh II of le Puiset, who complained of a violation of his jurisdiction by a neighbour during his absence on crusade. The canonist had to seek clarification from Paschal II about this 'new institution

⁷⁹ Chronica monasterii Cassinsis, iv, 11, MGH 34, 475. See I. S. Robinson, Papacy, p. 328.

⁸⁰ H. Hoffmann, ibid., vii-ix, xxviii-xxx.

⁸¹ Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei i. i. (n. 5), p.124.

⁸² JL 5812; PL 163, 43, xxii: Porro fratribus qui post perpetrata[m] divinitus victoriam revertuntur, jubemus sua omnia restitui sicut...Urbano predecessore nostro reminiscimini synodali definitione sancitum.

⁸³ Somerville, Decreta Claromontensia, p. 47.

which extends ecclesiastical protection to the property of knights setting out for Jerusalem' but he eventually decided that the property of those on crusade should be under the protection of the Church.⁸⁴ At the council of Anse, in 1099 or 1100, it was decided that those who had taken the votum crucis but failed to go to Jerusalem should be separated from communion with the Church until they kept their vow,⁸⁵ but there is no evidence for this decision having been grounded in anything proclaimed at Clermont. It was probably the direct result of the same letter of Paschal II to the prelates of France. Obviously legislation to deal with every crisis in the Crusades was initially devised on an ad hoc basis and had to be constantly reviewed.

At Tours,⁸⁶ during the third week of Lent, the pope probably repeated what he had said at Clermont. Bernold recorded that Urban reiterated at Tours the decisions of previous councils.⁸⁷ Robert Somerville has pointed out that there are still fundamental questions about eleventh-century conciliar procedure which are difficult to answer but he considers it likely that, given the goals of the reform movement, the basic program would have been reiterated specifically from council to council, and even from pope to pope. Decrees from Urban's earlier synods had been renewed for the French audience at Clermont.⁸⁸

A letter from the pope to Richerius of Sens and the other bishops of France reveals that these men had, on their own authority, remained in contact with the king and had even

⁸⁴ PL 162 , Ep. 168, c 170; Ep. 169, c 172; Ep. 173, c 176; dicentes esse novam institutionem de tuitione ecclesiastica impenda rebus militum Hierosolymam profiscentium.

⁸⁵ Mansi xx, 1127. See Council of Anse below p. 161.

⁸⁶ Mansi xx, 925.

⁸⁷ Bernoldi, Chronicon, MGH 5, 464, a. 1096.

⁸⁸ Robert Somerville, 'The French Councils of Pope Urban II; some basic considerations,' in Papacy, Councils and Canon Law in the 11th-12th Centuries, (Variorum 1990), V, p.62.

contemplated releasing him from the ban laid on him at Clermont. The sentence against Richerius, issued at Clermont, was confirmed at Tours and Urban threatened all those who continued in this disobedience with deposition. He instructed them to present themselves at Arles, where he intended to hold a council within the octave of the feast of SS. Peter and Paul.⁸⁹

The proposed council eventually took place in Nîmes.⁹⁰ At about this time Urban approved the consecration of William de Montfort (brother of Bertrada) to the bishopric of Paris.⁹¹ He did this at the request of the king⁹² and at the instigation of Ivo of Chartres, having first obtained an oath from seven members of the church of Paris that there had been no taint of simony in the election.⁹³ William had succeeded Anselm as abbot of Bec: his appointment to the bishopric of Paris, although made absolutely in accordance with his merits, was obviously a diplomatic manoeuvre on the pope's part. While continuing to condemn the king's crime, Urban was not going to close any avenue that might lead to negotiation and reconciliation. His allowing Richerius of Sens, a known favourite of the king, to resume the pallium for the performance of this consecration, in spite of his continuing refusal to recognise the primacy of Lyons, was a further indication of the lengths to which the pope was prepared

⁸⁹ JL 5636; PL 151, clxxxvii. See below p. 297, where the loyalty of the French bishops to the king is discussed.

⁹⁰ Mansi xx, 932 - 942; Robert Somerville, Papacy, Councils and Canon Law in the 11th-12th Centuries, v, p. 57.

⁹¹ JL 5650. Ivo, writing to Hugh of Lyons, said that Urban decreed that this should be done while he was at Montpellier on his return journey to Rome, (Ep. liv, PL 162, 65). ...rege postulante.

⁹² Letter of Ivo of Chartres to archbishop Richerius of Sens, PL 162, 62, Ep. l. ...ad petitionem regis.

⁹³ Letter of Ivo to Urban II, PL 162, 54, Ep. xliii; Quibus (quosdam de fratribus) bene cuncta renuntiantibus illi fratri dedimus consilium et assensum ut illi electioni cederet et divinae ordinatione non subduceret.

to go to resolve the situation.⁹⁴ It is difficult to make out the exact chronology of Philip's excommunications because he himself seemed to view his relations with the church with a cynical disregard, but according to Bernold he was reconciled for a time with the papacy during Urban's period in France.

Phillipus rex Galliarum iamdudum pro adulterio excommunicatus tandem domno papae dum adhuc in Galliis moraretur satis humiliter ad satisfactionem venit et abiurata adultera in gratiam receptus est seque in servitium domno papae satis promptum exhibuit.⁹⁵

This reconciliation is also recorded in the Chronicon Malleacense.⁹⁶ It may have been during this period of accord that Bertrada's brother was consecrated to the bishopric of Paris 'at the request of the king.'

Robert Somerville, in collaboration with Stephan Kuttner, has pointed out the difficulties caused to historians by the inclusion, by Mansi and others, of two monastic forgeries attributed to Gregory I and Boniface IV among the canons of Nîmes.⁹⁷ These canons are:-

2. Quod male quidam monachis negent sacerdotali officio fungi licere. (Boniface).
3. Quod monachi sacerdotali ministerio rectius fungi possint quam presbyteri saeculares.⁹⁸
(Gregory)

⁹⁴ Letter of Ivo to Richerius of Sens, PL 162, 62, Ep.1, ...secundum auctoritatem et consuetudinem ecclesiae vestrae ei manum imponatis et honore pallii ad tempus vobis interdicto in ejus ordinatione et consecratione uti nullatenus formidetis.

⁹⁵ Bernoldi Chronicon, a. 1096; MGH 5, 464.

⁹⁶ In Rerum gallicarum et francicarum scriptores, xii, 403; quoted in Hefele, Histoire des conciles, v, 452, fn. 2.

⁹⁷ Robert Somerville, Papacy, Councils and Canon Law, ix, 175.

⁹⁸ Mansi xx, 934.

Somerville has shown that these canons did not originate from the period of the visit of Urban II to France but had been in existence at least from the mid-eleventh century, when the 'Boniface' decree was referred to by Peter Damiani in his opusculum 28.⁹⁹ Somerville does not believe that they were re-enacted by Urban II at Nîmes and he is convinced, citing Baluze and Charles Dereine, that of the sixteen canons recorded by Mansi and others only canon 1 may be regarded with certainty as belonging to that council.¹⁰⁰ He does not refer to the council of Autun presided over by Hugh in October, 1094,¹⁰¹ at which it was decreed ...monachis interdictum est in eodem concilio ne parroechialium sacerdotum officia in parroechiis usurpent.¹⁰² The same interdict was laid down at the council of Poitiers in 1100.¹⁰³ These decrees look like a refutation of the pseudo-papal monastic forgeries, which may have been circulating in Burgundy at that time.

Canon 1 of the council of Nîmes was a restatement of Clermont canon 8,¹⁰⁴ condemning the form of simony which flourished in France. The other canons of Nîmes, rejected by Somerville, reiterate points of doctrine already defined at other councils. Canon 10; 'Whoever shall marry...the wife of another shall be excommunicated for as long as he keeps her',¹⁰⁵ may have been inspired by the continuing adulterous liaison of Philip and Bertrada.

At Nîmes Hugh of Lyons complained that, in spite of the edict issued at Clermont, and possibly at Tours, archbishop

⁹⁹ PL 145, 511 seq.

¹⁰⁰ Robert Somerville, Papacy, Councils and Canon Law, ix, pp. 175-189.

¹⁰¹ See below, p. 157.

¹⁰² Bernoldi Chronicon, a. 1094, MGH 5, 461.

¹⁰³ Mansi xx, 1125.

¹⁰⁴ Somerville, Decreta Claromontensia, p. 144; See above p. 139.

¹⁰⁵ Mansi xx, 935. Hefele, p. 450.

Richerius of Sens was still refusing to recognise the primacy of Lyons, although his suffragans had all recognised it. The sentence against Richerius was reaffirmed and, in a subsequent letter to Hugh of Lyons, the pope said that Richerius had died still adamant in this refusal.¹⁰⁶

A constant concern of Urban II, one which manifested itself many times during his journey through France, was his anxiety to see reform inaugurated and implemented in the lives of the canons regular.¹⁰⁷ The early history of this movement to restore apostolic poverty to the life of those in collegiate chapels is obscure and hard to trace. Hildebrand himself is credited with the initial impetus, when, at the Lateran Council of 1059, he urged that those who had taken up the 'communal life according to the example of the primitive church' (a period which never failed to meet with Hildebrand's approval) should not be pressed to abandon that life in order to return to the system of private property.¹⁰⁸ The Institutio Canoniorum, which had been drawn up under Louis the Pious, was examined by the Council and the sections which appeared to permit the retention of peculiaritas were declared to be a complete deviation from the ideal of canonical life.¹⁰⁹ Another problem was that the early ideals of communal life, particularly that of apostolic poverty, were being eroded by the necessities inherent in the cura animarum, as defined in the Rule of Aix (816). In the eyes of the reformers adaptation had become deviation. For centuries those canons who desired a more perfect life had gone on to become monks, but the new spirit of reform in the eleventh century caused them to look instead for a return to their apostolic origins. J. C. Dickinson

¹⁰⁶ Letter to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5788, PL 151, 543, ccxcii; see below pp. 313-17 for an account of Hugh's dealings with Daimbert, the successor of Richerius.

¹⁰⁷ See Charles Dereine, 'Chanoines' in: Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastique, xii, Paris 1953, pp. 353-405.

¹⁰⁸ Mabillon, Annales Ord. S. Benedicti iv, appendix lxxvii, 686. ...noscuntur communem vitam exemplo primitivae aecclesiae...

¹⁰⁹ ibid., 686-7.

has quoted G. Morin, who maintained that official ordinances were drawn up for regular canons at the Lateran Synod of 1074,¹¹⁰ but Leclercq, editing Hefele, was doubtful about the date of these ordinances, or if in fact they were ever enacted.¹¹¹ However, Charles Dereine claimed that a Rule for canons was composed by Gregory VII.¹¹² Undoubtedly Urban II made a significant contribution to the official recognition of the early doctrine of poverty in the communal life. His journey through France is marked on many occasions by instances of his approval for communities of canons living under the Rule of St Augustine. At Avignon he confirmed the charter he had previously granted to the canons of St. Ruf, saying that they had revived a neglected primitive tradition of the Church -the tradition of practical service.¹¹³ Also at Avignon he placed the canons of the cathedral of Notre Dame des Doms under the protection of the Holy See as a mark of his approval for their adoption of the Rule.¹¹⁴ He restored and confirmed to the canons of Cahors possessions which had been 'dispersed into the hands of knights and other secular persons.'¹¹⁵ Concern for this reform is evident at every stage of his journey.

Alfons Becker said that when Urban finally returned to Rome at the end of 1096 he could look back with satisfaction on his French journey, seeing it as one of his greatest successes and the most splendid manifestation of his papal authority. The

¹¹⁰ J. C. Dickenson, The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England, note 10, p. 43.

¹¹¹ Hefele, pp. 94-98.

¹¹² Charles Dereine, 'Note sur l'influence de la règle de Gregoire VII,' Révue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique xliii, (1948), pp. 512-14. See also F. Lot and R. Fawtier, Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age; iii, Institutions Ecclésiastiques, 132-4.

¹¹³ U. Chevailier, Codex diplomaticus ordinis sancti Rufi Valentiae, Valence 1891, pp. 8-9.

¹¹⁴ Gallia Christiana i, instr. xiii, 141.

¹¹⁵ JL 5573; PL 151, 423-4; ...Ea etiam que olim ad Caturciensium canonicorum usum collata sed post eorum negligentis detrita et in manus militum caeterorumque saecularium dissipata sunt.

French king had accepted his sentence, the French Church was subject to Rome and the call to crusade had been received with an enthusiasm beyond all expectation.¹¹⁶

COUNCILS OF HUGH OF LYONS DURING THE PAPACY OF URBAN II.

In contrast to his busy conciliar activity in the early period of his legation Hugh held only three councils during the period from his appointment to the archbishopric of Lyons in 1082 until his death. He also seems to have taken very little part in the papal activity in France. He is not referred to except in reference to the problems with the primacy, in which he was directly involved. In spite of his reappointment as legate by Urban II in 1094¹¹⁷ his period of authority and influence as the most important agent of the papacy in France was over. The new legates employed by Urban II and Paschal II were usually cardinal priests and bishops of the Roman Church.¹¹⁸

After the council of Lyons in 1082 Hugh's next recorded council was not until 1094, and he is recorded as having held only two further councils. The records of these councils show that, in the renewed excommunications of Wibert and Henry IV and in the condemnations of simony and nicholaism, he was continuing the policies of Gregory VII but the disturbing confrontations of his earlier councils are no longer in evidence.

BRIOUDE. 1094.¹¹⁹

According to the Tabula of Marmoutier an attempt was made at this council to excommunicate Ralph II of Tours and his associates.¹²⁰ Mansi claims that this was done by Amatus of

¹¹⁷ Letter of Urban II; JL 5523; RHG xiv, 758.

¹¹⁸ See 'Legates,' below p. 215.

¹¹⁹ Mansi xx, 797; Hefele, 387; Tabula of Marmoutier; De tribulationibus Majori-Monasteris injuste illatis ab archiepiscopis et clericis S. Mauricii Turonensis et de adquisitione et renovatione privilegii et libertatis ejusdem ecclesiae, RHG xiv, 95. A note, (b), states that the council of Brioude is only known from this record.

¹²⁰ RHG xiv, 95: Sed crudelium et insidiantium nobis obstinata et inveterata obturatio tot sapientum incantatorum molliri non potuit consilio nec divertì ab odia cui semel conglutinata et confoederata fuerat perversae mentis affectio.

Bordeaux in the presence of Hugh of Lyons¹²¹ but Amatus is not mentioned in the Tabula: however he is mentioned in the account of the council of Autun, some months later, as having already excommunicated Ralph.¹²² (This man had been allegedly been involved in a homosexual affair with archdeacon John of Orléans, afterwards bishop of Orléans).¹²³ The privileges of Marmoutier were recognised.¹²⁴

AUTUN. OCTOBER, 1094.¹²⁵

Hugh of Flavigny says that there were 32 bishops present at this council, with abbots and other religious men, but gives no names.¹²⁶ Bernold of St. Blasien reported that there were 'archbishops, bishops and abbots from various provinces'.¹²⁷ According to the Tabula of Marmoutier, one of these archbishops was Amatus of Bordeaux.¹²⁸ The excommunications of Henry IV and the anti-pope Clement III, with all their associates, were renewed.¹²⁹ King Philip of France was again excommunicated because of his continued association with Bertrada de Montfort.¹³⁰

121 Mansi xx, 800.

122 See below.

123 Letter of Ivo of Chartres, PL 162, 65, 82. See below p. 294.

124 RHG xiv, 95.

125 Mansi xx, 799; Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii, MGH viii, 473; Bernoldi Chronicon, 1094, MGH v, 461; Hefele, 387; Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, 156

126 Chronicon ii, MGH viii, 473.

127 Bernoldi Chronicon, 1094, MGH 5, 461.

128 RHG xiv, 95. See above.

129 Bernoldi, 461.

130 ibid.

In a letter summoning Lambert of Arras to attend this council Hugh of Lyons suggested that Hugh of Cluny might be present,¹³¹ but there is no record of his having been there. This is the first extant letter in which Hugh resumes the title apostolicae sedis legatus. The decrees against simony and nicholaism were renewed, punishable by excommunication.¹³² It was decreed that monks were not to usurp the office of parish clergy.¹³³ This decree was a direct contradiction of the two texts known and used as 'Gregory' and 'Boniface', which declared such work by monks to be perfectly legal, and is a further indication that these forgeries were not universally accepted at the end of the eleventh century.¹³⁴

PORTUS ANSILLAE.¹³⁵

The only account of this meeting is contained in a letter of Hugh to Robert of Langres about the affair of Robert of Molesme.¹³⁶ Robert had left his monastery to create a new foundation at Cîteaux but was allowed to return to Molesme at the request of the monks there.¹³⁷ In his letter to Robert of Langres explaining this Hugh said that it was settled at a colloquium apud portum Ansillae. In every reference to a council in previous letters Hugh used the words synodus or concilium, so this presumably was not a regular council but a

¹³¹ PL 157, xi, 516. ...tandem consilio domni abbatis Cluniacensis...

¹³² Bernoldi Chronicon, 1094, MGH 5, 461.

¹³³ ibid. item monachis interdictum est in eodem concilio ne parrochialium sacerdotum officia in parrochiis usurpent...omnia ibi sunt constituta et apostolica legatione firmata.

¹³⁴ See above, 'Council of Nîmes', pp. 151-2, where these forgeries are discussed.

¹³⁵ Th. Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 162.

¹³⁶ PL 157, 523, xxiii.

¹³⁷ See 'Life,' above pp. 63-5 for an account of Hugh's involvement in the foundation of the Cistercian Order and for a discussion of the location of this meeting.

meeting called to deal with this particular case. He named as present the bishops of Autun, Châlon, Mâcon and Beauvais, three abbots and 'many other good and upright men.'¹³⁸ These included Peter, the camerarius of the pope, who is the first to be referred to by this title. Karl Jordan suggests that this man was recruited from Cluny to revitalize the papal finances after the defections at the end of Gregory VII's pontificate.¹³⁹

...of the native ... together and ... in France ... to be dealt with ... from ... This ... development was obviously ... of ... refused to attend ... appointed to his ... although, ... as honorary title.

During the lifetime of Hugh of ... in Italy: ... (1102) and ... concerned France is ... that ... written after the ... against ...

... 1102 or 1103 ... Hugh of ... placed this council in ...

¹³⁸ ...

¹³⁹ ...

¹⁴⁰ ...

¹⁴¹ ...

¹³⁸ PL 157, 523, xxiii. ...multique alii viri honesti et boni testimonii.

¹³⁹ Karl Jordan, Finanzgeschichte, pp. 97-98; See also I.S. Robinson, The Papacy, 1073 - 1198, pp. 213, 251, 252.

PASCHAL II.

When Urban died in 1099 he was succeeded a fortnight later by Rainer of Bleda, cardinal-priest of San Clemente. Like his predecessors Gregory VII and Urban II, he had had some experience as a legate.¹⁴⁰ The re-establishment of the papacy in Rome and the increasing efficiency of the curia meant that this pope had less need of the native permanent legates and affairs in France tended to be dealt with by legates sent from Rome. This development was obviously seen as an insult by Hugh of Lyons, who refused to attend their councils.¹⁴¹ He was, however, reappointed to his legation by Paschal II in 1099 or 1100¹⁴² although, like his appointment in Asia, this looks like an honorary title.

During the lifetime of Hugh of Die Paschal II held six synods in Italy: Melfi (1100), Rome (1101), (1102), Benevento (1102) and Rome (1103), (1104/5).¹⁴³ No business which directly concerned France is mentioned as having been discussed at any of these synods. Two letters from the pope to Anselm of Canterbury, written after the Lateran synod of 1102, show that the decrees against investiture were renewed there.¹⁴⁴

ANSE, 1099 or 1100.¹⁴⁵

Hugh of Lyons held only one council during the papacy of Paschal II, at Anse. Hugh of Flavigny placed this council in

¹⁴⁰ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p. 146.

¹⁴¹ See 'Life,' above, p.67 and 'Suffragans,' below, p.226

¹⁴² Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 115.

¹⁴³ Mansi xx 1131, 1135, 1147, 1159, 1183 and 1184. Hefele believed that these last references are to one synod. He claimed that nothing is known of the council of Benevento except that it took place.(478, note 4)

¹⁴⁴ JL 5908 and 5909; PL 163, 90, 91.

¹⁴⁵ Mansi xx, 1127; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487; Letter of Hugh to Robert of Langres, PL 157, 523, xxii; Hefele, 467; this council is not mentioned by either Schieffer or Lühe.

1100, and he claimed that it was attended by five archbishops, Lyons, Canterbury, Sens, Tours and Bourges and by the bishops of Autun, Mâcon, Chalon-sur-Saône, Auxerre, Paris, Die and two others not named by the chronicler but making, according to him, a total of nine. If Anselm of Canterbury was present the council must have taken place before 23 September 1100, because by that time he had returned to England following the death of William Rufus on 2 August.¹⁴⁶

There was a discussion about those who, having taken an oath to go to Jerusalem, did not make the journey. It was decided that they should be separated from communion with the church until they kept their vow. Adhémar of Le Puy, the legate designated by Urban II as leader of the expedition, had written from Antioch in October, 1097, that it was well known 'that those who have remained apostate in deed after having been signed with the cross are in truth excommunicate'.¹⁴⁷ Both Guibert of Nogent and Orderic Vitalis claimed that the votum crucis carried with it the sanction of excommunication and that this was specified by the pope at Clermont,¹⁴⁸ but this letter of Adhémar is the earliest evidence that this pronouncement was widely accepted by the crusaders. Immediately after his consecration Paschal II wrote to the French archbishops and bishops urging them to compel those who had taken the sign of the cross to go to Jerusalem, or 'we decree that they are to be regarded as infamous. The fainthearted men who, wavering in their faith, withdrew from the siege of Antioch, are to remain excommunicate unless they confirm, with reliable guarantees, that they will

¹⁴⁶ According to Eadmer Anselm arrived in England on 23 September, 1100. Historia Novorum in Anglia, RS 81, (1884), p. 119.

¹⁴⁷ Letter of Patriarch Simeon of Jerusalem and Bishop Adhémar of Le Puy: Hagenmeyer, Epistulae (n.3) p. 132.

¹⁴⁸ Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei ii.5; (n.5) p. 140. Orderic Vitalis, Historia ecclesiastica x. 12 ed. M. Chibnall 4 (Oxford 1975), 268.

return.¹⁴⁹ It was undoubtedly this letter which prompted the excommunications pronounced at this council at Anse, and the discussion about the Crusade may also have influenced Hugh himself. He sent legates to Rome announcing to the pope that he wished to make the journey to Jerusalem and asking for the pope's blessing. This the pope gave him and made him his legate in Asia.¹⁵⁰

The council at Anse is Hugh's last recorded council, but some transactions indicate that there may have been councils for which the records have been lost. Some time in 1100 Hugh deposed Stephen of Garlande, bishop of Beauvais, who had been uncanonically elected by the clerks of Beauvais and who was leading a life of public scandal. According to Ivo of Chartres, his election had been carried out at the insistence of King Philip and Bertrada.¹⁵¹

During the rest of Hugh's life none of the business transacted at councils in Rome was concerned with France. But it is significant that in two important cases in France Paschal II did not employ Hugh of Lyons, reappointed as legate in 1099 or 1100,¹⁵² but sent cardinal bishops from Rome to represent him. Two of these men, John and Benedict, held councils in Valence and Poitiers in 1100 which Hugh refused to attend.¹⁵³ A part of their mission was to hear the case of Norgaudus who was

¹⁴⁹ Letter of Paschal II, JL 5812. PL 163, 45D; Qui de Antiochena obsidione fide pusillanimitate et ambigua recesserint, eos in excommunicatione permanere vult, nisi se redituos certis securitatibus confirmaverint.

¹⁵⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487. Lühe is convinced that the illness, which prevented Hugh from attending the council of Valence later that month, was genuine because otherwise Hugh would have left at once for Jerusalem; see below 'Suffragans,' p. 226.

¹⁵¹ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to the legates John and Benedict, PL 162, Ep. 87, 107. See 'French bishops' below p. 287.

¹⁵² Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 115.

¹⁵³ See above 'Life,' p. 66-7, where this legation is discussed.

a suffragan of Hugh, which might have been a reason why he was not employed,¹⁵⁴ but it is clear from a letter of Ivo of Chartres that their most important business was to try to persuade King Philip to abandon Bertrada.¹⁵⁵ The second legation was also concerned with Philip's matrimonial tangle. The pope's representative, Richard of Albano, had been in France dealing with ecclesiastical matters for almost two years¹⁵⁶ before he held a council at Troyes in April 1104,¹⁵⁷ where it was hoped that Philip's marriage might be discussed. Ivo of Chartres pointed out that it would be better not to bring the affair up in the kingdom of France¹⁵⁸ so the discussion finally took place at Beaugency in July.¹⁵⁹ During the early part of Richard's legatine journey Hugh was probably still in Jerusalem, but Eadmer's account of Anselm's sojourn with Hugh from late 1103 until April 1105 proves that Hugh was in Lyons while these councils took place.¹⁶⁰ Although Ivo of Chartres had urged Paschal to reappoint Hugh as his legate in Burgundy¹⁶¹ and Ivo was involved at all stages of the negotiations, there is no mention anywhere of Hugh having had anything to do with this important affair. When the council at Beaugency took place, Richard of Albano had already left France but Paschal instructed the archbishops and bishops of Rheims, Sens and Tours that, if Richard had left, Lambert of Arras should take over the organisation of the council.¹⁶² He did not mention the

¹⁵⁴ See 'Suffragans,' below, p. 226.

¹⁵⁵ PL 162, Ep. 84, 105.

¹⁵⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 502; Anno ab inc. Dom. 1102,...legatus quoque in Burgundiam et Franciam directus est Richardus Albanensis episcopus..

¹⁵⁷ Mansi xx, 1179.

¹⁵⁸ PL 162, Ep. cxli, 148.

¹⁵⁹ ibid. Ep. cxliv, 150

¹⁶⁰ Eadmer, Historia Novorum in Anglia, iv; RS 81, p. 163-4.

¹⁶¹ PL 162, cix, 127.

¹⁶² JL 5979; PL 163, 128.

archbishop of Lyons. Whether because of illness or old age¹⁶³ or a combination of both, augmented by the rigours of the journey to the East, Hugh's period of importance in the Church in France was over. The phrase employed by the pope in 1100 when he appointed Hugh legate in Asia - quam bene rexerat in Burgundia - has a valedictory ring, as though it were generally recognised that he had come to the end of his work. The use of the verb regere to describe his legation is evidence of the importance of that work and of the power and authority he had been able to bring to it. During the period of his greatest legatine activity, as bishop of Die from 1073 to 1081, he had been responsible for the deposition, excommunication or some lesser punishment of ten archbishops and seventeen bishops, as well as all the bishops of Normandy. As archbishop of Lyons (1082-1106) he found it necessary to depose just one archbishop and two bishops. Hugh of Flavigny said of him: Persequabatur symoniacos, adversus quos ei iugis pugna, conflictus fuit perpetuus quos etiam prout potuit ab ecclesia eliminavit et orthodoxos substituit.¹⁶⁴ This was the simple truth. Because of his energy and zeal, reform was implemented in the Church in France. Gregory VII had died before he could enjoy the results of Hugh's activities. It was, however, largely thanks to the efforts of his legate, that Urban II and Paschal II were able to carry on his work of reform in France with some degree of the harmony and cooperation which Gregory had hoped for at the beginning of his papacy.

ooo000ooo

¹⁶³ He was probably in his middle sixties; see 'Life' above p. 2.

¹⁶⁴ Hugh of Flavigny Chronicon ii, MGH viii, 413.

THE LEGATES OF POPE GREGORY VII IN FRANCE.

The papal legation was the most important element in Gregory VII's programme for reform. The legates formed the link between synodal decisions in Rome and the implementation of those decisions throughout the Church. Gregory's reliance on them undoubtedly arose from the fact that for twenty years before his accession to the papacy he was himself a competent and trusted legate of the see of Rome. In 1054 he was sent to France by Pope Leo IX, where he held a council in Tours to deal with the heretical doctrine of Berengar.¹ While he was still in France in 1054 Leo IX died. According to Bonizo of Sutri² and the chronicler of Monte Cassino, Leo of Ostia,³ Hildebrand was selected by the clergy and people of Rome to go to Germany to beg a pope from the emperor. Bonizo adds that Hildebrand had been urged to accept the papacy himself, but had refused.⁴ Bonizo was a determined Gregorian polemicist who never lost an opportunity to enhance the reputation of his hero and Leo of Ostia frequently used Bonizo as a source, so it would be unwise to accept Hildebrand's presence at Henry III's court at that time on their unsupported word.

Hildebrand was in France again in 1056. He held two councils, at Chalon-sur-Saône⁵ and at Lyons,⁶ where simony and nicholaism were condemned and six guilty bishops were deposed. He seems to have felt no trace at that time of the spirit of reconciliation which prompted his rebuke to Hugh of Die after the councils of Autun and Poitiers, when Hugh also condemned a great

¹ Berengarius, de Sacra Coena; in Jean de Montclos, Lanfranc et Berenger: La Controverse Eucharistique du xie Siècle. (Louvain, 1971). p.15.

² Liber ad Amicum v, Libelli de lite 1, 589.

³ Chronica Monasterii Casinensis ii, 86, MGH 34, 335.

⁴ Liber ad amicum v, Libelli de lite 1, 589.

⁵ Mansi xix, 843.

⁶ Peter Damien, Opus xix, PL 145, 433.

many bishops.⁷ It could even be that in 1077 and 1078 Hugh took Hildebrand's severity at the 1056 council in Lyons as an example.

In 1057 Hildebrand successfully carried out a difficult mission in the German kingdom when he persuaded the German court to accept the election to the papacy of Frederick, abbot of Monte Cassino.⁸ That he succeeded is evidence of his powers of persuasion. It was also an important first step on the road of reform, freeing the papacy from German tutelage. He is credited with having been instrumental in acquiring 300 soldiers from Richard of Apulia in 1059. With their help Nicholas II was able to subdue the anti-pope, Benedict IX.⁹

These legations, so successful in the field of politics as well as in the area of faith and morals, undoubtedly contributed to Hildebrand's belief in the efficacy of legates and the reliance on their integrity and loyalty which sustained his relations with his own legates throughout his pontificate.

References to legates and to their activities make up a very large part of the papal correspondence. In the 361 letters in Gregory's Register there are 159 references to legates, sometimes qualified by a descriptive word or phrase. 'Legate(s),' unqualified, occurs 41 times and 'our legate(s)' 77 times.¹⁰ These are the largest categories. 'Legate of the church of Rome'

⁷ Registrum v, 17, p.378.

⁸ Lampert of Hersfeld, anno 1058, MGH Rerum Germanicarum 43, 73. In La Réforme grégorienne, 1, 169, n.4 Fliche claims that Lampert wrongly places Hildebrand's encounter with Agnes and the German court at Mersberg instead of Goslar, citing the Annals of Altaich and Gundechar, History of the Bishops of Eichstädt.

⁹ Annales Romani, MGH 5, 471. Fliche pointed out that no other chronicle supports the theory that Hildebrand played a leading part in the formation of this alliance and suggests that Desiderius, always anxious to protect Monte Cassino from the warlike Normans, is more likely to have been the person involved. (La Réforme grégorienne, ii, 327-328.)

¹⁰ These appearances are too numerous to be itemised.

appears 6 times;¹¹ 'suitable (idoneus) legates,' 4 times;¹² 'legate(s) of the See of Rome,' 3 times;¹³ 'Roman legate(s),'¹⁴ and 'legate(s) of St. Peter,'¹⁵ each appears twice and 'confidential (a latere) legates,'¹⁶ and 'esteemed (caritatives) legates,'¹⁷ each appears once. The word 'legation' appears unqualified 15 times¹⁸ and 'our legation' 7 times.¹⁹

In the 65 letters of the Epistolae Vagantes the word 'legate(s)' appears unqualified 6 times,²⁰ 'our legate(s)' 9 times²¹ and 'my legate(s)' twice.²² 'Our brothers and legates,'²³ and 'legate of the Roman Church,'²⁴ each appears once.

¹¹ Registrum i, 44, p.67; i, 55, p.82; i, 64, p.94; ii, 63, p.219; vii, 12, p.476; and viii, 2, p.517.

¹² ibid. ii, 6, p.135; iv, 3, p.299; iv, 25, p.340; ix, 32, p.619.

¹³ ibid. iv, 10, p.309; vi, 17(a), p.428; vii, 16, p.490.

¹⁴ ibid. vi, 2, p.392; vi, 17(a), p.429.

¹⁵ ibid. i, 8, p.13; ii, 74, p.237.

¹⁶ ibid. ii, 30, p.165.

¹⁷ ibid. ii, 75, p.237.

¹⁸ ibid. i, 6, p.8; i, 8, p.13; i, 18, p.29; ii, 40, p.177; ii, 46, p.185; ii, 51, p.194; iii, 7, p.257; iv, 4, p.300; vi, 2, p.392; vi, 17(a), pp.428 and 429; vi, 21, pp.433 and 434; vii, 6, p.467; vii, 7, p.468.

¹⁹ ibid. i, 36, p.58; i, 61, p.90; i, 65, p.95; ii, 75, p.238; iii, 10(a), p.269; v, 9, p.360; vi, 19, p.431.

²⁰ E. V. 14, p.39; 21, p.57; 23, pp.61 and 63; 31, p.83; 33, p.89.

²¹ ibid. 14, p.39; 15, p.43; 19, p.51; 22, p.59; 23, p.61; 25, p.67; 44, p.109; 49, p.119; 52, p.127.

²² ibid. 27, p.71 (twice).

²³ ibid. 14, p.37.

²⁴ ibid. 24, p.63.

The word 'legation' occurs twice.²⁵

As well as these direct references to legates Gregory VII referred to them occasionally as messengers (nuncius) and as 'sons.' Throughout his correspondence he used the term vice nostra, but applied it to legates on special missions and to bishops settling local disputes, with no apparent distinction. The use of the word vicarius, which appears 15 times, 13 times in the Registrum and twice in the Epistolae Vagantes, is discussed elsewhere, in connection with Hugh of Die.²⁶

---***---

THE AUTHORITY OF THE LEGATES.

Gregory VII many times spoke of the bishop as a key figure in the structure of the Church. He told Hermann of Metz that the bishop was 'instituted by divine grace... and aspires ever towards the heavenly life.'²⁷ He wrote to Hugh of Cluny that bishops were ordained to 'govern Christian people in the love of Christ and not for worldly ambition',²⁸ but he admitted at the same time that he found 'scarcely any' bishops who lived up to these high ideals.²⁹ It is clear from the Dictatus Papae (caps 3, 4, 7, 13 and 25) that he intended to reduce episcopal authority with the object of accelerating his programme of renewal in the Church by the centralisation of government in Rome: and that he envisaged his legates as playing an essential role in the achievement of this end. In 1077 he wrote to the Christians of Narbonne, Gascony and Spain: 'Matters which the governor and ruler of the Roman church cannot manage to deal with

²⁵ ibid. 19, p.53; 31, p.81.

²⁶ See 'Life' above, p. 21.

²⁷ Registrum, iv, 2, p.293

²⁸ Registrum ii, 49, p.188.

²⁹ ibid. Vix legales episcopos introitu et vita qui christianum populum Christi amore et non seculari ambitione regant invenio.

by his own presence he can entrust on his behalf to legates and through them proclaim the precepts of salvation and integrity of life to all the churches established throughout the world.³⁰ In November 1078, he told the supporters of the rival German kings that he was sending legates to Germany who 'would be charged either to establish peace or else, after finding out the truth, to pass canonical sentence upon those who are the cause of this great division.'³¹ Thus both spiritual and political matters came within the scope of the legates. Regardless of their position in the hierarchy, they automatically took precedence over the local bishops and metropolitans, even to the extent of deposing and excommunicating them.³²

The legates were sent out by the pope with apparently unlimited power. Alexander II said of his legate, Peter Damian, noster est oculus,³³ but Gregory's legates were his voice also. The text he most frequently quoted to them and about them was 'He that heareth you heareth me.'³⁴ Informing the faithful of Narbonne, Gascony and Spain that he was sending Amatus, bishop of Oloron, as his legate to root out error and implant virtue, he said: 'We charge you by apostolic authority to receive him as though we, or rather St. Peter, were present: out of reverence for the apostolic See, whose messenger he is, we charge you to obey and heed him in all things as though you saw our own face and actually heard us speaking.'³⁵ He commended Richard, abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles, to King Alfonso of Leon in very similiar terms: 'May you listen to him as to ourself...Do not

³⁰ E. V. 21, p. 57.

³¹ E. V. 25, p. 65.

³² Registrum ii. 55(a), p. 203, 4; Quod legatus eius omnibus episcopis presit in concilio etiam inferioris gradus et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare.

³³ Letter of Alexander II to the archbishops of Gaul; JL 4516, RHG xiv, 534, 11.

³⁴ Luke, 10, 16. Quoted in; Registrum i, 17, p. 27; Registrum ii, 40, p. 177; Registrum ii, 73, p. 233; Registrum iii, 10, p. 263; E. V. 4, p. 11; others.

³⁵ E. V. 21, p. 57.

hesitate to lend him all credence, knowing as you do that he represents our authority over you.'³⁶ He sent Hugh of Die, Hubert and Wighard as legates to Tours, warning the archbishop, Ralph: 'Obey whoever may be present, even though only one, as if all of them were there and...show obedience as you would to myself if I were to hand.'³⁷ In Poland the legates were empowered to reorganise the structure of the Church and to bring any difficulties they encountered directly to Rome;³⁸ and in one of his first letters as pope Gregory VII said that in whatever company it found itself his legation must always take first place.³⁹ Finally, the decrees of a legate were to be obeyed even if they were wrong. 'Even...if he (in this case the legate Peter of Albano) had wanted to impose something on you ill-advisedly, you should have accepted it out of respect for the apostolic see.'⁴⁰

These comprehensive recommendations contained, by implication, the assurance of his unwavering support, but an examination of his letters to the legates themselves demonstrates that the strength of their position depended on their continuing co-operation with the pope. It was never left in doubt that they were not the ultimate authority, which was always grounded in the papacy and they cannot have failed to understand that they need only expect the pope's support when their judgements coincided with his opinions. At no time during Gregory VII's papacy was there any question of his legates acting with complete autonomy. Their verdicts could be resented and questioned in the field and the whole case be re-examined before the pope, who might or might not uphold their decisions. Gregory's 'beloved son,' Hugh of Die,⁴¹ was to experience this lack of support and to complain of

³⁶ Registrum vii, 6, p. 465.

³⁷ E. V. 23, p. 63

³⁸ Registrum ii, 73, p.233.

³⁹ Registrum i, 6, p.8.

⁴⁰ E. V. 38, p. 95.

⁴¹ E. V. 12, p. 29.

it,⁴² but the pope never relinquished his inclination to interfere in the work he had ostensibly delegated.

His interference frequently tended towards mitigation of the severity of the sentences passed by those to whom he had nominally given absolute authority. He reinstated Manasses, Archbishop of Rheims, who had been deposed by Hugh of Die at the council of Autun, in September 1077, 'because the sentence passed on him was not in accord with the dignity and customary gentleness of the Roman Church.'⁴³ It should, however, be noted that Gregory VII showed the same inclination to clemency in carrying out his own decrees. Hugh's complaint that sinners were quickly forgiven in Rome⁴⁴ probably expressed the feeling of all the legates that they were left floundering without papal support and it must have been particularly galling that the pope himself seemed unaware of any inconsistency in his behaviour. He told the legates in Germany, Peter and Ulrich, 'We have not deviated from the integrity of apostolic judgement, nor have we given way to any promises or threats and we trust that, under God's protection, we never shall act otherwise'.⁴⁵ In the wake of his action at Canossa and the consequent political upheaval in Germany, this pronouncement must have caused the legates a certain wry amusement.

The inconsistencies in Gregory VII's actions might be explained by two factors; on the one hand a strong desire (which

⁴² See Hugh's complaint, after the council of Poitiers in 1078, that his judgements were overturned in Rome, and the papal letter of March, 1078, in which he was accused by Gregory of acting too hastily; 'Life,' above pp. 38-40; also Gregory's rebuke to Richard of Marseilles in the case involving the monks of St. Sernin, below, p. 190.

⁴³ Registrum v, 17, p. 378. ...quia sententia super eum data non Romane ecclesia gravitate et solita mansuetudine videbatur.

⁴⁴ Letter of Hugh to Gregory VII, PL 157, 511B; ...quod simoniaci vel quicunque criminosi a nobis suspensi vel depositi aut etiam damnati libentur currunt Romam et...inde reportant quasi misericordiam pro voluntate.

⁴⁵ E. V. 31, p. 81.

he felt was not shared by the majority of his clergy)⁴⁶ to return the Church as a whole to 'the golden age of the apostles',⁴⁷ with, on the other, a sense of personal responsibility for the salvation of the individual members of that Church committed to his care. A letter to Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron reveals his awareness of this responsibility. 'It seems to us far better and easier to win him (William the Conqueror) to God...by gentleness and leniency and open reasoning rather than by severity and stern justice.'⁴⁸ Frequently this sense of responsibility led him to take an action that was an apparent betrayal of his closest allies and of his stated principles. The many French bishops whose sentences he commuted after Autun and Poitiers⁴⁹ could bear witness to the gulf between his formulation of the essential elements of reform and his application of them in individual cases. His pardon of Henry at Canossa, with its negative political consequences for the pope, provides an example of the dichotomy in his assessment of the duties inherent in the papacy. This conflict of priorities is reflected in the pope's instructions to his legates. He urged Hugh of Die to moderation and gentleness in his dealings with the rebellious element in his diocese⁵⁰ as well as with William I of England. He instructed him, with Hugh of Cluny, to 'act wisely and manfully; do all things in charity so that the oppressed may find you cautious defenders and oppressors may learn that you are lovers of justice.'⁵¹ A

⁴⁶ Letter to Hugh of Cluny, Registrum ii, 49, p. 188.

⁴⁷ On the reformers' notion of the 'golden age' see, for example, the letter of Peter Damiani to Gregory VI, PL 144, I, i, 205; Reparetur nunc aureum apostolorum saeculum...

⁴⁸ Registrum ix, 5, p. 579

⁴⁹ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, pp. 112-117 for details of these councils. Manasses of Rheims, Hugh of Besançon, Richerius of Sens, Geoffrey of Chartres, Richard of Bourges and Ralph I of Tours were all reinstated at the Roman council in March, 1078.

⁵⁰ Registrum ii, 43, p. 180.

⁵¹ Registrum vi, 3; The Correspondence of Pope Gregory VII, translated by Ephraim Emerton, Records of Civilization; Sources and Studies, Columbia University

favourite text throughout his correspondence was 'Cursed be the man who holds back his sword from blood,'⁵² but he publicly castigated Hugh of Die for his intemperate severity.⁵³

In his correspondence Gregory VII gave no indication that he made any distinction between the authority of his permanent legates in France and that of the men he employed to act in local affairs or to carry instructions from Rome. In fact, writing to Archbishop Manasses of Rheims, in 1078, he rejected any idea that such a distinction might exist, citing several precedents in support of his contention that all legates sent from the see of Rome were given equal powers.⁵⁴ He never employed the term used by later canonists, legatus natus, and he used the term latere only once in conjunction with the word 'legate' and twice with the word 'nuncius' (messenger). On one of these three occasions he was writing to King Henry IV and the term appears again in a decree concerning the king, which might suggest that he attached some special diplomatic significance to it. However, he used it also to Bishop Berengar of Gerona in a commonplace letter dealing with local disputes.⁵⁵ There is no suggestion that the duties of legates were categorised or that certain duties were reserved to legates of higher standing. In cases where the pope felt that the intervention of a legate was called for, the man who was on the spot, or going there with letters,⁵⁶ was entrusted with the solution of the problem. No legate appears to have been selected because he possessed special knowledge of the type of problem involved. All this strengthens the assumption that, in spite of his assertions to the contrary, his legates were not plenipotentiaries but were merely to be used as instruments to make papal decrees and papal wishes known and

Press, 1932, p. 132.

⁵² Jer. 48, 10; see 'Life,' above p. 33

⁵³ Registrum v, 17, p. 378.

⁵⁴ Registrum vi, 2, p. 391.

⁵⁵ Registrum ii, 30, p. 165; v, 14(a), p. 370; vi, 16, p. 422.

⁵⁶ See Registrum ii, 73, p. 234.

complied with.

Nowhere in Gregory's correspondence is there any evidence of the distinction between legati nati and legati a latere which appeared in the twelfth century.⁵⁷ He did, however, appoint two men, Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron, to two specific geographic regions, probably those in which they had been born.⁵⁸ These men, particularly Hugh, were given, in theory, great power but they had no successors. Theodor Schieffer has suggested that Hugh was employed as a weapon of the reform papacy against the local bishops⁵⁹ and this is certainly what he became. Although they had been given authority in specific areas there were no hard and fast rules about this. They occasionally acted together or in each other's territories

⁵⁷ The distinction is clearly made in a privilege exempting the abbey of Saint Gilles in Narbonne from the authority of the legate in Provence or any other legate except a legatus a latere; (Hadrian IV, JL 10354).

⁵⁸ Writing to the monks of Romans-sur-Isère, Gregory described Hugh as 'child of Romans and of Vienne' Registrum ii, 59, p.214. Degert, Amat d'Oléron, p. 36, presumes that Amatus was born in Gascony (See below. p. 198).

⁵⁹ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, 237.

THE LEGATES IN FRANCE DURING THE PAPACY OF GREGORY VII.

HUGH CANDIDUS, CARDINAL PRIEST OF SAN CLEMENTE.⁶⁰

Hugh Candidus, like many reformers of this period, came from Lotharingia in the train of Pope Leo IX. He was the only one of these men still surviving when Hildebrand became pope. He had been a monk in Remiremont and he became cardinal-priest of San Clemente in Rome under Leo IX.⁶¹ He was employed by Leo and succeeding popes on legatine missions, chiefly to Aragon and Catalonia, where he was outstandingly successful.⁶² When Alexander II died in April 1073, Hugh Candidus was in Rome and, according to Bonizo, he took a leading part in the election of Hildebrand to the papacy.⁶³ As the senior cardinal in Rome his direction of the election would have been in conformity with the decree of 1059,⁶⁴ but Bonizo, the Gregorian polemicist, may have stressed his prominence or even invented his role in the election in order to highlight his subsequent betrayal of Gregory VII in Germany. (According to Bonizo and Lampert of Hersfeld,⁶⁵ Hugh Candidus was present at the synod of Worms in January, 1076, at which Gregory was denounced by the German bishops. He was certainly at the synod of Brixen in 1080 at which Gregory was deposed.⁶⁶)

In April 1073, there were two legates in south-western

⁶⁰ Theodore Schieffer, Die Päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schism von 1140, Berlin 1935, pp. 74-6; Rudolf Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirch Roms 1049-1130 (Bibliotek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, xlviii), Tübingen 1977, pp. 158-159.

⁶¹ Bonizo, Liber ad amicum v, Libelli de lite 1, 588.

⁶² Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.158.

⁶³ Bonizo, Liber ad amicum vii, 601.

⁶⁴ MGH Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum i, 539 seq.

⁶⁵ Liber ad amicum vii, 606; Lamperti Annales 1076, MGH ss rerum Germanicarum 43, 253.

⁶⁶ MGH Constitutiones et acta i, 120.

France; Gerald of Ostia and Rainbald, a subdeacon.⁶⁷ They had been sent by Alexander II to inaugurate a mission to the Spanish church and to support Count Evolus of Roucy who was organising a campaign against the Moors in Spain.⁶⁸ Gregory sent a legate to replace them, to bring them his instructions and to tell them the details of his election. The man he chose for this was Hugh Candidus, referred to as 'this beloved son of ours.'⁶⁹ According to the chronicler Bonizo of Sutri, Hugh of Cluny had been accused of simony at the Lent council of 1073⁷⁰ and Gregory urged Gerald and Rainbald to persuade Hugh Candidus to resume peaceful relations with Hugh of Cluny during this mission to France.⁷¹ There is no record that this reconciliation took place. Another letter, to the barons of France who were preparing the expedition against the Moors, referred to the legate as 'our beloved son Hugo, cardinal-priest of the Holy Roman Church.'⁷² These letters indicate a cordial relationship between Gregory VII and Hugh Candidus at that time. There is no record of what caused their eventual enmity, but the breach may have been a result of Hugh's indulgence in simony in Spain, where he had been sent as a legate. Bonizo supplies the only account of Hugh's subsequent treacherous career.⁷³ His name appears just once again in Gregory's register - when he was condemned and anathemised at the Lent council in Rome in 1078 for his association with Cadalus of Parma (the anti-pope Honorius II) and other heretics and simoniacs.⁷⁴ He was sent to Germany as

⁶⁷ See below p. 177.

⁶⁸ Registrum i, 6, p.8.

⁶⁹ ibid. hoc dilecto filio...

⁷⁰ Liber ad amicum vi, 600.

⁷¹ Registrum i, 6, p.8. Hugh of Cluny had been reconciled with the pope. 'He has thrown aside his own opinions and returned to our heart...'

⁷² Registrum i, 7, p. 11.

⁷³ Liber ad amicum vi; Libelli de lite 1, 598. ...post multas et varias misérias... Bonizo is unreliable because of his determined championship of Gregory VII which makes him view any opponent as a villain.

⁷⁴ Registrum v, 14(a), p.368.

a legate in 1085 by another anti-pope, Clement III (Wibert of Ravenna). In 1089 he was transferred by Clement to the cardinal bishopric of Palestrina.⁷⁵ There is no record of when his death took place.

---***---

RAINBALD, SUBDEACON.⁷⁶

Having been replaced in southern France and Spain by Hugh Candidus, Rainbald does not appear again in Gregory's register.

---***---

GERALD, CARDINAL BISHOP OF OSTIA.⁷⁷

Gerald began his career as master of schools in Regensburg and in 1063 he became a monk in Cluny. He was made cardinal bishop of Ostia by Alexander II in late 1072 or early 1073, in succession to Peter Damien. At that time he was constantly on legation in France.⁷⁸ Writing to Gerald and Rainbald, Gregory expressed surprise and displeasure that they had not returned to Rome to give him an account of the work on which they had been engaged.⁷⁹ Two months later the pope wrote to Gerald, then in Spain, again chiding him for his failure to appear in Rome.⁸⁰ There are three points of interest in this letter. It defines

⁷⁵ Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus un Kirchen, p.159

⁷⁶ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 80
Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.100 and p.159

⁷⁷ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, pp. 80-89; Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, pp.100-101.

⁷⁸ Hüls, p. 100-101.

⁷⁹ Registrum i, 6, p.8.

⁸⁰ Registrum, i, 16, p.25. ...quod pro negotiis sancte Romane ecclesie in Hyspanias profectus es...debuerat prudentia tua aliquam qui synodo interfuisset...ad nos direxisse.

a line of conduct to which legates were expected to conform.

...Quando legatus apostolice sedis concilium in remotis partibus celebravit sine mora ad annuntiandum omnia qui egisset reverteretur...

It also demonstrates a desire on the pope's part to uphold the decision of his legate even when he may not be in complete agreement with it. Honori tuo providentes nulla querelis eius responsa dedimus... (referring to his perplexity in the case of the deposed Pontius of Bigorre). Finally, this letter contains no indication that Gregory considered that a legate's tour of duty ended with the death of the pope who had commissioned him.

This letter was written in July 1073, and presumably Gerald went at once to Rome in obedience to the sharp summons. It is obvious that Gregory's rebuke did not go unheeded because Gerald was again on his way back to Rome in October of the same year, when he visited the church at Die and was present at the election of Hugh to the bishopric there.⁸¹ After this Gerald's movements become interesting to follow. A letter from Gregory suggests that he held a council in the region of Bordeaux, probably in Poitiers, early in 1074,⁸² although the only evidence that a council took place there at that time is in other letters from Gregory later in the year.⁸³ The problem about Gerald arises from his attendance at the Lent council in Rome after which he was sent with Hubert of Palestrina and Rainald of Como on what Bonizo called a 'holy legation' to King Henry IV in Germany.⁸⁴ While it would not be impossible for a man to get from Bordeaux in January to Rome in early March and then to return 'across the mountains',⁸⁵ to be in Nuremburg by Easter, it cannot have been

⁸¹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 410. ...Romam rediens, et apud Diensem urbem hospitatus...; see above 'Life', p. 6. In view of Gregory's earlier rebuke, it seems unlikely the Gerald was going to Rome for the first time.

⁸² Registrum i, 51, p.77. Mansi xx, 449.

⁸³ Registrum ii, 23, p.155 and 24, p.156.

⁸⁴ Bonizo, Liber ad amicum vi; Libelli de lite 1, 601.

⁸⁵ Letter to Hugh of Cluny, Registrum, i 62, p.90.

easy, particularly in winter. Such journeys demonstrate the heroic dedication demanded by Gregory from his associates. Gerald's presence in Germany at Easter is confirmed by Lampert of Hersfeld.⁸⁶

The council in Bordeaux was concerned with a dispute about the ownership of the church of Sainte Marie de Soulac: this is discussed above in connection with papal intervention in French affairs.⁸⁷

In November 1074 the pope referred to Gerald's having placed an 'interdict' on Isembert, bishop of Poitiers, but he did not say when this took place.⁸⁸ It might have been at that same council in Bordeaux but there is no record anywhere else of Gerald's involvement in Isembert's affairs. It is possible that either the pope or his dictator mistakenly named Gerald instead of Amatus of Oloron, who certainly was involved with Isembert in the summer of 1074.⁸⁹

Like many of the men employed by Gregory as legates, Gerald was at Canossa in January 1077.⁹⁰ He died on 6 December of that year⁹¹ and was succeeded in his bishopric by another Cluniac, Odo of Châtillon, later Pope Urban II.

---***---

⁸⁶ Lampert of Hersfeld, MGH ss rerum Germanicarum 43, 193.

⁸⁷ See above, 'Agent of Reform,' p. 94.

⁸⁸ Registrum ii, 23, p.155. For details of Gregory's difficulties with Isembert of Poitiers see below, Amatus of Oloron, p.

⁸⁹ See below Amatus of Oloron, p. 198.

⁹⁰ Registrum iv, 12(a), p.314. Actum Canusie v.

⁹¹ Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.101.

HUBERT, SUBDEACON.⁹²

In April 1073, Gregory VII sent a letter describing his reluctant acceptance of the papacy to two of Alexander's legates, the deacon Albert and the subdeacon Hubert.⁹³ He confirmed Alexander's charge to them and asked for their prayers. Neither the object of their legation nor its locality is known.⁹⁴ It was more than three years before Hubert was again mentioned by Gregory, but he was then involved in a great deal of legatine activity in the northern areas of France.

He held a council at Montreuil some time before November 1076, at which he publicly convicted the archdeacon Hubert of Térouanne of heresy.⁹⁵ He was at Canossa⁹⁶ and in March 1077 the pope sent him to Dol in Normandy with the monk Teuzo to inquire into the scandalous affair of the bishop, Joel. Hugh of Die was to have accompanied them, but there is no record of his having been there.⁹⁷ This legatine mission was part of a diplomatic manoeuvre by Gregory VII to appease King William I of England, who had interceded with the pope for his candidate, Joel. Gregory considered Joel to be vicious and a danger to the

⁹² Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.93. Hüls, Kardinale, klerus und Kirchen, p. 110. In Gregory VII's Register Hubert appears variously as clericus, (Registrum i, 8, p.12), legatus, (Registrum iv, 10, p.309 and vi, 7, p.407, and subdiaconus, (Registrum iv, 12(a) p.314 and vii, 1, p.458). It is assumed that the same man is referred to in each case although Hüls makes no reference to his connection with Normandy.

⁹³ Registrum i, 8, p.13.

⁹⁴ ibid, n. 3. It is possible that they were in England. Hubert was at William's Whitsun assembly at Windsor in 1072; (Lanfranc of Canterbury, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson, Oxford 1979; item 3, p. 49).

⁹⁵ Registrum iv, 10, p.309.

⁹⁶ Registrum iv, 12(a), p.314. Actum canusie v.

⁹⁷ Registrum iv, 17, p.322; ...confratrem nostrum Hugonem venerabilem Diensem episcopum et dilectum filium nostrum Hubertum sancte Romane ecclesie subdiaconum et ipsum etiam Teuzonem monachum si ereptum ab infirmitate poterimus illuc mittere decrevimus.

church⁹⁸ and, while appearing to pay due deference to the king, the legates were to ensure that Gregory's chosen candidate, Ivo, was confirmed in the bishopric. This was done, although in the meantime one Gelduin, considered by Gregory to be below canonical age,⁹⁹ had been elected by the local bishops.¹⁰⁰ Sometime before May of the following year Ivo came to Rome to complain to the pope about the troublesome behaviour of the deposed Joel. Gregory wrote to Hubert and Teuzo¹⁰¹ and also to Eudes, Count of Brittany,¹⁰² informing them that he was putting the whole affair into the hands of Hugh of Die (who, although Gregory does not mention this, was supposed to have been involved from the beginning)¹⁰³ so that it might be brought up at a council in Lyons. This council, primarily intended to deal with the case of Archbishop Manasses of Rheims, did not take place until 1080¹⁰⁴ and there is then no mention of the problem of Dol, which remained an example of the papacy over-riding local decisions.

In the summer of 1078 Hubert was still in Normandy, dealing with the illness of John of Bayeux, archbishop of Rouen. John had been stricken with paralysis and Hubert was sent to evaluate his illness and, if it were completely incapacitating, to depose him and arrange for the election of a successor.¹⁰⁵ Presumably John was able to continue in office because, although the council

⁹⁸ ibid.

⁹⁹ Registrum, iv, 4, p.300.

¹⁰⁰ ibid.

¹⁰¹ Registrum v, 22, p.386.

¹⁰² Registrum v, 23, p.387.

¹⁰³ Registrum, iv, 17, p.322; This was one of the cases in which Hugh unaccountably did nothing; see 'Life,' above, p. 42.

¹⁰⁴ Mansi xx, 551.

¹⁰⁵ Registrum v, 19, p.382. H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'Pope Gregory VII and the Anglo-Norman Church and Kingdom', Studi Gregoriani ix, (1972), 96.

was held in 1078,¹⁰⁶ he remained in his bishopric until his death the following year.¹⁰⁷ By the time he died King William had prudently designated his successor - William of Bonne-Ame.¹⁰⁸

It is probable that Hubert went from Rouen to Tours with Wighard, a clerk of Besançon.¹⁰⁹ Hugh of Die was also named by the pope as one of this legation¹¹⁰ but it is possible that he did not in fact go to Tours: it was during this period that, although many times mentioned by Gregory as being about to take action in various affairs, he appears to have been completely inactive.¹¹¹ Some time later that year Hubert was involved with Hugo-Rainard, bishop of Langres, in the excommunication of Count Robert of Flanders.¹¹² This was one of the occasions where Gregory showed himself opposed to the action of his legates. Hugo-Rainard was reprimanded because he had dared to take this step without an order from the pope 'and the consent of my vicar, the bishop of Die.' Neither Hugo-Rainard nor Hubert, 'legate of the Roman church,' had any authority in the matter 'nor in those parts.' As always, Gregory was not prepared to recognise any autonomous power in his legates, in spite of the confidence in their judgement implicit in such phrases as 'obey and heed him...as though you actually heard us speaking,'¹¹³ and 'listen to him as to ourself...'¹¹⁴ Even 'my vicar,' Hugh of Die, is not envisaged as making decisions, merely as ratifying the orders

¹⁰⁶ Mansi xx, 507.

¹⁰⁷ Gams, p.614. Gall. Chris. xi, 36-37.

¹⁰⁸ D. C. Douglas, William the Conqueror, (London 1977), pp. 257 and 339.

¹⁰⁹ E. V. 23, p.61.

¹¹⁰ ibid. 'It seemed good for us...to commission on our behalf the lord Hugh, bishop of Die...

¹¹¹ See 'Life,' above pp. 42-45.

¹¹² E. V. 24, p.63.

¹¹³ E. V. 21, p.57.

¹¹⁴ Registrum vii, 6, p.465. ...ut eum sicut nos audiat...

from Rome. Hugh was instructed to go to Flanders to take charge of the case.¹¹⁵ Almost a year later Gregory was still angry about this affair. In a letter calling Hubert to Rome to discuss matters of importance in the Anglo-Norman church the pope again reproached him for what had happened in Flanders which was 'unjust and against reason' and urged him to come to an agreement with Hugh of Die to make some reparation to the count,¹¹⁶ but there is no indication that this was ever done.

A letter from the pope to William of England suggests that Hubert was in Rome early in 1080.¹¹⁷ He was then sent back to the English court with letters to the king,¹¹⁸ to Matilda¹¹⁹ and to their son, Robert.¹²⁰ Although it is not explicit in these letters, the reply from William to the pope makes it clear that Hubert had, on Gregory's behalf, linked a demand for fealty from the English king to the payment of the census - a demand which William indignantly rejected. 'One (request, the payment of the census) I have granted; the other I have not granted. I neither wished nor wish to perform fealty...'¹²¹ Gregory's earlier letter, combining fulsome praise for the Conqueror with a not very subtle reminder that he owed his present glory to Gregory's personal intervention, might be regarded as part of a softening-up process before Hubert arrived.

Notum esse tibi credo, excellentissime fili, priusquam ad pontificale culmen ascenderem quanto semper te sincere dilectionis affectu amavi, qualem etiam me tuis negotiis et quam efficacem exhibui insuper ut ad regale fastigium cresceres quanto studio laboravi.

¹¹⁵ Registrum vi, 7, p.407. This was another case in which he appeared to do nothing; see above p. 43.

¹¹⁶ Registrum vii, 1, p.458.

¹¹⁷ Registrum vii, 23, p.499.

¹¹⁸ Registrum vii, 25, p.505.

¹¹⁹ Registrum vii, 26, p. 507.

¹²⁰ Registrum vii, 27, p.508.

¹²¹ Lanfranc of Canterbury, Letter 39, ed. H. Clover and M. Gibson (Oxford 1979), pp. 130-132.

Qua pro re a quibusdam fratribus magnam pene infamiam
pertuli summurmurantibus quod ad tanta homicidia
perpetranda tanto favore meam operam impendissem.¹²²

There is a curious sequel to this mission. Hubert is not mentioned again in Gregory's letters but a letter from Urban II to Anselm of Bec, written in August 1089, shows that he had died at Bec.

... Huberti vero nostri subdiaconi qui apud vos
defunctus dicitur si qua res apud te dimisse sunt ad
nos citius destinabit. Cum enim a domino praede-
cessore nostro sanctae memoriae Gregorio legationem in
Anglorum regno acceperit, multa ex censu beati Petri
dicitur collegisse; quae si apud vos sunt, citius ad
nos volumus destinari necessitati sanctae Ecclesiae
profutura.¹²³

Evidently Hubert had never returned to Rome with the money received from William. Had he handed it over to the monks at Bec and, if so, did they know what it was? And why did the papacy never pursue this? In view of the chaotic situation in Rome after Henry IV's entry into the city, Gregory VII may have felt that the money was safer in Bec, or he may have simply forgotten about it, but seven years was a long time to have allowed a large sum of money to remain unaccounted for.

---***---

ALBERT.

This man is only mentioned once, in association with the legate Hubert.¹²⁴

---***---

¹²² Registrum vii, 23, p.499.

¹²³ JL 5406; PL 151, 305, xxiii.

¹²⁴ See above, p. 180.

WIGHARD.

Like Albert, Wighard is only mentioned once by Gregory VII, also in association with Hubert.¹²⁵ H.E.J. Cowdrey suggests that he may be the decanus of Notre-Dame and Saint Paul, Besançon, mentioned in a diploma of Henry IV of 1067.¹²⁶

---***---

TEUZO, MONK.¹²⁷

Associated with Hubert in the affair of Dol, the monk Teuzo is a mysterious figure who only appears three times in Gregory VII's correspondence, and only in connection with that case.¹²⁸ It is not known to what monastery he belonged nor how he came to be employed as a legate. Gregory thought well enough of him to use him in the delicate matter of the bishopric of Dol in spite of his doubtful health,¹²⁹ but he exceeded his brief when he criticised William the Conqueror. William had prevented Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury from coming to Rome at the time of Gregory's elevation to the papacy (or Gregory chose to believe so) but, although the pope complained of this to Hubert, he was annoyed when Teuzo, his legate, spoke out against the king.¹³⁰ As always, Gregory was determined that William should be treated with care although 'even a pagan king' would not have behaved so

¹²⁵ See above p. 182.

¹²⁶ E. V. 23, p. 61, n. 4; See Diploma Heinrici IV 106, MGH Dipl. 6, 253-4.

¹²⁷ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.93. See below, 'Legates of Urban II' for references to Teuzo in Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen.

¹²⁸ Registrum iv, 17, p.322; v, 22, p.386; vii, 1, p.458.

¹²⁹ Registrum iv, 17, p.322. ...si ereptum ab infirmitate poterimus...

¹³⁰ Registrum vii, 1, p.458.

outrageously.¹³¹ Perhaps because of this lapse, or because of his bad health, Teuzo does not seem to have been employed again by Gregory. He was taken up by Hugh of Die and was at the turbulent council of Poitiers in January 1078, when he was almost killed by the soldiers of Archbishop Ralph I of Tours.¹³² Sending him to Rome to give a full report of that council Hugh described him as 'your son and our faithful co-worker in the Lord.'¹³³

---***---

JOHN MINUTUS and PETER.¹³⁴

Replying to William of England's messages of congratulation in April 1074, Gregory said that two of his legates, John Minutus and Peter, would be with William to direct him in his foundation of the abbey of St. Stephen in Caen.¹³⁵ Neither of these men is referred to again as a legate in France. Peter could be the envoy sent to King Michael of Serbia in 1078.¹³⁶

---***---

¹³¹ ibid. nemo enim regum etiam paganorum contra apostolicam sedem hoc presumpsit temptare...

¹³² Letter of Hugh to Gregory, PL 157, vii, 510D; quo fratrem T. in mortem dedissent...

¹³³ ibid. 511B; Teuzo filius vester fidelissimus cooperator noster in domino...

¹³⁴ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.94. Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p. 140, lists a John Minutus as a cardinal priest in Santa Maria in Trastevere, but does not identify him with this man.

¹³⁵ Registrum i, 70, p.100. William built this abbey in return for an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of his marriage by Nicholas II in 1059: Douglas, William the Conqueror, pp. 79-80, citing Milo Crispin, Chronique du Bec, (ed.Porée), p.90.

¹³⁶ Registrum v, 12, p.365.

BERNARD, ABBOT OF SAINT VICTOR IN MARSEILLES.¹³⁷

In May 1077, Gregory sent two legates to Germany to endeavour to persuade the rival kings, Henry and Rudolf, to give him a safe-conduct into that country so that he might arbitrate between them.¹³⁸ One of these legates, Abbot Bernard of St. Victor in Marseilles, was taken prisoner by Henry's forces¹³⁹ but his captivity cannot have lasted long because he was again on legation in Germany the following September.¹⁴⁰

In February 1079, the pope told Count Centullus of Béarn that he was sending Bernard to join Amatus of Oloron on a legation to the count si ad vestrīs partes poterit pervenire,¹⁴¹ but it is not known if he ever went on this mission. The uncertainty about his ability to get there may have been because of his health; he died in July of that year on his way from Rome to Marseilles.¹⁴² In January Gregory had written to the monks of Saint Victor apologising to them for employing their abbot for so long as his legate and eulogising him for his devoted service to Saint Peter and to the pope himself. In acie nobis adhesit et adjutorium Christo gubernante impendit.¹⁴³ From Gregory there could be no higher praise.

Bernard's brother, Richard, who was to succeed him in the abbacy, was already a cardinal-priest of the Roman church and it seems possible that this office was also conferred on Bernard before his death. In his letter to the monks of Saint Victor

¹³⁷ Schieffer; Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.111. Although, with the exception of one doubtful appearance (see below), he was never on legation in France, Bernard is included among these legates because of his abbacy of Saint Victor, in Marseilles.

¹³⁸ Registrum iv, 23, p.334.

¹³⁹ Berthold of Reichenau; Annales, MGH 5, 299.

¹⁴⁰ Registrum v, 7, p.356.

¹⁴¹ Registrum vi, 20, p.431. See below, Amatus, p.

¹⁴² Berthold; Annales, MGH 5, 299.

¹⁴³ Registrum vi, 15, p.419.

Gregory announced his intention to unite their monastery with the church of Saint Paul in Rome, taking it, like Cluny, under the protection of the apostolic see. The chronicler Berthold of Reichenau wrote:

Abbas quoque Massiliensis, Bernhardus nomine, vir non minimae sanctitatis, sapientiae, religionis caritatisque ...domnus papa unice sibi praerogavit et idcirco Romae sancti Pauli aecclesia satis idoneum hunc iam primicerium incardinavit¹⁴⁴

but the precise significance of the term incardinavit is doubtful. Was Bernard made a cardinal-priest or merely incorporated into the church of Saint Paul? Gregory wrote two letters about Bernard after his death, one to his brother, the cardinal priest Richard, the other to the monks of Saint Victor, but he did not refer to him as a cardinal in either letter.

---***---

RICHARD, ABBOT OF ST. VICTOR, CARDINAL PRIEST.¹⁴⁵

Richard had been made a cardinal priest by Alexander II, but it is not known to what church he was attached.¹⁴⁶ Before he succeeded Bernard in the abbacy of St. Victor in 1079, he was employed by Gregory VII as a legate in Spain¹⁴⁷ and he and his brother were regarded with esteem and affection by the pope. The letter to Richard after Bernard's death shows, in its frequent confusion of the first person singular and plural, a degree of emotion which Gregory had not displayed since his early months in the papacy.¹⁴⁸ This emotion appears again in the fulsome letter he wrote at the same time to the monks of Saint

¹⁴⁴ Berthold, Annales, a. 1079, MGH 5, 299.

¹⁴⁵ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.129; Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, pp.217-8

¹⁴⁶ Gall.Chris. vi, 44.

¹⁴⁷ Registrum, v, 21, p.384.

¹⁴⁸ Registrum vii, 7, p. 466; Volo ergo...Volumus etiam...

Victor about their choice of Richard as Bernard's successor.¹⁴⁹ He referred to Richard in other letters as filius dilectus¹⁵⁰ and karissimus filius.¹⁵¹ Both before he was elected to the abbacy in his brother's place and afterwards Richard was chiefly concerned in the affairs of Spain and with Cluniac influence on Spanish monasticism. He was, however, involved in a case in Toulouse which illustrates Gregory VII's adverse reaction to an assumption of authority by his legate.

A quarrel arose between the canons of the suburban church of Saint Sernin, near Toulouse, and the cathedral chapter of Saint Stephen, recently reformed by the bishop, Isarnus. The cause of the quarrel is not mentioned anywhere, nor the precise date. Gregory referred to it in 1082 or 1083 as having arisen 'lately' (noviter).¹⁵² To strengthen their hand against the bishop, the canons of Saint Sernin sought and obtained from Gregory a privilege granting them papal protection and direct subjection to the Roman see.¹⁵³ Sometime during 1082 or 1083 Gregory wrote to inform Richard that the canons of Saint Sernin, relying on this privilege, had sought his help in several cases. One of these cases was a complaint that the monks of the monastery of Moissac, supported by the forces of Count William of Toulouse, were retaining possession of a church which the legate, Amatus of Oloron, had declared to be the property of Saint Sernin. Gregory urged Richard to see that the monks and the count withdrew from the situation. As Moissac was a daughter house of Cluny, he suggested that Abbot Hugh be called in to

¹⁴⁹ Registrum vii, 8, p.469.

¹⁵⁰ Registrum vii, 6, p.466.

¹⁵¹ Registrum viii, 4, p.520.

¹⁵² Registrum ix, 30, p.615.

¹⁵³ H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p.14, n. 3, mentions a seventeenth century document which states that this privilege was granted at the request of Isarnus. If this document is accurate it seems obvious that the monks forged letters from Isarnus to accompany their request.

ensure that the monks behaved with justice.¹⁵⁴ But before this was done the zealous bishop, Isarnus, expelled the canons from Saint Sernin itself and installed some monks from Moissac in their place to inaugurate a monastery on Cluniac lines.¹⁵⁵ The crisis was resolved when Hugh of Cluny went over the head of the abbot of Moissac and ordered the monks to withdraw from Saint Sernin, which they did.¹⁵⁶ But Richard, who had certainly been urged to severe measures by the pope, went further and excommunicated the monks, thereby drawing down on himself a stinging rebuke from the pope. 'We will and command you that you release them from the bond of excommunication and that in future you take every precaution not so lightly to pass a sentence of this kind against religious men.'¹⁵⁷ He had told Richard quite specifically that he would have the support of Rome in any action he might take to safeguard the libertas Romana of the canons of Saint Sernin¹⁵⁸ but, as in the case of Hugh of Die,¹⁵⁹ he failed to support his legate although he had given him absolute authority to act as he saw fit.

When Richard became abbot of St. Victor in 1079, Gregory occasionally dropped his title of cardinal, but he also used it several times, in conjunction with that of abbot, as 'Richard, cardinal and abbot';¹⁶⁰ 'Richard, cardinal of the holy Roman church and abbot of Marseilles';¹⁶¹ 'Richard, cardinal-priest of

¹⁵⁴ Registrum ix, 30, p.615; ...si qui illorum monitis immo beati Petri obtemperare contempserint quamcumque in eorum audaciam sententiam protuleris scias auctoritate nostra firmandam.

¹⁵⁵ E. Magnou, L'Introduction de la Réforme grégorienne à Toulouse. (Cahiers de l'association Marc Bloch de Toulouse iii. Toulouse 1958). Quoted in H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p.116.

¹⁵⁶ E. V. 50, p.121.

¹⁵⁷ ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Registrum ix, 30, p.615.

¹⁵⁹ See 'Life,' above p. 39.

¹⁶⁰ E. V. 44, p.107.

¹⁶¹ ibid. 50, p.121.

the holy Roman church;¹⁶² In view of this it is surprising that Fliche, pointing out the inaccuracies in the Cassinese chronicle, should say that Richard could not have been among the electors of Desiderius of Monte Cassino to the papacy in 1086 because he was not a member of the Roman clergy.¹⁶³ The Papal Election Decree of 1059 had given electoral rights to the cardinal bishops, but by the 1080s the belief had grown among the other ranks of cardinals that they were lawful electors. The summary of the decree of 1059 in the canonical collections of Anselm of Lucca, Bonizo of Sutri and Cardinal Deusdedit confirmed this belief by replacing the term cardinales episcopi with cardinales.¹⁶⁴ There is no indication anywhere that Richard lost his Roman office after he became abbot of Saint Victor. He would, therefore, have been entitled to participate in a papal election.

During the period when Desiderius was refusing to accept the papacy, Richard had possibly returned to St. Victor. The following year he accompanied Hugh of Lyons to Capua and was present when Desiderius was finally persuaded to accept the office. He was excommunicated at the council of Benevento, together with Hugh of Lyons, by Desiderius, then Pope Victor III, for trying to create a schism in the Church.¹⁶⁵ There is no record of the precise date of his reinstatement. He was back in Spain the following year, but his actions at the council of Husillos (1088) were declared null and void by Urban II because of his excommunication.¹⁶⁶ However, in 1089 the pope confirmed

¹⁶² Registrum ix, 6, p.581.

¹⁶³ Fliche, La Réforme Grégorienne iii, 210; '...qui ne faisait pas part du clergé de Rome.'

¹⁶⁴ Anselm of Lucca, Collectio Canonum, ed. F. Thaner. vi, 12-13, pp. 272-3; Bonizo of Sutri, Liber de vita Christiana, ed. E. Perels, iv, 87, p. 156; Deusdedit, i.168-9, ed. V. Wolf von Glanvell, p. 107. This change appears also in the forged 'imperialist' version of the decree.

¹⁶⁵ Chronica Mon. Cass., III, 72, MGH 34, 454. See 'Life,' above, p.

¹⁶⁶ H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p. 245.

the privileges of St. Victor, so presumably Richard had been restored to communion with the Church before that.¹⁶⁷ He was at the council of Clermont with Urban II.¹⁶⁸ He became archbishop of Narbonne in 1107 but did not retire from his abbacy, which was carried on by a vice abbas until 1113.¹⁶⁹ He died in 1121.¹⁷⁰

---***---

ROGER, SUBDEACON.¹⁷¹

Roger appears twice in Gregory's correspondence in 1078. In April he was commissioned by the pope to go with Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny to investigate the position of Rainerius bishop of Orléans.¹⁷² The latter was reputed to have been uncanonically elected and he had for several years been indulging in simony and defying papal authority by refusing to come to Rome to answer the charges against him.¹⁷³ The legates were to convene a council at which Rainerius should either clear himself or be deposed and excommunicated. This was one of the instances when Hugh of Die did nothing¹⁷⁴ and more than a year later the case of Rainerius was still unresolved.¹⁷⁵ He attended the

¹⁶⁷ PL 151, Ep. xiii, 296.

¹⁶⁸ Gall. Chris., i, 686.

¹⁶⁹ Gall. Chris. i, 686.

¹⁷⁰ Gall. Chris. vi, 46-47, quoting the necrologies of Narbonne and St. Victor, asserts that he died in 1121; Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.217, says this is 'probably' correct.

¹⁷¹ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.108; Hüls Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.253.

¹⁷² Registrum v, 20, p.383.

¹⁷³ Registrum iii, 17, p.279; iv, 9, p.307; v, 8, p.358; v, 9, p.360.

¹⁷⁴ See 'Life,' above, p. 42.

¹⁷⁵ Registrum vi, 23, p.435.

council of Issoudun in March 1081, still bishop of Orléans.¹⁷⁶

Sometime after 9 March 1078, when Gregory reversed many of the sentences imposed by Hugh of Die at the councils of Autun and Poitiers,¹⁷⁷ he wrote to the people and clergy of Tours that he was sending Roger to them 'with an envoy of the bishop of Die.' Roger was to ensure that in the restoration of the archbishop, Ralph, to his episcopal office no injustice had been done. He was also to evaluate the accusations still being made against Ralph.¹⁷⁸ A letter from Gregory to Ralph, in the summer of 1078,¹⁷⁹ infers that Roger was never sent to Tours and that Hubert and Wighard¹⁸⁰ had been commissioned to accompany Hugh of Die. Jean de Montclos, however, believed that Roger was in Tours at that time and could have been the person to whom Berengar wrote defending his theories during his exile in Saint Cosme.¹⁸¹ Roger is found in the train of Urban II at Piacenza,¹⁸² but not after that.

---***---

PETER, CARDINAL BISHOP OF ALBANO.¹⁸³

Peter may be regarded as a genuine hero of the reform movement. In February 1068 he underwent trial by fire in order to convict Bishop Peter of Florence of simony and other crimes. He was at that time a monk in Vallombrosa but shortly afterwards became prior of Passignano, and subsequently abbot of Fuceccio.

¹⁷⁶ Mansi xx, 579.

¹⁷⁷ Registrum v, 17, p.387.

¹⁷⁸ E. V. 22, p.59.

¹⁷⁹ E. V. 23, p.61.

¹⁸⁰ See above p. 182.

¹⁸¹ Jean de Montclos, Lanfranc et Berenger; la Controverse Eucharistique du xie Siecle, (Louvain, 1971), p. 243.

¹⁸² Hüls, Kardinal, Klerus und Kirchen, p.253.

¹⁸³ Schieffer p. 120; Hüls, Kardinal, Klerus und Kirchen, pp. 90-91.

He was appointed to the cardinal-bishopric of Albano by Alexander II but did not at once give up his abbacy.¹⁸⁴ He was one of Gregory's most trusted allies, as may be seen from his important mission to Cluny in 1080.

The privileged position of Cluny, exempted from all control except that of Rome, was a constant source of irritation to the bishops of Mâcon, in whose diocese Cluny was situated.¹⁸⁵ In 1079 a dispute arose between the canons of the cathedral of Saint Vincent in Mâcon and Cluny. The bishop of Mâcon, Landericus de Brézé,¹⁸⁶ supported by his metropolitan, Gebuin of Lyons, went to Rome to enlist the help of the pope. Although Landericus had always met with Gregory's approval,¹⁸⁷ he did not succeed in making him take action against Cluny. Landericus and Gebuin therefore took the law into their own hands. Gebuin placed an interdict on several of Cluny's churches and expelled the monks from Pouilly-les-Feurs, which Cluny had owned since 966. Landericus excommunicated certain of Cluny's chapels and their chaplains.

This was a direct challenge to the privileged position of Cluny. Abbot Hugh sent his prior, Odo of Châtillon (the future pope Urban II) to make a formal protest in Rome and Gregory replied by sending Peter of Albano to Cluny as his legate.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁴ Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.90.

¹⁸⁵ See the legation of Peter Damiani to Cluny in 1063 to deal with Drogo of Mâcon, who had attempted to hold a council in the monastery, accompanied by a band of soldiers; also the earlier confrontation between Walter of Mâcon and Abbot Odilo of Cluny (c. 1033), when the abbot, at that time without papal support, was forced to submit to the bishop: H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, pp. 45-48.

¹⁸⁶ See 'Suffragans,' below p. 239.

¹⁸⁷ E. V. 4, p.9; '...the love which we have towards your bishop'.... Landericus had been consecrated by Gregory himself.

¹⁸⁸ H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform pp. 54-5 and 'Cardinal Peter of Albano: a Legatine Mission to Cluny, 1080;' Journal of Theological Studies, 1973, pp.480-491. When Cluny was in trouble

On 6 February 1080 Peter held a council at Anse and he left an account of his proceedings at Cluny and in its neighbourhood. This is of interest because, besides redefining Cluny's privileges and prohibiting all murder, robbery and plunder in the vicinity of Cluny, it gives the precise topographical limits of her territory.¹⁸⁹ At the council Landericus was suspended from office, the churches which Gebuin had placed under interdict were freed and any further such bans forbidden. The monastery at Pouilly-les-Feurs was restored to Cluny.¹⁹⁰ Landericus seems to have been reluctant to comply with these decisions and he was instructed by Gregory to go to 'a public place between Mâcon and Cluny' and there to confirm Cluny's privileges and to live in peace with Hugh of Cluny until this dispute was settled before Hugh of Die.¹⁹¹ There is no record of Hugh having adjudicated in this case.

There was no question this time of any lack of support for the legate's handling of the situation, even though it involved the deposition of a bishop and the over-riding of the decisions of a metropolitan. In this case, unlike the affair of Saint Sernin in which the legate Richard was involved, Peter of Albano was on the side of the angels. To tamper with Cluniac privilege was to defy the central authority of Rome and to merit the utmost severity. Only a few weeks later, at the Lent council in Rome, Gregory underlined Cluny's extraordinary position. 'No person whatsoever, whether it be archbishop or bishop, whether it be king, duke, marquis, prince or count or even my legate, may ever open his mouth against this place and this monastery'.¹⁹²

she always obtained immediate and high-powered assistance from Rome: witness the legation of Peter Damien in 1063.

¹⁸⁹ Carta Petri Albanensis episcopi et cardinalis Romani de immunitate Cluniaci. Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms Lat. Nouv. Acq., 2262, No.9, pp. 8-10

¹⁹⁰ ibid.

¹⁹¹ E. V. 38, p.95.

¹⁹² Bullarium Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis; in fol. Lugduni 1680; quoted in H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p.272, n. 3.

Gregory, although seeming to lack consistency in many of his judgements, remained steadfast in his support for everything the libertas of Cluny stood for.

Peter of Albano was in France again, with Prince Gisulf of Salerno, to seek help for Gregory against Henry IV. The date of this mission is not certain, but it was probably in 1084.¹⁹³ He does not appear to have returned to Rome until 1087, two years after Gregory's death, when he took part in the consecration of Victor III.¹⁹⁴ He died in 1089.¹⁹⁵

---***---

GISULF, PRINCE OF SALERNO.¹⁹⁶

Prince Gisulf was the only layman ever employed as legate by Gregory VII and he seems to have been employed on just one occasion. Unlike Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia, he remained completely faithful to the pope, although his fidelity may have been prompted as much by fear of his more powerful neighbours in Apulia and Capua as by any religious sentiment. He was among those who responded to the pope's call for help against the barbarian forces threatening the Byzantine empire in 1073-4,¹⁹⁷ but the enterprise had to be abandoned, largely due to the trouble between Gisulf's army and the Pisans in the train of the Countesses Beatrice and Matilda.¹⁹⁸ In December 1076 Robert Guiscard invaded Salerno and Gisulf took refuge in Rome.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹³ See below.

¹⁹⁴ Hüls, Kardinale, Klerus und Kirchen, p.90.

¹⁹⁵ ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p.138.

¹⁹⁷ Registrum i, 46, p.69; ii, 37, p.172.

¹⁹⁸ Amatus of Monte Cassino, L'Ystoire de li Normant, (Paris, 1835), 7, xiii, 203.

¹⁹⁹ Peter Deacon, Chronica Mon. Cass., iii, 45, MGH 34, 422.

Guiscard did not pursue him into the lands of St. Peter, but the existence of this threatening situation may have influenced Gregory VII to return to Rome from Canossa, rather than wait for the meeting at Augsburg which might have salvaged his credibility in Germany. In 1077 another attack on Salerno by Robert Guiscard, this time supported by Richard of Capua, resulted in the excommunication of both men by the pope,²⁰⁰ who seems on the whole to have lost more than he gained by his friendship with Gisulf.

The sole occasion on which Gregory employed Prince Gisulf as a legate was in 1084, when he sent a letter to all the faithful, describing the disastrous situation in Italy and asking for help.²⁰¹ Gisulf, with Peter of Albano, took this letter to France. According to the chronicler Hugh of Flavigny they travelled by sea to Saint Gilles, in Languedoc, and visited Cluny and other monasteries.²⁰² The pope wrote to Gisulf and Peter, directing them to collect money for him in France.²⁰³ Caspar, relying on the 'pertinent arguments' of Sander, puts this letter among those written in 1081²⁰⁴ but it seems more likely that it was written during this legation, as there is no record of their having been together at any other time. Cowdrey, citing Borino, prefers 1084.²⁰⁵

---***---

AMATUS BISHOP OF OLORON.²⁰⁶

Amatus of Oloron shared with Hugh of Die the greater part

²⁰⁰ Registrum v, 14(a), p.371, No.8. Chron. Mon. Cass., MGH xxxiv, 423.

²⁰¹ E. V. 54, p. 129; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 464.

²⁰² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 464-465.

²⁰³ Registrum viii, 23, p.565.

²⁰⁴ ibid. n. 4; 'mit sachlichen Argumenten'.

²⁰⁵ E. V. p.129, footnote.

²⁰⁶ Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, pp.89, 111-115; A. Degert, 'Amat d'Oloron, un Ouvrier de la Réforme au XIe. Siècle: Révue des Questions Historiques lxxxiv (1908) 33-84.

of the legatine duties in France during the Gregorian period, but little is known of him before his appearance in Gregory's letters. Degert surmises that he came from Gascony or Béarn, because it was customary for bishops to be recruited from the local aristocracy²⁰⁷ and Oloron, in the metropolitancy of Aux, was too small a see to attract ambitious men from other regions.²⁰⁸ There is no contemporary record of his personal history. He was elected to the bishopric of Oloron in 1073,²⁰⁹ but we know from the anonymous canon of Albi that he was a legate before he was a bishop;

Quo tempore Romanae ecclesiae legatus, Amatus nomine, missus ad partes Aquitanicas et Hispanicas, qui postea fuit Oleronensis episcopus.²¹⁰

He is first mentioned by Gregory VII in a letter to the bishop of Poitiers, Isembert, written in September 1074.²¹¹ The confused history of the continuing feud between this bishop and the canons of his cathedral on the one hand and the canons of the church of Saint Hilary in Poitiers on the other is studied in another chapter.²¹² In this letter, Gregory upbraided Isembert for his outrageous behaviour at a council held at Poitiers by Amatus (obviously already a legate) and Archbishop Joscelyn of Bordeaux. This council was held to review the question of the marriage of Duke William VIII of Aquitaine with the daughter of Robert, duke of Burgundy.²¹³ When he had given judgement at an earlier date in favour of the canons of Saint Hilary, the pope had instructed Isembert to attend the council which would, he said, be presided over by the metropolitan, Joscelyn. It was

²⁰⁷ See below, p. 247-8, where this is discussed.

²⁰⁸ Degert, 36.

²⁰⁹ Gams, p.590; Gall. Chris. i, 1265-6.

²¹⁰ Notitia de Ecclesia S. Eugenii de Vianco, scripta ab anonymo Albiensis ecclesiae canonico. RHG xiv, 50.

²¹¹ Registrum ii, 2, p.125.

²¹² See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 93.

²¹³ Mansi xx, 447.

typical of Gregory's interference in local affairs that, when the council took place in the summer of 1074, it was under the jurisdiction of a legate, Amatus. It may have been as much anger at this flouting of traditional practice as disappointment at the decision in favour of Saint Hilary that caused Isembert to burst into the council with a troop of soldiers and to attack the papal representative and the archbishop.²¹⁴ Isembert was instructed to come to Rome for the council on 30 November, but he did not appear.²¹⁵

For the next three years there is no reference to Amatus in Gregory's correspondence and there is nowhere any hint of what he may have been doing to merit the honour which was about to be conferred on him. In June 1077, in a letter to the Christians of Narbonne, Gascony and Spain, Gregory announced that he was sending Amatus as his legate to those regions 'in order that whatever error ought there to be eradicated he may utterly root out and that, by God's grace, he may attend with careful vigilance to planting the seed-beds of virtue'.²¹⁶ Although Aquitaine was not mentioned, Amatus himself claimed that the affairs of that province also came under his jurisdiction.

Ego Amatus...jussu et vice domini papae Gregorii VII
ob ecclesiarum Dei correctionem in Aquitaniae partes
directus...²¹⁷

He thus shared with Hugh of Die the distinction of having been given a definite appointment as a permanent legate in a specific area and of having been announced to the people of that area with a degree of formality.²¹⁸

²¹⁴ ibid.

²¹⁵ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 94.

²¹⁶ E. V. 21, p.57.

²¹⁷ Litterae Amati Ellorensis episcopi A. S. Legati; RHG xiv, 763

²¹⁸ For Hugh's appointment see Registrum i, 69, p.99 and E. V. 12, p.29.

Amatus began his legation in Spain, but came at once into confrontation with a French archbishop: the frequently excommunicated archbishop of Narbonne, Geoffrey of Cerdana, whose father had purchased the see for him when he was ten.²¹⁹ Geoffrey succeeded in breaking up the first council held by Amatus at Gerona by the use of force²²⁰ (as Isembert had done at Poitiers), but Amatus convened another at Besalu on 6 December, 1077, to deal with Geoffrey and others accused of simony.²²¹ This council was attended by the bishops Raymond of Elne, Peter of Carcassone and Berengar of Agde, who had already been disciplined at the Roman council of 1076.²²² These men all expressed great annoyance with the count of Besalu because he had allowed the papal legate to hold a council in their region.²²³ Their anger may have stemmed in part from a natural desire to hold on to the ecclesiastical offices which they had purchased, but it is possible that it also had some reference to a pastoral letter which Gregory had sent to the rulers of Spain at the same time as his letter recommending Amatus. In it he stated categorically that the kingdom of Spain was the property of Saint Peter and of the holy Roman Church. This fact, he said, had been ignored for some time due to circumstances in Spain and to the negligence of his predecessors. He was now, however, reclaiming this proprietorship, with the implication that the tribute from Spain, never collected while the Saracens were in power, would once more be levied.²²⁴ The anti-legatine feeling manifested at Gerona and Besalu may have arisen from Spanish exasperation at having merely exchanged the Saracen yoke for a Roman one. But Amatus remained in control, excommunicated Geoffrey, deposed

²¹⁹ D. Vassete et Devie, Histoire de Languedoc (ed privat) iii, p.248. Chartres no. ccxi; cited in Degert, Amat d'Oloron, 50.

²²⁰ Fr. Diago, Historia de los Condes de Barcelona, folio 136, Barcelona 1603: cited in Degert, Amat d'Oloron, 50.

²²¹ Mansi xx, 491.

²²² Mansi xx, 467: Registrum iii, 10(a), p.268.

²²³ Fr. Diago, Historia, 51.

²²⁴ Registrum iv, 28, p.343.

the simoniac bishops and arranged that their successors and the count of Besalu and his successors should pay an annual sum to Saint Peter's in Rome.²²⁵ In spite of the strong antipathy of the bishops to the actions of the legate there seems to have been no question of their 'running to Rome' for a reversal of his decisions, as was the case of the bishops chastised by Hugh of Die at his councils in Burgundy;²²⁶ nor was there any question of a wholesale rejection of his sentences, such as Hugh experienced at that time.²²⁷

Amatus went back to Gerona early in the following year (1078) and held another, more successful, council.²²⁸ Although held in Spain, it is worth considering here because it demonstrates how Amatus undertook the implementation of reform at the outset of his career. Seven bishops were present: Berengar of Gerona, Berengar of Osona, Raymond of Elne, Raymond of Rota, Peter of Carcassonne, Humbert of Barcelona and William of Comminges, with the archdeacon Fulco appearing for the bishop of Urgel. Thirteen decrees were promulgated, each dealing with an aspect of reform. Intercourse with women was forbidden, not only to priests but to all those who served at the altar. The sons of priests could not be promoted to any office which they did not already hold. No bishop was to ordain a clerk for money, nor secure his promotion for money, nor sell the offices of the church.²²⁹ These decrees are very much in line with those enacted at various councils in France at the same time, but there is no record of the violent resistance to the legislation prohibiting clerical marriage which had manifested itself at Paris and Rouen a few years earlier²³⁰ and which was expressed

²²⁵ Mansi xx, 491.

²²⁶ See PL 157, vii, 511C; letter of Hugh of Die to Gregory VII after the council of Poitiers in January, 1078,

²²⁷ Registrum v, 17, p.378.

²²⁸ Mansi xx, 520.

²²⁹ ibid.

²³⁰ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 77.

by the clerks of Cambrai after the council of Poitiers, which was also held early in 1078.²³¹

A decree (cap. 9) was promulgated at the council of Gerona which illustrates a reactionary tendency in the legate Amatus:

Item statuerunt ut si quae ecclesiae per pecuniam essent consecratae vel a simoniaco a legitimo canonice consecrentur episcopo. Si qui etiam clerici pecuniam praebendo vel a simoniaco sunt ordinati eodem modo a catholico ordinentur episcopo. Non enim in his fit reiteratio sed ipsa consecratio; quoniam nihil praecesserat quod ratum haberi queat.²³²

This was a retrograde step for the reform movement. In Milan in 1052 Peter Damian had imposed severe penalties on those clerks and priests ordained by simoniacs, but he had not deprived them of their office, maintaining that the intention of the person to be ordained was what mattered, not the state of the ordinand's soul.²³³ At the Roman council of 1060 Nicholas II had gone even further, allowing all clerks who had been ordained by simoniacs to retain their office 'from motives of mercy rather than of justice,' although he directed that for the future anyone ordained by a simoniac should be deposed.²³⁴ At Gerona Amatus and the bishops were returning to the harsher doctrine of Humbert of Silva Candida²³⁵ and, like him, showing a fine disregard of the fact that the implementation of this decree would have eliminated a large part of the Spanish clergy. Although there is no indication that Amatus ever sought to apply these

²³¹ RHG xiv, 778.

²³² Mansi xx, 520;

²³³ Peter Damian, Actus Mediolani, PL 145, 89-98.

²³⁴ Mansi xix, 899.

²³⁵ Humbert, Libri iii adversus simoniacos, Libelli de lite, i, 118; ...nec enim qui honorem non habet honorem dare potest.

sanctions, they may have reflected his own position.²³⁶ Was this reactionary legislation endorsed by Gregory VII? At the Roman council in November that same year (1078) it was decreed: Ordinationes que interveniente pretio vel precibus vel obsequio personae ea intentione impenso vel que non communi causam cleri et populi secundum canonicas sanctiones fiunt et ab his ad quos consecratio pertinet non comprobantur irritas esse diiudicamus.²³⁷

This would render all sacraments administered by the person ordained null and void also, but in the accounts of bishops found guilty of simony there is no record of those ordained by them having been deposed with them. (Hugh of Die turned this legislation on its head when, at the council of Poitiers he sent the bishop of Amiens, accused of simony, to Rome for judgement together with the bishops of Laon, Soissons and Senlis who had ordained him.)²³⁸ Writing to Hermann of Metz in August 1076, Gregory had said that ordination and consecration by bishops in communication with the excommunicated king was an abomination (execratio)²³⁹ but he failed to clarify the position of those who had been so consecrated or ordained. Everything that is known about his character suggests that he would have favoured a pragmatic approach, dealing with each situation on its merits. He was constantly unwilling to pursue a theoretical doctrine to its logical conclusion, when that conclusion involved the condemnation of one of those entrusted to his care. He ratified the excommunications of those sentenced by Amatus, but gave no indication of a reaction to canon 9 of the council of Gerona.

In contrast, a decree of the council of Gerona concerning lay ownership of churches demonstrates that Amatus's approach to the question was less harsh than that of Rome. Canon 13 declared

²³⁶ See L. Saltet, Les réordinations. Étude sur le sacrement de l'ordre, (Paris, 1907) pp. 207-8: 'a decision unique of its kind,' 'probably ...imputable to Amatus alone.'

²³⁷ Registrum vi, 5(b), p.400, clause 5.

²³⁸ Letter of Hugh to Gregory VII, PL 157, vii, 511B. See also 'Manasses,' below, p. 260.

²³⁹ Registrum iv, 2, p.293.

that lay men should not be owners of churches. However, if this abuse could not be avoided, they must not feel that they had any right to the offerings made in those churches or to any payment for baptisms or burials.²⁴⁰ In the decree of the Rome council of November 1078 there was no suggestion that circumstances might exist which would render lay ownership unavoidable. The decree read: Ut annuntietur laicis cum quanto periculo anime sue decimas detinent et ecclesias possident.²⁴¹ Amatus's policy of taking reform one step at a time, unlike the methods of Hugh of Die, could account for the more peaceful atmosphere in which his councils were completed.

For almost a year Amatus does not appear in the documents, although he was obviously active in the south-west of France. In February 1079 he was sent by Gregory to hear the case of the consanguineous marriage of Count Centullus of Béarn.²⁴² (This was the mission on which he was to have been joined by Abbot Bernard of Saint Victor). Amatus dealt satisfactorily with this case. The 17th century historian Marca in his Histoire de Béarn cited a charter by which Centullus presented a church to Cluny: Centullus declared that he was inspired to do this by his awareness of his sin in marrying against the law of God and at the instigation of, among others, Amatus, bishop of Oloron.²⁴³

Amatus probably went from Béarn to Bordeaux to contend with a case already tackled by Gerard of Ostia and the pope himself: the quarrel between the abbeys of Saint Séver and Sainte Croix concerning the ownership of the church of Sainte Marie de

²⁴⁰ Mansi xx, 518. Scimus quidem laicis ecclesias non competere sed ubi illi ex toto auferri non possint saltem oblationes missarum aut altarium seu primitias laicis omnino prohibemus. De coemeteriis autem et sepultura et baptisteriis exactionem fieri omnino prohibemus.

²⁴¹ Registrum vi, 5(b), xxxii, p. 402.

²⁴² Registrum vi, 20, p.431.

²⁴³ Marca, Histoire de Béarn, (Paris, 1640), 300; cited in Degert, 'Amat d'Oloron,' 58.

Soulac.²⁴⁴ This case has already been discussed in connection with papal interference in French affairs.²⁴⁵

In November 1079 Gregory wrote to the bishops and barons of Brittany requesting that they summon Amatus, 'whom we have designated as our representative in your region,' to hold a council there to deal with the subject of penance and other matters.²⁴⁶ That council may have taken place at Rennes,²⁴⁷ but there are no records extant. This letter marks a definite end to the period of Amatus's legation in Spain, Narbonne and Gascony and raises a question about the the possible reasons for his removal after only two years. Certainly the area he had originally been sent out to cover was enormous. Narbonne alone comprised ten dioceses in France²⁴⁸ and four in Spain.²⁴⁹ There were eleven dioceses in Gascony²⁵⁰ and a large territory in Spain not yet properly organised since the defeat of the Saracens, in addition to the sixteen dioceses of Aquitaine.²⁵¹ This could have been a reason for his translation to a less widespread area but there might also have been another, more discreditable. There was a suggestion that, as bishop of Oloron, Amatus had been guilty of rather less than honest behaviour in the dispute between the dioceses of Oloron and Dax, regarding the ownership of certain parishes. The only account of this complicated quarrel appears in a document entitled Controversia de Limitibus Aquensis et Olorensis Episcopatum.²⁵² In this

²⁴⁴ See 'Gerard of Ostia,' above p. 179.

²⁴⁵ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, pp. 94-5.

²⁴⁶ Registrum vii, 10, p.471.

²⁴⁷ RHG xiv, 191, note (e); Mansi xx, 527.

²⁴⁸ Gall. Chris vi.

²⁴⁹ ibid., p. 3.

²⁵⁰ Degert, 46.

²⁵¹ Gall. Chris. ii, 1 and 785 lists 6 dioceses in upper (prima) Aquitaine and ten in lower (secunda) Aquitaine.

²⁵² RHG xiv, 185 seq.

document the author, violently partisan, accuses Amatus, *vir magnae astutiae et calliditatis*, of having secured a considerable amount of territory for his diocese by trickery. It is evident that there was some truth in the story. A letter of Gregory VII to Hugh of Die and Richard of Saint Victor in 1081, informed them of the accusations against Amatus and others in the area, and of the counter charges made by Amatus.²⁵³ The pope urged Hugh and Richard, or at least one of them, to go and settle the affair on the spot. The author of the account maintained that Richard went to Béarn, where he presided at a meeting, but that Amatus, although in the area, did not appear, knowing his cause to be unjust. Richard therefore decided in favour of Dax. However the representatives from Dax foolishly omitted to secure the decision in writing and Amatus, by further machinations, was able to claim the disputed areas for his diocese after all. This anonymous chronicler is by no means reliable; there are many errors and inaccuracies in his account, but Gregory's letter indicates that there were allegations against Amatus which merited investigation. Although he did not write until 1081, he could have been aware of the accusations as early as 1079 and have felt that it would be politic to remove Amatus from the area as a legate.

In 1079 Gregory made Gebuin, archbishop of Lyons, primate over the four provinces of Lyons, Rouen, Tours and Sens.²⁵⁴ Referring to this appointment, Degert claimed that when the pope gave 'some kind of primacy or apostolic vicariate' (*une sorte de primatie ou de vicariat apostolique*) to Gebuin he was careful to detach the province of Tours in order to confide it to Amatus; also that Gebuin displayed bad temper about this.²⁵⁵ It is difficult to understand how Degert reached this conclusion. Gregory wrote four letters about the primacy - one to Gebuin himself and the others (all identical) to the archbishops of

²⁵³ E. V. 44, p.107. Amatus claimed that the churches in question had belonged 'from ancient times' to the church of Oloron.

²⁵⁴ *Registrum* vi, 34, p.447 and 35, p.450.

²⁵⁵ Degert, *Amat d'Oloron*, 65.

Rouen, Tours and Sens. In none of these is there any suggestion that he was giving Amatus special jurisdiction in Tours: his name is not even mentioned. Provincias autem illas quas vobis confirmamus dicimus Lugdunensem Rotomagensem Turonensem et Senonensem...²⁵⁶ he wrote to Gebuin; and to the three archbishops: ...apostolica vobis auctoritate precipimus ut sepedicte Lugdunesi ecclesie honorem et reverentiam a maioribus nostris de ecclesiis vestris prefixam ita vos exhibere humiliter et devote procur-etis.²⁵⁷ In the letter which Gebuin wrote to Ralph of Tours and Eusebius of Angers, to which Degert referred as evidence of the new primate's annoyance, he said categorically that the pope did not mention Amatus when writing to him.²⁵⁸ This suggests that someone, perhaps Amatus himself, was claiming that a division had been made in the primatial authority. If that were the case, Gebuin's annoyance was reasonable - and Amatus's reputation for trickery justified. Neither then or later is there any evidence that such a division had been contemplated by the pope.

Two councils are recorded as having taken place at Bordeaux, one in 1079 and one in 1080,²⁵⁹ at which both Amatus and Hugh of Die were present. We have already seen, however, that a study of the records suggests that there was only one council.²⁶⁰ On the conciliar documents the subscription of Amatus comes before that of Hugh of Die, proving that he was still the papal representative in Aquitaine, although relieved of his duties in Spain, Gascony and Narbonne.

During 1081 Amatus and Hugh appeared together at three more councils; Saintes, Issoudun and Meaux.²⁶¹ This departure from

²⁵⁶ Registrum, vi, 34, p.447.

²⁵⁷ Registrum vi, 35, p.450

²⁵⁸ RHG xiv, 671, viii; see 'Life,' above, p. 19.

²⁵⁹ Mansi xx, 527, 529, 551.

²⁶⁰ This situation is discussed in 'Agent of Reform,' above p. 124.

²⁶¹ Mansi xx, 571, 577 and 583.

their normal routine poses a tantalising problem to which there seems no obvious solution. Had Hugh been deputed to keep a watchful eye on Amatus because of the suspicions about Dax? Or was Amatus taking the role originally intended for Abbot Hugh of Cluny, that of applying a curb to the overly zealous Hugh of Die?²⁶² Nothing that remains on record for these councils, or for the preceeding one in Bordeaux, suggests that they warranted the presence of two legates.

In view of the fact that it was then more than two years (perhaps even longer) since the promulgation to the whole church of the decree against lay investiture,²⁶³ they made an interesting decision at Saintes. This allowed the abbess of Sainte Croix in Poitiers to retain her traditional rights over the canonesses of Saint Radegonde, including the rights of investiture,²⁶⁴ in spite of the fact that the abbess might be a lay woman. Also at Saintes the dispute between Tours and Dol concerning metropolitan rights was settled and the bishops and abbots of Normandy who failed to attend the council were excommunicated.²⁶⁵ Because Gregory's letter reprimanding his legates for this high-handed action is addressed to Hugh of Die and merely refers to Amatus as 'the bishop A',²⁶⁶ Degert would like to believe that Hugh alone was responsible, but he admits that as the council was presided over by Amatus he presumably could have prevented any action which seemed unjust.²⁶⁷ It is, however, true that such uncompromising severity was more in Hugh's style.

Issoudun, at which seventeen bishops were present, has

²⁶² Letter of Gregory VII to Count Robert of Flanders, Registrum ix, 34, p. 621; see 'Life,' above, p. 45.

²⁶³ Rome, November 1078; Registrum vi, 5(b), canon 3, p.403. See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 83-91.

²⁶⁴ RHG xiv, 767.

²⁶⁵ Mansi xx, 571. See 'Agent of Reform,' above p.125-6.

²⁶⁶ Registrum ix, 5, p.579.

²⁶⁷ Degert Amat d'Oloron, 70-71.

already been noted as marking an improvement in relations between the papacy and King Philip of France. At the council of Meaux the consecration of Robert, abbot of Rebais, to the see of Meaux without election and without reference to the metropolitan, Richerius of Sens, provided a new example of legatine intrusion into the province of the metropolitan, backed this time by a papal decree.²⁶⁸

After Meaux the legates parted company with nothing to show why they had spent a year together. Their most dramatic measure, the excommunication of the bishops and abbots of Normandy, had been immediately countermanded by Gregory and, with the exception of the consecration of Robert to the see of Meaux, their joint decisions appear to be of purely local importance.

Amatus held a council at Charroux in 1082 and another at Saintes, probably in 1083.²⁶⁹ Marca, in his Histoire de Béarn, claimed that Amatus was in Rome to attend Gregory's last council in November 1083.²⁷⁰ He then retired to his diocese where he remained until made archbishop of Bordeaux at a council at Saintes in 1089. It is interesting that his election took place nolente comite, that is, against the will of Duke William IX of Aquitaine.²⁷¹ He resumed his legatine journeys under Pope Urban II.²⁷²

²⁶⁸ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 127-131, where these councils are discussed.

²⁶⁹ Mansi xx, 581 and 589. The only source for these councils is the inaccurate chronicler of Saint Maxienne.

²⁷⁰ Histoire de Béarn, p. 323.

²⁷¹ Chronicon S. Maxentii Pictavensis, RHG xii, 402; Amatus tenuit concilium Sanctonas...in quo idem elevatus est archiepiscopus Burdegalae.

²⁷² See below, p. 214-5.

In the Dictatus Pape Gregory VII emphasised the supreme authority of the papal legates: 'his legate takes precedence over all bishops in a council even if (he is) of inferior rank and he can give sentence of deposition against them'.²⁷³ But any attempt by his legates to assume this status provoked fierce opposition from local bishops. The men through whom Gregory, at the beginning of his papacy, had hoped to proclaim 'the precepts of salvation and integrity of life' to all the world²⁷⁴ were not always well received in France. On at least three occasions their councils were interrupted by the armed forces of a bishop who found their decisions unpalatable and their intrusion into affairs formerly conducted by a metropolitan intolerable.²⁷⁵ But, more significantly, there was a fundamental resentment of their presence and resistance to their precepts which meant that instead of furthering the cause of reform they were frequently an impediment to it. This resentment was not a chauvinistic dislike of foreign intellectuals sent from Rome to enlighten the provinces. The man whose presence caused the greatest bitterness and resentment, Hugh of Die, was a native of the area where he wielded his authority.²⁷⁶ Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims wrote to Gregory in 1078, explaining why he had not fulfilled the promise he had made earlier, to appear before Gregory's legate to answer the charges against him. He told the pope that he wished to deal only with a Roman legate - by which, he explained, he meant a man sent from the Roman church, not an ultramontane.²⁷⁷ He regarded 'the Lord Hugo' (Hugh of Die) with suspicion and dislike and was to avoid any personal confrontation

²⁷³ Registrum ii, 55a, c.4, p. 203. Quod legatus eius omnibus episcopis presit in concilio etiam inferioris gradus et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare.

²⁷⁴ E. V. 21, p.57.

²⁷⁵ See above, councils of Poitiers 1074 and 1078 and Gerona 1074, pp.94, 115 and 200.

²⁷⁶ Registrum ii, 59, p.212; ...et Romanus et Viennensis ecclesie filius est...

²⁷⁷ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611.

with him as long as he retained his archbishopric.²⁷⁸ Manasses had many faults, but this letter conveys the frustration of a sincere churchman at the disturbances produced in his diocese in the name of reform.

It is evident that he was not alone in his objection to the activity of the legates. The clerks of his diocese wrote to the clerks of the diocese of Cambrai expressing their dissatisfaction with the events at the council of Poitiers in January, 1078.²⁷⁹ The letter has been lost but its contents may be deduced from the reply of the clerks of Cambrai, who said that the importunity of 'the Romans' threatened to upset the existing order of things by the excommunication of archbishops, the deposition of bishops and the elevation of ambitious men, of no religious principles, to the episcopate. (In fact achieving exactly the result which their programme of reform was designed to correct). These clerks did not make the same mistake as Manasses of Rheims: the 'Romans' referred to were two venal men, Hugh, bishop of Langres and Hugh of Die.²⁸⁰ Understandably, the anger of the clerks was chiefly roused by the injunctions against clerical marriage promulgated at Poitiers and by the speed with which married clergy had been banished from the cathedral chapter at Cambrai. When, however, they had protested that such measures should not be taken without the consent of the metropolitan (Manasses of Rheims was in Rome at the time) their bishop told them that this had been done by order of Hugh of Die.²⁸¹

It is not possible to tell how many people were involved in this letter from Cambrai, nor in a similar but more circumspect one from the clerks of Noyen,²⁸² to whom the the clerks of

²⁷⁸ See 'Metropolitans,' below pp. 249-71, for a detailed study of this case.

²⁷⁹ Canon 9 forbade clerical marriage; above, p. 118.

²⁸⁰ RHG xiv, 778 seq. ...quosdam impostores quibus omnia cum pretio et quorum dextera semper repleta est munieribus...

²⁸¹ ibid.

²⁸² RHG xiv, 780.

Rheims had written also. It is, however, obvious that during Gregory VII's papacy there was an undercurrent of dislike and distrust of the pope's legates throughout the French church. This resentment was most frequently manifested against Hugh of Die but there seems to have been a general inclination to flout the legates' authority, occasionally even by the use of arms. At the outset of his pontificate Gregory wrote to Gerald of Ostia, who had been Alexander II's legate, reproaching him for his lack of communication with Rome and for the harshness and injustice of his decisions.²⁸³ The code of behaviour for legates which he outlined in that letter suggests that he expected that in the future things would be different, but this was never the case. Complaints against the legates, particularly against Hugh of Die, were a constant feature of Gregory's pontificate.

There were three reasons for this mutinous attitude. In the first place the legates were empowered to take over the traditional and canonical rights of bishops and metropolitans. For a sincere churchman there could be no greater calamity than the intrusion of a stranger into the sacred relationship between a bishop and his diocese. That this was done at the instigation of the pope was not a justification - quite the reverse. As Manasses of Rheims pointed out, the pope should have upheld the authority of his bishops.²⁸⁴ This was undermining it.

A second cause of resistance sprang from the character of Gregory himself. Although in theory he gave his legates complete autonomy it must have become apparent very early in his pontificate that a personal appeal to the pope could result in a reversal of their decisions: so in practice they could be disobeyed with impunity. Gregory's weakness as a reformer lay in the strength of his religious conviction. He could not turn his back on an offender. The man who devised such a stringent policy for reform should, to make it effective, have carried it

²⁸³ Registrum i, 16, p.25. ...alii injuste se excommunicatos alii inordinate depositos alii immerito interdictos...

²⁸⁴ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII; RHG xiv, 611.

out ruthlessly, but this Gregory could never bring himself to do. Therefore his legates could be defied.

A third reason for the widespread resistance to the decrees of the legates was undoubtedly the unpalatable nature of those decrees. Bishops who had purchased their preferment and clerks who were married and who held several prebends were reluctant to give up a pleasant way of life, one moreover which they felt could be justified by economic necessity. The clerks of Cambrai maintained that for them pluralism was absolutely essential: their meagre salaries would have been insufficient to live and keep a wife on, unless supplemented by two or even three stipends.²⁸⁵ (It did not seem to occur to them that the cost of living could be greatly reduced by their not taking a wife in the first place). It was natural that the legates, as the men entrusted with the implementation of these unwelcome measures, should encounter a good deal of hostility. Manasses, writing to Gregory about Warmond, bishop of Vienne, complained that he had come into the archdiocese of Rheims, deposed members of the clergy, filled his purse by taking bribes and in general 'behaved like a Roman legate although he was not one.'²⁸⁶ This outspoken lack of elementary tact may in part explain why Manasses was one of the few people on whom Gregory finally turned his back, but that such a contemptuous attitude towards the legates of the holy see could be expressed by the premier churchman of France illustrates the enormous difficulty of the task which Gregory had set himself, and them, at the outset of his papal career. 'We are so placed that, whether we will or no, we are bound to proclaim truth and righteousness to all peoples ...according to the word of the Lord: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet and declare to my people their transgressions."²⁸⁷

²⁸⁵ RHG xiv, 779.

²⁸⁶ Letter to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611. ...legatum se Romanum cum non esset simulavit.

²⁸⁷ Registrum i, 15, p. 23. (Is. 58, 1)

THE LEGATES OF POPE URBAN II AND POPE PASCHAL II.

Because Pope Urban II was never completely master of Rome, communication between the curia and the western churches was difficult. At the beginning of his papacy he was forced to rely on permanent legates. He made Gebhard, whom he had already consecrated to the bishopric of Constance,²⁸⁸ his permanent legate in Germany in 1089.²⁸⁹ Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, on whom he already conferred the office of 'primate of all the bishops who are in Spain,' was appointed to a permanent legation in 1096. Richard, abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles, who had been excommunicated with Hugh of Lyons by Victor III, was made the pope's legate in southern France and Spain.²⁹⁰ But Theodor Schieffer pointed out that in spite of his increased reliance on standing legates elsewhere, in the case of France Urban, although retaining the services of Hugh and Amatus, seemed to rely more on Bishop Ivo of Chartres, who became an agent of the pope without ever receiving the title of legate. Schieffer attributed this to Urban's increasing reluctance to deal too abruptly with the lay powers, especially the king, in view of the urgency of finding a peaceful solution to the question of investiture.²⁹¹

Amatus of Oloron remained in his legation under Victor III and, unlike Hugh of Lyons,²⁹² he continued to enjoy his former importance as a legate of Urban II. Following his election to the archbishopric of Bordeaux in 1089,²⁹³ he held councils at Béziers (with Richard of Marseille);²⁹⁴ at Toulouse (with

²⁸⁸ Becker, Urban II, i, 64-5.

²⁸⁹ Bernold Chronicon, MGH v, a. 1089, 448.

²⁹⁰ JL 5424; PL 151, 536; Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten, p. 143.

²⁹¹ Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich, p. 140.

²⁹² See 'Life' and 'Agent of Reform.'

²⁹³ Chronicon S. Maxentii Pictavensis, RHG xii, 402.

²⁹⁴ Mansi xx, 727; Schieffer, p. 146.

Bernard of Toledo) in 1090;²⁹⁵ at Bordeaux (1093);²⁹⁶ at Saintes (1096), where Urban II was present (although the direction of the council was left to Amatus);²⁹⁷ and at Bordeaux (1098).²⁹⁸ Amatus was constantly in the company of the pope in France in 1095-6 and he retained his office under Paschal II until his death in 1101.²⁹⁹

During the pontificate of Urban II a new policy began to emerge, which indicated the growing importance of the cardinals in the post-Gregorian reform movement. Although retaining the permanent legates and creating new ones, the pope began to employ cardinals of the Roman churches, sent directly to deal with specific problems and to return at once to Rome. One of these was the subdeacon Roger, who had already been employed by Gregory VII.³⁰⁰ In 1093 he was sent to Normandy, with Bishop Herbert of Thetford,³⁰¹ and at that time, according to Ivo of Chartres, he held a council at Senlis. In a subsequent letter Ivo referred to Roger as 'cardinal'.³⁰² Schieffer called him 'cardinal subdeacon,' and subsequently 'cardinal deacon'.³⁰³

The monk Teuzo, employed once as legate by Gregory VII, appears again in the service of Urban II in France in 1090.³⁰⁴ In his study of the cardinals and clergy of the reform papacy, Rudolf Hüls has five references to the name Teuzo. One is placed

²⁹⁵ Mansi xx, 734.

²⁹⁶ Mansi xx, 786; RHG xiv, 772.

²⁹⁷ Degert, Amat d'Oloron, 81; Mansi xx, 931.

²⁹⁸ Mansi xx, 955; Degert, 83.

²⁹⁹ Schieffer, pp.149-52; Degert, 80-83.

³⁰⁰ See above p. 180-4.

³⁰¹ Schieffer, p. 142; Hüls, p. 253.

³⁰² Letters of Ivo of Chartres to Bishop Walter of Meaux, and to Roger, PL 162, 28, 16 and 31, 18. This is the only reference to this council at Senlis.

³⁰³ Schieffer, pp. 141, 142.

³⁰⁴ JL 5389, called 'monk'.

in the service of the anti-pope Clement III.³⁰⁵ Another is listed as a cardinal priest in 1095.³⁰⁶ Another (a monk Teuzo) was sent into France by Urban II in 1090.³⁰⁷ A Teuzo, formerly in the service of Clement III, is noted as having been condemned by Gelasius II in 1118 as an active follower of the anti-pope.³⁰⁸ Finally Hüls refers to a 'Tuezo (?)' who 'ist nur aus dem Spurium von 1092 Sep. 14 bekannt.'³⁰⁹ Hüls has no reference to the Teuzo who was employed by Gregory VII in the case of the bishop of Dol in 1077 and by Hugh of Die at the council of Poitiers in 1078.³¹⁰ It seems obvious that at least two men are involved here, as it is very unlikely that an active follower of Wibert of Ravenna would have previously been a legate of Gregory VII and subsequently of Urban II and, twenty years later, been condemned for allegiance to the anti-pope, Gregory VIII. It is presumed that the monk sent into France by Urban is identical with Gregory's legate and that he is probably the same man who became cardinal priest of SS. John and Paul and accompanied Urban during his journey in France in 1095-6.³¹¹

Also representing Pope Urban briefly in France were the cardinal priest Rainer of San Clemente (the future Pope Paschal II) who appeared there as a legate on his way to Spain in 1090 and Walter, cardinal bishop of Albano, also going to Spain, who

³⁰⁵ Hüls, Kardinaler, Klerus und Kirchen, p.50.

³⁰⁶ ibid., p.85. At the synod of Piacenza, in 1095, Count Raymond of Toulouse recorded the restoration of a church to the monks of S. Aegidius. One of the subscriptions on that document is 'Teuzo presbyter Cardinal'. Mansi xx, 808

³⁰⁷ ibid., p.166; JL 5389, called 'monk.'

³⁰⁸ ibid., p.218.

³⁰⁹ ibid. p. 227.

³¹⁰ See above, p. 116.

³¹¹ JL 5540, 1095 (cardinal presbyter nostris); 5620, 1096 (nostris cardinal); 5633, 1096 (called Heuzonis cardinal); 5788, 1099 (cardinal presbyter); Schieffer p. 146.

was in southern France for a short time in 1092.³¹²

Although Pope Paschal II retained the permanent legates appointed by his predecessor, he, even more than Urban, relied on envoys sent from Rome to deal with specific problems in France and then to return to Rome. Theodor Schieffer noted that reasons for this withdrawal from established Gregorian practice are not to be found in the sources but he surmised that, as the conflict between papacy and empire developed, Paschal may have wished to distance himself from entanglement in French politics.³¹³ I. S. Robinson suggests also that the curia might have begun to distrust the concentration of power represented by legates in provinces too distant for supervision.³¹⁴ (Hugh's early autocratic record could certainly have prompted such distrust). Ivo of Chartres wrote to Paschal, pointing out that this policy of despatching trouble-shooters who did not have a complete grasp of all the circumstances was not a good one and urging him to re-establish Hugh of Lyons as permanent legate.³¹⁵ The only evidence for the pope's having re-appointed Hugh to the legation in Burgundy is a charter in which the archbishop was acting as arbiter in a disagreement between the monks of St. Benignus of Dijon and the clerks of Besançon. In this charter Hugh referred to himself as 'legate of the holy Roman See.'³¹⁶ The pope's reference, in 1100, to the success Hugh had made of his legation in Burgundy³¹⁷ makes it virtually certain that he continued to hold the office during the papacy of Paschal.

John, cardinal priest of S. Anastasia, and Benedict, cardinal priest of S. Pudenziana, calling themselves sanctae

³¹² Schieffer, pp. 146-148; Hüls, pp. 91 and 160.

³¹³ Schieffer, p. 162.

³¹⁴ I. S. Robinson, The Papacy, 1073-1198, p. 157.

³¹⁵ PL 162, Ep. 109, 127; Schieffer, p. 170. See above 'Life,' p. 66.

³¹⁶ Gall. Chris. xv, Instr. 17, xiv. PL 157, 526, Ep. xxviii.

³¹⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487.

Romanae ecclesiae cardinales et legati, were examples of the new type of mission.³¹⁸ To deal with the affair of the troublesome bishop of Autun, Norgaudus, they held a council at Valence in 1100, and one at Poitiers later the same year.³¹⁹ At this council they renewed the excommunication of King Philip, in spite of the threats of Count William of Poitiers. Unlike his father in 1078,³²⁰ he resented the presence of the legates and he declared that they would not depart unscathed if they dared to excommunicate the king in the city which he held from the crown. Sixteen canons were promulgated at Poitiers, dealing mainly with various aspects of clerical life. The ten canons which Rudolf Schieffer has confirmed as belonging to Hugh of Die's council at Poitiers in 1078 were originally thought by historians to have come from this council.³²¹

In 1102 Paschal was again constrained to send a legate into France to intervene in a dispute between Norgaudus of Autun and the monks of Vezelay, a daughter house of Cluny.³²² Milo, cardinal bishop of Palestrina, held a council at Mazille at which this affair was settled.³²³ He went on to Angers to settle a dispute between the bishop of Angers and the monks of Marmoutier.³²⁴

Richard, cardinal bishop of Albano, appeared several times in France between 1101 and 1104.³²⁵ He dealt mainly with minor

³¹⁸ Schieffer, pp. 163-68; Hüls, p. 146.

³¹⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 488-9; Mansi xx, 1115 and 1125; see 'Suffragans,' below, p. 225-6.

³²⁰ See council of Poitiers, above p. 115.

³²¹ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 117-8.

³²² PL 163, 102-4.

³²³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 495; Mansi xx, 1161-4; H.E.J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, pp. 86-7; Schieffer, p. 169; Hüls, p. 112. See below, 'Suffragans,' p. 229 for details of this affair.

³²⁴ Schieffer, p. 169.

³²⁵ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 502; Hüls, p. 93.

local matters, but in April 1104 he called a council in Troyes which was attended by Daimbert, archbishop of Sens, Ralph II, archbishop of Tours, Manasses II, archbishop of Rheims and a great number of bishops, including Ivo of Chartres.³²⁶ It is possible that the position of the king was discussed at that council because Richard had written to Ivo that the pope was anxious to absolve Philip, if certain conditions could be met.³²⁷ Philip and Bertrada came to a council convened by Richard at Beaugency³²⁸ the following July and took an oath that they would only meet in the presence of witnesses until the pope should grant them a dispensation to live together. But the assembled bishops refused to come to a decision about the case, although Ivo, with some support, declared that they might be given absolution.³²⁹ The king appealed to Rome and he and Bertrada were once again reconciled with the Church at a synod in Paris the following December.³³⁰ According to Schieffer the legate, Richard, was not present, being already on his way back to Rome.³³¹

The last legate sent into France by Paschal II during the lifetime of Hugh of Lyons, was Bruno, cardinal bishop of Segni. In 1106 he came with Prince Bohemund of Antioch, who was looking for support for another expedition to the Holy Land. Schieffer suggested that Paschal siezed the opportunity of strengthening the renewed relationship between Philip I and Rome by sending a legate as companion to the prince. Certainly the presence of Bruno in Chartres at the wedding of Bohemund and Philip's daughter, Constance, provided visible proof of the new friendship

³²⁶ Mansi xx, 1179; Schieffer, p. 173-4.

³²⁷ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Richard, PL 162, 141, 148.

³²⁸ Mansi xx, 1184; Hüls, p. 93.

³²⁹ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Paschal II, PL 162, Ep. 144, 150.

³³⁰ Mansi xx, 1194.

³³¹ Schieffer, p. 174.

between the king and the curia.³³² In May Bruno held a council in Poitiers at which Bohemund was present.³³³ The primary concern of the council was the proposed crusade, although several other matters were settled there. Bruno did not return to Italy until the end of the year but he held no further councils in France.

The legates of Urban II and Paschal II in France never encountered the overt hostility experienced by the legates of Gregory VII, notably by Hugh of Die and Lyons. In spite of the loyalty of the French bishops to Philip I a more peaceful settlement of differences was achieved than had been possible in the early years of reform. One reason for this was the changed attitude which the papacy and the French episcopate brought to the conference table. In France, due largely to the efforts of the legate Hugh of Die and Lyons, the more intransigent and reactionary bishops had been replaced by men who were open to at least some of the theories of reform. Men like Ivo of Chartres and Archbishop Manasses II of Rheims³³⁴ were prepared to work patiently to achieve accord in the episcopate and between the bishops and Rome. On the papal side, the developing crisis in Germany made both Urban and Paschal more inclined to a policy of conciliation in France.

Another reason for the comparatively easy passage the legates of Urban II and Paschal II enjoyed lay in the eventual success of the key element of Gregory VII's reforming policy, the centralisation of ecclesiastical government in Rome. When the papacy was re-established in Rome, Paschal was able to take the reins of government of the Church into his own hands. This was possible because of the presence in Rome of the cardinal bishops

³³² Schieffer, p. 175-6

³³³ Mansi xx, 1205.

³³⁴ See the letter of Ivo of Chartres to Urban II about the election of Manasses II to the archbishopric of Rheims; Non enim poterat illa ecclesia inter omnes filios suos quemquam invenire sedi apostolicae magis devotum, suis utilitatibus magis necessarium, tum propter generis nobilitatem, tum propter morum honestatem. PL 162, Ep. xlviii, 59-60.

who, with one exception (John II of Porto had defected to the imperial party in 1084)³³⁵ had remained loyal to Gregory VII and had been responsible for the election of Urban II. Because the control of the titular and regional churches was of vital strategic importance in the struggle for the city of Rome, the imperial anti-pope, Clement III, had conceded a role in papal government to the cardinal priests and cardinal deacons. Urban II was constrained, for the same reason, to imitate this policy. Thus the cardinales, (bishops, priests and deacons) whose functions up to the middle of the eleventh century had been purely liturgical, became by the end of the century closely associated in the administration of Church policies. From that time the cardinals of the Roman Church came to France not merely as accredited representatives of the papacy, but as government officials. The increased credibility of these envoys allowed for a new definition of the role of the legate from the beginning of the twelfth century.

ooo000ooo

SUFFRAGANSI AUTUN.

AGANO, 1055-1098.

Bishop Agano was formerly an abbot in the Cathedral church of Autun. The Gallia Christiana comments: alicujus earum abbatiarum quae capitulo unitae fuerunt et quarum titulum precipui e canonicis assumebant.¹ The date of his accession to the bishopric of Autun is not certain. A footnote by G. H. Pertz in the Monumenta Germaniae Historica edition of the Verdun Chronicle places him as bishop of Autun in 1042.² That bishop, not named, is described in the text as vir vitae longevitate grandivis.³ Agano was certainly a very old man; he did not die until 1098,⁴ but the fact that he was an abbot before his accession to the bishopric seems to make it impossible that he should have been a bishop in 1042. The Gallia Christiana gives 1055 as the probable date of his accession to the bishopric.⁵ This could be correct, as he was certainly present at the coronation of Philip I of France in 1059.⁶

Agano was at St. Médard de Soissons in the company of the king in 1075⁷ and he was at the royal council of Orléans in 1077.⁸ This suggests that, like most of the bishops of the kingdom of France, he had been appointed by the king or at least elected with the king's approval, but there is no indication that

¹ Gall Chris iv, 381.

² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 403; fn 18. Hagano, obit 1098.

³ ibid.

⁴ ibid., 477.

⁵ Gall Chris. iv, 381.

⁶ Coronatio Philippi I. RHG xi, 32

⁷ Prou, No. lxxviii, p 197.

⁸ Prou, no. lxxxvi, p 226.

he was antagonistic to papal reform policies. He is found indeed cooperating with the papal legate Hugh of Die (later of Lyons).

Agano was undoubtedly present at the council of Autun in 1077, although nowhere mentioned. He was at Issoudun and Meaux in 1081⁹ and at Lyons in 1082¹⁰. At the council of Anse held by Peter of Albano on 6 February 1080 Agano, with Warmund of Vienne, supported Abbot Hugh of Cluny in his struggle to maintain Cluny's immunity from spiritual and temporal interference by Landericus of Mâcon and Gebuin of Lyons.¹¹

After the council of Clermont Hugh of Lyons sent Agano, with Bishop Lambert of Arras, to interview Archbishop Richerius of Sens, in an effort to persuade him not to reject the authority of the primacy. Urban II had confirmed, at Clermont, the primacy of Lyons over the sees of Sens, Rouen and Tours and Richerius had left the council rather than submit. Agano and Lambert were not successful in this mission.¹²

At the funeral of Landericus of Mâcon in 1096 Agano, touched by the plight of the monastery of Flavigny which had been without an abbot since the death of Reynaldus,¹³ seven years earlier, asked Hugh of Lyons to allow Hugh, a monk of St. Benignus, to take the abbacy. In his chronicle Hugh of Flavigny implies that he was not a popular choice with the monks but that his election was assured by Agano's manipulation of the votes of the canons and the laity of Autun.¹⁴ From the time of the foundation of the monastery of Flavigny by Clovis I a struggle for control had

⁹ Mansi, xx, 573-583

¹⁰ Mansi, xx, 587.

¹¹ Carta Petri Albanensis Episcopi et Cardinalis Romani de Immunitate Cluniaci; for details of this council see 'Legates,' p. 195.

¹² Letter of pope Urban II to Hugh of Lyons, JL 5600; PL 151, clxv, 439A; see 'Richerius of Sens,' p. 281

¹³ Gall. Chris. iv, 460.

¹⁴ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 475; Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 162.

developed between the monks and the bishop of Autun, their diocesan. It is possible, therefore, that the fact that Hugh was Agano's man militated against his being readily accepted as abbot. Later, Hugh of Flavigny lost the support of the bishop by incurring the enmity of Agano's successor, Norgaudus. This may have been the reason he was ultimately rejected by the monks, although he had the support of Hugh of Lyons and eventually of the Roman legates, the cardinals John and Benedict.¹⁵ Agano died in 1098.¹⁶

NORGAUDUS, 1098-1112.

Norgaudus was a precentor in the church of Autun prior to his elevation to the bishopric.¹⁷ As bishop, he created a lot of trouble for the chronicler, Hugh of Flavigny, who obviously detested him and consequently tended to become incoherent when writing about him. Hugh claimed that the election of Norgaudus in 1098 was not legally recognised (sub contentione)¹⁸. A letter from Paschal II written in April 1100, confirms Norgaudus in all the ecclesiastical and temporal benefices of the bishopric of Autun, which are listed in great detail.¹⁹ This suggests that there was some truth in Hugh's assertion. Jaffé mentioned that the letter was issued at the request of Norgaudus,²⁰ as such letters invariably were. Hugh of Flavigny regretted that he himself had not been present at the election, although invited, as he felt it important that the voice of the abbot of Flavigny should have been heard; but it is difficult to understand how, feeling this, he did not make a greater effort to attend. His excuse is rather vague - cum essem in exteris

¹⁵ See 'Life,' above, p. 67.

¹⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 477.

¹⁷ ibid, 477. Gall. Chris. iv, 385 B.

¹⁸ ibid.

¹⁹ PL 163, 39-40

²⁰ JL 5831; petente Norgaudo episcopo.

partibus.²¹

Norgaudus was infuriated by Hugh's failure to appear and refused to be appeased although Hugh 'alone among the abbots' went to Lyons for Norgaudus's consecration²². Returning from Lyons Norgaudus sought hospitality at Flavigny and Hugh's description of the behaviour there of Norgaudus and his entourage is so venomous and complicated as to be almost incomprehensible. As a result of this quarrel Norgaudus withdrew the power of celebrating the sacraments from the abbot.²³ The author of the passage concerning Norgaudus in the *Gallia Christiana* comments: Si vera sunt quae de illo refert Hugo Flaviniacensis abbas in chronico vir fuisse videtur nimium vehemens feroxque natura, gloriae et honorem appetens.²⁴

Immediately after the election of Norgaudus, delegates from his church went to Rome to accuse him of simony - that he promised a certain archdeacon Walter preferment in the church if he would help him to attain the bishopric²⁵. Hugh of Flavigny's antipathy to Norgaudus makes it difficult to gauge the veracity of his account of the subsequent proceedings against the bishop.

In September 1100, Paschal II sent two legates, the cardinal priests John of S. Anastasia and Benedict of S. Pudenziana,²⁶ into Gaul to hear the accusations against Norgaudus²⁷. On 30 September they held a council at Valence, where he was again

²¹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 477.

²² ibid; Lugdunum euntum ad consecrationem solus de abbatibus sum prosequutus.

²³ ibid., 477-8.

²⁴ Gall Chris iv, 384.

²⁵ ibid, 490.

²⁶ Hüls, p. 146.

²⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 488.

accused of simony by his canons and others.²⁸ Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, was not present 'because he was ill',²⁹ and neither were two other suffragans of Lyons, Robert of Langres and Walter of Chalon-sur-Saône: they claimed that they had been forbidden to attend by their metropolitan. Berardus of Mâcon, the fourth suffragan of Lyons, had been a prisoner of Wibert of Ravenna and was only released on the anti-pope's death, which took place during this council.³⁰ Hugh of Flavigny had no doubt that the opposition of Hugh of Lyons to this council - so determined that he forbade his suffragans to attend and was himself stricken with what Hefele described as a 'diplomatic illness',³¹ - stemmed from resentment that other legates had been sent from Rome to sit in judgement on his suffragan outside his territory: (Valence was in the archdiocese of Vienne.) Leclercq, in his edition of Hefele's councils, commented: 'Le vent avait tourné', pointing out that at the height of his legatine power Hugh of Die had paid scant attention to the rights of metropolitans.³² The archbishop's absence may also have been part of a manoeuvre, ultimately successful, to ensure that Norgaudus should not be deprived of his bishopric. He did, however, send legates from Lyons to the council.³³

There was some argument about procedures to be observed in the case, the Roman legates maintaining that it was up to the accusers to furnish proofs of the bishop's guilt while the French bishops maintained that in the Gallic church the accused was

²⁸ ibid; Mansi, xx, 1115.

²⁹ ibid; quia ipse infirmabatur.

³⁰ ibid.

³¹ Hefele, p. 468. See above, 'Life', p. 41, for another instance of an illness viewed with suspicion by some historians. However Lühe (Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 164) is convinced that in this case the illness was genuine and was the reason for the delay between his announcing his intention of visiting Jerusalem at the council of Anse, early in 1100, and his actual departure at the end of that year.

³² Hefele, p. 468, n. 2

³³ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 488.

customarily required to establish his innocence. Norgaudus tried to get permission to bring his case to Rome and, when that was refused, he tried to bribe members of the council. He was suspended from all sacerdotal functions and commanded to appear six weeks later at Poitiers.³⁴

Hugh of Lyons again failed to appear at the council of Poitiers on 18 November 1100, but this time he sent Ismidus of Die to represent him in the bishop's defence. The bishops of Chalon and Mâcon were there also. Norgaudus ignored the sentence of the legates, that he was guilty of simony and that he should give up the ring and the stole until such time as he should have purged himself of his crime with the help of 'suitable persons' (*idoneae personae*). Neither the bishop of Die nor the bishop of Chalon was allowed to speak for him because the legates suspected them of partiality, but he was told that if disinterested men would appear for him he would be permitted to try to prove his innocence. Norgaudus refused these terms and again tried to appeal to Rome. He also refused to give up the stole and the ring and took refuge behind the altar with his followers. He was again stripped of all sacerdotal rights and, until he submitted, he was separated from the threshold of the church and those who gave him the reverence due to a bishop were threatened with eternal damnation.³⁵

All this was related by Hugh of Flavigny at great length and with a great deal of complicated detail. (Mansi justly described Hugh's treatment of the affair of Norgaudus at the councils of Valence and Poitiers as *prolix*).³⁶ It emerges, however, that Norgaudus was able to behave in this way, ignoring the pronouncements of the legates and disobeying their orders, because he was supported by his metropolitan, Hugh of Lyons. Hugh of Flavigny is quite categorical about this:

Ipse vero, quamquam depositus, quamquam a
consortio et communione ecclesiae

³⁴ Hugh of Flavigny, 490-91.

³⁵ *ibid.*, 491.

³⁶ Mansi, xx, 1115.

sequestratus, stolam retinuit et annulam;
bona tamen episcopii clerici providebant et
disponebant quod et nunc usque faciunt,
omnimodis id egre ferente archiepiscopo,
quod extra voluntatem suam et accusatus et
indicatus et depositus foret a se sacratus
episcopus, querimonia extra provinciam
ventilata per manus legatorum, nec ad se,
qui metropolitanus et primas erat
provinciae, infra provinciam relata secundum
scita canonica.³⁷

When the legates returned to Rome they confirmed the sentence against Norgaudus. Accompanied by Norgaudus and the bishop of Chalon, Hugh of Lyons arrived in Rome at the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem and publicly refuted their action. He was legally able to do this because of the absence of any accusers of Norgaudus in Rome and, importantly, because he himself had not been present at either Valence or Poitiers. His testimony, credo Norigaudum istum Eduensem episcopum vera jurasse sicut me Deus adjuvet,³⁸ was sufficient to have the bishop reinstated, although the cardinals, John and Benedict, maintained that this was uncanonical and contrary to the interests of the church.³⁹ Hugh of Flavigny could not comprehend the archbishop's championship of Norgaudus, whom he always referred to in his chronicle as invasor. He wrote;

Ego miror, gravitatem tanti viri, pro
ingenita sibi bonitate et honestate fama
ubique celebrati, cuius inadulatem
constantiam Gallicana veneratur ecclesia,
ita ab uno homine potuisse decipi, ut nunc
usque partes illius manu teneat tueatur et
protegat et fere solus sit in nostro orbe

³⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 491.

³⁸ ibid. 494.

³⁹ ibid. 495. At vero cardinales in sua sententia permanentes, quod factum erat publice reprehendebant, quod non esset canonicum, sed ab aequitate Petri alienum.

qui de illo homine bona et recta sentiat cum
sententiae eius huic omnium fere etiam
absentum et ignotorum repugnet generalitas
et generalis unanimitas.⁴⁰

On his way back from Rome Norgaudus sought hospitality in the church of St Martin in Autun but the canons refused to receive him. He took no notice of them, said Mass and blessed the oil, having, according to Hugh of Flavigny, small regard for the decrees of the cardinals against him, and relying on the protection of the archbishop, the loyalty of the pope and his own liberality.⁴¹ This is obviously nonsense. Although the legates still maintained his guilt he had been reinstated in Rome and was entitled to exercise all his rights. The chronicler was so carried away by his detestation of Norgaudus that he lost sight of the legalities of the case.

Norgaudus, together with another suffragan of Lyons, Berardus of Mâcon, made trouble for Cluny also.⁴² In November 1102, Pascal II wrote to abbot Altardus of Vezelay to confirm that the monks of Vezelay had the right to seek ordination from any bishop subject to the advice of the abbot of Cluny.⁴³ It is obvious from this letter that Norgaudus had been trying to reserve to himself the right of ordaining the monks. He eventually succeeded, at least partially, in establishing his authority because the Placitum drawn up at the council of Mazille in 1103, presided over by cardinal Milo of Palestrina, declares that Norgaudus, bishop of Autun, may not extract a profession of obedience from the monks of Vezelay, nor may they give him one, but that he shall ordain the monks if he himself be canonically

⁴⁰ ibid. 494.

⁴¹ ibid. 495.

⁴² H. E. J. Cowdrey suggests that Hugh of Lyons may have supported his suffragan bishops against the Cluniacs in this affair (The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p. 56, note 1).

⁴³ PL 163, 102-104.

ordained.⁴⁴ It is clear that Hugh of Flavigny was not alone in having doubts about the legality of Norgaudus's consecration to the bishopric.

Norgaudus was at the meeting at Rupem Scissam in 1099 at which Robert of Molesme was given permission to leave Cîteaux and return to Molesme.⁴⁵ He was present at the council of Anse in 1100 at which Hugh of Lyons announced his forthcoming journey to Jerusalem.⁴⁶

According to the Gallia Christiana his name appears for the last time in the tabulis annorum of 1111 and 1112. The Necrology of Autun states that before his death Norgaudus gave five marks in silver towards the adornment of the altar in the church of Autun. The date of his death is given as 2 May (vi nonas Maii obiit Norgaudus episcopus), but the year is not identified⁴⁷.

⁴⁴ RHG xiv. 117

⁴⁵ Gall Chris iv, 385D (called Petram Scissam); See 'Life', above p. 64.

⁴⁶ Mansi, xx; 1127.

⁴⁷ Gall.Chris. iv, 389 DE.

II LANGRES.

RAINARDUS-HUGO, 1065-1081/82.

Bouquet mistakenly described this bishop (who is referred to variously in the sources as Rainardus-Hugo, Hugo-Rainardus, Hugo and Rainardus) as a brother of Walrannus, abbot of St. Vitonis in Verdun⁴⁸. The Hugh who was Walrannus's brother, also bishop of Langres, was one of many French bishops deposed by Leo IX at the council of Rheims in 1049.⁴⁹ Rainardus-Hugo was not elected to his bishopric until 1065. He may have been a nephew of the earlier bishop. He is described in the Gallia Christiana as belonging to the ancient and famous family of Bar-sur-Seine.⁵⁰

Hugh of Flavigny said of Hugo that he was well versed in rhetoric, had a lively mind, was fluent in discussion, with a keen grasp of knowledge and that he was affable in conversation and wise in council.⁵¹ However, not all his contemporaries shared this good opinion. Manasses I, archbishop of Rheims, writing to Gregory VII and describing Hugo as the counsellor and master (consiliarius ejus ac magister) of Hugh of Die, gave a bad account of his character.⁵² He said that the bishop of Langres had lately visited the countryside around Rheims and that his behaviour had been a source of continuing scandal. Those in the neighbourhood whose tastes resembled his own were still singing the 'love songs' which he composed on his travels, one of which Manasses quoted, with apologies for bringing such language to the

⁴⁸ RHG xiv, 838 (index).

⁴⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 406. Mansi xix, 727.

⁵⁰ Gall. Chris. iv, 560;

⁵¹ Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon ii, MGH viii, 415. ...vir adprime rhetoricis inbutus studiis, clarus ingenio, sermone facundus, scientia praeditus, affabilis alloquio et prudens consilio.

⁵² Letter of Manasses I of Rheims to Pope Gregory VII, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann & N Fickermann (Weimar 1950) p. 178-9;

attention of the pope. Manasses professed himself particularly upset by this conduct because not only was Hugo an adviser to the legate he was also a relative of Manasses himself.⁵³

The chronicler of St. Hubert in the Ardennes confirmed Rainardus-Hugo's gift for versification. He related how Hugo, on a journey to Jerusalem encountered William the Conqueror and addressed this flattering couplet to him:

Si quis in ante videt qui te circumspicet, ex te
Colliget, ante comes, rex modo, caesar erit.⁵⁴

This, like his more vulgar lyrics in Rheims, was long remembered. When his friend Hugh of Die found some fault in the manner in which Hugo had ordained an exorcist, and re-ordained him, Hugo refuted this supposed insult in a verse of biting wit.⁵⁵

In May 1077, Gregory VII spoke highly of Rainardus-Hugo to Hugh of Die, praising him for his fidelity and co-operation. 'We have great hope and confidence in him'.⁵⁶ But after the council of Poitiers in March 1078, the clerks of Cambrai writing to the clerks of Rheims gave very unflattering descriptions of both Hugo and Hugh of Die, saying that Hugo was well known for his dissolute life and that they were both always ready to take a bribe.⁵⁷ These clerks were by no means disinterested - they were incensed by the recent promulgation by Hugh of Die of a decree forbidding clerical marriage⁵⁸ - so their strictures are not completely reliable. However, in November 1078 Gregory was compelled to write to Hugo to reprove him for his part in two

⁵³ ibid., 179; noster consanguineus erat.

⁵⁴ Chronicon S. Huberti Andaginensis, MGH 8, 577,

⁵⁵ ibid.

⁵⁶ Registrum iv: 22, 332. Nos in eo multam spem habemus et fiduciam.

⁵⁷ RHG xiv, 778. ... cujus vita et mores satis omnibus innotuerunt and ... per quosdam impostores quibus omnia cum pretio, et quorum dextera semper repleta est muneribus.

⁵⁸ This decree had been promulgated at Poitiers in March, 1078, (cap. 9). Mansi xx, 499. See 'Agent of Reform' above, p. 118.

serious cases; the excommunication of the count of Flanders and the reported attacks on pilgrims journeying through his diocese to Rome.⁵⁹ Gregory had been urging Robert, count of Flanders (who, Fliche asserted, governed his province 'en maître absolu')⁶⁰ to improve the moral tone of his clergy, a great many of whom were married, or considered themselves to be so.⁶¹ Robert does not seem to have done anything about this but nevertheless Gregory was shocked when 'through the stratagems of their enemies' Robert was excommunicated by Hugo of Langres and the legate Hubert.⁶² He wrote to Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny ordering them to reinstate Robert.⁶³ About the attacks made by Hugo on the pilgrims, the pope said: 'We both warn and charge you to permit neither yourself nor others in your parts in any way to harm pilgrims travelling to and from the threshold of the apostles - for we have already heard many complaints against you on this score',⁶⁴. These charges of injustice and piracy, more serious than that of composing ribald songs, seem to justify the low opinion of Hugo held by Manasses. Like Norgaudus twenty years later, he appears a curious friend for the conservative Hugh of Die and Lyons, although Lühe maintained that he was a zealous ally of Hugh's in the struggle against simony and investiture.⁶⁵

Hugo was present at the council of Autun in September, 1077,⁶⁶ and at the councils of Saintes in 1080 and Meaux in

⁵⁹ Registrum vi, 7, 407 and E.V. 24, p.65

⁶⁰ A. Fliche, Philippe Ier de France, p 184.

⁶¹ Registrum iv; 11, 310.

⁶² See 'Legates', p. 182 above.

⁶³ Registrum vi, 7, 407; ...per machinationes inimicorum suorum... See 'Life,' above p. 43.

⁶⁴ E.V. 24; p 65

⁶⁵ Wilhelm Lühe, Hugo von Die und Lyon, p. 153.

⁶⁶ Letter of Hugh of Die to Gregory VII after the council of Autun. PL 148, 744B. RHG xiv, 613, lxxix.

1081.⁶⁷ It is probable that he was at the council of Lyons in 1080 at which Manasses of Rheims was finally deposed.⁶⁸

The date of Hugo's death is uncertain. The Gallia Christiana states categorically that he died in 1085.⁶⁹ But in a letter which is the only record of a council in Lyons, confidently placed by Mansi in 1082, the bishop of Langres is given as Robert, Hugo's successor.⁷⁰ Obviously if Hugo died before Hugh of Die became archbishop of Lyons he was never a suffragan of Hugh, but the date of Hugh's consecration is not certain either.⁷¹ In that same letter Hugh of Die/Lyons, who was not present, is described as primatus and legate of the Roman church, which implies that he was already archbishop. But had he been archbishop before the death of Hugo? Altogether there is a great deal of confusion about this period, but Hugo has been included here because it is possible that he was a suffragan for a short time. He was included as a suffragan by Lühe in spite of the fact that, relying on the necrology of the cathedral of Lyons, Lühe preferred early 1083 as the date of Hugh's accession to the archbishopric.⁷² If the date for the council of Lyons at which Robert was bishop of Langres is correct, Rainardus-Hugo was certainly dead by that time.

⁶⁷ Mansi xx, 571, 573 and 583.

⁶⁸ Mansi, xx; 551.

⁶⁹ Gall.Chris. iv, 563D. Ac tandem post anno pontificatus xx, an. reparatae salutis 1085, tertio vel quinto mensis Aprilis diem clausit extremum.

⁷⁰ Mansi, xx, 587.

⁷¹ See above, p. 16, where this confusion is discussed.

⁷² Lühe, pp 14-15, citing Gall. Chris iv, 109; Rexit autem hanc ecclesiam Lugdun. annis 23, mensis 8, diebus 7.

ROBERT. 1081/2 - 1110.

Bishop Robert was an archdeacon in the church of Langres before his accession to the bishopric.⁷³ He is described in the Gallia Christiana as a Burgundia, regia Burgundiae ducum stirpe satus.⁷⁴ In the same source he is described as a brother of Reynaldus, the abbot of Flavigny whose death left the monastery seven years without an abbot, and who was also a brother of Duke Hugh of Burgundy.⁷⁵ In 1082 he attended the council of Lyons at which Count Fulk of Anjou was excommunicated for his attack on a church at Tours.⁷⁶ In 1104 he was a witness to the charter in which the mistake occurs which led Mabillon to describe Hugh of Die as a nephew of the duke of Burgundy.⁷⁷

He is best known for his involvement with Hugh of Lyons and Walter of Chalon in the foundation of the new monastic order at Cîteaux.⁷⁸ Molesme was in the diocese of Langres so Bishop Robert's consent was necessary to allow Robert of Molesme to leave Cîteaux with those of his companions who were disappointed with life there. The level-headed pragmatism of Hugh and Robert of Langres ensured the survival of the Cistercians during their early difficulties.

In 1092 he accompanied Hugh of Lyons and Walter of Chalon on what they thought might be a dangerous mission - to consecrate the newly-elected bishop of Metz, Poppo, called also Burchardus, a brother of Henry, the count Palatine of Lotharingia. This ceremony should have been performed by the archbishop of Trier but he was contaminated by association with the emperor and his anti-pope and the people of Metz were anxious that the archbishop

⁷³ Gall. Chris. iv, 566.

⁷⁴ ibid.

⁷⁵ ibid., 460. See 'Agano of Autun' above p. 223.

⁷⁶ Mansi xx, 587. See above, p. 132 and below, p. 277.

⁷⁷ Gall. Chris. iv, Ins. 236; see 'Life', pp. 2-3.

⁷⁸ See 'Life,' above p. 63-5.

of Lyons should take his place.⁷⁹ They went to Metz per bella et gladios but encountered no difficulties and returned uneventfully.⁸⁰

In 1099 Ernaldus, abbot of St. Petrus Vivus, wrote to Daimbert of Sens to inform him that Robert of Langres had taken possession of a church which was the property of the monastery. Ernaldus said that he had taken this complaint to Rome and had there agreed to accept Hugh of Lyons as arbiter in this case; but unfortunately illness had prevented his going to Lyons.⁸¹ The affair is not mentioned again so it is not possible to evaluate Robert's degree of guilt.

It is very probable that he was one of the thirty-two bishops who, according to Hugh of Flavigny, were at the council of Autun presided over by Hugh of Lyons in 1094, at which King Philip I was excommunicated. He may have also been one of the two bishops not named in Hugh of Flavigny's list of those attending Hugh of Lyons's last recorded council at Anse in 1099 or 1100.⁸² In 1110 he was taken gravely ill and retired to Molesme, where he died on 19 October. He was buried at Molesme.⁸³

⁷⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 473; Chronicon S. Huberti Andaginensis, MGH 8, 604.

⁸⁰ MGH 8, 473.

⁸¹ RHG xiv, 795.

⁸² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 473 and 487.

⁸³ Gall. Chris. iv, 568-9.

III MACON.LANDERIC DE BRÉZÉ. 1074 -1096.

Bishop Landeric had previously been an archdeacon in the church of Autun.⁸⁴ The Gallia Christiana states that he had three brothers: Gunterius, a prior, Walter, a monk in Cluny and Altaldus, baron of Brézé.⁸⁵

According to Gregory VII, Landeric was elected to the bishopric of Mâcon with the consent of the clergy and the people,⁸⁶ in succession to Drogo who died in March 1072.⁸⁷ King Philip I then insisted on being paid before allowing him to be consecrated. In this letter to Roclinus, bishop of Chalon, Gregory denounced Philip, not for his assumption of a right to concede the bishopric, but for his refusal to do this without payment (dono gratis).⁸⁸ This incident, very early in Gregory's papacy, proves that his policies for reform in the area of investiture were not cut and dried from the beginning, but were modified and cristallised by the indifference and opposition he met with from Philip I and Henry IV. At that stage he was prepared to acknowlege the king's right to take part in the consecration of the bishop.⁸⁹

Landeric was consecrated by the pope in March 1074, probably at the same time as Hugh was consecrated to the bishopric of Die. This can be seen from two letters written by Gregory only a week apart, one to Count William of Die⁹⁰ and one to Humbert of

⁸⁴ Registrum i, 35, p. 57.

⁸⁵ Gall. Chris. iv, 1064.

⁸⁶ Registrum i, 35, p. 57.

⁸⁷ ibid. n. 1.

⁸⁸ ibid.

⁸⁹ See 'Decrees against Investiture', above p. 83.

⁹⁰ Registrum i, 69, p. 99.

Lyons.⁹¹

Three months earlier, at the time of the letter to Roclinus of Chalon, Gregory had written to Humbert of Lyons informing him of the election of Landeric and urging him to see that Philip carried out the promise he had made to Gregory through an intermediary a short time before: namely that he would submit to all Gregory's wishes (and, by inference, that he would allow this consecration). In the case of Philip's remaining obdurate Landeric was to be consecrated either by Humbert or by one of his suffragans. If Landeric objected, Humbert and Agano of Autun were to make every effort to compel him to accept consecration from them. And if Humbert failed or neglected to do this then Gregory would consecrate Landeric in Rome (and incidentally be very annoyed with Humbert).⁹²

Two things are clear from this letter: that Landeric might refuse consecration by Humbert and Agano because of the objections of the king, and that the bishops might, for the same reason, refuse to consecrate him. Gregory, although deploring this disobedience, seems to understand and almost to expect it. This may be seen from his further letter to Humbert following the eventual consecration in Rome: Confratrem nostrum Matisconsem episcopum quem intervenientibus quibusdam rationabilibus causis ordinavimus...⁹³ There is no sign of the anger with which he had threatend Humbert in his previous letter. The pope wrote to the people of Mâcon in fulsome praise of the newly consecrated Landeric:

You should receive, honour, fear and love him with the more joyful minds in that he is well known to be spotlessly clean from all simoniacal ambition, neither did he enter the church to assume custody of your souls, nor climb the watch-tower of episcopal

⁹¹ Registrum i, 76, p. 107.

⁹² Registrum i, 36, p. 57; Quodsi fraternitas tua in hac causa negligens fuerit, procul dubio tu motum apostolice incurres.

⁹³ Registrum i, 76, p. 107.

vigilance some other way than by the door.⁹⁴

Besides demonstrating Gregory's initial hesitations in the matter of investiture this incident illustrates the extent of the power and influence of the French king, and also the ambiguous position of a metropolitan whose suffragan bishoprics were in another jurisdiction. Philip was capable of applying pressure on churchmen not merely in his kingdom, but also in Burgundy.⁹⁵ In this case the archbishop of Lyons was persuaded not to consecrate the man who was refusing to pay the king of France for his bishopric, although Lyons was part of the empire. But the king's power was not absolute. If the bishops wished to circumvent him they had the option, derived from the pope's assumption of judicial supremacy, of appeal to Rome.⁹⁶ In this case that seems to have been the end of the matter; there were no reprisals. Landeric was one of the bishops attending the king's council at Orleans in 1077 or 1078⁹⁷ and his name also appears in conjunction with that of the king in 1075 on a diploma granting a privilege to the monastery of St. Philibert of Tournus; although, as both names have been added to the copies of the document, neither was necessarily present.⁹⁸

In 1079 Landeric went to Rome to enlist the help of the pope in a dispute between the canons of his cathedral, St Vincent, and the monks of Cluny.⁹⁹ In this he had the support of his metropolitan, Gebuin of Lyons. Because Gregory, as always, was reluctant to proceed too vigorously against Cluny¹⁰⁰ Gebuin took

⁹⁴ E.V. 4, p.8

⁹⁵ Also in Aquitaine; see his attempt to forbid the council of Poitiers in 1078, above p. 115.

⁹⁶ See 'Agent of Reform,' above pp. 69-70.

⁹⁷ Prou, lxxxvi and lxxxvii. pp. 224-228.

⁹⁸ ibid. lxxviii, p. 199.

⁹⁹ H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'Cardinal Peter of Albano: a Legatine Mission to Cluny, 1080,' Journal of Theological Studies, 1973. p.481. Also E.V. 38, p.94 and E.V. 30, p. 76.

¹⁰⁰ Registrum vi. 33, 446. This is a very mild reproof to Hugh of Cluny.

matters into his own hands, placed an interdict on certain of Cluny's churches and expelled the Cluniac monks from Pouilly-les-Feurs; and even the more peaceable Landeric excommunicated certain chapels of Cluny and their chaplains. This led to the legatine journey of Cardinal Peter of Albano to Burgundy in 1080 which is discussed in detail elsewhere.¹⁰¹ Landeric was himself excommunicated and suspended from office for his failure to uphold Cluny's privilege (which he feebly declared he knew very little about).¹⁰²

Landeric was obviously reinstated quite soon because in the letter which is the only record of the council of Lyons held sometime in 1082 he is described as vice primatis curam gerentes ecclesiae Lugdunensis.¹⁰³ It is possible that Hugh, archbishop elect of Lyons, had gone to Rome to be invested with the pallium, leaving the bishop of Mâcon to act as his deputy. When Hugh went to Jerusalem in 1101 he appointed Berardus, Landeric's successor in Mâcon, to act for him.¹⁰⁴

There is no record of the presence of Landeric at Clermont in November 1095 but it is very likely that he was there. In the Gallia Christiana there is a letter from Urban II to Landeric, written on 18 October, 1096, while Urban was at Cluny, confirming the bishop and his successors in the possession of various lands which he had 'snatched from hostile hands'.¹⁰⁵ Had he not been present at Urban's synods in France the pope might not have been so accommodating. Landeric died in late November or early

¹⁰¹ See 'Legates', above, p. 193-6.

¹⁰² Carta Petri Albanensis Episcopi et Cardinalis Romani de Immunitate Cluniaci; Ille vero cum se privilegium minime legisse fateretur...

¹⁰³ Mansi xx, 587. See above, p. 16, for the confusion caused by the date of this letter.

¹⁰⁴ See 'Council of Mazille' early in 1103; above p. 229 and below p. 242.

¹⁰⁵ Gall. Chris. iv, Instrumenta 284; ...ex hostium manibus erepta... Jaffe has no record of this letter.

December of that year.¹⁰⁶

BERARDUS (BERNARDUS). 1096 - 1121.

Bishop Berardus was formerly an archdeacon in Lyons.¹⁰⁷ He is described in the Gallia Christiana as Milonis Castellionis domini ad oram Dombensem ex Ingeltrude filius et Stephani ejusdem loci dynastae frater.¹⁰⁸ A charter, wrongly dated in the Gallia Christiana,¹⁰⁹ gives his surname as Orseli and states that he went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem with his brother, Humbert. A letter from Paschal II to the abbot of Cluny, written in 1110 would appear to confirm this.¹¹⁰

Hugh of Lyons was present at his election, which took place after the funeral of his predecessor, Landeric, in Mâcon.¹¹¹ It is very probable that Berardus came to the funeral from Lyons in the archbishop's train. He was consecrated immediately by Hugh. The bishops of Autun and Chalon-sur-Saône were also present.¹¹²

Returning from a journey to Rome in 1097 or 1098 he and several other members of the clergy were captured by the forces of Wibert of Ravenna, the anti-pope Clement III.¹¹³ He was not released until Wibert's death in 1100.¹¹⁴ For this reason he was not in his bishopric at the time of the council of Valence

¹⁰⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 475, n. 19.

¹⁰⁷ ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Gall.Chris. iv, 1067 C.

¹⁰⁹ ibid. Instrumenta xxx, 284 B. This charter is dated 1096 but an internal reference to 'Peter, archbishop of Lyons', proves it to have been enacted after Hugh's death in 1106.

¹¹⁰ JL 6280.

¹¹¹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 475.

¹¹² ibid.

¹¹³ ibid., 488.

¹¹⁴ ibid., 490.

when the case against Norgaudus was heard; but even had he been there it is unlikely that Hugh of Lyons would have permitted him to attend.¹¹⁵ On his release he went to Rome and he was there when the legates, John and Benedict, brought the account of the judgement against Norgaudus. Berardus interceded for him but was told that the judgement should stand.¹¹⁶ He was among the large number of bishops at the council of Poitiers in November but was not acting specifically for the archbishop of Lyons in the matter of Norgaudus.¹¹⁷

In 1103, acting as deputy for Hugh of Lyons who was in Jerusalem, he was present at Mazille when the Placitum between Norgaudus and the monks of Cluny was enacted. This was the second occasion during the pontificate of Hugh on which a bishop of Mâcon acted as his vices.¹¹⁸

A letter from Hugh of Lyons to his suffragans Norgaudus of Autun, Robert of Langres and Walter of Chalon, probably written in 1104 after his return from Jerusalem, calls on them to assist their brother Berardus of Macon in his difficulties with the monks of Cluny.¹¹⁹ This letter was not included by J. P. Migne in the collection of Hugh's letters and it is not referred to by H. E. J. Cowdrey in The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform. If genuine, it would be further evidence of Hugh's struggle to maintain episcopal and metropolitan rights over Cluny.¹²⁰ Hugh

¹¹⁵ See above, p. 226.

¹¹⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 491.

¹¹⁷ ibid.

¹¹⁸ Mansi xx, 1161; ...Maticensis B. qui tunc cum Episcopatu suo Lugdunensis Archiepiscopi domni Hu. vices agebat. See above p. 240.

¹¹⁹ RHG xiv, 796.

¹²⁰ See his possible involvement with Norgaudus, p. 229, n.42, above and his second letter to Mathilda of Tuscany: Praeterea notificamus unanimitati vestrae a monachis Cluniacensibus nobis tantas supergressiones et injurias inferri ut nullo modo eas aequanimiter sustinere valeamus. Hugh had tried to prevent their saying prayers for the excommunicated emperor (PL 157, 515 AB).

is not specific about these difficulties between Berardus and Cluny but the trouble between the bishops of Mâcon on the one hand and the monks of Cluny on the other was long standing and never completely settled during this period.¹²¹ In 1110 Paschal II (in a complete volte-face for the papacy) will be found writing to the new abbot of Cluny, Pontius, rebuking him for the continuous usurpation by his monks of the rights of bishop Berardus of Mâcon while the latter was on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.¹²² In his article on Abbot Pontius of Cluny, however, H. E. J. Cowdrey describes Berardus as a 'not unfriendly neighbour' during the rule of Pontius.¹²³

In 1104 Berardus, like Robert of Langres, was a witness to the charter by which the Duke of Burgundy restored the church of Fleury to St. Marcellus.¹²⁴ He was still bishop of Mâcon in 1124, when he was present at the council of Vienne.¹²⁵ He died on either 20 or 21 July, but the year is incertum.¹²⁶

¹²¹ See H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, pp. 44-57.

¹²² PL 163, Ep. cccviii, 281; JL 6280; H. E. J. Cowdrey, The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform, p. 262-3.

¹²³ H. E. J. Cowdrey, 'Two Studies in Cluniac History 1049 1126,' Studi Gregoriani xi, (Rome, 1978). 218.

¹²⁴ Gall Chris iv. Ins 236.

¹²⁵ Mansi, xxi, 317

¹²⁶ Gall. Chris. iv, 1070A.

IV CHALON-sur-SAONE.

WALTER (GUALTERIUS). 1080-1120.

Bishop Walter was formerly an archdeacon in Chalon.¹²⁷ His predecessor in the bishopric, Roclinus, had died in 1077. The instrumentum of Walter's election in 1080 comments that this was a long interval (jamdudum).¹²⁸ It is possible that the reason for the delay is to be found in a letter from Gregory VII to Hugh of Die written some time in April or May 1079, denouncing a man who had invaded the church at Chalon 'by means of the temporal power - that is by royal investiture.'¹²⁹ Gregory urged Hugh to excommunicate all those disobeying the Roman decree against investiture.¹³⁰ A charter of Philip I in 1084¹³¹ was witnessed by a Frotger, bishop of Chalon, probably the same usurper, still supported by the king in his invasion of the bishopric in spite of the subsequent election of Walter. There is no record of Frotger's having been excommunicated by Hugh in conformity with Gregory's orders.

Mansi claimed that Walter was elected at a council in Langres held by Hugh of Die but admits that there is no record of such a council in the records of Hugh of Flavigny, 'the painstaking contemporary investigator and measurer of every step taken by Hugh of Die.'¹³² There is no mention of the location

¹²⁷ Gall.Chris. iv; Instrumenta 231 D.

¹²⁸ ibid. C.

¹²⁹ E.V., 30, pp.78-79

¹³⁰ ibid. The reference to just one decree in this letter supports the contention of Rudolf Schieffer that the decree of November, 1078, was the first against investiture. (Die entsehung des papstlichen Investiturverbots fur den deutschen Konig. MGH Schriften 28. 1981)

¹³¹ Prou. No. cxiii. pp. 285-7. Gall.Chris. iv. 887B.

¹³² Mansi xx, 569. Sunt qui eodem praeside Hugone Diensi episcopo celebratum asserunt concilium adversus investituras laicorum. Verum ut iam alias docui in synopsi historica non meminit illius noster Hugo Flaviniacensis abbas auctor synchronos atque Hugonis

of the election in the instrumentum or anywhere else and Mansi does not explain why he assumes it to have taken place at a council and at Langres.

In the instrumentum Walter is described as sprung from a noble root, most learned in sacred and profane literature, celebrated for his probity, 'crowned with all the virtues by his most beautiful mother', eloquent, articulate and conspicuous for his great goodness. Gebuin of Lyons, Agano of Autun, Landeric of Mâcon and Hugh of Cluny were all witnesses to the instrumentum.¹³³ According to the Gallia Christiana, Hugh of Cluny specifically requested that Walter be given the bishopric,¹³⁴ but there is no extant record of this.

With Landeric of Mâcon and Robert of Langres, Walter was present at the council of Lyons in 1082 at which Count Fulk of Anjou was excommunicated, together with the monks of Marmoutier, for their attacks on the church at Tours.¹³⁵

Because Cîteaux was in the diocese of Chalon it was Walter who consecrated Robert of Molesme to the abbacy of the new monastery in 1096 and later, following representations from the monks of Molesme, released him as abbot.¹³⁶ Like his metropolitan, Hugh of Lyons, and his fellow-suffragan, Robert of Langres, he demonstrated good sense in his dealings with Robert of Molesme.

In November, 1100, Walter was present at the council of

Diensis itinerum metator atque omnium prope passuum
sedulus investigator.

¹³³ Gall.Chris. iv, Instrumenta, 231 D.

¹³⁴ Gall.Chris. iv, 90 D: ab Hugone abbate Cluniacensi
rogatus favit electioni Walterii Cabilonensis
episcopi.

¹³⁵ Mansi xx, 587. See 'Metropolitans,' below, p. 277.

¹³⁶ PL 157; xxii and xxiii, 523-524. See 'Life,' above, p. 64.

Poitiers at which the affair of Norgaudus was discussed in the presence of the cardinal legates John and Benedict; but he was refused permission to speak in favour of Norgaudus, as was Ismidus of Die who had been sent to the council to act for Hugh of Lyons.¹³⁷ When Hugh was on his way to Jerusalem the following year, he brought Norgaudus and Walter with him to Rome where they were successful in clearing Norgaudus.¹³⁸

Walter was present with Hugh of Lyons when Norgaudus confirmed a donation of land to abbot Hugh of Cluny in 1105¹³⁹ and in 1107 he acted as arbiter, with the archbishop of Lyons, between the canons of St. Vincent and the monks of St. Peter in Mâcon.¹⁴⁰ That he was not always a disinterested observer of St. Peter's is obvious from a letter written about him by Hugh of Lyons in 1099 or 1100, accusing him of blind cupidity in his treatment of the monks.¹⁴¹

The various documents in which his name appears show that his death occurred not before 1120 and not after 1121.

¹³⁷ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 491.

¹³⁸ ibid., 494. See above, p. 228.

¹³⁹ Gall. Chris. iv, 889 C.

¹⁴⁰ ibid.

¹⁴¹ Gall. Chris. iv, Instrumenta xvi, 234; Ex authentico S. Petri Cabilon., exeunte xi vel ineunte xii seculo. This is another letter not included by Migne in his collection of the letters of Hugh of Die/Lyons (see p. 242 above).

One important fact emerges from this brief study of the seven men who were suffragans of Hugh during his pontificate in Lyons. The campaign against simony, begun under the auspices of Henry III and Leo IX in the middle of the eleventh century and intensified and extended by Gregory VII, was achieving demonstrable success in this area of France. At the twelve councils recorded between 1075 and 1081, held by Hugh, then Roman legate and bishop of Die, five archbishops and eight bishops were either suspended or excommunicated for simony;¹⁴² but during his twenty-six years as archbishop only one of his suffragans was accused of simony (on a fairly minor charge), and he was eventually exonerated.¹⁴³ The credit for this obvious success in the implementation of the ideals of reform must belong primarily to Hugh himself. His draconian methods frightened even Gregory VII, who warned him that it was better to be accused of leniency than to bring odium on the church through his severity¹⁴⁴ and he was eventually publicly rebuked by the pope and many of his sentences were revoked.¹⁴⁵ But his insistence that the law be upheld and that transgressors be punished undoubtedly had a salutary effect in his own province.

Of interest also is the fact that, on the evidence of the Gallia Christiana, six of these suffragan bishops of Lyons belonged to noble families from the area in which they obtained their bishoprics. Bernard Guillemain has pointed to the very high proportion of bishoprics which were held by members of the families who lived near and governed the cathedral cities and he instances the diocese of Lyons as having more than 50% of its bishops from such families at any given time.¹⁴⁶ In fact,

¹⁴² See 'Life,' above, p. 31.

¹⁴³ See 'Norgaudus,' above p. 225.

¹⁴⁴ Registrum ii, 43, p. 180.

¹⁴⁵ Registrum v, 17, p.378.

¹⁴⁶ Bernard Guillemain, 'Les Origines des Eveques en France aux xie et xiie Siecles' in: Le istituzione ecclesiastiche della "societas christiana" dei secoli xi -xii, 1 (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Mediaevali 7, Milan 1974), 374-402. p.384

during this twenty-six year period the proportion is 75%, the exceptions being Norgaudus and Archbishop Hugh himself, about whose origins nothing is known. It is easy to see how the practice of simony had flourished out of the necessity for both parties to maintain this alliance between the nobility and the higher echelons of the church. In his article on Urban's journey through France in 1095-6 René Crozet linked the number of bishops connected to the nobility with the striking number who had started their religious careers as monks. He commented about them '...mêlés à la vie féodale et rompus, en même temps, à la discipline monastique, ils pouvaient par cette double qualité apporter une aide puissante et efficace à l'entreprise pontificale.'¹⁴⁷

147

René Crozet, 'Le Voyage d'Urbain II et ses Négociations avec le Clergé de France (1095-1096),' Revue Historique 179, 1937, 287.

THREE METROPOLITANS.

In his study of the papal legates in France Theodor Schieffer came to the conclusion that under Hugh of Die the Gregorian legation was in fact an instrument of aggression and that a legatine victory meant a weakening of the power of bishop and metropolitan.¹ The cases of Manasses I, archbishop of Rheims, Ralph I, archbishop of Tours and Richerius, archbishop of Sens are considered here because they provide an illustration of this conflict between legatine power and traditional episcopal authority. Manasses of Rheims is studied in greater detail than the other two because his case is more fully documented in the sources and because he was an eloquent exponent of what he considered to be his rights.

MANASSES I, ARCHBISHOP OF RHEIMS

The archbishopric of Rheims was the most important position in the French hierarchy. From the 3rd century the city was a stronghold of Christianity. In 940 Louis IV conferred the comitatus, the rights of a count of the civitas, on the archbishop, thus giving him temporal sovereignty of the city and a large area to the east for which the Count of Champagne owed him fealty.²

From the Carolingian period it had been the custom for the archbishop of Rheims to consecrate the kings of France. In 999 this privilege was elevated to a right by Pope Sylvester II, a former archbishop of Rheims.³ In 1089 Urban II reaffirmed and

¹ Theodor Schieffer, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130, Berlin 1935, p. 237. ...mit dem Kampfe für die Kirchenreform eine Ausdehnung des kurialen Machtbereichs, eine Schwächung der Bishops- und Metropolitangewalt Hand in Hand ging...

² See Ferdinand Lot et Robert Fawtier, Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age, i; Jean Lognon, La Champagne, 125, 127, for an analysis of the complications by which the Count of Champagne lost the comitatus of the city of Rheims and its environs.

³ JL 3908; Gall. Chris. x, Ins. xvii, 20.

extended this right, telling Archbishop Renardus that not only was he entitled, as archbishop, to crown the king for the first time but that he and his successors alone might place the diadem on the king's head on subsequent ceremonial occasions.⁴ When Hildebrand was elected to the papacy as Gregory VII, Manasses of Rheims was one of the few people he notified at once,⁵ indicating the importance of the see to the papacy.

Pope Sylvester II, formerly Gerbert of Aurillac, had been twice master of the cathedral school in Rheims before he succeeded to the archbishopric there in 991. Under his direction the school had become the most important in Northern Europe. He was universally renowned not only as a profound scholar but as an inspiring teacher. After his departure the school lapsed into relative obscurity until the middle of the eleventh century. At that time, under the master Herimann and Archbishop Gervase (1055-1067), the predecessor of Manasses, it regained much of its former prestige and renown. The school continued to thrive under Manasses, who was himself a scholarly man and a patron of scholars. The importance of the school is indicated by the presence there with Herimann of other masters, notably Bruno of Cologne.⁶

There are very few facts available about Manasses's origins and early life. A manuscript preserved at Rheims until the seventeenth century gave his name as de Gournay and his father's position as vice-dominus of Rheims.⁷ In a letter to Pope

⁴ JL 5415; PL 151, 310C. Letters of Ivo of Chartres to Urban II and the Roman legate, John, (PL 162, 66 and 84, 82, 105) show that in the period 1097-99 the ceremonial crowning was carried out by various bishops who remained loyal to the king; see below, 'French bishops,' pp. 293 and 295.

⁵ Registrum, i, 4, p. 7. The others were Hugh of Cluny, Beatrice of Tuscany, Sven, king of Denmark and Bernard, abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles.

⁶ John R. Williams, 'The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century'; Speculum xxix, 4, October 1954, 665-6.

⁷ Gallia Christiana ix, 71.

Gregory VII written after the council of Autun in 1077 Manasses claimed kinship with the bishop of Langres who belonged to the house of Bar-sur-Seine.⁸ Guibert of Nogent in his autobiography said that Manasses was of noble birth, although no credit to his family, but he gave no details about them.⁹ He is described in the dedication of the church of St. Quentin in Beauvais in 1069 as Manasses tunc nobilis clericus, mox futurus Remensis archiepiscopus.¹⁰ He had a brother, Hugo whose name appears in two charters of the period.¹¹

The date of his accession to the archbishopric is not certain. His predecessor, Gervase, died in 1067 but, according to the annals of Rheims and Cologne, Manasses was not consecrated until 1070.¹² However, a copy of a charter of Philip I, internally dated June 1068, is witnessed by Manasses as archbishop of Rheims. Prou has no doubt that the copy of the signature is contemporaneous with the copy of the text but the original which was extant at Senlis until the eighteenth century is reputed to have contained only King Philip's signature.¹³ Another charter, internally dated August 1069, has the signature of Manasses immediately following that of Philip but it also is only a copy.¹⁴ If the name of Manasses was added by mistake to the originals of these documents then the annals of Rheims and Cologne could be correct in placing his accession to the see in 1070 because the first holograph signature is on a charter of May

⁸ MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann und N. Fickermann (Weimar, 1950), 179; ...noster consanguineus erat.

⁹ Autobiography of Guibert, abbot of Nogent sous Coucy; De vita sua, PL 156, 853C: ...vir quidem nobilis sed nihil prorsus serenitatis...

¹⁰ RHG xiv, 29.

¹¹ Prou, pp. 132 and 134.

¹² RHG iv, 29.

¹³ Prou, xxxix, p. 110.

¹⁴ Prou, xliii, p. 120.

of that year.¹⁵

A delay of almost three years after the death of Gervase in 1067 might possibly have been because there was another contender for the see - Helinand, bishop of Laon, who, according to Guibert, purchased it from King Philip I but was told by the pope that anyone having one wife (the see of Laon) could not under any circumstances marry another (the see of Rheims).¹⁶ That this had taken place before Manasses became archbishop rather than after his deposition is borne out by Manasses himself, in a letter to Gregory VII. Manasses attributed Helinand's role in the decision to depose him taken at Autun to the enmity engendered by this circumstance, saying: cuius odium manet...pro episcopio quod in presentia vestre dignitatis amisit et ego per intercessionem vestre paternitas obtinui...¹⁷ Another reason for the delay could have been King Philip's custom, exercised also by his ancestors, of collecting the revenues of vacant bishoprics for his own use.¹⁸

Manasses was a well-educated man who surrounded himself with men distinguished for their learning, intelligence and literary gifts. He employed Master Godfrey of Rheims, a noted classicist and poet, as his dictator and he made him chancellor of the cathedral chapter following the expulsion of Bruno.¹⁹ Because of his association with Godfrey Manasses's letters are remarkable for their apt use of canonical precedent, their classical allusions and their lively, witty style. The poets Baudri of Bourgueil and Fulcoius of Beauvais were his intimates and spoke

¹⁵ Prou, xlviii, p. 132.

¹⁶ Guibert of Nogent, Book iii, 2, p. 131-2; PL 156, 909C.

¹⁷ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann & N. Fickermann (Weimar 1950), 179.

¹⁸ A. Fliche, Philippe Ier, Roi de France, p. 338; see 'Loyalty of the French bishops to the king', below, p. 286.

¹⁹ See below, p. 256.

of him always with admiration. Fulcoius's most important work, Uterque, a translation of the Old and New Testaments into verse, was undertaken at the suggestion of Manasses and dedicated to him.²⁰

In spite of his scholarly reputation and his professed desire to be associated with the work of reform²¹ Manasses from the beginning of his papacy embarked on a course of conflict with Rome which was to lead to his disgrace and downfall. The first clash occurred during the pontificate of Alexander II but was brought to light in a letter from Gregory VII.²² It is recorded here to demonstrate a view of Manasses which does not accord with the scholarly image fostered by Baudri and Fulcoius. In spite of repeated promises to the pope Manasses had failed to appoint a successor to the abbot of the monastery of St. Remigius in Rheims, dead since 1071. One reason for this delay, according to the hostile witness of the monks and of the reform papacy, seemed to be that the archbishop was appropriating the revenues from the monastery for his own use. He was also treating the monks with contemptuous cruelty. Gregory urged him to appoint an abbot without delay.²³ Shortly afterwards Walo, abbot of St. Arnulph in Metz, was appointed to the vacancy, but this appointment was not a success. The following year Gregory informed Manasses that Walo had asked to be allowed to retire to Metz, as he found the strain of directing two abbeys too much. In this letter the pope expressed his warm friendship for Manasses and said that the appointment of Walo (although not

²⁰ John R. Williams, 'The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century', Speculum xxix, No. 4, October 1954, 661-677; 'Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII', American Historical Review No. 54, 1948-1949, 804-824. Fulcoius was described by Marvin Colker ('Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistulae', Traditio 10 1954, 191) as 'one of the most distinguished literary figures of the eleventh century'.

²¹ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 612; ...ego debeo per vos ea quae sunt providentiae nostrae corrigere...

²² Registrum i, 13, p. 21

²³ ibid.

working out) had 'refreshed his heart with great happiness'.²⁴

Two letters from Walo to Manasses put a different complexion on this seemingly straightforward situation, showing that Walo's desire to get away from Rheims was because of the enmity which had arisen between the two men. In the first letter²⁵ Walo adopted a tone of sardonic reproach, suggesting that if the archbishop were going to threaten people with canonical judgements he should conduct his own life more in accordance with canon law. However, he was more specific in the second letter. Manasses had called him a fool, had told lies about him to the bishop of Metz, had made him a laughing stock in Rome and had tried to steal the money which he (Walo) had put aside for a journey to Rome. He referred to the archbishop as a 'wild, savage, ferocious immoderate beast'.²⁶ In a letter to his successor in the abbacy, Henry of Homblières, Walo described Manasses as a monster, a rapacious wolf and the incarnation of evil.²⁷ (It should be noted that Walo was not a strong character. When Bishop Herman of Metz was driven out by the forces of Henry IV Walo allowed himself to be created bishop in his stead. He subsequently resigned within a year overcome with remorse).²⁸ Some years later Manasses was accused of having imposed Henry of Homblières on the monastery by bribery and of having excommunicated two monks and blinded a lay-brother because they refused to accept his rule.²⁹ But Guibert of Nogent described Henry as 'a distinguished man indeed'.³⁰

²⁴ Registrum i, 52, p. 78.

²⁵ MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann & N. Fickermann (Weimar 1950) 185-187.

²⁶ ibid, 182-185.

²⁷ PL 150, 879-80.

²⁸ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 471.

²⁹ Letter of Gregory to Geoffrey of Paris, Registrum iv, 20, p. 326.

³⁰ Guibert of Nogent, De vita sua, Book ii, 2, p. 111. PL 156, 897D.

In 1074 Manasses held a council at Rheims, at which he confirmed several donations made to the monastery of Morimond.³¹ During that year the pope wrote twice to Manasses urging him to take issue with King Philip about his scandalous personal life and his robbery of foreign merchants on the roads of France. Gregory suggested that Manasses should come to Rome to discuss what could best be done, or, if this journey were not possible, that he should give all possible help to the legates in dealing with Philip.³² In March 1075, Gregory wrote to upbraid Manasses for his negligence in dealing with Roger of Châlons-sur-Marne, a suffragan of Rheims, who had been stealing from his clergy. These letters were written as to an ally, although in the third the pope was manifestly angered by Manasses's dilatoriness.³³ Manasses did nothing about either the king or Roger. In a letter to Hugh of Die written two years later the pope urged his legate to see that the long case of Roger was brought to a conclusion.³⁴ The charters show that Manasses, with other bishops of the kingdom, had remained constantly in the king's company during the period 1075-77.³⁵

During that period a campaign against Manasses had begun, which was conducted by his own clergy. A letter to Gregory VII from Hugh of Die concerning the council of Autun in September 1077 referred sketchily to the council of Clermont held in August 1076.³⁶ It described the arrival at Clermont of a deputation from Rheims to accuse their archbishop. These men had been found worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus, said Hugh, presumably referring to their treatment at the hands of the archbishop, but that section of the letter has been damaged and it is impossible

³¹ Mansi xx, 441.

³² Registrum ii, 5, p. 130; Registrum ii, 32, p. 168-9.

³³ Registrum ii, 56, p. 209.

³⁴ Registrum iv, 22, p. 330.

³⁵ See Prou lxxviii, p. 197; lxxx, p. 202; lxxxii, p. 207; lxxxiii, p. 211; lxxxvi, p. 224. Roger of Châlons also appears as a witness in one of these charters (lxxxii, p. 207).

³⁶ PL 148, 744; see above, 'Agent of Reform', p. 113.

to decipher the nature of the charges.³⁷ This is unfortunate because the original charges brought against Manasses are not specified anywhere else. The men who accused him were the provost of the cathedral of Rheims (another Manasses who would subsequently become archbishop of Rheims), Bruno of Cologne, master of the cathedral school (and subsequently founder of the Carthusian order) and some members of the chapter.³⁸ It was undoubtedly after this that Bruno was dismissed from the cathedral school and replaced by the archbishop's dictator, Godfrey. Manasses later referred to Bruno contemptuously as a 'German', belonging not to Rheims but to Cologne.³⁹

Before receiving the letter concerning the charges made against the archbishop, the pope had instructed Hugh to summon Manasses, as metropolitan of Gerard of Cambrai, to a council to discuss the matter of Gerard's investiture.⁴⁰ This council was eventually held at Autun in September 1077.⁴¹ Manasses did not attend it and he was deposed there. Hugh of Flavigny said: Accusatus est in eodem concilio Remensis ecclesiae invasor symoniacus Manasses a clericis Remensibus et suspensus ab officio, quia vocatus ad concilium ut se purgaret, non venit.⁴² If, as this suggests, the accusation against him was that he was guilty of simony, Manasses had reason for his subsequent outrage. He could not possibly have usurped the archbishopric: letters exchanged between him and Gregory VII state explicitly that the pope himself, then Archdeacon Hildebrand, was personally concerned in his elevation to the see. As well as the reference

³⁷ ibid.

³⁸ ibid.

³⁹ Letter to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 783. ...Bruno nec noster clericus nec noster natus aut renatus est, sed S. Cuniberti Coloniensis in regno Teutonicorum positi, canonicus est.

⁴⁰ Registrum iv, 22, p. 330

⁴¹ See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p. 112

⁴² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415.

to Helinand of Laon,⁴³ Manasses, in the same letter to Gregory, quoted the archdeacon Wido of Rheims, sent by him to the council of Autun to speak on his behalf. The archdeacon said that if justice could not be obtained for his master at the council, 'appellamus ex sua parte domnum papam qui eum in sede Remensi constituit.'⁴⁴ As the letter was written to the pope himself, this can only be the truth. Gregory confirmed his involvement in the appointment of Manasses in a letter of 1074: Presertim nos adeo tue promotioni favimus et consensimus ut nequeamus vitare grave periculum si ea feceris que tuum ordinem dehonestent aut tuam non deceant dignitatem.⁴⁵ It is difficult to understand how, with these credentials, a charge of simony could have been brought against him with any hope of success. Hugh of Flavigny mentioned another charge against Manasses: he said that when the representatives from the cathedral at Rheims were returning from laying their accusations before 'the council', he ambushed them, broke up their houses, sold their prebends and laid waste their goods.⁴⁶ As this appears immediately following the accusation of simony in the chronicler's account of Autun it would appear that this act of brigandage took place after that council, but whether the council he referred to was Clermont or Autun is immaterial; this obviously could not have been part of the original charge. That it was true in substance is confirmed by Gregory VII's letter to Manasses after his deposition.⁴⁷

From that time Manasses was fighting to retain his office and to have his name cleared in Rome. He wrote to the pope after

⁴³ See above, p. 252.

⁴⁴ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, 180-1.

⁴⁵ Registrum i, 52, p. 78-79.

⁴⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415: Qui cum canonis Remensis aecclesiae accusatoribus suis a concilio redeuntibus plurimas parasset insidias, demum domos eorum fregit, praebendas eorum vendidit et bona eorum diripuit.

⁴⁷ Registrum vii, 20, p. 496: ut Manasse et Brunoni et ceteris... rebus suis in integrum restitutis.

Autun, the letter of a violent man unable to contain his anger. His defence, in this letter as in his other two surviving letters, was based on canon law and recognised custom, two sources of authority dear to the heart of Pope Gregory VII. He pointed out that he had sent Archdeacon Wido of Rheims and some 'most worthy clerks' (optimi clerici) to represent him at Autun and that two of his suffragan bishops, Laon and Soissons, were also present. He did not deny that he had been asked to appear because of the question of the election of his suffragan, Gerard of Cambrai, but he declared through Wido that he had not dared to come because of the concourse of his enemies who had gathered there - Hugh of Die and 'his adviser and master' (consiliarius eius ac magister) Hugh Rainard of Langres, Helinand of Laon and Manasses, provost of Rheims. Moreover he had not felt it necessary to attend because, said Wido on his behalf, he had not been summoned to clear himself of any crime: cum pro culpa vel aliquo crimine quod sibi imponeretur vocatus non fuerit. After Wido had spoken, continued Manasses to Gregory, the lord Hugh of Die, moved by anger and urged on by the bishop of Langres and his accomplices, acted not as he should have but as he was determined to and did what the pope had not done in the six years of the affair of the bishop of Châlons: he excommunicated and suspended Manasses. Citing precedents from Popes Leo I, Nicholas I and Hilary, Manasses urged Gregory to revoke this sentence of the legate, delivered so flippantly and with such arrogance (de tanta levitate de tanta superbia). He concluded his letter with a shrewd reference to Gregory's difficulties with the Milanese church: Longobardi non sumus, sed vestre ditioni ut fideles et servi semper colla summittimus... and he maintained that such an excommunication was nostris temporibus inaudita.⁴⁸ If it was true that he had not been summoned to appear at Autun in order to answer any charges then, regardless of the degree of his guilt, he had been uncanonically deposed.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5: Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV, ed. C. Erdmann & N. Fickermann (Weimar 1950) 178-182.

⁴⁹ John Gilchrist, Collectio in LXXIV titulos, 89, p. 65; Si accusatus episcopus et accusatores eius ad causam dicendam invitati, quia unus absque altero audiri non debet ... This work was considered acceptable Canon

Following this letter Manasses went to Rome and waited there for eleven weeks for his judge, Hugh of Die, to confront him but Hugh did not come, although he eventually sent envoys. At the Lent synod of 1078 Manasses defended himself so successfully that, in his own words, 'the judgement passed on us was found to be violent and wilful and not tenable and was annulled.'⁵⁰ Gregory's words were: 'Because the sentence passed on him was not in accord with the dignity and customary mildness of the Roman Church he was restored to his office.'⁵¹ It should be noted that the case of Manasses was not the only one heard at that synod in which Hugh of Die was deemed to have acted unjustly.⁵² Manasses took a solemn oath that his failure to attend the council at Autun had not been because of pride and that he would attend any synod if summoned by letter or messengers of the apostolic see and obey any judgements delivered there: that, if required by the pope, he would answer charges before the legate: and that he would faithfully administer the finances of the church of Rheims and not alienate them in order to resist justice.⁵³ He later claimed that he had agreed with the pope that the person to whom he would be accountable was Abbot Hugh of Cluny.⁵⁴ The pope confirmed that this had been at least partially the case.⁵⁵

Law at the time.

⁵⁰ Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 783; ... temere ac violenter actum esse et constare non debere iudicatum atque correctum est.

⁵¹ Registrum v, 17, p. 378: ...quia sententia super eum data non Romanae ecclesie gravitate et solita mansuetudine videbatur in proprium gradum officiumque restituimus...

⁵² See Hugh's relations with Gregory VII, above p.39.

⁵³ Registrum v, 17, p. 378.

⁵⁴ Letter to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 782; ...abbas Cluniacensis de nobis iudicaret.

⁵⁵ Registrum vi, 2, p. 394 ...Diensi videlicet episcopo et Cluniacensi abbati... See also Registrum vi, 3, p. 394, which is addressed to both Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny.

On his return from Rome he wrote to the pope, making an obvious attempt to modify the terms of his oath.⁵⁶ He claimed that by the term 'legate' he had inferred an envoy sent directly from Rome not an ultramontane, thereby laying the foundation for a subsequent refusal to attend any council presided over by Hugh of Die, and he asked permission to deal solely with the pope. He accused Count Ebohus of Roucy of complicity with the provost Manasses in continually harassing him and he urged the pope to punish them. He did not mention Bruno: presumably he had already dismissed him from the cathedral school. No doubt as evidence of good intent he requested that the consecration of a certain Radulphus to the bishopric of Amiens, performed by the bishops of Laon and Soissons during his absence in Rome, should be declared void. Radulphus had received his bishopric as a gift from a layman and these bishops had both heard the decree declaring such transactions to be illegal promulgated by Hugh of Die at the council of Autun. (In fact these men, with the bishop of Senlis, had already been ordered to Rome by Hugh of Die after the council of Poitiers,⁵⁷ but no doubt Manasses was eager to prove himself a loyal supporter of papal policies). In his reply to this letter Gregory dealt crisply with Manasses's attempt to differentiate between legates, saying that any legate acting with papal authority was a Roman legate, but at the same time he manifested a certain sympathy with the archbishop. Nec id dicimus ut privilegia vestre ecclesie contra tationem vel infringi velimus vel imminui...⁵⁸ The pope agreed to examine charges made against the bishops of Laon and Soissons, who had obviously not gone to Rome. He wrote to Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny urging them to make enquiries about these cases⁵⁹ and to take measures against the provost Manasses if the archbishop's accusations should prove to be true, as the pope seemed inclined

⁵⁶ Letter of Manasses to Pope Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611.

⁵⁷ See Letter of Hugh of Die to the pope after that council; vobis remisimus...item Ambianensem pervasorem cum ordinatoribus suis, videlicet Laudunense, Suessionense, Silvanectense. PL 157, vii, 511A

⁵⁸ Registrum vi, 2, p. 391.

⁵⁹ Registrum vi, 3, p. 394.

to think was the case.⁶⁰ However he was shrewd enough to realise that Manasses was using these delaying tactics in order to avoid any confrontation.⁶¹

Manasses was successful in that manoeuvre. In 1079 Hugh of Die summoned him to a council at Troyes, including the name of Hugh of Cluny in the summons.⁶² This council was cancelled⁶³ but Manasses went to Troyes accompanied by his abbots and clerks and all his household. His reason for continuing his journey, although he knew of the cancellation, was extraordinary. He told Hugh of Die: 'The apostolic lord made me promise that if I was called to a council in Gaul either by the nuncio or by letters of the apostolic see I should not fail to come... But this he did not add that if the call to the council was countermanded I should abandon the journey... therefore I went there and although you did not come I nevertheless fulfilled my part in the council.'⁶⁴

At about this time Manasses held a council at Soissons at which nine decrees were promulgated, all of them in conformity with papal decrees of the previous years. His purpose in holding this council could have been, like his denouncing the simony of his suffragans, to provide proof of the loyalty to the pope of which he had boasted the previous year: Sed ego fidelis vester et per omnia ecclesiae jura vobis obedire paratus...⁶⁵ The decrees of the council deal at length with infractions of the Treuga Dei; they confirm the prohibitions of clerical marriage and the holding of churches by laymen; they forbid usury and the bearing of arms by clerics and they deny the right of lay powers

⁶⁰ Registrum vi, 3, p. 395: ...ut ad pacem redeat et ab inquietatione ecclesie et persecutione archiepiscopi quiescat.

⁶¹ ibid. Ipse autem...indutias querit ut subterfugiat.

⁶² Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 782.

⁶³ See above, pp. 41-5, where Hugh's failure to conduct any business during that period is discussed.

⁶⁴ Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 782.

⁶⁵ Letter to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611B.

to tax the clergy.⁶⁶ This is the only council directed by Manasses for which there is a detailed record. He had held a council in Rheims in 1074, but there is no record of what was enacted there.⁶⁷

Gregory again urged Hugh of Die to hold a council to investigate the case of the archbishop, about whom an evil report was circulating not only in France but also in almost all of Italy. Again the note of sympathy with Manasses is detectable. If he could get six bishops of good repute to appear for him and thus absolve himself then 'let him remain peacefully in his church and episcopal office.'⁶⁸ The council was finally arranged to take place in Lyons in January or early February 1080 and three weeks before it Hugh sent Manasses two summonses to attend, enclosing a copy of the pope's letter with the second and, according to Manasses, giving him two completely different sets of instructions. These letters are not extant but Manasses's reply to the legate is.⁶⁹ This angry and acrimonious document, in which he seems at times almost incoherent with rage, is quite different in tone from his two letters to the pope. He refused absolutely to attend the council, citing seven canonical reasons why he should not. If what he said was true, one of these should have been enough. He claimed: Quia dixistis ut, si accusatores deessent, ad concilium venirem paratus...me expurgare.⁷⁰ That an accused person should have to justify himself before a council in the absence of his accusers was

⁶⁶ Léopold Delisle; Littérature latine et histoire du moyen-âge (Instructions adressées par le Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques aux correspondants du Ministère de l'Instruction publique et des beaux arts, Paris, 1890) pp. 23-25. This council is referred to in a Charter of January 1079, Prou xciv, p. 245. It is possible that Philip I was present at the council.

⁶⁷ Gall. Chris. x, Ins x, 156-57; Mansi xx, 441.

⁶⁸ E. V. 30, p. 79.

⁶⁹ Letter of Manasses to Hugh of Die, RHG xiv, 781.

⁷⁰ ibid. 783C.

contrary to accepted canon law.⁷¹ The pope himself had referred to this canon in his letter to Archbishop Joscelyn of Bordeaux concerning the accusations against the bishop of Poitiers, Isembert,⁷² and in recognition of this law it had been necessary for Manasses to wait eleven weeks in Rome until his accusers should be present in order to have his case heard.⁷³ He concluded this, his last surviving letter, with a contemptuous defiance of Hugh:

Quod si in pertinacia vestra sicuti domno Papae iisdem verbis mandavimus permanere disposueritis, et pro sola voluntate vestra nos vel suspendere vel excommunicare volueritis, ostensa est vobis via quam sequamur apposita forma cui imprimantur. Sequar verba B. Gregorii, qui dicit 'Saepe in ligandis ac solvendis subditis, suae voluntatis motus, non autem causarum merita sequitur pastor. Unde fit ut et ipsa ligandi ac solvendi potestate se privet, qui hanc non pro subditorum meritis sed pro suae voluntatis motibus exercet.' ... Asseram etiam quod si me excommunicaveritis deerit privilegium Petri et domni Papae, id est potestas ligandi et solvendi...quia non manet Petri privilegium ubicumque ex eius aequitate non fertur iudicium.⁷⁴

The letter which he wrote to the pope is not extant but Gregory, in his reply, urged him not to defy the legate but to go to Lyons, where he would receive a sympathetic hearing from the bishop of Die and also from the bishop of Albano and Hugh of Cluny, who would, the pope hoped, be present.⁷⁵ Hugh of Flavigny said that while Hugh of Die was at Vienne recovering

⁷¹ John Gilchrist, Collectio in LXXIV titulos, 109, p. 74; Non oportet quemquam iudicare aut damnare antequam suos accusatores presentes habeat locumque defendendi accipiat spatiosum ad abluenda crimina.

⁷² Registrum ii, 4, p. 129. Novit...quod personis absentibus accusationem per scripta canonica non probet auctoritas.

⁷³ RHG xiv, 782A.

⁷⁴ ibid. 786CD.

⁷⁵ Registrum vii, 12, p. 476.

from an illness, Manasses tried to bribe him to allow him to clear himself by the oath of six bishops, or by his own oath, without coming to Lyons.⁷⁶ In the light of the letter to Hugh quoted above this attempt at bribery does not seem probable.

Manasses was finally deposed in his absence at the council of Lyons in 1080.⁷⁷ There is no record of either Peter of Albano or Hugh of Cluny having been there, although Peter was in the area at the time.⁷⁸ When the sentence became known in Rome Gregory wrote to him 'in direct contravention of the custom of the church of Rome',⁷⁹ again urging him to recognise the authority of the legate and giving him until the feast of St. Michael to exculpate himself - if he complied with certain conditions. He was to restore the property of the provost Manasses and Bruno and the others who had testified against him and he was to retire to either Cluny or Chaise-Dieu until he had cleared himself, taking from the church of Rheims only what was necessary for him to live on during that time. The pope said that he had been inspired to this clemency by the bishops of Soissons, Laon, Cambrai and Châlons, but undoubtedly he was prompted also by his own wish, implicit in all his letters, to see the archbishop restored to his see if at all possible.

Manasses did not avail himself of this offer. Quite the reverse, he appears to have continued to harass the members of his chapter behaving, according to the pope, 'not as a shepherd to his flock but as thief and a savage brigand'.⁸⁰ Finally, in December 1080 three months after the deadline, Gregory wrote to the clergy and people of Rheims, to Count de Roucy, to the

⁷⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 421-2. See 'Life,' above, p. 41.

⁷⁷ ibid., MGH 8, 422; Mansi xx, 551.

⁷⁸ See 'Legates', below p. 195.

⁷⁹ Registrum vii, 20, p. 496. ...contra morem Romanae ecclesie nimia...

⁸⁰ Registrum viii, 17, p. 539. ...utpote quam non per hostium ut pastor sed aliunde ut fur et sevissimus predo intravit...

suffragans of Rheims and to King Philip that Manasses should be irrevocably deposed and driven out, by force if necessary.⁸¹ Guibert of Nogent reported with relish that he was driven from Rheims by the nobles and clegy of the city and joined the Emperor Henry.⁸² Benzo of Alba also placed him in Henry's camp outside Rome in 1081.⁸³ There is no record of when or where his death took place.

An evaluation of the confrontation between Manasses and the reform papacy is made difficult because of the lack of any precise account of the accusations against him. However, one theme appears in all the documents: his greed for money. He delayed the appointment of an abbot to St. Remigius in order to convert the benefices of the monastery to his own use and there is a suggestion that Henry of Homblières paid for the office when Manasses finally appointed him. Walo accused him of trying to steal from him. It was included in his short oath that he would not alienate the treasures of his church but after his deposition at Lyons he was accused again of seizing those treasures. The pope's command that he was to take with him from Rheims only what was necessary for him to live on if he went to Cluny is significant, and his long delay in replacing Roger of Châlons suggests the possibility that he was involved with Roger in his thefts from his clergy. It is obvious that Gregory had been convinced of the truth of the allegations of robbery and violence perpetrated on the households of Manasses's accusers after the council of Clermont, since two years later he stipulated that their property was to be restored. There is no record of Manasses having specifically denied any of these charges. His usual

⁸¹ Registrum viii, 17, 18, 19 and 20, pp. 538, 539, 540 and 542.

⁸² Guibert of Nogent, De vita sua, Book 1, xi, p. 35. PL 156, 853D.

⁸³ Ad Henricum IV Imperatorum libri vi, MGH 11, 657.

procedure was to make counter-charges against his accusers.⁸⁴

His constant presence in the entourage of King Philip, as witnessed by the frequent appearance of his name in conjunction with that of the king in the charters,⁸⁵ might explain his greed for money, as this constant attendance at the court would certainly have involved him in a great deal of expense. Guibert of Nogent claimed that the pride of Manasses caused him to imitate the imperial pomp of foreign nations (as opposed to the frugality of the French kings) which resulted in his paying more attention to his army than to his clergy. Guibert reported him as saying 'To be archbishop of Rheims would be a good thing if one had not to celebrate Mass because of it.'⁸⁶ Everything reported of him, even by his friends,⁸⁷ suggests an expensive, extravagant life-style which makes his dishonesty about money completely credible.

It is unfortunate that this intelligent, articulate and humorous man should only appear in the records because of his chicanery and violence. His manoeuvres to extricate himself from the consequences of his crimes serve as a screen, concealing a very important standpoint - his conviction of his autonomy in his diocese and his total rejection of, and contempt for, the

⁸⁴ See for instance the charge of scandalous and licentious conduct made against Hugo Rainardus, bishop of Langres (MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 5, 179), of dishonesty against Guarmundus, archbishop Vienne (RHG xiv, 611) and the many accusations of violence and injustice made against Hugh of Die (RHG xiv, 781-6).

⁸⁵ Eleven times between June 1068 and January 1079: see Prou pp. 110-245.

⁸⁶ Guibert of Nogent, *De vita sua*, Book 1, xi; PL 156, 853C.

⁸⁷ The biographer of St. Theodric, abbot of the monastery of St. Hubert in the Ardennes, although an admirer of Manasses, said that he was by nature and custom more than commonly wild and fierce (*Vita Theoderici abbatis Andaginensis*, MGH 12, 49). Fulcois of Beauvais, who accompanied him into exile, conceded that 'no human being lives without sin and rich people do and say displeasing things' (Colker, *Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistulae*, *Traditio* 10, 1954, 212).

authority of the legates. Manasses, in his refusal to yield to Hugh of Die, represented a challenge to a central element of Gregorian policy: that papal authority could be delegated and that the legates, once appointed, spoke with the voice of the pope and could therefore outrank any bishop.⁸⁸ It was his refusal to cede the autonomy of his metropolitancy to these men that caused his eventual downfall, in spite of the pope's obvious partiality for him.

Behind all the anger in his letters his determination to deal only with Rome appears constantly. His archdeacon Wido said on his behalf, explaining his absence from the council of Autun in September 1077: 'He was waiting until the lord pope should have crossed the Alps, as he had said in his letters that he would...'⁸⁹ In the expectation that justice would not be accorded to him at Autun, Wido declared that Manasses would appeal to the lord pope, who had placed him in the see of Rheims.⁹⁰ At the end of the letter reporting this Manasses expressed his confidence that even before he came to Rome he would be delivered by the pope from an excommunication which was 'unheard of in our time'.⁹¹

Manasses returned to this theme in the letter written when he had returned from Rome.⁹² He implored the pope to be mindful of the honour accorded by his predecessors to the predecessors of Manasses in the see; the honour of dealing directly with the pope or with legates sent directly from Rome, not ultramontanes.

⁸⁸ Dictatus Papae, Registrum ii, 55(a), p. 203: Quod legatus eius omnibus episcopis presit in concilio etiam inferioris gradus et adversus eos sententiam depositionis possit dare.

⁸⁹ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, 180. Expectabat etiam si forte domnus papa sicut per epistolam suam sibi mandavit, ultra Alpes transitum faceret...

⁹⁰ ibid. See p. 258 above.

⁹¹ ibid. et me interim, donec ad vos usque perveniam, de excommunicatione nostris temporibus inaudita liberum esse permittatis.

⁹² RHG xiv, 611-12.

These ultramontanes had issued insulting commands to him, Manasses, who was empowered by right to call together all the bishops of Gaul, and for whom it was lawful to deal with the pope without being summoned by a legate.⁹³ He ended that section of the letter with a plea for papal endorsement of his authority as he saw it:

...ego nullatenus volo excedere metas auctoritatis: quandoquidem enim illi qui legatos vestros se faciunt, multo justius ego debeo per vos ea quae sunt providentiae nostrae corrigere, quam quisquam aliena tractare.⁹⁴

John R. Williams said of Manasses: 'Even his opposition to the legatine authority does not appear to have been based on any principle.'⁹⁵ This is not accurate: he stated his principle many times in the two letters to the pope which have survived. His theme was simple. He would deal directly with the pope or with someone sent by the pope to consider specific problems in the diocese: hence his willingness to accept Hugh of Cluny as a judge. There is no reason to suppose that he was aware of the new status conferred on the legates by Gregory in the Dictatus Papae and he would have nothing to do with anyone purporting to stand in place of the pope in Gallia - a vice-pope as it were. All his complaints and requests on the subject of his authority

⁹³ ibid. 611D: Obsecro ut dignitatem quam antecessores vestri antecessoribus meis archiepiscopis servaverunt et privilegiis aliisque scriptis ad posterorum memoriam reliquerunt, mihi reservare dignemini: ne irritum aut infractum privilegium quod ipse dedistis mihi, scilicet ut vobis ipsi interpellatus et non interpellatus respondeam et legatis vestris Romanis, non ultramontanis...Unde propter talium pudendas reprehensiones et vocationes, mihi qui totius Galliae episcopos debeo convocare, liceat confidere de vobis sine legatorum vocatione donec...veniam ad vos. In his reply (Registrum vi, 2, p. 391) Gregory reminded him that the privileges accorded by the See of Rome could equally be revoked if the good of the Church required it.

⁹⁴ RHG xiv, 612A.

⁹⁵ John R. Williams, 'Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII'; American Historical Review, 54, (1948-1949), 823.

were directed to the pope. In his long abusive letter to Hugh of Die he dealt solely with what he saw as infractions of canon law. He did not refer to the rights of his metropolitancy, no doubt feeling that to do so would be to give the appearance of seeking an endorsement of his authority from the legate.

The theme of the constant violation of canon law in Hugh of Die's encounters with him appears throughout his correspondence. In both letters to the pope he complained of the consecration of two men to suffragan bishoprics of Rheims without his knowledge and without his being present. Gerald of Cambrai had obtained his bishopric from Henry IV, but, on learning that this was forbidden, he resigned it into the pope's hands. On Gregory's instructions he was restored to the office and consecrated at the council of Autun in September 1077, but the pope had stipulated that this was to be done in the presence of the metropolitan, Manasses.⁹⁶ He was not there nor had he been informed about it (*me ignorante*).⁹⁷ The consecration of the second man, Radulphus, to the bishopric of Amiens took place while Manasses was in Rome and again without his knowledge (*me nesciente*) but with the connivance of the bishops of Laon and Soissons, also suffragans of Rheims.⁹⁸ Standing firmly on his canonical rights Manasses wrote: *Quin potius quia sine metropolitano juste expleri non potest a quibuslibet coepiscopis consecratio pontificis sicut scitis...*⁹⁹ Gregory was aware that this was a violation of canon law. He instructed Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny to investigate the charges against the three men with the utmost care.¹⁰⁰

The whole theme of Manasses's diatribe to Hugh of Die was his outrage at what he saw as Hugh's continuous disregard of the

⁹⁶ *Registrum* iv, 22, p. 330.

⁹⁷ Letter to Gregory VII, MGH, *Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 5, 182.

⁹⁸ Letter to Gregory, RHG xiv, 611C.

⁹⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Registrum* vi, 3, p. 394.

laws of the Church. Although he was undoubtedly 'seeking for delay as a means of escape,' as Gregory had noted,¹⁰¹ there is an element of truth in what he alleges, enough to suggest that there had been a conspiracy against him among the clergy of his diocese. He was not alone among the prelates of France to resort to violent behaviour when accused of doubtful monetary transactions. When Ralph I, archbishop of Tours, was called to the council of Poitiers in 1078, charged with having paid for his bishopric, he arrived with a troop of soldiers and caused a riot at the council.¹⁰² Because of this he was suspended by Hugh of Die and sent to Rome. Like Manasses he was reinstated at the Lent synod of 1078, but unlike Manasses he was subsequently able to come to terms with the new manifestations of papal authority and he continued in his archbishopric until his death.

Manasses's was not an estimable character: he was violent, overbearing, contemptuous and blatantly dishonest and had obviously made himself very unpopular with his cathedral clergy. On the other hand he could command complete loyalty from his friends. The poet Fulcoius of Beauvais is reputed to have followed him into exile¹⁰³ and it is interesting that his suffragan bishops who went to Rome to plead for him with the pope - Soissons, Laon, Cambrai and Châlons - had all been embroiled with him at some time. The biographer of St. Theoderic, abbot of the monastery of St. Hubert in the Ardennes, described him as wise and strong, worthy of his archbishopric, and said that, although inclined by his nature to ferocity, he made friends easily because of the excellence of his conversation.¹⁰⁴ His intelligence and his wit are manifest in his letters. His various crimes and his ultimate disgrace tend to confuse the issue, but his anger at the usurpation of his authority and the uncanonical manner of his dismissal is understandable. Fulcoius

¹⁰¹ Registrum vi, 3, p. 394.

¹⁰² See below, p. 275.

¹⁰³ Marvin Colker, 'Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistulae', Traditio 10, (1954), 194.

¹⁰⁴ Vita Theoderici abbatis Andaginensis, MGH 12, 49. (mistakenly refers to him as Gervasius).

urged Gregory to pardon Manasses, who could be a 'powerful friend,' and he said to Hugh of Die: 'You are using coercion on a praiseworthy man.'¹⁰⁵

Many of the bishops who were deposed by Hugh as legate of the pope were unworthy to hold office in a reformed Church. They were the men described by Hugh of Flavigny as simoniacs, or ordained by simoniacs or as having received investiture from the hands of laymen.¹⁰⁶ Some of them were notorious for their scandalous and degenerate lifestyles. Manasses of Rheims was none of these things but he was something even more inimical to the new theory of papal authority. He was the voice of the Church in Rheims. He believed in his canonical right to rule his own diocese without legatine interference and although he declared himself prepared to co-operate with the pope in the work of reform nothing known or reported about him suggests that this was anything more than a gesture prompted by expedience. If there was a conspiracy against him in his diocese, as he claimed, it was intelligent of Hugh of Die to make use of that situation to get rid of him in spite of Gregory's vacillations.

¹⁰⁵ Marvin Colker, 'Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistulae,' *Traditio* 10, (1954), 213, lines 32-3; 215, line 35.

¹⁰⁶ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 412.

RALPH OF TOURS.

Ralph de Langeais, archbishop of Tours, was another metropolitan who appears to have fallen foul of the legate, Hugh of Die, although his case is much less well-documented and clear-cut than that of Manasses of Rheims. It is possible that, like Manasses, he resented the intrusion of a permanent representative of Rome in the area of his metropolitancy. It is also possible that his violent outburst at the council of Poitiers in 1078 was orchestrated by the bishops of France because of the prohibition of investiture, first heard in France at Autun a few months before.¹⁰⁷

Like so many of the French bishops at the end of the eleventh century Ralph was of noble birth.¹⁰⁸ He was a son of Fulcredus or Fulcardus of Langeais, a town on the Loire near Tours. Neither the date of his consecration nor that of his death is certain - perhaps 1073 and 1086 respectively.¹⁰⁹ He is referred to occasionally as inimicus Dei¹¹⁰ but the Gallia Christiana cites Joannes Maan, who declared him to be both pious and good living and in no way blameworthy.¹¹¹ In 1074 Gregory summoned him to Rome to 'make satisfaction' for having kept company with the excommunicated Count Fulk of Anjou but it is obvious from this letter that he was otherwise in good standing with the pope, who urged him to come 'lest, heaven forbid, you compel us to pass a sentence against you which we do not desire

¹⁰⁷ Letter of Manasses I to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611; apud Augustodunense concilium ubi domnus H... promulgavit et statuit ...hoc vestrum ecclesiasticum decretum.

¹⁰⁸ See 'Suffragans,' above, p. 247.

¹⁰⁹ Gall. Chris. xiv, 63.

¹¹⁰ Chronicon Turonensi 1081; RHG xii, 463. Narratio controversiae inter capitulum S. Martini Turonensis et Radulphum ejusdem urbis archiepiscopum; RHG xii, 459.

¹¹¹ Gall. Chris. xiv, 63; pium et bonum asseruit et in nulla re culpandum.

to pass'.¹¹² It is possible that his subsequent bad reputation may have been acquired when he fell foul of King Philip, because of his supposed friendliness with the papal legates, and became the subject of a vicious attack by the anonymous monk of St. Martin of Tours.¹¹³ It is also possible that it may be founded, at least in part, on a confusion with his successor in the see, Ralph II.

Three letters survive from Hugh of Die to Ralph de Langeais written during the years 1075-1077.¹¹⁴ Both Migne¹¹⁵ and Bouquet¹¹⁶ include a fourth in which the identity of the sender is indicated only by the letters Hu. Bouquet points out, however, that this letter should be attributed to Hubert, subdeacon of the Roman church.¹¹⁷ The use of the word apocrisarius, never employed by Hugh to describe himself, indicates an envoy of the pope at the court of a king, which Hubert was on several occasions:¹¹⁸ Hugh was not, until he went to Byzantium at the end of his life.¹¹⁹

The first letter from Hugh to Ralph shows the chronicler Hugh of Flavigny to be mistaken in placing the council of Clermont before that of Dijon.¹²⁰ This letter was written after Anse, probably at the end of 1075. Ralph had not been at the

¹¹² E. V. 3, p. 9.

¹¹³ See below, p. 277.

¹¹⁴ PL 157, 507-509, ii, iii and iv.

¹¹⁵ ibid. i.

¹¹⁶ RHG xiv, 778, iv.

¹¹⁷ ibid. n. (c).

¹¹⁸ Registrum iv, 17, p. 323; v, 19, p. 382; vii, 26 and 27, pp. 507 and 508.

¹¹⁹ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 487. Romanus pontifex annuerat ...ut legationem suam ei committeret in Asia...

¹²⁰ PL 157, 507, ii. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 413; ...primum concilium celebravit apud Ansam secundum apud Clarummontem...Tertium Divioni.

council and matters were brought up at it about which Hugh would welcome the opinion and advice of his 'brother'. The ardour (caritate) of the people has cooled, the sheep are beset by dangers and the shepherds have no care for them (Anse had marked the beginning of Hugh's campaign against simony). The purpose of the letter was to announce to the archbishop that Hugh was holding a council at Dijon early in the following January and to urge him to be present with his suffragans. The tone, apart from the hyperbole of the description of the evils which beset the church, is business-like. Ralph obviously came to Dijon because in his next letter¹²¹ Hugh calls on him affectionately (caritative vocamus) to come to the council at Clermont in August, 1076. Te quoque, sicut fidelissimum socium in via Dei et adiutorem ejus...¹²² The tone of this letter is warmer, suggesting that these men have become friends. The records show that Ralph came to Clermont and that he presided over the council with Hugh.¹²³

The last letter from the legate to the archbishop, summoning him to the council at Autun in September, 1077, indicates their continuing friendship.¹²⁴ Gratias habeo innumeras quia semper obediens extitisti et sanctae Ecclesiae in necessitate subvenire pro posse et scire tuo non refugisti. Te igitur valde nobis necessarium pro tua ipsius etiam necessitate apostolica auctoritate vocamus, et per te tuos suffraganos episcopos, tuos etiam utiliores clericos et abbates ad synodum in Augustodunensi...: but there may be a hint of the accusations that were to be brought against Ralph in the idea that he should come for his own sake as well as for Hugh's. Hugh of Flavigny recounts that many illustrious men, bishops and clerics, gathered at Autun from France and Burgundy,¹²⁵ but he does not mention Ralph, nor does Hugh in the letter which he eventually wrote to

¹²¹ ibid., 508, iii.

¹²² ibid.

¹²³ Mansi xx, 481.

¹²⁴ PL 157, 508, iv. RHG xiv, 778, iii.

¹²⁵ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 415.

Gregory VII about this council at the end of 1077.¹²⁶ However, the anonymous chronicler of the monastery of Marmoutier says that Ralph was present at Autun.¹²⁷

A letter to Gregory VII from Hugh after the council of Poitiers just four months later, in January 1078,¹²⁸ reveals an extraordinary enmity which had sprung up between the legate and the man he had so lately held in the highest esteem, and describes the unedifying scenes that took place at the council because of this. Ralph, now referred to by Hugh as pestis et dedecus sanctae ecclesiae archiepiscopus, with his suffragan, Sylvester of Rennes, disrupted almost the whole meeting. Both men were accused of having obtained their bishoprics by simony. Ralph was charged with having purchased his bishopric from the king and with having bribed a knight with the gift of a forest to help him secure it. Ralph and Sylvester behaved quite wildly when this accusation was made, shouting and laughing and inciting their armed servants to attack members of the council. Although Hugh changed the location of the council, the following day Ralph continued his attack: ...draco ille insurgens tamquam leo rugens... (anger had obviously disrupted Hugh's grasp of metaphor). The council refused to hear him and he was sent to Rome for judgement.¹²⁹

This is difficult to understand. Had Ralph been told of these accusations before the council? Did Hugh know of them before Autun when he said that it would be a good thing for Ralph himself to come to that council? If Ralph did not know of them, then canon law was contravened here,¹³⁰ as Gregory was later to

¹²⁶ PL 148, 744, viii.

¹²⁷ RHG xiv, 95.

¹²⁸ PL 157, 509, vii.

¹²⁹ ibid.

¹³⁰ John Gilchrist, Collectio in LXXIV titulos, 71, p. 57-8; Si quis episcopus ab illis accusatoribus qui recipiendi sunt fuerit accusatus, postquam caritative ipse ab eis conventus fuerit ut ipsam causam emendare debeat et eam corrigere noluerit, non olim, sed tunc ad summos primates canonice causa eius deferatur...

point out.¹³¹ Ralph does not seem to have cited canon law in his own defence at this council, but more surprisingly he does not seem to have mentioned a circumstance which certainly excused his anger, if not his behaviour; namely that this case against him had already been heard and settled in Rome during the pontificate of Alexander II. Gregory was obviously surprised that it should be brought up again: ...'especially since his case had been tried and settled before our predecessor of respected memory, Pope Alexander'.¹³²

Hugh is undoubtedly correct in attributing this violent behaviour on Ralph's part to the attitude of the king. It is obvious that Philip resented the prohibition of investiture proclaimed at Autun four months earlier.¹³³ Before the council at Poitiers he wrote obsequiously to Hugh to assure him of the honour and respect in which he held his legation, but at the same time he informed Count William of Poitiers (Duke William VIII of Aquitaine) and the bishops of the region that he would regard them as criminals if they allowed a conventicula or quasi concilia to take place in which the glory of his crown and the authority of his kingdom might be obscured. Hugh, writing of this to the pope, claimed that as a result Sylvester and Ralph, 'the enemies of truth,' were emboldened to behave as they did, leaving him uncertain as to who were his friends and who his enemies.¹³⁴

This incident illustrates the difficulty the legates encountered when dealing with Philip who, while appearing to support them, was in reality trying to sabotage their mission and

¹³¹ E.V. 22, p. 59; to the clergy and people of Tours; ...we have discovered that he was not suspended from office by due process of law...

¹³² ibid.

¹³³ Letter of Manasses of Rheims to Gregory VII, Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, (Carl Erdmann und Norbert Fickerman), MGH 107, 178.

¹³⁴ PL 157, 509, vii. Ex hac ergo adversitate inimici veritatis audaciam nacti nobis insultandi, eos pene traxerunt in sinistram quos considerabam ad dexteram et videbam et non erat qui cognosceret me.

calling successfully on his bishops to emulate him. The only possible explanation for the failure of Ralph to show that his case had already been judged in Rome and for his disruptive behaviour at the council of Poitiers is that he was determined to discredit the legate, in spite of his earlier friendship. In this he succeeded, as Gregory VII's letter of 9 March 1078 demonstrates.¹³⁵ There seems to have an element of conspiracy in this case also, because Ralph's earlier acquittal must have been known to his accusers.

The anonymous monk of Touraine, extremely hostile to Ralph, recounts a curious sequel to this.¹³⁶ According to this source Ralph had shown himself so submissive to the legates Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron (who were seeking to deprive Philip of the bishoprics of his demesne)¹³⁷ that in 1081 he was summoned to present himself at the king's court. When he failed to appear, the king compelled Fulk of Anjou to invade the archbishopric of Tours and drive out the archbishop if he refused to give satisfaction to the king. The canons of the cathedral of St. Martin of Tours, who were at the time complaining of ill-treatment by Ralph, were associated in this attack. Most of these details also appear in the Narratio controversiae inter capitulum S. Martini Turonensis et Radulphum ejusdem urbis archiepiscopum.¹³⁸ This was not written until the middle of the twelfth century, but a letter of Gregory to the canons of St. Martin shows that there was some truth in the account. The pope castigated the canons for their attack on the archbishop and commanded them to restore him with honour to his church. He

¹³⁵ Registrum v, 17, p. 378. See 'Relations with Gregory VII,' above p. 39.

¹³⁶ Ex chronico Turonensi 1081; RHG xii, 463.

¹³⁷ ibid; ...ejectus est Radulphus Dei Inimicus ab Archiepiscopatu Turonensi a Fulcone Comite Andegavensi, de mandato Philippi Regis Franciae, eo quod idem Radulphus favebat Episcopo Legatis Romanae Ecclesiae qui auferre Regi Episcopatus regni sui subdole praesumebant...

¹³⁸ RHG xii, 459.

also warned them to stay away from the excommunicated Count Fulk.¹³⁹ H. E. J. Cowdrey attributes this puzzling episode to the king's displeasure at the translation of Hugh to the primatial see of Lyons, deducing that Philip instigated the attack on Ralph because of his early collaboration with the legate.¹⁴⁰ This explanation takes no account of the violent enmity that had arisen between Hugh of Die and the archbishop at the time of the council of Poitiers early in 1078.

When Gregory VII conferred the title of Primate on Archbishop Gebuin of Lyons in 1079 Ralph, writing to Ernardus of Le Mans, professed himself confused about whether the office had been given to Gebuin or to the legate, Amatus of Oloron.¹⁴¹ This supposed confusion may have been intended to demonstrate Ralph's contempt for the office as an intrusion of papal authority into the French Church. Unlike Manasses of Rheims, however, Ralph was subsequently able to come to terms with the legate. He may be found in Hugh's company between 1080 and 1082 at the councils of Toulouse, Bordeaux, Saintes, Issoudun and Lyons.¹⁴² He remained in his archbishopric until his death in 1094.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ E. V. 52, p. 126.

¹⁴⁰ *ibid.* note. See also the council of Lyons 1082, 'Agent of Reform', pp. 131-2.

¹⁴¹ RHG xiv, 671.

¹⁴² Mansi xx, 457, 527 (529 551), 571, 577 and 587.

¹⁴³ *Ex chronico Turonensi*, RHG xii, 466.

RICHERIUS OF SENS.

Unlike Manasses of Rheims and Ralph of Tours, whose quarrel was with the papal legates, Richerius lost his office because of his revolt against what he saw as an illegal act of the papacy - the granting of the primacy over the provinces of Lyons, Rouen, Tours and Sens to the metropolitan see of Lyons rather than to that of Sens. However, his case resembled theirs in that his ultimate rebellion was against papal authority.

The archbishop of Sens, the metropolitan see of Paris, was an important figure in the kingdom of France, constantly in the company of the king.¹⁴⁴ Richerius had been consecrated to the see in Paris at Easter 1062, in the presence of the king and the princes.¹⁴⁵ Although Fliche dates the archbishop's antagonism from the appointment of Hugh of Lyons to the primacy in 1081-2,¹⁴⁶ there is evidence that he resented Hugh as legate long before there was any question of his succeeding to the primacy. Hugh's letter to Gregory VII after the council of Autun in September 1077 shows that Richerius was already offering 'contempt and insults' to the legate at that time. Hugh said that his messenger 'R' would have told the pope about this:

De Senonensi autem archiepiscopo quantam contulmeliam quantamve injuriam auctoritate vestrae in nostra legatione intulerit a praedicto R., ut spero, sufficienter audistis.¹⁴⁷

From Hugh's next words it is possible to conjecture what might have been behind this incident: Neque hoc dicens, Deus testis est, gloriam meam quaero.¹⁴⁸ It is obvious that Richerius's contemptuous insolence had been resented by Hugh, not for himself alone, but also as representative of the pope. Given the

¹⁴⁴ See the subscriptions to Philip's diplomas, Prou, lxxxi, p. 207; lxxxvi, p. 224; lxxxvii, p. 227 and xci, p. 234.

¹⁴⁵ Gall. Chris. xii, 38C.

¹⁴⁶ A. Fliche, Philippe I, p. 350.

¹⁴⁷ PL 148, 744, viii.

¹⁴⁸ ibid.

importance of the archbishopric of Sens to the king of France, it seems very probable that the king was supporting Richerius in his defiance of the legate. It was at this council of Autun that the decree against investiture was first proclaimed in France. A tacit encouragement of rebellion on the part of his archbishop would have been typical of Philip I's policy of passive resistance to unwelcome papal legislation.¹⁴⁹ Richerius had been suspended for non-attendance at a council, probably at Clermont the previous year.¹⁵⁰ Re-instating him in March 1078, Gregory said:

...coram eodem legato debeat exponere et in negotiis ecclesiasticis pro posse suo consilium et auxilium fideliter et humiliter sibi impendere eisque animum placare.¹⁵¹

There is no record that Richerius ever appeared before Hugh to explain himself. There is also no record of any further trouble between the two men until Urban II's journey through France, eighteen years later.

When Gregory VII appointed Gebuin of Lyons to the primacy in Gallia Richerius appears to have made no difficulties. He probably realised that Gebuin posed no threat to his authority as metropolitan, because Gregory immediately by-passed the new primate and continued to employ his legates to implement his policies.¹⁵² (Gebuin is not recorded as holding any councils while he was primate and archbishop of Lyons). However, a letter from Urban II to Hugh of Lyons at the time of the council of Clermont shows that Hugh had been experiencing difficulties from

¹⁴⁹ See below, p. 284, where this attitude of Philip is discussed.

¹⁵⁰ This letter from Hugh to Gregory refers to both Clermont and Autun.

¹⁵¹ Registrum v, 17, p. 379. See above, 'Life' p. 39, where this reinstatement of Richerius is discussed.

¹⁵² See letters of Gebuin to Ralph of Tours and Eusebius Bruno of Angers which show his confusion about the areas of his authority; RHG xiv, 670, vi and vii. For a discussion of the office of primate see above 'Life' pp. 17-20 and 'Ivo of Chartres' below p. 315.

Richerius about the primacy 'at many previous councils,'¹⁵³ for which no records now exist. The resentment that Richerius was eventually to express about the primacy of Lyons may not have been solely because of what he saw as an injustice to his see of Sens, but also because of the fact that Lyons was not in the kingdom of France, but in the Empire. This must have been a cause of aggravation to Philip I, who would undoubtedly have supported his archbishop in any attacks on the primacy.

It was to be thirteen years before Richerius's rebellion attracted public papal attention, when he withdrew in anger from the council of Clermont, where the primacy of the archbishopric of Lyons over the provinces of Lyons, Rouen, Tours and Sens was confirmed. That this was seen as a necessary step by the pope supports the theory that Richerius had never accepted the subordination of his see to the primacy of Lyons, in spite of the lack of any record of specific incidents. Richerius refused to accept the confirmation at Clermont and, although he was allowed some time to present his case, he chose not to do so and absented himself from the council completely. Hugh of Lyons sent his suffragan, Agano of Autun, and Lambert of Arras to reason with him but he refused to yield. The pallium was therefore withdrawn from him and his suffragans released from their obedience.¹⁵⁴

Reviewing all this for Hugh of Lyons, Urban stressed that he had not been alone in taking this decision: his judgement was confirmed by a number of bishops, including Archbishop Ralph II of Tours and the suffragans of Rouen (in the absence of their archbishop). The suffragans of Sens also promised humbly to obey the decision.¹⁵⁵ Obviously the pope hoped that Richerius would

¹⁵³ JL 5600. PL 151, clxv, 438B; Fraternitas tua de primatu sanctae Lugdunensis Ecclesiae querelam exposuit, multis iam ante provincialibus conciliis agitatam.

¹⁵⁴ ibid, 438: ...nos toto consentiente concilio, pallii usum et suffraganeorum obedientiam, donec ipse obediret, Senonsensi archiepiscopo interdiximus.

¹⁵⁵ ibid. Ipsius itaque suffraganeis qui praesentes aderant sententiam nostram debita humilitate suscipientibus ac obedientiam promittentibus...

eventually relent because he allowed him to resume the pallium the following year in order to consecrate William de Montfort (brother of Bertrada) to the bishopric of Paris.¹⁵⁶ This magnanimous gesture on the part of Urban II demonstrates the lengths to which the pope was prepared to go to accommodate both the king and the archbishop.

Richerius, however, was prepared to have the pallium withdrawn from him and to die in disgrace with Rome rather than submit to the primacy. His importance in the French Church may be deduced from the attitude of Ivo of Chartres. Ivo advised him to look for documents to support his contention that the Church of Sens should not be subject to Lyons, and in the meantime to submit, hoping that such documents might turn up.¹⁵⁷ (There is no likelihood that such documents ever existed. Since the institution of the office of primate in 876 not only Sens, but also the sees of Arles, Metz and Rheims had had the primacy conferred on them).¹⁵⁸ In spite of his earlier differences with Richerius,¹⁵⁹ Ivo was deferential and sympathetic in this letter, although writing to Hugh shortly afterwards he described Richerius's attitude as 'unreasonable',¹⁶⁰

Richerius died the following year (1097) without submitting.¹⁶¹ His successor, Daimbert seemed set to follow in his intransigence but a very real danger of schism in the French church was averted by the uncompromising authority of Hugh of Lyons.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁶ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Richerius, PL 162, ep. 50, 62,

¹⁵⁷ PL 162, l, 62A.

¹⁵⁸ Fliche, Philippe Ier, p. 351.

¹⁵⁹ See 'Debate with Ivo of Chartres' below, p. 302.

¹⁶⁰ PL 162, 54, 65D; irrationaliter;

¹⁶¹ Letter of Urban II to Hugh of Lyons; PL 151, 543, ccxcii; Richerius pro sua pertinacia interdictus obit.

¹⁶² See 'Debate between Ivo of Chartres and Hugh of Lyons,' below.

The careers of these three metropolitans demonstrate how successful the papal movement to gather the reins of the church into its own hands had been in France. Bishops either submitted, like Ralph of Tours, or were eliminated, like Manasses and, eventually, Richerius. Rebellion was no longer fashionable.

ooo000ooo

THE FRENCH BISHOPS AND THE KING.

It was made clear to the young King Philip I at the time of his consecration at Rheims that, under God, his power came to him solely through the authority of the French Church. It was only when Archbishop Gervase of Rheims had elected him to the kingship that the assent of the papal legates who were present was sought. The archbishop of Rheims claimed the right of the first vote in a royal election and exercised this right in 987. Gervase's action in 1059 was an attempt to revive this right (perhaps influenced by the role of the archbishop of Mainz in the election of 1024 in Germany).¹ The assent of the legates was sought, not because the legality of the election depended in any way on their approval, but merely out of respect and regard (*honoris tamen et amoris*) for the pope.² This aloofness of the French Church from the papacy³ allowed the king to disregard unpalatable papal legislation, knowing that he could depend on his bishops' taking at least a passive attitude. Unlike Henry IV, Philip I never contemplated a schismatic confrontation with Rome. A letter from Gregory VII, in 1080, expressed the pope's gratification at having heard through envoys of the king's desire to obtain his friendship and the favour of St. Peter.⁴ It was a common policy of Philip and his bishops to resist unpalatable legislation rather than to challenge papal authority. A. Luchaire commented that in Philip I the Church was confronting a very powerful force - the force of inertia. In spite of at least three excommunications, he appeared no more and no less religious than his predecessors. Throughout his reign his bishops either gave

¹ U. Reuling, Die Kur in Deutschland und Frankreich, (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 59 *et seq.*

² Coronatio Philippi I, RHG xi, 32; Prou, Introduction p. xxiv; A. Fliche, Philippe Ier, pp. 2-3

³ It was not a new phenomenon: At St. Basle de Verzy in 991 and at Chelles in 995 French bishops had affirmed their right to sit in judgement on the decisions of the pope.

⁴ Registrum viii, 20, p. 542.

him their complete loyalty or he was able to purchase it.⁵

During the eleventh century royal authority was increasingly dependent on its ecclesiastical property as a source of revenue. Pierre Imbart de la Tour asserted that, during the period of papal reform, the French king had at his disposal the four metropolitan sees of the north of France, Rheims, Tours, Bourges and Sens; and also that he could control the elections in the bishoprics of Soissons, Lâon, T  rouanne, Amiens, Beauvais, Ch  lons-sur-Marne, Meaux, Troyes, Langres, Chalon-sur-S  one, M  acon, Auxerre, Autun, Orl  ans, Paris, Chartres and Le Puy.⁶ There is no doubt that Philip expected to control these bishoprics and that both Gregory VII and Urban II were prepared to concede some rights to him in the elections. After the deposition of Manasses I of Rheims Gregory felt it necessary to urge the king to allow the free election of a successor⁷ and Urban was prepared to agree to the appointment of the unsuitable John to the bishopric of Orl  ans in spite of the protests of Ivo of Chartres.⁸ On the other hand, Philip was not always successful in forcing the election of his candidate against firm opposition. At the council of Meaux in 1081, Arnulf of Pam  le was elected to the bishopric of Soissons and Ursio, appointed simoniacally by the king, was deposed. This was done in spite of the presence at the council of several of the bishops thought by Imbart de la Tour to be in Philip's control.⁹ It is, however, extremely difficult to discover exactly the bishoprics from which Philip I could claim the rights of gustum and servitium. On the basis of a survey of the places where his diplomas were issued, it has not proved possible to reach a conclusion about bishoprics

⁵ A. Luchaire, Les premiers Cap  tiens, p. 168-169; cited by H. Leclercq editing K-J. von Hefele, Histoire des Conciles v, i, 121, n. 3.

⁶ Pierre Imbart de la Tour, Les   lections   piscopales dans l'  glise de France du IXe au XIIe Si  cles, p. 439.

⁷ Registrum viii, 20, p. 542.

⁸ See below.

⁹ See 'council of Meaux,' above p. 129.

which owed him hospitality, as the diplomas emanated either from his own property or that of his castellans.

Philip I was constantly preoccupied with the extension of his demesne and the expenses of conquest and he was not above raiding the treasures of his churches when he needed money (as in the case of St. Germain des Prés).¹⁰ Also, bishops who incurred his displeasure risked not only personal attacks but temporary confiscation of their property. When Ivo of Chartres refused to approve the union of Philip with Bertrada de Montfort, the king sent Ivo to gaol and encouraged Hugh of Le Puiset and others to ransack the bishop's house and lands,¹¹ presumably sharing in the spoils. But undoubtedly the king's chief source of revenue from the Church was his sale of ecclesiastical office. Gualterius, abbot of Pontoise, accused him of selling the free gifts of the Holy Spirit and of setting up a chain of this trafficking in church offices,¹² but for Philip I simony and investiture were methods of government.

Fliche referred to a right, seldom mentioned in the sources but exercised by Philip, as it had been by his ancestors: the right to collect the revenues of the bishoprics of his kingdom during the absence of the bishop (whether because of death or any other reason.)¹³ By this right the king could exercise all the temporal functions of the bishopric. A charter of 1102 reads in part ...Tempore quo hac firmata sunt, erat in Jherusalem Guillermus, Parisiorum episcopus, et episcopatus erat in manu Philippi regis.¹⁴ The exercise of this droit de régale could be a continuing source of revenue to the king and meant that he

¹⁰ Acta Sanctorum, RHG xiv, 24. See also the case of Beauvais below.

¹¹ J. Fronto, Vita S. Ivonis episcopi Carnot; Bollandus, Acta Sanctorum, 1685, v, Maii, p. 249*; Letter of Ivo of Chartres to William, abbot of Fécamp, PL 162, 19, 32.

¹² Vita S. Gualterii Abbatis Pontisarensis, RHG xiv, 74.

¹³ A. Fliche, Philippe 1er de France, p. 338.

¹⁴ Prou, cxliv, p. 358.

was in no hurry to see vacant sees filled.¹⁵

The revenues of the bishopric of Beauvais came into the king's hands twice during his reign. These cases illustrate the king's ability to resist ecclesiastical pressure without allowing his resistance to escalate into a real conflict. They also demonstrate a changing policy on the part of the papacy. Urban II and Paschal II showed themselves willing to leave the direction of affairs to local churchmen and to await the outcome with some patience. The relative silence and obscurity of Hugh of Lyons after the death of Gregory VII was of major importance in this new approach of the papacy.

When Philip was still very young he attacked the bishop of Beauvais, Guy, and with the help of the people of Beauvais, expelled him from his bishopric, seizing not only the revenues but even the treasures of the bishopric for his own use.¹⁶ Order was finally restored when Gregory VII issued a condemnation of the actions of king and people and Guy was able to repossess his bishopric.¹⁷ After Guy's death, Stephen of Garlande was chosen by Philip I and Bertrada to succeed him in the bishopric of Beauvais, but he was excommunicated by Hugh of Lyons for public adultery.¹⁸ Due to the efforts of Ivo of Chartres, a certain Galo, of humble origins but renowned for his learning and probity, was elected in his place. The king manifested great hostility to Galo and swore that he would never confer the temporalia of the bishopric on him. Ivo of Chartres wrote impassioned letters to Manasses II of Rheims, metropolitan of the see of Beauvais, and to Paschal II, pointing out that if the king could nullify a canonical election by this kind of oath there would never again be any hope of eliminating simony in elections

¹⁵ See the correspondence between Gregory VII and Archbishop Manasses of Rheims concerning the long delay in filling the vacancy in the bishopric of Châlons-sur-Marne (above p.255).

¹⁶ Vita S. Romanae virginis, RHG xiv, 29.

¹⁷ Registrum i, 74, p. 105.

¹⁸ There is no record of where this excommunication took place.

in France. This argument proved successful: Galo was consecrated to the bishopric of Beauvais, probably by Paschal II. The king, however, remained obdurate and refused to invest Galo with the temporalities, so Beauvais remained virtually without a bishop for almost five years. Finally, when the bishop of Paris died in 1104, further strenuous efforts on the part of Ivo of Chartres secured permission for Galo to transfer to that see. The pope and the king accepted this compromise and a certain Gaufridus was elected to the see of Beauvais.¹⁹ During the five years of the impasse the king had continued to enjoy the revenues from the bishopric.

On the other hand Philip I could be a most generous patron. In the acts of his reign there are many instances of gifts made to monasteries of land and churches from his demesne, of privileges granted and of exemptions from taxes.²⁰

The loyalty of the French episcopate to the king is clearly demonstrated in the conflict between Philip I and the papacy, in the affair of the king's marriage to the wife of Count Fulk of Anjou, Bertrada de Montfort. In 1090 or 1091 Philip repudiated his wife, Bertha, and had her confined in Montreuil-sur-Mer.²¹ In 1092 he either eloped with Bertrada or, more likely, acquired

¹⁹ Gams, *Series episcoporum*, p. 511. The history of this affair is given in the letters of Ivo of Chartres, PL 162, 87, 107; 102, 120-1; 104, 122; 105, 123-4; 144, 150-1; 145, 151; 146, 151-2.

²⁰ See Prou, *Receuil des Actes de Philippe Ier, Roi de France*, lxxvi, p. 192; xc, p. 232; xcv, p. 245; ci, p. 260; cix, p. 276.

²¹ Bouquet's annotation of the Continuation of the History of Aimon, RHG xii, 122, gives 1092 for this; ...*Rex Philipus, suggestione diabolica, Bertam reginam repudiavit et ei subtrahens sui praesentiam ad castrum quod dicitur Monsteriolum super mare situm, quo illam dotaverat, eam destinavit.* If Philip's elopement with Bertrada is accepted as having taken place in May, 1092 (see note below) an earlier date seems more probable, particularly in view of Geoffrey of Malaterra's account of Philip's attempt to form an alliance with Emma, daughter of Roger of Sicily; (*Gaufredi Malaterrae historia Sicula*, iv, viii: RHG xiii, 726).

her with the consent of her husband.²² He went through a form of marriage with her and she remained with him until the end of his life.²³ There is no suggestion in the chronicles that this episode caused any enmity between Bertrada's two husbands.²⁴ An alliance had existed between the king and the count since 1068, when Fulk had seized Anjou from his brother, Geoffrey, and imprisoned him in the castle of Chinon where he went mad. Philip I, always hungry for territory, seems to have been given the Gâtinais and Château Landon by Fulk in return for his non-intervention in this affair, although the date of these acquisitions is not certain.²⁵ Fulk was castigated by Pope Alexander II for his barbaric treatment of his brother and, according to himself, he released Geoffrey for a time.²⁶ However, a letter written by Hugh of Die to Gregory VII after the

²² Clarius Chronicon, S. Petri Vivi Senonensis, a. mxcii. (Bibl. Hist. de l'Yonne, vii, p.512; quoted in Fliche, Philippe I, p.142) The Chronicon S. Martini Turonensis, RHG xii, 465, places the elopement in 1093, but the earlier date is confirmed by a charter of Ralph of Beaugency which is dated 'in the month of May in the year in which Philip took as wife Bertrada, wife of Fulk, count of Anjou, that is to say the year of the incarnation 1092' (quoted in Fliche, Philippe I, p.42, fn.3) and by a letter of Urban II to Rainaldus of Rheims, dated October 1092; JL 5469.

²³ See William of Malmesbury, De gestis Regum Anglorum, ed. W. Stubbs, RS 90, iii, p. 293, v, p. 480; Orderic Vitalis, vii; ed. Chibnall, iv; Clarius Chronicon, S. Petri vivi Senonensis, a. mxcii, RHG xii, 280.

²⁴ Orderic Vitalis (viii, iv, 261-3) attributed the acceptance of the situation on the part of her two husbands to Bertrada's charms, which were such that she could entertain them together at a banquet in perfect harmony.

²⁵ Chronicae S. Albin Andegavensis. RHG xi, 287. Gesta Consulum Andegavensis, RHG xi, 273-4; ipsique Landonense castrum in perpetuum concessit. Hugh of Fleury, Modernorum regum Francorum actus, MGH 9, 390; Fulco vero comes, qui fratris honorem sibi rapuerat, formidans ne rex Philippus pro perpetrata nequicia super eum irrueret et honore privaret, Vastinensem comitatum ei reliquit.

²⁶ RHG xi, 138; Ex historiae Andegavensis, fragmento; auctore Fulcone comite, ...cum eum fratrem meum de vinculis ubi eum tenueram liberavissem jussu Papae Alexandri.

council of Poitiers in 1078, shows that the count was still under a cloud then, either on account of his imprisonment of his brother or because of his matrimonial entanglements.²⁷ Before his marriage to Bertrada he had had three wives: one was dead and he had repudiated the others.²⁸ He was in no sense the conventional injured party.

Initially Urban II took a conciliatory approach to this matter, urging Rainaldus of Rheims and his suffragans to try to persuade the king to turn away from his crime.²⁹ The pope's management of the affair of the king's marriage was criticised by Hugh of Flavigny, who contrasted his supineness with the firmness of his legate, Hugh of Lyons.

Multa hii a domno episcopo Lugdunensi tunc temporis legato Romanea ecclesiae coerciti invectione multa nisi ipse sibi praecavissent multati fuissent severitate. Sed...Romana pietas et errata donavit et remissione sua infamiam superavit.³⁰

However the chronicler did not specify precisely what was achieved by Hugh's firmness.

The date of Bertha's death is uncertain, but she was probably dead when Philip called a council in Rheims in 1094, hoping to have his marriage with Bertrada recognised.³¹ Nothing is known of the proceedings at this council but the very large number of bishops present proves that the king maintained a firm grip on his church. As well as Renaldus of Rheims, Richerius of Sens, Ralph of Tours, Geoffrey of Paris, Walter of Meaux, Hugh

²⁷ Causas Andegavensis comitis sicut praecepistis ab ipsius ore audientes rationabiles pene esse credidimus; sed de absolutione ejus non praesumentes diffinitionem hujus rei prudentiae sanctitatis vestrae committimus. PL 157, 511B.

²⁸ Orderic Vitalis. Historia Aecclesiastica, iv, 187, n. 3.

²⁹ JL 5469; PL 151, 354, lxviii.

³⁰ Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 493.

³¹ Mansi, xx, 795

of Soissons, Helinandus of Laon, Rathbodus of Noyen, Gervinus of Amiens and Hugh of Senlis were present.³² Ivo of Chartres was not there, giving as reason for his absence the fact that the summons to attend had not been issued by the bishops of his own province and that the king had not offered him a safe-conduct.³³

In a letter to Hugh of Lyons (in which he is called 'legate of the holy Roman church' for the first time since his break with Desiderius) Urban II explained that he had left the conduct of this matter in the hands of the archbishop of Rheims 'to keep the peace and expedite a solution'.³⁴ This was the only occasion after the breach between Hugh of Lyons and the papacy in 1087 where the pope seemed to feel that some explanation was due to Hugh because he was not being employed as a legate. However, shortly after this Hugh came into the case through the back door. On 24 June 1094, he met Fulk of Anjou at the abbey of St. Florentius at Saumur and, having seen for himself that Geoffrey was mad, he released Fulk from his excommunication on two conditions. First, that should Geoffrey regain his sanity Fulk would either restore Anjou or make a peaceful settlement with him. Second, that Fulk would not, without Hugh's consent, acquire any more wives, because he already had a deplorable abundance of them (de quarum numerositate culpabatur).³⁵ Was there a third condition, not mentioned by Hugh, imposed on Fulk in return for this release?³⁶ In 1110 Ivo of Chartres claimed that at Clermont Urban II had ratified Hugh's excommunication of the king because Fulk had proved that a marriage between Philip and Bertrada would have been incestuous, since Fulk and the king

³² Baluze, de Atrebatensi episcopatu ab Urbano II restituto, RHG xiv, 750, n. c. Mansi xx, 795; Clarius Chronicon, s. Petri vivi Senonensis a. mxciv, RHG xii, 280; Hefele, 386

³³ PL 162, ep.35, 46-47.

³⁴ PL 151, 389, cxvi. JL 5523.

³⁵ Charter of Hugh of Lyons, PL 157, xiii, 517-518.

³⁶ This suggestion has been put forward by Georges Duby in The Knight, the Lady and the Priest, pp. 11-12.

were (distantly) related.³⁷ Might Hugh have persuaded Fulk to produce this evidence and come out firmly against the marriage? In June, 1095, a year after his release from the excommunication and a few months before the council of Clermont, Fulk added the words 'at a time when France was defiled by the adultery of the unworthy king, Philip' to the date of a diploma.³⁸ This sanctimonious attitude does not ring true in Fulk, whose own marital record was so poor and who appears from the beginning to have been a very complaisant third party in the affair of Philip and Bertrada. This revelation of his kinship with Philip and his conversion to a more conventional disapproval of the abduction of his wife, whether real or feigned, earned the approbation of the pope for Fulk. On 25 March 1096, in Tours, he received the golden rose from Urban II and recorded the first description of that ceremony: (The pope) 'was led in solemn procession from the church of St. Maurice to the church of Blessed Martin, where he gave me the golden flower which he was holding in his hand.'³⁹

In October of 1094 Hugh went to Autun. At a council there Philip was excommunicated⁴⁰ because, says Bernold of St. Blasien, 'while his wife was still alive he united himself with another woman'.⁴¹ Philip sent envoys to protest against this sentence to the council of Piacenza, held by Urban in March 1095,⁴² and he was allowed until Pentecost (not an unduly long time) to regulate his affairs.⁴³ This concession by the pope

³⁷ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to the archbishop of Rheims; ep. 211, PL 162, 215.

³⁸ Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin Ms. 11792, folio 143.

³⁹ Ex Chronico Sancti Martini Turonensis, MGH 26, 461; ...cum sollemni processione ab ecclesia sancti Mauricii ad ecclesiam beati Martini deductus; ubi mihi florem aureum, quem in manu gerebat, donavit.

⁴⁰ Mansi xx, 799. Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 473.

⁴¹ Bernoldi Chronicon, a. 1094, MGH 5, 461. Rex Galliarum Philippus excommunicatus est, eo quod vivente uxore sua alteram superinduxerit.

⁴² Mansi, Concilia Supplementa, ii, 131.

⁴³ Bernoldi Chronicon, a. 1095. MGH 5, 462.

was undoubtedly prompted by the fact that Hugh of Lyons, who had excommunicated Philip at Autun, was not at Piacenza, and was in fact briefly suspended from his office for his non-attendance.⁴⁴ The resentment felt by Hugh of Lyons, because of this and because of the pope's temporary suspension of the sentence passed on the king, may have inspired Hugh of Flavigny's criticism of the pope. At Clermont, when Hugh was present, Urban ratified Hugh's excommunication of the king, and included Bertrada in this condemnation.⁴⁵

A charter of May, 1095, confirming the donation of the monastery of Mozac to Cluny by Count Robert of Auvergne and his son William, bears the signature of Hugh beside that of the king and he is also mentioned in the text as being present,⁴⁶ but there is no indication in the sources of what may have passed between them. This is the only recorded instance of Hugh's having been in the king's presence: it also marks the end of his brief involvement in the affair of the king's marriage.

Philip was restored to communion with the Church at about the time of the council of Nîmes.⁴⁷ He was, however, excommunicated at least twice more for his refusal to abandon Bertrada: sometime before the end of 1096⁴⁸ and at Poitiers in 1100 by the cardinals John and Benedict, legates of Pope Paschal II.⁴⁹ During this period of Philip's continuous state of

⁴⁴ See 'Life,' above, p. 62.

⁴⁵ Bernoldi Chron., MGH 5, 464. Philippum regem Galliarum excommunicavit, eo quod propria uxore dimissa militis sui uxorem sibi in coniugium sociavit. William of Malmesbury (RS 90 iv, p. 393) is the only chronicler to specify that Bertrada was excommunicated with Philip I at Clermont. Similiter et illam maledictam conjugem ejus, et omnes qui eam Reginam vel dominam nominaverint.

⁴⁶ Prou, cxxxv, p.342.

⁴⁷ Bernoldi Chronicon a. 1096; MGH 5, 464

⁴⁸ See below, fn. 52.

⁴⁹ The Life of St. Hilary (Ex appendice Ms (a) ad vitam B. Hilarii auctore Fortunato Pictavensis circa excommunicationem Philippi Francorum Regis: anno 1100)

separation from the Church, the documents all bear the subscriptions of bishops and abbots of the kingdom together with that of the king, proving that they never separated themselves from him, as canon law stipulated that they should.⁵⁰ Even Ivo of Chartres, although he went to gaol for his refusal to attend the council at Rheims, always spoke of the king with charity and addressed him with deference, stressing that his refusal to approve the union did not spring from disloyalty - quite the reverse. It was a mark of his profound love that he should try to prevent a marriage so perilous to the king's soul.⁵¹

Archbishop Ralph II of Tours was prepared to crown Philip ceremoniously at Christmas in 1096, although Philip was once more under the ban of excommunication.⁵² Ralph II had been thrust into the archbishopric of Tours by Philip, against the wishes of the clergy and the people, because of his loyalty to the king rather than to the papacy.⁵³ Philip's cynical disregard of even an appearance of conformity with papal authority is evident in his rewarding Ralph for his part in the coronation ceremony by helping to ensure that Ralph's creature, the archdeacon John of Orléans (known as Flora because of his alleged homosexual relationship with the previous bishop) was given the bishopric of Orléans. Iste etenim juvenis qui rege jubente et Turonensi archipresbytero impingente praedicta ecclesiae est intrusus ita

gives a most dramatic account of this incident; RHG xiv, 108-9,

⁵⁰ See Prou, cxxxii - cxxxiv, pp. 333-341. The bishops who witnessed these documents with Philip were Ursio of Senlis, Richerius of Sens, Reynaldus of Rheims, Helinand of Laon, Rathbodus of Noyen, Hugh of Soissons, and Hugh of Senlis (successor of Ursio),

⁵¹ Letter of Ivo to Philip I, PL 162, 15, 27.

⁵² Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Hugh of Lyons, PL 162, 66, 83B; contra interdictum legati vestri. Philip had received absolution at the time of the council of Nîmes (July 1096) but the letter of Ivo of Chartres proves that the ban had been renewed, although there is no record of when that took place.

⁵³ Gall. Chris., xiv, 70B. Quem sibi fidum expertus, ut in aulicorum turba praepollentem et regiae potius quam pontificiae causae faventem, Philippus Turones misit archiepiscopi titulo suis litteris insignitum nec cleri nec populi petitis sufragiis.

est sub Turonensi archiepiscopo sicut puer sub paedagogo...⁵⁴

In this way the king ensured that Ralph II had control over two dioceses.⁵⁵ Ivo, writing of this affair to Hugh of Lyons, told him that the king was well aware of John's reputation and had discussed it in public with him,⁵⁶ but at the same time he requested Ivo to ordain John and then to consecrate him as bishop.⁵⁷ Even the celebrated canonist was reluctant to oppose Philip directly, without a firm order from Hugh of Lyons or from the pope, to whom he wrote also.⁵⁸ He asserted to Hugh that all the clergy of the area were afraid to oppose the election of John, because it had been secured by the entreaties of the king which were, according to a popular proverb, 'as good as threats'.⁵⁹

In 1096, when Philip had returned to Bertrada having sworn to renounce her, Urban II castigated Richerius of Sens and other bishops of France for not withdrawing from the excommunicated king as they would from a leper. He threatened them with deposition⁶⁰ but this had no effect. Orderic Vitalis said that, in spite of the excommunication, because of the tolerance of his bishops, the king's chaplain daily celebrated Mass for the king and his family.⁶¹ Two letters from Ivo of Chartres, one to

⁵⁴ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Hugh of Lyons, PL 162, 65, 84A.

⁵⁵ ibid. 83C ...cum duos episcopatus habere non potest retinere per propriam, per submissam vult possidere personam...

⁵⁶ ibid. 83B ...rex Francorum non secreto sed publice mihi testatus est quod praedicti Joannis succubus fuerit...

⁵⁷ ibid. 84B.

⁵⁸ Letter of Ivo to Urban II; PL 162, 67, 86CD

⁵⁹ PL 162, 69, 88A; ...regiis precibus quae idem valent secundum vulgare proverbium quod minae...

⁶⁰ JL 5636: PL 151, clxxxvii, 460. See 'Agent of Reform,' above, p.

⁶¹ Orderic Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica iv, Book viii, 20; 263. 'On account of his royal dignity he was allowed by the bishops, whose lord he was, to have his

Urban II and one to the Roman legate, John, cardinal priest of St. Anastasia, show that in spite of his oaths the king continued to keep Bertrada with him. His ceremonial crowning at Christmas in 1097 or 1098 was performed by the archbishop of Tours⁶² and at Pentecost, probably in 1099, by the bishops of Belgica.⁶³ According to the privilege granted to the archbishopric of Rheims by Urban II in 1089, this ceremony should have been performed by Archbishop Manasses II.⁶⁴ While never separating himself completely from Philip, Manasses remained a trusted ally of the papacy⁶⁵ and would undoubtedly have balked at such a public recognition of the excommunicated king.

The affair was still dragging on after the death of Urban II and the election of Paschal II in 1099. The excommunication was renewed at the council of Poitiers in 1100.⁶⁶ At a council at Beaugency, in July 1104, Philip, in the presence of the bishops from the provinces of Rheims and Sens, swore to renounce all carnal intercourse with Bertrada.⁶⁷ He reiterated this oath in Paris in December of the same year, in the presence of Lambert of Arras, legate of the pope, the archbishops of Sens and Tours and the bishops of Chartres, Orléans, Auxerre, Paris, Meaux, Noyen and Senlis: in fact all the bishops of the demesne and its environs with the exception of Rheims.⁶⁸ There is no reason to

own chaplain to recite private Masses for him and his immediate household.'

⁶² Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Urban II; PL 162, 66, 82-83.

⁶³ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to the legate, John, PL 162, 84, 105.

⁶⁴ JL 5415; see 'Manasses', above, p. 249-50

⁶⁵ See the letters of Urban II to the archbishop on the subject of the king's marriage; JL 5637, 5574.

⁶⁶ Mansi xx, 1115; Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 488-9; see 'Legates,' p. 218 and 'Suffragans,' p. 227, above.

⁶⁷ Letter of Ivo of Chartres to Paschal II, PL 162, 144, 150.

⁶⁸ Letter of Lambert of Arras to Paschal II, RHG xv, 197.

suppose that he was any more faithful to this oath than he had been to the others he had taken. In 1106 Bertrada was with the king at Angers, where she witnessed a charter as queen.⁶⁹ Fliche declared, on the authority of 'certain historians,' that some time after 1104 Paschal II capitulated and confirmed the marriage.⁷⁰

There is no doubt that King Philip was able to carry on this long comedy because of the support of his bishops, who never deserted him in spite of the exhortations and threats of Urban II and Paschal II. Alfons Becker comments that 'der französische Kronepiscopat, zwischen Papst und König stehend, hielt zwar durchweg dem König die politische Treue.'⁷¹ This is accurate as far as it goes but it does not present the whole picture. It is important that the bishops were not finally compelled to take sides. Urban castigated them for not avoiding the sinful king as they would a leper, but he never tried to force them into a confrontation. This restraint meant that, while maintaining their loyalty and support for the king, the bishops were also prepared to render useful services to the papacy. Ivo of Chartres, about whose probity and integrity there can be no doubt, remained the principal agent of Urban and Paschal in France, although he never turned his back on the king. Hugh of Flavigny would have liked the pope to adopt a more authoritarian attitude, but Urban II was not to be caught, as the more impulsive Gregory VII had been, in a position from which he could not retreat. The whole affair of the marriage of King Philip is an example of successful papal and episcopal diplomacy in the period following the death of Gregory VII.

ooo000ooo

⁶⁹ Prou, clvii, p. 391.

⁷⁰ Fliche, Philippe Ier, p. 74.

⁷¹ Alfons Becker, Papst Urban II. (1088-1099), (Schriften des Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 19/1, 1964), p. 189.

THE DEBATE BETWEEN HUGH OF LYONS AND IVO OF CHARTRES.

Very little is known about the early life of the canonist Ivo, bishop of Chartres from 1090 to 1115 or 1116.¹ Rolf Sprandel² and Jean Leclercq³ refer to a brief Vita of Ivo, written in 1647, which drew on sources then available in the archives of the bishopric of Chartres which are now lost. Fronto, author of this Life, was a canon in Ste. Geneviève in Paris and was also chancellor of the academy of Paris⁴. He wrote the Life as a preface to an edited collection of Ivo's letters. Although most of Fronto's sources are not named, Leclercq felt that the Life was 'solidement fondée'⁵. Sprandel, however, had some doubts about it.⁶

According to Fronto, Ivo was born in 1040, in the neighbourhood of Beauvais, to one Hugh of Auteuil and his wife, Hilemburgis. An entry in the necrology of the monastery of St. Quentin in Beauvais refers to the death of Hilemburgis, mater magistri Ivonis episcopi cartonensis⁷, but Fronto's linking this Hilemburgis with Hugh of Auteuil is based on another entry in the cartulary of St. Quentin. Sprandel maintained that there is not enough evidence to link these two entries and that only the

¹ J. Fronto, Vita S. Ivonis episcopi Carnot., Bollandus; Acta Sanctorum, 1685, Maii, vol. v. pp 248*-253*
Paul Fournier, 'Yves de Chartres et le droit canonique,' Revue des Questions Historiques, 1898, v. xix, pp 51-98 and, 2nd series, 63-64, 384-405. J. Leclercq, ed., Lettres d'Yves de Chartres, in Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen-Age, Paris, 1949. Rolf Sprandel, Ivo von Chartres und seine Stellung in der Kirchengeschichte. Stuttgart, 1962. L. Chevailler, 'Yves de Chartres' in Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique vol. 7, 1965, 1641.

² Sprandel, p 5.

³ Leclercq, p vii.

⁴ Fronto, 247*

⁵ Leclercq, p viii.

⁶ Sprandel, pp 5-6; see below.

⁷ Sprandel, p 5.

mother's name may be regarded as certain. Sprandel also considered it likely that Ivo's family belonged, not to Auteuil, but to Chartres itself. As evidence for this he cited three charters. In two of these nephews of Ivo are mentioned, one as a canon in the church of St. Chéron in Chartres and one as a member of the bishop's household in Chartres. The third charter refers to an uncle of Ivo who had a house in Chartres for which he paid a rent to the cathedral. Sprandel believed that the presence of so many relatives in Chartres is strongly indicative of the family's having been a local one.⁸ Because of the property-owning uncle and the presence of a nephew in the bishop's household, he agreed with Fronto that they were at least minor nobility.⁹ This opinion is ostensibly contradicted by Ivo's own statement in his letter to Pope Urban II,¹⁰ according to which he was non generis nobilitas. To this, however, he added that he was non scientiae dignitas, which is manifestly absurd. Sprandel argued against a literal interpretation of these disclaimers, seeing in them examples of the captatio benevolentiae characteristic of eleventh century letters. Such expressions of modesty were not intended to be taken literally. But in this context Sprandel failed to point out the great distinction that existed in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries between the lesser and the greater nobility. Orderic Vitalis referred to servants of Henry I of England as being 'elevated, as it were, from the dust'.¹¹ R. W. Southern, taking Geoffrey de Clinton, the king's Chamberlain, as an example of all these men, has shown that he was in fact a large landowner in Warwickshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire.¹² This may also have been the situation of Ivo's family. The fact that Ivo became bishop of Chartres is highly indicative of a

⁸ Sprandel, p 6.

⁹ Sprandel, p 7: Fronto, p 248*; nobili a sanguine.

¹⁰ PL 162, Ep. 3, 13.

¹¹ Orderic Vitalis, Historia ecclesiastica, ed. M. Chibnall (Oxford, 1978), vi, ix, 17.

¹² R. W. Southern, Medieval Humanism and Other Studies, Oxford (1970); p. 214.

certain degree of nobility because so many bishops of the period belonged to local noble families.¹³

Ivo probably received his early education in Beauvais and then went to Paris. A document of St. Quentin of Beauvais confirms that he studied for a time in the school of St. Martin-des-Champs,¹⁴ but Chevailler and Leclercq were agreed that there is very little information about the courses of study he pursued there. Chevailler said: 'On ne possède que de rares indications sur les études poursuivies par Yves, et sur la formation qu'il a reçu,' while Leclercq declared merely that at Paris 'il apprit les belles-lettres et la philosophie.'¹⁵ But Fournier pointed to the high quality of his writings as proof of the excellence of his education: 'Ainsi qu'on peut juger d'après ses lettres, ...les connaissances qu'il avait acquises dès sa jeunesse ne lui furent pas d'une médiocre utilité.'¹⁶ After Paris, Ivo continued his studies at Bec, where he read theology under Lanfranc.¹⁷ It is likely that he and Anselm of Canterbury were students at Bec at the same time: he refers to a youthful friendship with Anselm in a letter written in 1094: ...non tamen ideo credimus paternitatem tuam nulli religioso onerosam minus esse memorem eorum quos aliquando in Christo dilexerat...¹⁸

He left Bec to become a canon in the church of Nesles, in

¹³ See 'Suffragans,' p.247-8, where this is discussed.

¹⁴ Ch. Dereine, Les coutumiers de St. Quentin de Beauvais et de Springiersbach. RHE 43, 1948 S. 436. Cited in Sprandel, p 7, fn 18.

¹⁵ L. Chevailler, Dictionnaire du Droit Canonique, 1644-5; J. Leclercq, Lettres d'Yves de Chartres, p. viii.

¹⁶ Paul Fournier, Yves de Chartres et le Droit Canonique, Part 1, 51.

¹⁷ Gall Chris. viii, 1126.

¹⁸ Ep. 39, PL 162, 51. According to Eadmer Anselm became a monk in Bec in 1060; De vita et conversatione Anselmi archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, RS 81, p. 320.

Picardy,¹⁹ and from there he was called, in 1078, by the bishop of Beauvais to take charge of the monastery of canons regular newly established in honour of St. Quentin.²⁰ In 1079, identified by the term prelatus, he appeared as witness to a charter of Philip I which granted an immunity to St. Quentin.²¹

In March 1081 he attended the council of Issoudun, presided over by Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron.²² This attendance at the legatine council is the earliest known link between Ivo and the papal reform movement. G. B. Borino, however, argued that Ivo was already known in Rome in 1076. In an article in Studi Gregoriani,²³ he identified a reference to 'Master Ivo of Chartres' in the Register of Gregory VII²⁴ with the canonist and bishop. This is surely an error. Sprandel pointed out that the man referred to by Gregory was already well known as a canon in the cathedral school of Chartres in 1050, and was therefore too old to be the canonist.²⁵ (Caspar and Chevailler made this same mistake)²⁶

In 1089, Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, for many years in disgrace because of simony and his disorderly life,²⁷ was

¹⁹ Cartulaire de S. Quentin de Beauvais; Ms Bibl. Nat. Paris, Nouv. acq. lat. 1921, f. 1. 12^{me} siècle; Sprandel, Appendix iv, p. 198.

²⁰ Gall. Chris. viii, 1126; Fronto, 248*

²¹ Prou, no. xciv, p 242.

²² Mansi xx, 577; PL 162, Ep. 181, c 183 A: see 'Agent of Reform', above p. 127.

²³ G.B. Borino, Ivo magister scholarum ecclesiae Carnotensis dell'aprile 1076 e il canonista poi vescovo di Chartres. Studi Gregoriani VII, 1956.

²⁴ Registrum iii, 17a, 282, (April, 1076); Ivo tunc magister scholarum in eadem ecclesia (Chartres).

²⁵ Sprandel, p 8, fn 19.

²⁶ Registrum 282, fn 4; Chevailler, Yves de Chartres, 1644.

²⁷ See Hugh of Die, 'Relations with Gregory VII' above, pp. 35-7.

finally deposed by Urban II. Ivo, at the request of the pope, was elected by the clergy and people of Chartres to succeed him.²⁸ His election was opposed, however, and he was refused consecration by the metropolitan, Richerius of Sens, who had supported Geoffrey.²⁹ This probably explains Ivo's reluctance to accept the office. Writing to Richerius he said: ...nec episcopatum nec benedictionem episcopalem a vobis petii nec a quoquam. Sed cum clericorum primo ingenio, postea violentia regi fuissem praesentatus...³⁰ and he referred to himself as irritatus magis quam canonice vocatus.³¹ This does not sound like the expression of reluctance and distress on being called to high office which was conventional at the time.³² He appears genuinely concerned at the hostility shown to him by Richerius which had forced him, having accepted the pastoral staff from Philip I, to go to Rome for his consecration. Even when in Rome he refused consecration until he had been assured of Geoffrey's final deposition by Urban.³³ Richerius was very bitter about all this: most unjustly, as Ivo pointed out to him.³⁴

In the necrology of the cathedral of Chartres the date of

²⁸ Letter of Urban II to the people of Chartres, JL 5438; PL 151, 44, 326A; secundum nostra monita.

²⁹ Letter of Urban II To Richerius of Sens, JL 5439; PL 151, 45, 326D.

³⁰ Ep. 8, PL 162, c 20C.

³¹ ibid. 20D

³² See Gregory VII's letters to Desiderius of Monte Cassino and Wibert of Ravenna, Registrum i, 1, p. 3, and 3, p. 5.

³³ Ep. 8, PL 162, 20C ...cum virga pastorali a rege mihi intrusa...cumque, clericis petentibus et pulsantibus, nullum diem consecrationis meae velletis praefigere, interea consilium mihi fuit electioni eorum non omnimodo assensum praeberere donec certus fierem et de Gaufridi depositione et summi pontificis voluntate; ad quem cum pervenissem ad petitionem ecclesiae Carnotensis apostolica auctoritate sum constrictus et ita in episcopum consecratus.

³⁴ ibid., c 18B

Ivo's death is given as December 23.³⁵ Leclercq gave the year as 1116³⁶ but Sprandel (with Fronto) preferred 1115.³⁷

From 1092 until 1104 Ivo was involved with the dissensions in the French church brought about by the adulterous union of the king with Bertrada de Montfort, wife of Count Fulk of Anjou. Alone among the bishops of the kingdom of France, Ivo never faltered in his opposition to the marriage,³⁸ even to the extent of submitting to imprisonment rather than modify his views.³⁹ His letters to the king on this subject, unwavering in their condemnation of the sin but unwavering also in their loyalty to the sinner, reflect the spirit of charity which imbued his work. Ego autem nolo vos scandalizare vel regiam maiestatem vestram minuere, quamdiu possum aliqua honesta ratione dissimulare.⁴⁰ Ivo attended the stormy council of Poitiers in 1100,⁴¹ where the king and his mistress were excommunicated for the third time and he organised the negotiations between the king and the legate, Cardinal bishop Richard of Albano, sent by Paschal II.⁴² His efforts appeared to be successful (for a time at least) at the council of Beaugency in 1104,⁴³ where Philip and Bertrada expressed their repentance and took an oath not to see each other again. There is no evidence that they kept this oath, but Ivo, like the Pope Paschal II, seemed to be prepared to accept their protestations.

Ivo is best known as one of the most prolific authors of his

³⁵ Sprandel, p 173.

³⁶ Leclercq, Lettres, p. xi

³⁷ Sprandel p. 173. Act.Sanct. p. 252* D.

³⁸ See PL 162; eps. 14, 15, 28, 56 and others.

³⁹ Eps. 15 and 20, PL 162 27B and 33B

⁴⁰ Ep. 28. PL 162, 41 B.

⁴¹ Mansi xx, 1118.

⁴² Hugh of Flavigny, MGH 8, 502: see 'Agent of Reform', above p. 163.

⁴³ Mansi xx, 1184.

time. All his surviving writings date from his period as bishop of Chartres. They consist of 25 sermons, almost 300 letters and his canonical collections. For a modern reader his sermons⁴⁴ are the least important of his works. Five of them are so long as to constitute brief treatises: they were delivered before councils of bishops. The remaining twenty are quite short and were obviously written to celebrate the major feasts of the Church.

Ivo's letters⁴⁵ bear witness to his busy life as bishop of Chartres and as a recognised authority on canon law. They show that he was constantly consulted by his fellow bishops and by the religious houses of his diocese, and also by lay people, on a great variety of topics. He had been a regular canon. As bishop of Chartres he was also a feudal lord and master of the school of Chartres and he subsequently became well known as a canonist and theologian. In his preface to his edition of the letters Jean Leclercq pointed out that because of this wide range of interest and experience we obtain, through Ivo's letters, insights into many facets of medieval life, of religious institutions and feudal customs, as well as clear expositions of the application of canon law in the daily life of clergy and laity.⁴⁶ They cover the whole period of his episcopate and deal with a great variety of subjects. They are addressed to people from all walks of life; from kings and popes to simple clerics as well as to his personal friends. Giles Constable⁴⁷ has commented on the 'prodigious flowering' of letter writing during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, witnessed in the many letter collections that have survived from that period.⁴⁸ This

⁴⁴ PL 162, 505-610; PL 39, 2158.

⁴⁵ PL 162, 11 - 288

⁴⁶ Leclercq, Lettres, p. xx.

⁴⁷ 'Letters and Letter Collections' in Typologie des Sources du Moyen-Age Occidental, Tournhout, Belgium, 1976.

⁴⁸ See for example the letter collections of Meinhard of Bamberg, Lanfranc of Canterbury and Anselm of Canterbury.

increased flow of letters was undoubtedly due to the improved communications of the time and to the awakening interest in classical literature and culture. Ivo's letters are excellent examples of this developing intellectual scope and liveliness. Here he discussed theological and canonical problems, difficulties in marriages, as well as simple disputes between monasteries or between individual monks. He quoted extensively from the Old and New Testaments, from the Church Fathers and from classical writers. This wide range of expertise is evidence of the excellence of the teaching he had received in Bec and shows how far from accurate was his description of himself to Urban II as not possessed of scientiae dignitas. Hugh the Chanter said of him: ...nec alter in Gallis tempore suo melius in divinis eruditus et exercitatus nec fide et doctrina magis catholicus extitit.⁴⁹

He was no literary stylist. His object was always to make himself understood, so he frequently repeated himself and made use of cumbersome and awkward constructions, disregarding the niceties of syntax in favour of clarity and precision. Although he was universally regarded as one of the most learned men of his time, he remained essentially simple and his letters reflect his charitable and benevolent nature.

Ivo's most important works are his canonical collections. He listed the sources on which they were based in a letter addressed to the Roman Church in 1108 and in the Prologus, which appeared as an introduction to the Decretum.⁵⁰ These fontes formales were the writings of the Evangelists, the Acts of the Apostles, the epistles of the Apostles, the decrees of the Roman pontiffs and the orthodox patristic writings. He also included laws enacted by the catholic kings and emperors and, very important for him, laws sanctioned by long custom.

From the early eleventh century the canonical collection of

⁴⁹ Hugh the Chanter; The History of the Church of York 1066 - 1127, ed. C. Johnson (London 1961), p. 14

⁵⁰ PL 162, Ep. 189, 196D; RHG xv, 144; PL 161, 47.

Burchard of Worms⁵¹ was the most complete available throughout the schools; but, relying as it did on Carolingian sources in which the Frankish rulers were seen as the dominant influence in the Church, it was not in line with reformist thinking after the middle of the eleventh century. Although Burchard continued to be the most widespread (and therefore presumably the most utilised) collection until Gratian in the mid-twelfth century,⁵² he did not recognise the supremacy of the papacy as insistently as reformers like Peter Damian demanded.⁵³ The Collection in 74 Titles,⁵⁴ the Collectio Canonum of Anselm of Lucca⁵⁵ and the Collectio Canonum of Deusdedit,⁵⁶ inspired by reformist ideas in Italy and by a renewed interest in the Corpus Juris Civilis of Justinian, all laid greater emphasis on the authority of the papacy; an authority tersely affirmed in the Dictatus Papae of Gregory VII.⁵⁷ Ivo represented a via media between the work of Burchard and these papalist collections. In his canonical collections, particularly in the Prologus, he seems to have attempted to tone down their monarchical tendency in order to make reform more acceptable to the French church, always slow to adopt reforming decrees because of the widespread simony which kept the episcopacy dependent on the king.⁵⁸ By dwelling on the sanctity of the old laws, particularly in the area of metropolitan rights, Ivo may have been trying to reassure these

⁵¹ PL 140, 337 - 1062.

⁵² Corpus iuris canonici Decretum magistri Gratiani; ed. Æ Friedberg (Leipsig, 1879).

⁵³ Peter Damien, Opusculum quintum: De Privilegio Romanae Ecclesiae ad Hildebrandum. PL 145, 89.

⁵⁴ Collectio in LXXIV titulos digesta, ed John Gilchrist, 1973.

⁵⁵ Anselm of Lucca, Collectio Canonum, ed F. Thayer (Innsbruck, 1906).

⁵⁶ Deusdedit, Collectio Canonum, ed. Wulf von Glanvell, (Paduborn, 1905).

⁵⁷ Registrum ii, 55a, p.201.

⁵⁸ See 'French Bishops' above, p. 284 and the account of Hugh of Die's council at Poitiers in 1078, above, p.115.

ultra-conservatives about the parameters within which reform was possible. Ut ea quae usus antiquitatis statuit intemerata serventur.⁵⁹

Three canonical collections are attributed to Ivo: the Tripartita, the Decretum and the Panormia. They all date from the years 1091 to 1095. The first two parts of the Tripartita consist largely of extracts from previous collections, mainly (as is the case with all late 11th century collections) from Pseudo-Isidore⁶⁰, and from the Collectio Dionysis-Hadriana. The third part appears to be a shortened version of the Decretum, probably added to the first two parts at a later date.⁶¹ The author of the latest study of medieval canon law, J. A. Brundage, is, however, of the opinion that the basis for ascribing the Tripartita to Ivo is 'rather shaky.'⁶²

The Decretum is a disorderly collection of 3,760 chapters divided into 17 parts.⁶³ It has been compared to a storehouse of material assembled by the author with the object of drawing on it for a more methodical subsequent collection.⁶⁴ It was

⁵⁹ Decretum, Pars iv, 199; PL 161, 309B

⁶⁰ P. Hinschius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni, (Leipzig 1863). H. Fuhrmann, Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen, MGH schriften, xxiv, 3, pp. 773-8, lists 10 collections inspired by Pseudo-Isidore before that of Gratian.

⁶¹ Paul Fournier, "Yves de Chartres et le Droit Canonique", Revue des Questions Historiques, xix, 1898, Part 2, 393-395.

⁶² J.A. Brundage, Medieval Canon Law (Longman, 1995), p. 38; citing Martin Brett, Urban II and the collections attributed to Ivo of Chartres.

⁶³ PL 161, 59 - 1022.

⁶⁴ Paul Fournier, Yves de Chartres et le Droit Canonique, 396.

probably completed in its present form about 1095.

The more orderly collection is the Panormia,⁶⁵ which became a seminal work for subsequent canonists (notably for Master Gratian of Bologna). It consists of eight books: de Fide etc., de Constitutione Ecclesiarum et Oblatione Fidelum, de Summi Pontificis Electione, de Primatu Romanae Ecclesiae et de Jure Metropolitanorum et Episcoporum etc., de Clericis Sola Infamia absque Testibus Accusatis, de Nuptiis et Matrimoniis, de Separatione Conjugii Carnalis ob Causam Carnalis Fornicationis and de Homicido. As can be seen from the titles, it covers a wide area of religious life and ecclesiastical government. Although containing less material than the Decretum, the Panormia is more efficiently arranged and much easier to consult, which probably explains its popularity. The many manuscripts which remain throughout the libraries of western Europe show that, unlike the Decretum, of which there are very few copies, it was widely known in France and Germany and even in Poland. Fournier put forward a theory, which he stressed was pure hypothesis, that Ivo composed these collections with a view to providing Urban II with documents for his councils in France, at which a great deal of ecclesiastical legislation was formulated. The fact that they all date from the years 1094-1095 suggested this possibility to Fournier.⁶⁶

In the order and method he displayed in the Panormia and in the large amount of material assembled in the Decretum and the Tripartita Ivo may be said to have laid the foundation for the work of the great canon lawyers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Many of the rubrics of the Concordia discordantium canonum of Master Gratian reproduce the summaries of the Panormia and the Decretum as a whole does not differ greatly from the collections of Ivo, which were obviously Gratian's main source.

⁶⁵ PL 161, 1041 - 1344.

⁶⁶ Fournier, 'Yves de Chartres et le Droit Canonique' 397-8.

The Prologus⁶⁷ was written as an introduction to the Decretum. It was the most widely disseminated of Ivo's works, appearing many times by itself and as an introduction to other collections. J. A. Brundage asserts that canonists found the Prologus 'immensely valuable' as a guide for resolving the discrepancies they found between contradictory ecclesiastical laws.⁶⁸ It might be briefly described as a treatise on dispensation. In it Ivo expounded his theory of the imperative and non-imperative precepts and prohibitions. Praeceptiones immobiles sunt quas lex aeterna sanxit; quae observatae salutem conferunt; non observatae, eadem auferunt...mobiles vero sunt quas lex aeterna non sanxit, sed posteriorum diligentia ratione utilitatis non ad salutem principaliter obtinendam sed ad eam tutius muniendam...⁶⁹ Ivo emphasised that the distinction between these precepts could only be made by serious churchmen and he maintained that if it were not for this power of dispensation the ministers of the church could retire from the world.⁷⁰ The theory of imperative and non-imperative precepts was central to Ivo's approach to the most contentious problem of the late 1090s, that of lay investiture. Quod si haec aeterna lege sancita essent, non esset in manu praesidentium ut ea in quibusdam districte vindicarent, quibusdam misericorditer relaxarent...⁷¹

Ivo's views on lay investiture and on the authority of primates and legates as opposed to the autonomy of metropolitans are to be found in his correspondence with Archbishop Hugh of Lyons. Before going on to study the letters between Ivo and Hugh

⁶⁷ PL 161, 47 - 60.

⁶⁸ Brundage, Medieval Canon Law, p. 39. He also comments (n. 27) that the text of the only available copy, that in PL 161, fails to measure up to modern standards and may not be what Ivo actually wrote.

⁶⁹ PL 161, 50.

⁷⁰ PL 162, Ep. 190, 196-7: ...oportebit pene omnes ministros administrationibus suis renuntiare aut de mundo exire...

⁷¹ PL 162, Ep. 60,

it will be useful to look at some points in the Decretum and the Prologus which clarify the arguments used by the canonist.

Ivo was first of all a traditionalist. Custom which was grounded in the patristic writings had for him the force of law.⁷² This reliance on custom could lead him into seeming contradictions. For example, having quoted pope Zozimus to Hugh of Lyons, Contra statuta Patrum concedere aliquid vel mutare ne hujus quidem sedis potest auctoritas,⁷³ he said at the same time that he did not wish to imply that new laws could not be made to combat new abuses.⁷⁴ Ivo could hold these apparently opposing views because of his belief in the doctrine of dispensation which he had developed in the Prologus. For him the salvation of souls and the maintenance of an ordered Christian life were things which took precedence over individual laws. In dispensationibus ecclesiasticis ubi non periclitatur (sic) fidei veritas et morum honestas, quedam instituta temperare debemus ut tantis ecclesiae ruinis subvenire valeamus.⁷⁵

From his belief in the sanctity of custom Ivo derived his determined championship of the rights of metropolitans. In Decretum V, De Primatu Romanae Ecclesiae, it is obviously Ivo's intention to define the extent of the power of metropolitans and the limits of the power of legates and primates, particularly in the area of episcopal elections. Quod vicarii Romanae sedis non habeant plenitudinem apostolicae potestatis,⁷⁶ Quod legati Romani pontificis in causis episcoporum examinandis funguntur

⁷² Quod ea quae universa custodit ecclesia et si non inveniantur scripta vel ab apostolis viris credanta tradita. Decretum Pars iv, 195. PL 161, 308 C. Ut ea quae usus antiquitatis statuit intemerata serventur. ibid. 199.

⁷³ PL 162, Ep. 60, 71.

⁷⁴ ibid. Neque hoc dico quod contra novos excessus non liceat nova promulgare mandata.

⁷⁵ Ep. 214, PL 162, 218C

⁷⁶ Decretum: Pars v, Cap.11, PL 161, 326B

auctoritate eius a quo missi sunt⁷⁷ and other similar chapters, indicate clearly that while the pope has supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters, his legates do not, except in specifically designated instances. It was precisely on this point that Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims broke with Pope Gregory VII.⁷⁸ At the same time Non esse ordinandum episcopum sine consensu metropolitani⁷⁹ inhibits the legate or primate from interfering in an election over the head of the metropolitan.

There is a significant chapter in the Decretum concerning primates. Qui sunt primates, qui metropolitani. 'Primates illi et non alii sunt quam qui in Nicaena synodo sunt constituti. Reliqui vero qui metropoles tenent sedes archiepiscopi vocantur et non primates salva in omnibus apostolicae sedis dignitate.'⁸⁰ Did Ivo concur with this contention, which implies that the subsequent creation of primates by various popes, including Gregory VII, was contrary to canon law? Such agreement would explain his apparent refusal to concede any rights to Hugh of Lyons, as primate, in the correspondence studied in this chapter. When the office of primate was first conferred on Ansegisus of Sens by John VIII in 876 the bishops assembled at the council of Pont were doubtful about its implications. They said that they would not wish to prejudice the rights of metropolitans as defined by canon law.⁸¹ Ivo appeared to have shared this doubt.

When Pope Gregory VII enlarged the office of legate so as to ensure that local ecclesiastical authorities should be directly accountable to Rome, he gave the legates, in theory at least, a great deal of power. Such phrases as 'he (the legate)

⁷⁷ ibid. Cap 27.

⁷⁸ See 'Manasses of Rheims', above p. 268.

⁷⁹ Decretum Pars v, Cap. 113. 363.

⁸⁰ ibid. Cap. 273, 408.

⁸¹ Hincmar, Annalium Bertinianorum; MGH ss 1, 499.

represents our authority over you',⁸² and 'show obedience to him as if to myself',⁸³ appear to give the legates the plenitudo potestatis accorded to the cardinal legates in the twelfth century. But when the pope revived the primacy for Gebuin of Lyons in 1080, he was not so categorical about the status of the primate. He quoted Pseudo-Isidore and ecclesiastical tradition to the metropolitans subjected to Lyons to enjoin obedience on them,⁸⁴ but nothing more specific. Because of this imprecision about the limits of the primate's authority, particularly in areas where it overlapped the authority of the legates, a confusion remained about the definition of the office.⁸⁵ Ivo of Chartres, as jealous for the rights of metropolitans as the bishops assembled at Pont in 876,⁸⁶ wished to project the primacy as an almost honorary function. Urban II extended it by making primates of the archbishop of Rheims in the northeast and the archbishop of Narbonne in the southwest.⁸⁷

In 1091 or 1092 Ivo urged Urban II to send a legate into France.⁸⁸ He did not say who he thought the legate should be, but he implied in a subsequent letter, congratulating Hugh of Lyons on his appointment, that he had asked for him⁸⁹ (although there is no record of this). This is ironic in view of the profound differences between these men which became apparent in

⁸² Registrum vii, 6, p. 465.

⁸³ E.V. 23, p. 63.

⁸⁴ Registrum vi. 35, p. 450.

⁸⁵ See above 'Life,' p. 18.

⁸⁶ Hincmar, a 876; MGH ss 1, 490.

⁸⁷ Rheims in 1089; JL 5415: Narbonne in 1097; JL 5688, PL 151, Ep. ccxxiv, 495.

⁸⁸ Ep. 12; PL 162, 25D.

⁸⁹ Ep. 24, PL 162, 35B; ...Laetatus sum in his quae dicta sunt mihi tum propter sinceram qua te amplector charitatem tum propter communem Ecclesiae Christi utilitatem.

the two letters considered here.⁹⁰

The argument between them was essentially about the basis of authority. The affair of Daimbert, archbishop elect of Sens, who was refusing, like his predecessor Richerius, to take an oath of obedience to the primacy,⁹¹ provided a platform for the two men to express their very different views of the government of the church in the post-Gregorian period.

Ivo saw the extension of the offices of primate and legate as repugnant to canon law and to his conviction that juridical and electoral power was intrinsic to local churchmen, subject only to the apostolic See. He also admitted that loyalty and obedience were due to Hugh as the pope's representative, but he urged him not to try this loyalty too highly.⁹²

Hugh's letter is imbued with the uncompromising authoritarianism which had characterised him from the time of his first being appointed legate. It is significant that he uses the words 'obedience' and 'disobedience' ten times, and that his only quotation from the canons, from the *Moralia* of Gregory I, equates disobedience with the sin of witchcraft and idolatry. It was also a favourite text of Gregory VII.⁹³ Hugh was never at any time in his life influenced by the fact that Gregory VII frequently modified his own precepts when the salvation of an individual seemed to require it. More than twenty years earlier Gregory had advised him that it was better to be accused of being

⁹⁰ The letters considered here are Ivo of Chartres, Ep. 60, PL 162, 70 *passim*, (Libelli 2, 640-47) and Hugh of Lyons, Ep. 18, PL 157, 520 *passim*.

⁹¹ See 'Richerius of Sens,' above, p. 282.

⁹² Ep. 60, 70D *...petimus...ut parcius de caetero nos apostolicae obedientiae vinculis astringatis...*

⁹³ Ep. 18, 521B; *...inobedientia hariolandi peccatum dicitur ...*; from the *Moralia* of Pope Gregory I (PL 76, xxxv, 28, 765). See *Registrum* ii, 66, p. 222; iv, 2, p. 296; iv, 11, p. 311; iv, 24, p. 338; ix, 35, p. 626, E. V. 10, p. 27 and 33, p. 87.

too merciful than to be hated for his severity,⁹⁴ but Hugh had been prepared to suffer humiliation himself rather than make concessions to the weakness of others.

Concerning the rights of legates, Ivo had already raised some of the points at issue in a previous letter to Hugh about Sancho, bishop-elect of Orléans.⁹⁵ In that letter he quoted Pope Leo I writing to his legate, Anastasius: legationis officium pars sit apostolicae sollicitudinis, non plenitudo potestatis.⁹⁶ (With typical impartiality Ivo at once admitted that the extent of this participation depended on the intention of the pope who conferred it). In this letter concerning Daimbert, Ivo again referred to Leo's letter to Anastasius in which it was made clear that while provincial clerics should let the legate know the name of a bishop-elect, the legate should not delay a legitimate election by making difficulties.⁹⁷ It is obvious that the canonist was struggling to maintain the traditional rights of the metropolitan without seeming to detract from the legitimate power of the legate, whose rights as papal representative he was prepared to admit. Clearly for Ivo there was a fine distinction here. In specific instances the legate might act with the authority of the pope who appointed him, but he might not extend that authority so freely that he was in fact acting as pope.

Ivo's belief in the inviolability of metropolitan authority was already out of date. By the end of the eleventh century the electoral rights of metropolitans were being eroded and they were to disappear by the end of the twelfth century. There were three reasons for this. The first was the obsolescence of the theoretical principles on which they were based. Having established the supremacy of the papal office, it was not

⁹⁴ Registrum ii. 43. p. 179.

⁹⁵ Ep. 59, PL 162, 69.

⁹⁶ Pope Leo, Ep. 14, PL 54, 671.

⁹⁷ ibid. 673.

possible to continue to set against it the canons and traditions of the primitive church which granted local autonomy to metropolitans. In the second place the archbishops, in France and elsewhere, had contributed to their own loss of authority by their resistance to the ideas of reform. Men like Manasses I of Rheims, Richerius of Sens and Ralph I of Tours demonstrated an independence that engendered a wariness in the papacy, and a willingness to circumvent them where possible.⁹⁸ And finally the prohibition of investiture undermined the close alliance of the metropolitans with the king and with the nobility from which so many of them had been recruited. The centre of power was being shifted gradually from the royal and ducal courts to the Roman Curia.

Because the office of primate was less precisely defined than that of legate or metropolitan, Ivo obviously felt on firmer ground in dealing with it. He had no hesitation in accusing Hugh of violating ancient tradition by demanding, as primate, an oath of obedience from Daimbert. He quoted eight texts condemning the introduction of new laws when they were not specifically required to deal with a new situation. (One of these, from Gregory I, Omnia quae usus antiquitatis statuit intemerata servantur,⁹⁹ might be a summary of his own position). He invoked two texts which categorically forbade any interference with traditional episcopal rights. The first, Quia per ambitiones illicitas non pudet quosdam...privilegia quae metropolitanis vel provincialibus episcopis decrevit antiquitas avida praesumptione pervadere...,¹⁰⁰ was a shrewd thrust at Hugh without making an outright accusation of ambition against him. The second text reiterated his conviction of the inviolability of local prelates and the sanctity of tradition: Primates vel patriarchas nihil privilegii habere prae ceteris episcopis, nisi quantum sacri canones concedunt et prisca consuetudo illis

⁹⁸ See 'Three Metropolitans,' above.

⁹⁹ Ep. 1. 9, 53; MG Epistolae, ii, 78.

¹⁰⁰ Gelasius I; PL 59, 101.

antiquitus contulit, diffinimus.¹⁰¹ Hugh should ask himself whether by insisting that the archbishop-elect of Sens should promise him obedience and submission he was not violating the teachings of the fathers and arrogating to himself an authority which he did not have. Ivo could find no suggestion anywhere that a bishop-elect should be required, as a condition of consecration, to promise obedience to a primate: quod hactenus nec in Senonensi provincia nec in aliis provinciis antiquitas instituit nec consuetudo servavit.¹⁰²

Had Hugh been more scholarly and widely-read¹⁰³ he might have quoted in rebuttal Ivo's Decretum, V. 62: Quod prius examinari debeant qui episcopi sunt ordinati.¹⁰⁴ He was, however, quick enough to realise what Ivo was doing; 'You are trying, although obliquely, to stain our innocence';¹⁰⁵ but he refused to be drawn into a canonical argument with the canonist Ivo. He was quite clear about what was due to him both as legate and as primate. As legate he was entitled, as Ivo had admitted, to have the name of the elect brought to his notice¹⁰⁶ and as primate he was authorised by the rights conferred on him by Pope Urban II and his predecessor to demand obedience from Daimbert.¹⁰⁷ After the synod of Clermont Urban had written to

¹⁰¹ Nicholas I, ep. 177; MG Epistolae 4, 634. Ivo repeated this quotation to Urban II when writing to him about the affair (PL 162, Ep. 65, 82D).

¹⁰² Ep. 60.

¹⁰³ Gilles Bollenot comments that, confronted with a supple mind like Ivo's, Hugh of Lyons could not be other than disoriented; Un légat pontifical au xie siècle, p. 215.

¹⁰⁴ PL 161, 347.

¹⁰⁵ ...innocentiam nostram quasi ex obliquo tangendo inficere nusus estis...

¹⁰⁶ Legationis autem nostrae privilegio...electum nobis praesentari contendimus.

¹⁰⁷ Ep. 18: ...manus imponeretis interdiximus donec obedientiam et debitam subjectionem nobis promitteret primatum Lugdunensis ecclesiae secundum domini nostri Papae Urbani et praedecessorum eius apostolicas sanctiones recognosceret...

Hugh: Lecta sunt in eodem concessu eundem primatum astruentia Romanae et apostolica auctoritatis privilegia...¹⁰⁸ Because he was involved in the mutiny of Richerius, Daimbert could be said to have been elected for that reason and not for personal merit; he could therefore be legitimately subjected to an enquiry. Hugh was not prepared to accept direction from Ivo in his conduct of this matter, either as legate or as primate .

Hugh mounted an oblique attack of his own by reminding Ivo that he, with the other suffragans of Sens, had been required by Urban II to promise obedience and submission to the primacy : ...Papa Urbanus...vos et alios suffraganeos vestros obedientiam et subjectionem nobis ut primati vestro promittere fecit.¹⁰⁹ Ivo, by encouraging the subversive Daimbert, could share in the sin of Richerius and his successor.

These fundamental differences about the basis of authority were obviously irreconcilable. The tensions inherent in Ivo's doctrines would bring them into conflict with the monolithic structure of the reform and post-reform papacy. Hugh's insistence on the obedience due to the papacy and its representatives was founded on the definition of the papal imperium in canon 26 in the Dictatus Papae of Gregory VII.¹¹⁰ Many writers have drawn attention to the increasing assumption of a monarchical role by twelfth century popes.¹¹¹ From the beginning of his legation Hugh was an early example of this autocracy in action, an autocracy that was in conflict with Ivo's belief in the autonomy of local churchmen.

Evidently Urban II also felt that Ivo, in this matter of the archbishopric of Sens, was undermining papal authority. His

¹⁰⁸ JL 5600; PL 151, 543.

¹⁰⁹ Ep. 18.

¹¹⁰ Registrum ii, 55a. p. 201. 'That no one may be regarded as a catholic if he is not in agreement with the Roman church.'

¹¹¹ See for example I. S. Robinson, The Papacy 1073-1198, 5, Papal justice and papal legislation, pp. 179-208.

letter to Ivo on the subject is missing, but it is obvious from Ivo's reply that the pope had been made aware of Ivo's letter to Hugh and had reprimanded him for his attitude to the church of Rome.¹¹² Ivo maintained that he had upheld the authority of Rome but suggested that what he had said, particularly about the primacy, might have been misrepresented to Rome by the archbishop of Lyons. (Typically, he at once excused Hugh for this: Liceat cuique dicere quod sentit). He offered to resign his bishopric rather than offend the pope but it is clear that he was not conscious of having erred: Malo omni episcopatu renuntiare quam iram vestram juste vel injuste sustinere.¹¹³

The differences between the two men were not confined to the question of authority in the Church. In the letter to Hugh of Lyons Ivo of Chartres set out for the first time his theory of a possible solution to the growing dissensions between Church and State because of the continuing prohibition of the investiture of bishops by the lay authority.¹¹⁴ Ivo's position on investiture was based on his theory of non-imperative precepts formulated in the Prologus. For him the issue was a simple one. Because the spiritual and temporal areas of a bishopric were clearly defined and in no way interconnected, the temporalities of the bishopric could legitimately be conferred on the elect by the person from whom, under God, he held them. It was not within the power of any lay man to confer the spiritual elements. The difficulty in this simple theorem lay in the confusion it could cause. Did everyone grasp the essentials at stake here or did they believe that kings made bishops? Most importantly, did kings themselves believe this? Ivo confronted this difficulty by declaring that in that case kings themselves were at fault and should be declared heretics for their diabolical belief.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Ep. 67, PL 162, 85.

¹¹³ ibid.

¹¹⁴ On this subject see Hartmut Hoffmann, Ivo von Chartres und die Lösung des Investiturstreitproblems; (Deutsches Archiv, 1959), pp. 393-440; S. Beulertz, Das Verbot der Laieninvestitur in Investiturstreit (MGH Studien und Texte 2: Hanover, 1991) pp. 114-6.

¹¹⁵ Ep. 237, PL 162, 244D

For Ivo the evil of the quarrel about investiture lay in the destruction of the harmony that should exist between church and state. Some years later he was to write to Paschal II: Novit enim paternitas vestra qua cum regnum et sacerdotium inter se conveniunt bene regitur mundus, floret et fructifat ecclesia.¹¹⁶

His liberal and open-minded approach to the problems of his time might be summed up in something he wrote to Hugh of Lyons: Neque enim, ut nobis videtur, damnose aliquando rigor canonum remittitur ubi multorum utilitati providetur.¹¹⁷

Ivo had an opportunity to explain his theory of the different elements in the investiture of a bishop in this letter to Hugh of Lyons because there had been a suggestion that the archbishop-elect, Daimbert, had received investiture from the king.¹¹⁸ Ivo maintained that, even if this were true, it was unimportant because such an investiture could have no sacramental force. He quoted St. Augustine to demonstrate that a bishop, being made secure in his territorial possessions by the strength of the king, might reasonably receive the temporalities of his bishopric from the hand of the king.¹¹⁹ It was Ivo's contention that if this matter of investiture had any bearing on salvation it could not be a subject for debate. He derived this argument from his theory of the imperative and the non-imperative precepts. He also made the point that he was to make later to Paschal II, that the real evil in this quarrel lay in the disruption it caused between the Church and the secular authority.¹²⁰

When Gregory VII wrote ordering Hugh, then bishop of Die, to 'make a public and emphatic declaration' that no metropolitan or bishop should dare to consecrate anyone who had received his

¹¹⁶ Ep. 238; PL 162, 246B

¹¹⁷ Ep. 55; PL 162, 67AB

¹¹⁸ Ep. 60: Quod autem scripsistis praedictum electum investituram episcopatus de manu regis accepisse...

¹¹⁹ St. Augustine, In Joannis evangelium, vi, 25 and 26; PL 35, 1437.

¹²⁰ See above.

bishopric from a lay person, he quoted, in support of this edict, the decree of Pope Adrian II at the eighth council.¹²¹ Ivo also quoted this decree of Adrian to Hugh, taking the view that the lay authority was not forbidden by it to invest with the temporalities: ...quamvis octava synodus solum prohibeat eos interesse electioni, non concessione.¹²² If Gregory took this view of Adrian's decree, or if he at any time intended in his decrees to separate the spiritual and the temporal elements in investiture, he never expressed this intention (although there may be a suggestion of it in his letter to the clergy and people of Aquileia).¹²³ This absence of any indication of what he may have thought leaves the subject open to speculation. But Ivo was on slippery ground when he claimed that, as he understood it, Urban II did not prohibit the granting of their property to bishops (concessio) by kings.¹²⁴ During Urban's pontificate decrees against investiture had been promulgated at two synods. Chapter 8 of the decrees at Melfi, September 1089, was 'No priest may, under pain of deposition, receive investiture from a lay man',¹²⁵ and at Clermont,¹²⁶ November 1095, it was decreed: 'Kings and princes shall not bestow any investiture'.¹²⁷ Ivo was present at Clermont and therefore must have known that the next decree at that synod was 'No bishop or priest shall swear fealty as a vassal to a king or to any other layman'.¹²⁸ Whatever may

¹²¹ Registrum iv, 22, p. 333. See 'Agent of Reform' above p. 86, where this is discussed.

¹²² Ep. 60, 73B

¹²³ Registrum v, 5, p. 353. See 'Agent of Reform' above p. 86.

¹²⁴ Ep. 60; Domnus papa Urbanus reges tantum a corporali investitura excludit, quantum intelliximus, non ab electione...vel concessione...

¹²⁵ Mansi, xx, 721, 725; S. Beulentz, p. 10

¹²⁶ Hefele (395) maintained that, according to ancient tradition, lay investiture was expressly forbidden at the council of Piacenza but S. Beulentz (p. 38) finds no evidence for this.

¹²⁷ Extracts from William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis, and Codex Lamberti in Mansi xx, 815, 885, 901, 904.

¹²⁸ Mansi xx, 817; Hefele, 402.

have been intended by the earlier decrees this was unambiguous; investiture with the temporalia was prohibited. In view of this it is difficult to see how Ivo, writing to Hugh in 1097, could claim that Urban had not forbidden kings to invest bishops with their property.

In the whole corpus of legislation against investiture under Gregory VII,¹²⁹ in the decree at Benevento under Victor III¹³⁰ and in Urban's decree at Melfi there is no indication that a lay man might be involved in any way in the consecration of a bishop. Humbert of Silva-Candida in the earliest polemic of the papal reform period, the libri III adversus simoniacos, attacked the whole practice of investiture as evil because he refused to recognise the episcopal office and the property which supported it as two separate entities.¹³¹ Peter Damian also saw any attempt to divide the property of the Church from the Church as schismatical and sacrilegious.¹³² Gregory came slowly to the prohibition of investiture but, apart from his reference to the loyalty and fealty due to the king, in his letter to the clergy and people of Aquileia,¹³³ there is no indication that he saw the property of the Church as divisible from the Church. For reformers the danger of investiture was that allowing the king to appear to take part in the appointment of a bishop could inhibit canonical elections and lead to simony, with the offices

¹²⁹ See 'Agent of Reform,' above pp. 83-91.

¹³⁰ Chron. Mon. Cassinensis, MGH 34, 454-5: Constituimus etiam si quis deinceps episcopatum vel abbatiam de manu alicuius laice persone, nullatenus inter episcopos vel abbates habeatur nec ulla ei episcopo seu abbati audientiae concedatur.

¹³¹ Libelli de Lite 1, 200: Continet autem episcopalis dignitas res Deo sacratas, continentur quoque ab eis, immo in eis, utputa et ipsa a Deo consecrata.

¹³² Letters of Peter Damian, PL 144, Ep. xiii, 221A; Quod si bona Ecclesiae sine Ecclesia suscepisti scismaticus es atque sacrilegus qui bona aecclesiae ab aecclesia dividis.

¹³³ Registrum v, 5, p. 323. Ceterum quod ad servitium et debitam fidelitatem regis pertinet et nequaquam contradicere aut impedire volumus. See 'Agent of Reform' above p. 86.

of the Church going to the highest bidder. This danger had been apparent to reformers from the time of Humbert, who all saw canonical election as the surest way to reform. Their decrees therefore were aimed at removing the lay presence completely from the election and consecration, and what exactly was being conveyed by investiture, whether spiritualities or temporalities, was not relevant to that issue. Ivo does not appear to have considered this aspect of investiture.

Hugh of Lyons again refused to be drawn into a theological argument on this point. He accused Ivo of himself violating the traditions of the early Fathers by opposing the legislation against investiture and he wondered why he, who had heard all the decrees promulgated since the time of Gregory VII, had remained so long silent about something he considered wrong. This insistence on the authority of the papacy was the strongest element in Hugh's response. These were papal decrees and Ivo himself had admitted, even while defending the inviolate nature of ancient rights and customs, that new laws could be enacted to combat new abuses; neque hoc dico quod contra novos excessus non liceat nova promulgare mandata.¹³⁴

In his position as metropolitan, legate and primate Hugh was unassailable. Ivo, the magister, could advise and exhort but he could not command. Although deploring Hugh's actions as legate and primate, he never ceased to accord him the veneration and respect due to his position and he obeyed his instructions in spite of his disagreement with them. Factus est ut imperastis...et litteras vestris per comprovinciales pro apostolicae auctoritatis obedientia direximus.¹³⁵ But he did reprimand Hugh for his intransigence in making severe judgements in matters which were in themselves indifferent. Cum vero ea quae indifferenter se habent in quibus non observatis minime salus periclitatur vel observatis minime juvatur...attendere debet prudentia vestra quid saluti eorum quibus per omnia

¹³⁴ Ep. 60.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

prodesse debetis conferatis...¹³⁶

Hugh of Lyons was in the direct line of succession to the reformist policies of Gregory VII. At the time of this correspondence Henry IV was still emperor and still supporting his anti-pope, Clement III; therefore Hugh would not find it possible to yield any of the authority which Gregory had struggled to obtain for the papacy. Because of Henry's continued resistance to that authority and the lack of any real support for the papacy from Philip I, Hugh was not able to envisage the state of mutually enriching harmony between church and state which Ivo regarded as an ideal for which to strive. Hoffmann commented about Ivo: 'Seine "Theorie" war anfechtbar und belastet mit einer Hypotek guten Willens.'¹³⁷

This letter to Hugh of Lyons was widely disseminated and is found in many German manuscripts, notably in the most important of the manuscripts containing the Treatise on the investiture of bishops which was commissioned (c. 1109) by the emperor Henry V.¹³⁸ Hoffmann¹³⁹ maintained that Ivo's most important contribution to the resolution of the struggle between papacy and empire lay in his discovery of the sententia of Augustine, which he quoted to Hugh of Lyons:

Jure humano dicitur: Haec villa mea est, haec domus mea est, hic servus meus est. Tolle jura imperatorum, quis audet dicere: Haec villa mea est, meus est iste servus, mea est iste domus?...Per iura regum possidentur possessiones.¹⁴⁰

With this text Ivo conferred intellectual respectability on the defenders of investiture. By showing that the subjective rights of the individual derived from the objective rights of the king,

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Hartmut Hoffmann, Ivo von Chartres und die Lösung des Investiturproblems, 416.

¹³⁸ Tractatus de investitura episcoporum, MGH Libelli 2, 502.

¹³⁹ Hartmut Hoffmann, Ivo von Chartres, p. 407.

¹⁴⁰ In Joannis evangelium, vi, 26; PL 35, 1437.

Ivo attributed to the king a dominion over land and movable property, the bona exteriora. As a result, the position of the king in investiture could be seen to be derived from his material possessions rather than from any spiritual function. This shift of emphasis, while doing nothing to diminish papal hostility towards investiture, allowed the most offensive features in the investiture of bishops to disappear and was a major element in the final solution of the problem.

ooo000ooo

As bishop of Die, Gregory VII was not a pope in the strict sense. With the exception of the council of Reims in 1076, his actions were more notable for their disciplinary character than for their doctrinal content. In a very short time his name came to stand for papal authority and intervention in the affairs of a church accustomed to an almost complete autonomy. His title called his claim Gregory VII, because he had a more consistent character than the pope he represented. Gregory was never unaware that, as successor of St. Peter, his primary function was to reconcile transgressors with the church. His High of Die seems to have thought of any condemnation as weakness; he sought always, by striking hard at sinners' excuses, to make papal decisions feared rather than respected. Unlike the pope who appointed him, he was always prepared to thrust the transgressor out and to close the door on him. A. Giry pointed out that the reputation for harshness which the reform of the Church has acquired, and for which Gregory VII was blamed, was largely due to the ambition and the fiery zeal of this pope.¹ In the papal and monastic records the pope is depicted as a man of justice whose subjects were terrified and humbled by his sternness and his individuality and because of this he was called the pope of the sword.

¹ See above, pp. 17-18 where the sources promulgated at the council of Reims are listed.

² Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin, *Histoire de l'église*, Paris 1909, vol. 8, 17.

³ A. Giry, 'Grégoire VII et les origines de l'investiture', *Revue Historique*, 1, 1875, 231.

CONCLUSION

It has been the aim of this dissertation to assess the progress of reform in France at the end of the eleventh century through a consideration of the life and work of the most prominent agent of the papacy during that period, Hugh of Die and Lyons. An attempt has also been made to view his life in the context of the lives of his contemporaries by providing a brief survey of the churchmen who were active in France during his lifetime.

As bishop of Die, Hugh was a tireless holder of councils. With the exception of the council of Poitiers in 1078,¹ these meetings were more notable for their disciplinary actions than for their doctrinal content. In a very short time his name came to stand for papal autocracy and interference in the affairs of a church accustomed to an almost complete autonomy. Fliche called him 'plus Grégorien que Grégoire VII,'² because he had a more consistent character than the pope he represented. Gregory was never unaware that, as successor of St. Peter, his primary function was to reconcile transgressors with the church. But Hugh of Die seems to have thought of any concession as weakness: he sought always, by striking hard at chosen examples, to make pontifical decisions feared rather than respected. Unlike the pope who appointed him, he was always prepared to thrust the transgressor out and to slam the door on him. A. Giry pointed out that the reputation for harshness which the reform of the Church has acquired, and for which history has blamed Gregory VII, was largely due to the ambition and the fiery zeal of this agent.³ In the pursuit and accusation of unchaste and simoniac bishops and in the establishment of the legatine council as a court of justice where suspects could be arraigned and despatched to Rome he stamped his individuality on the papal policies for

¹ See above, pp. 117-8 where the decrees promulgated at this council are listed.

² Augustin Fliche et Victor Martin, Histoire de l'Église, Paris 1950, vol.8, 92.

³ A. Giry, 'Grégoire VII et les évêques de Têrouanne,' Revue Historique, 1, (1876), 391.

reform in France.

The most important thing to be said in Hugh's defence is that he was successful in what he had been sent out to achieve. With no thought of making himself popular he had struggled against simony, got rid of simoniacs and substituted upright men for them.⁴ Twenty years after Hugh's appointment as legate, Pope Urban II was able to make a successful journey through France and Burgundy, besieged by petitioners anxious for the exercise of papal authority. His successor, Paschal II, was the first of six twelfth-century popes who found refuge and financial support in France when they had lost control of Rome. By the end of Hugh's life the papacy, still involved in conflict in Germany, could see a great many of the bishoprics of the French Church in the hands of serious men who had not paid for their office and who were willing to acknowledge the authority of Rome. This situation was not totally the result of the work of Hugh: in some cases it was achieved in spite of him, and some of its successes were due to the greater flexibility of the popes who succeeded Gregory VII. He was, however, undoubtedly the originator of the revolution which resulted in the establishment of an episcopate looking to Rome for its authority.

In the course of his reforming activities his unyielding severity made exiles of many men who, approached in a different spirit, might have cooperated with the papacy in implementing reform in a more tranquil manner. On the other hand, given the prevalence of simony in the French Church at that time, it is difficult to see how a less vigorous and inflexible approach could have succeeded. At the beginning he had been encouraged by the pope to take a 'hard line' with offenders. His career demonstrates the difficulties inherent in working for Gregory VII, who, having encouraged his supporters to a course of action, frequently abandoned them when they pursued it. When Hugh was appointed to the bishopric of Die Gregory wrote to count William

⁴

See Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, MGH ss viii, 413. Persequebatur symoniacos adversus quos ei iugis pugna conflictus fuit perpetuus quos etiam prout potuit ab aecclesia eliminavit et orthodoxos substituit.

of Die nos enim eum sollicite ammonuimus ut contra symoniacam heresim erigeretur.⁵ But certainly after the council of Poitiers in 1078, and perhaps before it,⁶ the pope withdrew his support from Hugh's policies and castigated him publicly for his severity.⁷ His own uncertainty about his standing with the papacy and the unpopularity engendered by his unyielding rectitude allowed the bishops of his province to defy him and to reject the new doctrines emanating from Rome when they came through him. This rejection is manifest in several of the documents of the period. The clerks of Cambrai spoke of him with contempt as a taker of bribes⁸ and archbishop Manasses of Rheims accused him of seeking the satisfaction of his own greed and not the honour of the church.⁹ None of the records suggests that there is any truth in these charges, but they demonstrate the spirit of resistance to Roman authority which was engendered by Hugh's rigid orthodoxy.

Before his translation to the archsee of Lyons he had effectively broken that resistance. The bishops who were sent to Rome after Poitiers in 1078 were reinstated by the pope and Hugh was reprimanded for his severity, but, with the exception of Manasses of Rheims, they bowed to the inevitable. Hugh's councils during the years that followed were models of accord. That the records show that he held only three councils after he became archbishop of Lyons is not altogether surprising. In a sense his eventual eclipse was inevitable because his success made his mission self-limiting. The affair of the archbishops

⁵ Registrum i, 69, p.99.

⁶ Hugh's letter, written immediately after the council of Poitiers, suggests that there had been previous instances of his sentences being overturned. ...quod simoniaci...a nobis suspensi...libentur currunt Romam et...inde reportant quasi misericordiam pro voluntate. Letters of Hugh, PL 157, 511.

⁷ Registrum v, 17, p.378.

⁸ Letter of the clerks of Cambrai to the clerks of Rheims, RHG xiv, 778.

⁹ Letter of Manasses to Gregory VII, RHG xiv, 611D. (legatos) qui...quaerunt quae sua sunt...et cupiditati suae consulunt, non ecclesiae Dei.

Sens and the primacy is an illustration of this. Richerius, one of the last of the old guard, was prepared to die rather than submit to the primacy of Lyons, but Daimbert, his successor, yielded. As an agent of papal reform, Hugh of Die and Lyons had created a climate in which the tenets of reform were acceptable.

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896).

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

ooo000ooo

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

Annals of Hesse, Collectio canonica, ed. F. Theuer, (Homburg 1896),

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 PRIMARY SOURCES

- Alberic of Three Fountains, Chronicon, MGH ss, 23, 647-950
- Anselm of Lucca, Collectio canonum, ed. F. Thaner, (Innsbruck 1906)
- Arnulf of Milan, Gesta archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium, MGH ss 8, 1-31
- Benzo of Alba Ad Henricum IV Imperatorum Libri vii, MGH ss 11 591-681
- Bernold, monk of St. Blasien, Chronicon, MGH ss, 5, 385-467
- Berthold of Reichenau, Annales, MGH ss 5, 264-326
- Bonizo of Sutri, Liber ad amicum, MGH Libelli de lite 1, 571-620
- Briefsammlungen der Zeit Heinrichs IV., ed Carl Erdmann und Norbert Flickermann, MGH Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit 5, Munich 1981.
- Carta Petri Albanensis episcopi et cardinalis Romani de immunitate Cluniaci. Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms Lat. Nouv. Acq., 2262, No. 9
- Chronica Monasterii Casinensis, ed H. Hoffmann, MGH ss, 34 (1980)
- Chronicon S. Maxentii Pictavensis ab ortu rerum ad a. 1134, RHG xi, 216-21, xii, 400-8
- Chronicon S. Huberti Andaginensis, MGH 8, 565-630
- Clarius, Chronicon S. Petri Vivi Senonensis, RHG xi, 196 and xii, 279
- Coronatio Philippi I seu ordo qualiter is in regem coronatus est, RHG xi, 32
- Corpus Iuris Canonici, Decretum Magistri Gratiani, ed. E Friedberg, (Leipsig 1979)
- De Atrebatensi episcopatu ab Urbano II restituto, RHG xiv, 738-757
- Dedicatio Ecclesiae S. Quintini Bellovacensis, ex Vita S. Romanae virginis, RHG xiv, 29
- Deusdedit, Collectio Canonum, ed V. Wolf von Glanvell, (Paderborn 1905)
- Die Briefe Heinrichs IV, ed. Carl Erdmann, MGH Deutsches Mittalter Kritische Studentexte 1 (1937)

- Diversorum patrum sententie, sive Collectio in LXXVI titulos digesta, ed. John Gilchrist, Monumenta Iuris Canonici, Series B, Corpus Collectionum, (Vatican City, 1973)
- Eadmer, De vita et conversatione Anselmi archiepiscopo Cantuariensis, RS 81
- Eadmer, Historia novorum in Anglia, ed. Rule, RS 81
- Ex Vita S. Gualterii Abbatis Pontisarensis, RHG xiv, 73-4
- Ex Continuatione Historiae Aimonii, RHG xii, 122-3
- Ex Chronico Turonensi auctore Turon. Ecclesiae S. Martini canonico, RHG xii, 461-478
- Ex Gaufredi Malaterra historia Sicula, RHG xiii, 726
- Ex Gestis Consulum Andegavensis, RHG xi, 265-274
- Ex appendice Ms (a) ad vitam B. Hilarii auctore Fortunato Pictavensis circa excommunicationem Philippi Francorum Regis: anno 1100, RHG xiv, 108-9
- Ex Chronico monasterii S. Albini Andegavensis, RHG xi, 286-7
- Fulcois of Beauvais, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms Lat. 16701
- Fulk of Anjou, Historiae Andegavensis fragmentum, RHG xi, 137-8, xii, 491-2
- Fulk of Anjou, Diploma, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms Lat. 11792, folio 143
- Gallia Christiana in Provincias Ecclesiasticas Distributa, i-xvi, Paris, 1715-1865
- Guibert of Nogent, De vita sua, PL 156, 838-962
- Hincmar, Annalium Bertinianorum, MGH ss 1, 455-515
- Hugh of Fleury, Modernorum regum Francorum actus, MGH ss 9, 376-395
- Hugh the Chanter; The History of the Church of York 1066-1127, ed. C. Johnson, (London, 1961)
- Hugh of Die and Lyons, Letters, PL 157, 507-28
- Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon Hugonis Monachi Virdunenses et Divionensis, abbatis Flaviniacensis ii, MGH ss 8, 368-502
- Humbert, cardinal bishop of Silva Candida, Libri iii adversus simoniacos, MGH Libelli de lite 1, 196-253
- Ivo of Chartres, PL 161, Prologus 47-60; Decretum 59-1022; Panormia 1045-1314: PL 162, Letters, 11-288; Sermons, 505-610: Prologus, MGH Libelli de lite ??

- John Deacon, S. Gregorii magni Vita, PL 75, 63-242
- Lambert of Hersfeld, Annales, MGH ss 5, 134-263
- Lanfranc of Canterbury, Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium Turonensem, PL 150, 407-42
- Lettres d'Yves de Chartres, ed J. Leclercq, Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen-Age, (Paris 1949)
- Liber Pontificalis, ed. Abbé L. Duchesne, (Paris, 1892)
- Mabillon, Dom Jean, Vetera Analecta, (Paris, 1723)
- Mabillon, Dom Jean, Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, (Lucca, 1749)
- Mansi, J., Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, xix, xx, (Florence and Venice, 1757-98)
- Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Constitutiones et Acta publica imperatorum et regum 1
- Notitia de Ecclesia S. Eugenii de Vianco, scripta ab anonymo Albiensis ecclesiae canonico, RHG xiv, 49-52
- Orderic Vitalis, The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 vols. (Oxford 1969-80)
- Peter Damiani, Opera, PL 144, 145.
- Peter Damiani, Disceptatio Synodalis, MGH Libelli de lite, 1, 76-94
- Placitum inter Norgaudum, Aeduensem episcopum et Cluniacenses coram Milone R. E. legato, a 1103. RHG xiv, 117-18
- Pope Gregory VII, Das Register Gregors VII, ed. E. Caspar, MGH Epistolae selectae 2 (1920-3)
- Pope Gregory VII, Correspondence, translated by Ephraim Emerton, Records of Civilisation, Sources and Studies, (Columbia University Press, 1932)
- Pope Gregory VII, Epistolae Vagantes, ed. H. E. J. Cowdrey, (Oxford, 1972)
- Pope Leo IX, Letters, PL 143, 591-798
- Pope Paschal II, Letters, PL 163, 31-448
- Pope Urban II, Letters, PL 151, 283-558
- Prou, Maurice, Recueil des actes de Philippe Ier, roi de France, 1059-1108, (Paris 1908)
- Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France, Dom Martin Bouquet, nouvelle éd. Léopold Delisle, i-xxiv (Paris 1869-1904)

Sigebert of Gembloux, Epistola Leodicensium 2, MGH Libelli de lite 2, 436-448

Suger, Vita Ludovici regis, translated Henri Waquet, Classiques de l'Histoire de France au moyen-âge, (Paris, 1929)

Tractatus de investitura episcoporum, MGH Libelli de lite 2, 495-504

Vita Theoderici abbatis Andaginensis, MGH ss 12, 36-57

Vita B. Simonis Crespeiensis, RHG xiv, 37-40; MGH ss 15, 905-6

Vita Sancti Hugonis Episcopi Gratianopolitani, auctore Guigoni priore carthusiensi, PL 153, 759-784

William of Malmesbury, De gestis Regum Anglorum, ed W. Stubbs, RS 90.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

2 SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Arquillière, H. X., Saint Grégoire VII. Essai sur sa conception de pouvoir pontifical (Paris 1934)
- Barracclough, Geoffrey, The Medieval Papacy (London, 1968)
- Becker, Alfons, Papst Urban II. (1088-1099), (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 19/1 1964)
- Becker, Alfons, Studien zum Investiturproblem in Frankreich. Papsttum, Königtum und Episkopat im Zeitalter der gregorianischen Kirchenreform (1049-1118) (Schriften der Universität des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, 1955)
- Becquet, Jean, 'La Paroisse en France aux XIe et XIIe Siècles,' Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della "societas christiana" dei secoli XI-XII 2: Diocesi pievi e parrocchie (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Mediaevali 8, Milan 1977)
- Beulertz, S., Das Verbot der Laieninvestitur in Investiturstreit, MGH Studien und Texte 2, (Hanover 1991)
- Bloch, Marc, La Société Féodale (Paris, 1949)
- Bollenot, Gilles, Un Légat pontifical au XIème siècle: Hugues, évêque de Die (1073-1082), primat des Gaules (1082-1106), Thèse, (Lyon, 1973)
- Borino, G. B., 'Ivo magister scholarum ecclesiae Carnotensis dell'aprile 1076 e il canonista poi vescovo di Chartres,' Studi Gregoriani vii, (1956)
- Brooke, Z. N., 'Lay Investiture and its Relation to the Conflict of Empire and Papacy,' Raleigh Lecture 1939, Proceedings of the British Academy, xxv
- Brundage, J. A., Medieval Canon Law, (London, 1995)
- Chevailier, L., 'Yves de Chartres,' Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique 7, 1965.
- Colker, Marvin, 'Fulcoii Belvacensis Epistulae' Traditio 10, (1954)

- Constable, Giles, Letters and Letter Collections
(Typologie des Sources du Moyen Age
occidental, Tournout 1976)
- Cowdrey, H. E. J., The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform
(Oxford, 1970)
- Cowdrey, H. E. J., The Age of Abbot Desiderius: Monte
Cassino, the Papacy and the Normans in
the Eleventh and early Twelfth Centuries
(Oxford, 1983)
- Cowdrey, H. E. J., 'Cardinal Peter of Albano: a Legatine
Mission to Cluny, 1080,' Journal of
Theological Studies, (1973)
- Cowdrey, H. E. J. 'Pope Gregory VII and the Anglo-Norman
Church and Kingdom', Studi Gregoriani
ix (1972).
- Crozet, René, 'Le Voyage d'Urban II et ses
négotiations avec le clergé de France
1095-1096,' Revue Historique, 179
(1937)
- de Montclos, Jean, Lanfranc et Bérenger: La Controverse
Eucharistique du XIème Siècle (Louvain,
1971)
- Degert, A., 'Amat d'Oloron, un Ouvrier de la
Réforme au XIe Siècle,' Revue des
Questions Historiques lxxxiv: 1908
- Delarc, O. J-M., Saint Grégoire VII et la Réforme de
l'Eglise au XIème Siècle (Paris, 1889)
- Delisle, Léopold, Littérature latine et histoire du moyen-
âge (Instructions adressées par le
Comité des Travaux historiques et
scientifiques aux correspondants du
Ministère de l'Instruction publique et
des beaux arts, Paris, 1890)
- Dereine, Charles, 'Note sur l'influence de la règle de
Grégoire VII,' Revue d'Histoire
Ecclésiastique, xliii (1948)
- Dereine, Charles, 'Chanoines,' Dictionnaire d'Histoire et
de Géographie Ecclésiastique, xii,
(Paris, 1953)
- Dickenson, J. C., The Origins of the Austin Canons and
their Introduction into England, (London
1950)
- Douglas, D. C., William the Conqueror (London, 1977)
- Duby, Georges, The Knight, the Lady and the Priest:
the making of modern marriage in

- medieval France translated by Barbara Bray (London, 1984)
- Dunbabin, Jean, France in the Making 843 - 1180 (Oxford, 1985)
- Ebersolt, Jean, 'Essai sur Berenger de Tours et la Controverse Sacramentaire au xie Siècle,' Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, xlviii, (Paris 1903)
- Erdmann, Carl, The Origin of the Idea of Crusade translated by Marshall W. Baldwin and Walter Goffart (Princeton, 1977)
- Fawtier, Robert, The Capetian Kings of France: Monarchy and Nation 987-1328 translated by R.J. Adam and Lionel Butler (London, 1960)
- Fazy, Max, Notice sur Amat, évêque d'Oloron, arch-évêque de Bordeaux et légat du Saint-Siège, Bibliothèque de la Faculté des Lettres, Université de Paris xxiv; Cinquième Mélangé d'Histoire du Moyen-âge (Paris, 1908)
- Fliche, Augustin, 'Y a't'il eu en France et en Angleterre une Querelle des Investitures?,' Revue Bénédictine 46 (1934)
- Fliche, Augustin, La Réforme Grégorienne (Geneva, 1978)
- Fliche, Augustin, 'La Primatie des Gaules 876-1121,' Revue Historique clxxiii
- Fliche, Augustin, Le Règne de Philippe Ier, Roi de France (1060-1108) (Paris, 1912)
- Fliche, Augustin, et Martin, Victor, Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos Jours, 8, (Paris 1950)
- Fliche, Augustin, 'Le Pontificat de Victor III (1086-1087)' Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, xx, (1924)
- Fliche, Augustin, 'Le Cardinal Humbert de Moyenmoutier,' Études sur les Origines de la Réforme Grégorienne, Revue Historique cxix (1915)
- Fournier, Paul, 'Yves de Chartres et le Droit Canonique,' Revue des Questions Historiques, 2nd Series, 19 & 20, (1898)

- Fronto, J., Vita S. Ivonis episcopi Carnotensis: Bollandus, Acta Sanctorum, (1685)
- Fuhrmann, Horst, Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudo-isidorischen Fälschungen, MGH ss 24
- Gams, P. P. B., Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae, (Ratisbon, 1873)
- Gaudemet, Jean, 'Grégoire VII et la France,' Studi Gregoriana, xiii, (La Riforma Gregoriana e l'Europa Congresso Internazionale, Salerno, 20-25 Maggio, 1985: Rome 1989)
- Gaussin, P.-R., 'Hugues de Die et l'episcopat franco-bourguignon (1075-1085),' Cahiers d'Histoire 13, (1968)
- Gibson, Margaret, 'Councils and Assemblies,' Studies in Church History, 7, 1971.
- Giry, A., 'Grégoire VII et les Évêques de Térouane,' Revue Historique, (1876)
- Guillemain, Bernard, 'Les Origines des Évêques en France aux xie et xiie Siècles,' Le istituzionie ecclesiastiche della "societas christiana" dei secoli XI-XII. 1 (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Mediaevali 7, Milan 1974)
- Guillemain, Bernard, 'L'Action Pastorale des Évêques en France aux XIe et XIIe siècles,' Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della "societas christiana" dei secoli XI-XII 2: Diocesi, pievi e parrocchie (Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Mediaevali 8, Milan, 1977)
- Hagenmeyer, Heinrich, Epistulae et Charte, (New York, 1973)
- Hefele, K.-J. von, Histoires des Conciles, 5 (1), ed. Dom H. Leclercq, (Paris, 1912)
- Hess, Hamilton, The canons of the council of Sardica, A. D. 343, (Oxford, 1958)
- Hoffmann, Hartmut, 'Ivo von Chartres und die Lösung des Investiturproblems,' Deutsches Archiv, 1959
- Hüls, Rudolf, Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, xlviii (Tübingen, 1977)
- Huyghebaert, D. N., 'Un légat de Grégoire VII en France: Warmond de Vienne,' Revue de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique, xl, (1944-5)

- Imbart de la Tour, P., Les Élections Épiscopales dans l'Église de France du IXe au XIIe Siècles, (Geneva, 1974)
- Knowles, David, The Monastic Order in England from the times of St Dunstan to the fourth Lateran Council, 940-1216, (Cambridge, 1950)
- Lemarignier, J.-F. Le Gouvernement royal aux premiers temps capétiens (987-110), (Paris, 1956)
- Lerner, Franz Kardinal Hugo Candidus: (Beiheft 22 der Historischen Zeitschrift München-Berlin, 1931)
- Lot, Ferdinand, et Fawtier, Robert, Histoire des Institutions Françaises au Moyen Age (Paris, 1958)
- Lühe, Wilhelm, Hugo von Die und Lyon, Inaugural-Dissertation, (Breslau, 1898)
- Mabillon, Jean, Annales ordinis S. Benedicti, Lucca, (1749)
- McKeown. Peter, 'Gregory VII and the Primacy of Archbishop Gebuin of Lyons,' Church History 38, 1. (The American Society of Church History 1969)
- Parker Mason, W. A. 'The Beginnings of the Cistercian Order,' Alexander Prize Essay, 1904, Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, new series xix.
- Reuling, U., Die Kur in Deutschland und Frankreich, (Göttingen, 1979)
- Robinson, I. S., 'Zur Arbeitsweise Bernolds von Konstanz und seines Kreises,' Deutsches Archiv, 34, 1978
- Robinson, I. S., Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest, (Manchester, 1978)
- Robinson, I. S., '"Periculosus Homo:" Pope Gregory VII and Episcopal Authority,' Viator, Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 9, (1978)
- Robinson, I. S., Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085). Bibliographical Surveys II, Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36, 3, (1985)
- Robinson, I. S., The Papacy, 1073-1198 (Cambridge, 1990)
- Rony, Abbé, 'Élection de Victor III,' Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France, xiv (1928)

- Rony, Abbé, 'Hugues de Romans, Légat Pontifical (1073-1106),' Revue des Questions Historiques, cvii, 1927, 297-303
- Rony, Abbé, 'La Politique Française de Grégoire VII,' Revue des Questions Historiques, cix, 1928, 5-34.
- Saltet, L., Les réordinations. Étude sur le sacrement de l'ordre, (Paris, 1907)
- Schieffer, Theodor, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Vertrage von Meerssen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130 (Historische Studien 263, Berlin, 1935)
- Schieffer, Rudolf, Die Entstehung des päpstlichen Investiturverbots für den deutschen König; (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 28, 1981)
- Schmale, F.-J., 'Synodus - synodale concilium - concilium,' Annuario Historiae Conciliorum 8, (1976)
- Smith, L. M., 'Cluny and Gregory VII,' English Historical Review 26, (1911)
- Somerville, Robert, 'The Councils of Gregory VII,' Studi Gregoriani xiii, (La Riforma Gregoriana e l'Europa Congresso Internazionale, Salerno 20-25 Maggio, 1985: Rome, 1989)
- Somerville, Robert, 'The French Councils of Pope Urban II: Some Basic Considerations,' Papacy, Councils and Canon Law in the 11th and 12th centuries, Collected Studies Series, (1990)
- Somerville, Robert, 'The councils of Urban II, i, Decreta Claromontensia,' Annuario Historiae Conciliorum, (Amsterdam, 1972)
- Southern, R. W., Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, (London, 1978)
- Southern, R. W., Medieval Humanism and Other Studies (Oxford, 1970)
- Southern, R. W., Eadmer: Life of St. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, Nelson, Medieval Texts, (1962)
- Sprandel, Rolf Ivo von Chartres und seine Stellung in der Kirchengeschichte, (Stuttgart, 1962)
- Tellenbach, Gerd, Europe from the 10th to the 12th Century, (Cambridge, 1993)

- Violante, C, 'Anselmo II,' Dizionario Biografica degli Italiani 3, 399-407
- Wattenbach, Wilhelm
& Holzmann, Robert, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter, teil 2, ed. F.-J. Schmale, (Cologne, Graz, 1967)
- Williams, J. R., 'Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII,' American Historical Review, 54, (1948, 1949)
- Williams, J. R., 'The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century,' Speculum xxix, 4, (October 1954)
- Williams, Watkin, 'St. Robert of Molesmes,' Journal of Theological Studies xxxviii, (1936)

ITINERARY OF HUGH OF DIE AND LYONS

Time	Place	Occasion	Reference
1072	Lyons	Election of Abbot of St. Riguadus	<u>Gall. Chris</u> iv, <u>Ins</u> 282
1073 Oct	Die	Election to Bishopric	MGH 8, 410 MGH 5, 306
1073/4	Rome	Consecration	MGH 8, 411
1075	Anse	Council	Mansi xx, 481 MGH 8 413
1076 Jan	Dijon	Council	Mansi xx, 483 MGH 8, 413
1076 Feb	Rome?	Commended for services	<u>Registrum</u> iii 10(a)
1076 Aug	Clermont	Council	Mansi xx, 481 MGH 8, 413, PL 148, 744, viii
1077 Sept	Autun	Council	Mansi xx, 483 MGH 8, 415, PL 148, 744, viii
1078 Jan	Poitiers	Council	Mansi xx, 495 MGH 8, 418, PL 157, vii, 509
1078 May	Rome	Meeting with Pope	<u>Registrum</u> v, 22 p. 385
1078-9	Vienne	Recuperation	MGH 8, 421
1080 Jan/Feb	Lyons	Council	Mansi xx, 551 MGH 8, 421
1080 Jan/Feb	Avignon	Council	Mansi xx, 553 MGH 8, 422
1080	Toulouse	Council	Mansi xx, 457
1080	Bordeaux	Council	Mansi xx, 527
1081 Jan	Saintes	Council	Mansi xx, 571
1081 March	Issoudun	Council	Mansi xx, 577
1081	Meaux	Council	Mansi xx, 573, 583
1081/2?	Rome?	Consecration as Archbishop	-

Time	Place	Occasion	Reference
1086	Rome	1st election of Desiderius	PL 157, 511, viii
1087	Capua	Election of Victor III	PL 157, 511, viii
1094 June	Saumur	Meeting with Fulk of Anjou	PL 157, 517-8 xiii
1094 Oct	Autun	Council	Mansi xx, 799 MGH 8, 473, MGH 5, 461
1095	Le Puy	On way to Spain	MGH 8, 474
1095	Compostela	Pilgrimage	MGH 8, 474
1095	Mozac	With Philip I	Prou, p.342
1095 Aug	Cluny	With Urban II	RHG xiv, 101
1095 Nov	Clermont	Council	JL 5600
1096 March	Tours	Council	Hefele, p.446
1096 July	Nîmes	Council	JL 5600
1096 Nov/Dec	Mâcon	Funeral of Landeric	MGH 8, 475
1097/8	'Portus Ansillae'	Meeting	PL 157, 523, xxiii
1099/1100	Anse	Council	Mansi xx 1127, MGH 8, 487, PL 157 523
1100	Rome	On way to Jerusalem	MGH 8, 494
1100-?1103	Jerusalem	Pilgrimage	MGH 8, 494
?1103-5	Lyons	With Anselm of Canterbury	RS 81, 407-8
1106	Susa	Death	PL 159, 241

<p>Gregory I John Deacon</p>	<p>...Gregorium, licet t o t i s v i r i b u s renitentem, <u>clerus</u>, <u>senatus</u> <u>populusque</u> <u>R o m a n u s</u> <u>s i b i</u> <u>concorditur</u> <u>pontificum</u> <u>delegerunt</u>. Quem ille apicem totis viribus evitare decernens, <u>sese</u> <u>indignum</u> <u>omnino</u> <u>tali</u> <u>honore</u> <u>clamitabat</u>; ...praeveniens quia palam egredi portas civitatis non poterat, a negotiatoribus e x p o n e n d u m s e <u>dissimulato</u>, ut fertur, <u>habitu</u>, <u>callidus</u> impetravit, <u>silvarum</u> <u>salus</u> <u>expetiit</u>,</p>
<p>Hugh of Die Hugh of Flavigny</p>	<p>...ecce personuit ad aures eorum, advenisse illic et aecclesiam qua tenebantur intrasse <u>orationis gratia</u> <u>domnum</u> Hugonem Lugdunensem cameriarum... fit clamor et concursus fidelium, ocreatus cum calcaribus <u>invenitur</u>, <u>rapitur</u>, <u>tenetur</u>; in conspectu apostolicae sedis vicarii summo omnium favore et gratia deducitur; quod dignus sit qui possit aecclesiae praeesse et prodesse <u>aclamatur</u>.</p>
<p>Hugh of Die Berthold</p>	<p>...episcopus Divensis, <u>qui non humana set</u> <u>divina electione</u> <u>episcopus factus est</u>. Quippe <u>causa orationis</u> dum se domo sua Romam moveret, ad Divensem civitatem illic pernoctaturus devenit. <u>L e g a t u s</u> <u>a u t e m</u> apostolicae sedis Geraldus Ostiensis episcopus, qui et ipso tempore eo loci concilium...collegit, videns eum, non parum de adventu illius gavisus est; namque i p s i n o t u s e t amicissimus fuerat. Et osculato eo statim intulit: <u>Bene venisti</u>,</p>
<p>Gregory VII Berthold</p>	<p>Romae Alexander papa decessit. Pro quo v e n e r a b i l i s Hiltebrandus Romanae e c c l e s i a e archidiaconus, vir prudens sobrius et castus <u>communi omnium</u> <u>consilio expetitur</u> <u>papa</u> <u>constituendus</u>. Quo audito <u>sese inparem</u> <u>tanto honori immo oneri</u> <u>reputans</u>, <u>inducias</u> <u>respondendi vix</u> <u>inploravit</u>; et sic fuga elapsus aliquod dies ad <u>Vincula sancti Petri</u> <u>occultatus latuit</u>. <u>Tandem vix inventus et</u> <u>ad apostolicam sedem vi</u> <u>perductus</u>, <u>papa 158us</u> <u>ordinatur et Gregorius</u> VII appellatur.</p>

Gregory VII
Registrum 1, 3

cavernarum latibula
requisivit. In quibus
dum ab omnibus summa
solllicitudine
quaereretur indicio
columnae fulgidae super
se jugiter a coelo
dependens,
agnoscitur, capitur,
trahitur et apud beati
Petri apostolorum
principis templum
summus pontifex
consecratur

Reclamabat ille, et
votis populi parabat
obsistere... In hac
devota contentione
placuit divinitati
beneplacitam suae
praesentiae voluntatem
in ostensione lucis
suis fidelibus
declarare. Nam cum
esset nubilus dies, lux
in modum sperae per
aliquas horas in gremio
et facie splenduit
ecclesiae, quae sic
accendit cunctos qui
aderant et viderant, ad
laudandum
propiciationem divinae
clementiae ut
clamaretur ab omnibus:

quia Deo auctorante
huius ecclesiae,
episcopo suo orbatae et
destitutae, te pro illo
episcopum et provisorem
habituri sumus...
Deinde, cum non ioco
set serio hoc dictum
sibi veraciter
persensisset, inducias
pro hoc respondendi in
crastinum usque vix ab
eo acquisivit. In ipsa
nocte pondus curae
pastoralis
quomodo cumque
subterfugere... ipse
solus ab eis furtive se
subtrahebat, cuiusdam
illuc aecclisiae
latibulum se
occultaturus ibidem
irrepperat...

Sed subito, cum
predictus dominus
noster papa in ecclesia
Salvatoris sepulture
traderetur, ortus est
magnus tumultus populi
et fremitus et in me
quasi vesani
insurrexerunt, nil
dicendi, nil consulendi
facultatis aut spatii
relinquentes violentis
manibus me in locum
apostolici regiminis,
cui longe impar sum,
rapuerunt.

<p><u>Benedictus dominus Deus</u> ...Sic clamores et vota omnium iudicium probavit caeleste, et electus ille, qui nec valuit nec voluit... voluntati divinae contraire, compulsus est ... et confirmata est super eum electio cleri et populi.</p>	<p>... Cum vero ad aecclesiam ubi fugitivus latuit perventum est, lux coelitus emissa super eum resplendens, electum Dei prodidit. Sic itaque proditus, regiminis culmen, quod ex corde humiliter fugerat, dispositioni divinae subditus, quamquam invitus subire coactus est.</p>
--	---

